Chapter IV

Impact of Feudalism on Central Asian Khanates

For comprehending the impact and trend of development in a certain society, one needs to understand the entire dynamics of that society as regards the means and forces of production. Karl Marx poetically unfolds the implications of the mode of production while saying: “It (mode of production) assigns rank and influence to the others; bathes all other colours and modifies their particularity and as other determines the specific gravity of every being which has materialized within it.”

Therefore, if the mode of production is based on surplus extraction relations, it tends to impose very adverse impact on the growth and development of the societies. Divergent theories have been put forth to explain the impact of the feudal mode of production on societies. As per the classical economic school of thought, feudalism was a genius institution in the threatened politico-administrative and poorly endowed technological system in which the lords protected the peasants. This was significant in absence of well-organized markets and state-level subsidies. The constitutional experts, however, hold other way round. They perceive that feudalism exhibited denial of individual liberty in English and American societies. Similarly, Maurice Dobb, Rodney H. Hilton, Robert Brenner, Hatcher and Bailey describe feudalism as an exploitative system wherein the basic

---

2 The term "classical economics" was coined by Karl Marx. Adam Smith, David Ricardo and James Mill were the prominent economists of the said school.
producers were squeezed of their surplus produce and labour; hence, a deterrent to their growth. The fact of the matter is that whereas feudalism redeemed people amid crises, it juxtapose perpetrated immense exploitation of the serfs at the hands of the feudatories. The otherwise independent peasant community was enslaved on its account, which adversely affected the overall conditions of the hoards of tenants under the Khanates. This can better be understood under the following headings:

(A). Politico-Economic Impact on State:

To begin with, Central Asia was caught in a vicious web of political crises during the 18th century. The decentralized mode of feudal governance, practically fragmented the Khanates into number of power pockets held by swath of feudatories. These ran parallel to the state-run institutions. The success of feudal units of governance


depended upon the lord’s personal strength, capability, resources and relations with the overlord, the Khan or Amir. Amir Nasrullah’s reign represents the successful tale of vassal-overlord relationship in Bukhara (1826-1860). Any weakness from either side was exploited by the other to its advantage. Usually, a failing state system sufficed the emergence and consolidation of feudal organs and transformed them into “parcelized sovereigns” in real practice.9

We have ample references of the strong feudal power structures that were analogous to the state system from time to time. The feudatories of Shahr-i-Sabz,10 Hisar, Qarategin, and Darvaz11 in Bukhara and Nurata, Kolab, Khujand, Ura- Tube,12 Jizak, Khatirchi, Kattakurgan, etc. in Khokand, substantiate the fact.13 While thereupon, the royal power shrunk, that of feudatories swelled. Obviously, because of this factor, Abul Fayz Khan (1711-1747) of Bukhara was weakened and virtually confined to his fortified palace.14 The growing feudal influence was correspondingly felt in the royal assembly (jamo)15 to such an extent that Amir Daniyal (1758-1785) helplessly allowed Fazil Tutra/Tura to become de jure Khan of Bukhara.16 In Khiva, the otaliqs (tutor/regent) assumed the same authority as that of the king.17 Muftis and

---

9 The feudatories were required to put certain number of troops at the disposal of the Amir as an overlord and provide him a stipulated share of revenue: Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asian, pp. 25-26, 28-29.
10 Shahr-i-Sabz, a part of Bukhara Khanate, was located in the south of Samarkand at the distance of approximately fifty miles.
12 The principality was located between the Khanates of Bukhara and Khokand. Dominated by the Uzbek tribe of Yuz, it remained bone of contention between the three Khanates despite repeated efforts to resolve the conflict.
15 Jamoe literally meaning “gathering” or “assembly,” was a nominal consultative body of the Amir: Sarfraz Khan, Muslim Reformist Political Thought: Revivalist, Modernist and Free Will, New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003, p. 17.
17 In Khiva, the title was awarded to those wazirs who were older than the Khan: History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. V, p. 79.
qazis were no exception to above phenomenon. Oblivious of their religious obligations, they amassed disproportionate wealth from their religious grants, and, at times, meddled with political affairs of the Khanates. Makhdum-i-Azam, a sufi saint of the 19th century Farghana, frequently recruited Kyrgyz army to attack the cities of Eastern Turkestan. The other sufi leaders like Ihsan Baba Akhund Shadman, established his own standing army (sarboz) in the early 20th century. In sequence of their weakening tendencies, Amir Muzaffar (1860-1885) unusually shared his power with the mullahs of Bukhara and Samarkand.

True, instances exist which certify to the royal will to execute the recalcitrant lords, say in Khiva and quell them with military might. But this was possible with the backing of other feudatories under the normal vassal-overlord provisions. To

---

21 He initially held temporal and spiritual power in the Pamir region and Sinkiang (Eastern Turkestan). Gradually loss of influence in Sinkiang drove him into Farghana where he consolidated his position with the support of his accomplices.
27 The Amirs were abundantly dependent upon the military support of the vassals. Quite precisely, out of the total 19,500 cavalymen, Amir Nasrullah possessed only 2,000 men with him and out of whom only 500 were regular troops (sarbaz): A. Burnes, Travels in Bukhara (1813-33), Lahore: Sang-e-Meeel Publications, reprint, 2003, p. 345; Arminius Vambery, History of
weaken the strength of the feudatories, the Amirs, at times, took recourse to divide and rule policy, and used one vassal against another for the furtherance of the Khanates. The vassals were also used during inter-Khanate conflicts. Amir Nasrullah (1826-60) of Bukhara hired 10,000 Turkmen of Tekke and Salor tribes against Mohammad Ali of Khokand. External support was evenly sought by the Amirs to marginalize the insubordinate feudatories. Mohammad Rahim Khan (1865-1910) of Khiva invoked the support of a Russian commander, N. A. Ivanov, in August 1876 to subdue feudal chiefs of Iomut and Kara-Kalpaks and other restive Turkmen. The above instances of intra-Khanate and inter-feudal conflicts and wars, though rare, suffice their cascading effects in terms of the human killings and their exodus to neighbouring regions for security and sustenance. Otherwise the Khanates, vassals, and their inter-relations had smooth sailings within the mutually settled terms of vassalage.

However, as and when, their bilateral relations were strained, the feudatories encroached upon the Amir’s domain and realized tax otherwise payable to him on the milkiyati (private) land. Further, kharaj was transformed into rent and land ownership rights of the peasants were confiscated in the process. The gradual absorption of peasant rights over the means and forces of production made the lords

---

28 *Travels in Bukhara (1813-33)*, p. 345.
29 N. A. Ivanov was in-charge of Petro-Aleksandrovsk.
economically strong,\textsuperscript{34} whereupon they denied payment of state share to the weak Amirs. This was particularly true amid the conditions following natural calamities. One feudatory of Balkh, Ihsan Khoja, expressed reluctance to remit land revenue of 20,000 \textit{tillas} to Amir Nasrullah (1826-1860). Likewise, while exploiting the Amir’s weakness, some \textit{waqf} institutions withheld the payment of 18 \textit{lacs} out of total 36 \textit{lacs} of rupees to the Amir from two regions of Balkh and Jizzak.\textsuperscript{35} This is not to deny that the Amirs would not exempt the feudal lords from annual tribute or fixed share from produce during eventualities. Yalangtush-bi, a feudal lord of Samarkand in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century was exempted from paying a stipulated share to the state.\textsuperscript{36} But in all cases, it amounted to economic loss to the Amirs and a serious impediment to the growth of the Khanates. Florio Beneveni reports about one Amir, Abdul Fayz Khan (1711-1747) of Bukhara, “The Khan says that he has great ideas but no power to implement them … because of the scarcity of the funds in the treasury.”\textsuperscript{37}

In order, therefore, to augment the exchequer, the Amirs and Khans adopted several measures including, for example, the sale of state land to the private individuals in Bukhara with tax exemption on 1/3\textsuperscript{rd} of the sold land.\textsuperscript{38} However, the vendors were the big landlords rather than the commoners. As a result, the extent of the feudal land increased manifold measuring, for instance, 3,700 \textit{dessiatines} of arable land alone in Zarafshan Valley in 1920.\textsuperscript{39} In one instance, Shah Murad (1800-
1825) sold madrassa land to those private individuals who had no knowledge of learning. To quote Mir Izzatullah about Samarkand, “It (Samarkand) had fallen into such utter ruin and decay, that tigers and wolves had actually taken abode in the colleges … which were situated in the centre of the city.”[41] In Khokand, the Khans adopted a new monetary policy to cope up with the economic crises. The weight of the coins was reduced in the early 19th century from 4.44 grams a tanga/tenghe (a silver coin) to 3-2.50 grams, while in the mid 19th century one tanga was worth 20 silver kopecks only. The prices of the commercial crops correspondingly dropped. In Bukhara, an indigo costing 12 tillas/pood (one tilla was equal to 15 rubles), fell by 11 to 10, 8, 6, 4 and 2 tillas a pood by 1833. The purchasing power went so low that “the customers were dragged by his sleeves and flap,” and trading activities were again subordinated to the barter and credit system.

Therefore, under feudalism, the state(s) was relatively seen as a feeble organization overwhelmed by anarchy, chaos and confusion, thereby affecting the normative political order and economic development of the Khanates. However, the

---

42 The Life of Alimqul: A Native Chronicle of 19th century Central Asia, fn. 165, p. 50.
43 A tanga during 1605-27 was worth 1/3 of a rupee, devalued to 1/5 of a rupee by 1633: Audrey Burton, Bukharan Trade: Dynastic, Diplomatic and Commercial History (1550-1702), Surrey: Curzon Press, 1997, p. 87.
44 One pood or pud was equal to 16.38 kg.
45 E. V. Rtveladze, “Eastern and Northern Central Asia (c. 1750 to c. 1850),” History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Part V, p. 449.
normalcy of lord-vassal relations and the obedience and allegiance of the feudatories to the Amirs, was, more often than not, governed by the ethnic factor.\textsuperscript{48}

(B). Socio-Economic Impact on Society:

Though the ‘classical school of economics’ viewed feudalism as an efficient institution, suiting to the indigent agricultural communities, yet the surplus extraction of gross produce from the tenants triggered artificial food scarcity when there was no crop failure. The procedure of surplus extraction was done through number of taxes/rents/levies imposed on the tenants in one or the other name. They subjected to pay $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ of the yield as rent to the lord for the leased land, $\frac{2}{5}$-$\frac{3}{4}$ for the leased working cattle and implements, $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{4}{5}$ for the leased seeds, and $\frac{1}{4}$-$\frac{1}{6}$ of the yield for the leased money and clothes.\textsuperscript{49} Besides, they paid other feudal levies (\textit{wujuhat}).\textsuperscript{50} Taken together, just a little of produce was left with the basic producers at the end. In the process, they were left with little or no food as is attested by Boris Pazuklin, the envoy of Tsar Alexci Mikhailovich (1875-1895) to Bukhara, “…and over the years very little bread is left in some homes [of Bukhara, Balkh and Khiva].”\textsuperscript{51} Therefore, for most part of the year, the serfs/tenants subsisted on fruits, vegetables, milk etc. The concept of surplus with them for rainy days was obviously a distant dream.

Since feudalism had an agrarian base in the Khanates as elsewhere,\textsuperscript{52} majority of the tenants (\textit{karandas}) were engaged in agriculture and pastoral farming\textsuperscript{53} on the

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia}, pp. 36-37.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Muslim Reformist Political Thought: Revivalist, Modernist and Free Will}, p. 24.
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landed estates of the feudatories. That the tenants constituted the bulk of the agricultural community is indicated by the greater share of the feudatories in the overall land distribution pattern: 12.2% land was *khasa* (personal property of the Amir), 55.8% *amlak* (state land), 24.2% *waqf* (endowment), and just 7.8% was *milki* (private) lands.\(^\text{54}\) This reveals that 92.3% of the peasant population, out-numbering the *milkiyati* holders, worked on rent basis. Living in the countryside and bound by law to the land, they depended on their little crops for subsistence; hence, money played a minor role in their economy. Amid this sort of “natural economy,” the society had two broad divisions, the lord and the servile peasantry.\(^\text{55}\) The former being privileged controlled maximum means and forces of production, and the latter facilitating their job to the effect.\(^\text{56}\) The society was, as such, characteristic of “the White Clans’ (the upper stratum) and ‘the Black Clans’ (the commoners) in the Khanate of Khiva.\(^\text{57}\) Such a division diversified further under the Tsars with the addition of the classes of the *bednyaki* (hired labourers), *izdolshchik/yarmichi* (share croppers), *seredniaks* (middle peasants) and *kulaks* and *beys/biis* (land lords), and *batraks* (landless agricultural workers).\(^\text{58}\) The great deal of economic differentiation

---


\(^{55}\) *Pre-Tsarist and Tsarist Central Asia: Communal Commitment and Political Order in Change*, p. 87.


between the “exploiter” and the “exploited” in Central Asian Khanates, created what Maurice Dobb terms as the “bi-polarity” of European feudalism. In sequence, tenants were reduced to the position of limited rather than absolute owners despite being the basic producers.

(C). Peasantry: Material Conditions:

As such, the serfs had a mere satisfaction from the right to land use (*tasarruf-i-malikana*), which assured him food for sustenance. They upheld the same right while bearing all sorts of feudal excesses. In sequence, a strong psychological landlord-tenant relationship existed, and to sustain which tenants always wished to have a male child to succeed them. Nevertheless, they had limited access to produce, which subjected them to most appalled conditions in terms of housing, food, and clothing.

As regards housing, these were scattered around the citadels (*ark*) of the lords, [Fig. 4.2 & 4.3] and symbolized adobe type of buildings generally made of mud in sharp contrast to the brick and stone made castles of the lords. A thick wall built up

---

59 Studies in the Development of Capitalism, p. 35.
61 N. N. Muravyev (1819) writes, “I have never seen such careful tending of the fields in Germany as in Khiva.” Cf. History of Civilization of Central Asia, Part V, pp. 71-72, 77.
63 Under the feudalism, tenants were provided limited lands so as to produce little lest they accumulate wealth and transcend the serf status. The concept of small holdings was also due to fragmentation of landed property on hereditary lines as is laid down in Islamic inheritance law. The shift from ‘patriarchal family’ to more ‘progressive’ family relations within feudalism was the offshoot of the Soviet regime: Paul Georg Geiss, “Mahallah and Kinship Relations: A Study on Residential Communal Commitment Structures in Central Asia of the 19th century,” *Central Asian Survey*, Vol. 20, Issue 1, London: Routledge, 2001, p. 101.
of lumps of loess mud surrounded the outbuildings and courtyards.\textsuperscript{64} A house had no windows facing the street,\textsuperscript{65} only a closed door, strongly barred at night. The household furnishings were simple. Reed mats were laid on the mud floors, and over these were spread felt or pile-less woven rugs while as in the homes of the rich, the floors were laid with Bukharan pile rugs or most highly prized Turkmen rugs. For keeping teapots and other household articles, niches in the mud walls were fixed.\textsuperscript{66} The other food items were kept in the packed clay terrace, called \textit{aivans}. However, the lack of space in the dwellings,\textsuperscript{67} and poor ventilation in hot seasons compelled the serfs to sleep in the \textit{aivans}\textsuperscript{68} actually meant for storage purpose. For the guest, a single room was furnished and rest of the house was without matting.\textsuperscript{69} Similarly, the \textit{kibitkas} (tents of nomads) were small and usually smoky and meant for multilateral purpose.\textsuperscript{70} By and large, the dwellings of the poor were ill equipped and poorly planned\textsuperscript{71} which exposed them particularly the women and children to many diseases like blindness,\textsuperscript{72} \textit{rishta} (an internal worm infection acquired by drinking impure water), cholera, leprosy, rheumatism, etc.\textsuperscript{73}


\textsuperscript{65} Through Khiva to Golden Samarkand, p. 230.

\textsuperscript{66} Central Asians under Russian Rule: A Study in Culture Change, pp. 60-62.

\textsuperscript{67} The excavation conducted at Utrar (city in southern Kazakhstan) revealed that the main room of the household of the rich measured up to 45 square meters, whereas those of the poor measured 8 to 15 square meters. The usable floor space in the former was between 60 to 90 square meters and only 25 to 35 in the latter case: G. A. Fedorov-Davydov, “Archaeological Research in Central Asia of the Muslim Period”, \textit{World Archaeology}, Vol. 14, No. 3, Taylor & Francis, Feb., 1983, p. 400, \url{http://www.jstor.org/stable/124350} (accessed: 13/01/2010).

\textsuperscript{68} Central Asians under Russian Rule: A Study in Culture Change, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{69} Racial Problem in Muslim Soviet Central Asia, p. 47.

\textsuperscript{70} The Heart of Asia: A History of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the Earliest Times, p. 283.

\textsuperscript{71} Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossacks, p. 236.


\textsuperscript{73} To end the cholera and \textit{rishta} problem, a Russian engineer, Kh. V. Gelmen verily endeavored to drain the swamps, ponds around the capital city of Bukhara as the Amir Abdul Ahad (1885-1910) refused to provide 120,000 \textit{rubles} for the plan despite his large income between 7 to 18
They had evenly the poor diet to thrive on. Though it varied, but bread formed the staple food (ash). Usually taken fresh, it was at times taken days after to make up the food shortage in the dwellings of the poor. Chinese green tea was commonly brewed by all and sundry. Instead of kumiss (a beverage made from mare’s milk), bozej made from different kinds of grains, formed the beverage of the poor. Pilau, rice cooked with fat of mutton, vegetables and dried fruits, a favourite of the well-to-do, was rarely relished by the poor for poverty and servility. However, the pastoralists cherished barley instead of rice. Even the middle class relished it on certain occasions like feasts only. The poor mostly thrived on milk, curd, eggs, fruits and vegetables. Amid extreme food scarcity, grains of horse-fodder, the jogan, were taken as substitute for food by the poor. Poor food apart, clothing of the peasantry was no better. Mostly they put on ragged clothes.

Their material possessions were few and far between, and included simple tools such as a spade (katmen), wooden harrow (mola), sickle (orag), wooden plough (amach), a pair of oxen (gosh) and hoe. Being insufficient, driving cattle like pair of oxen (gosh) together with implements were shared on shirkat basis. In fact, whole Uzbekistan had alone 1, 35,000 wooden and 1,071 metal ploughs besides 337 iron harrows and 12 seeders by 1910. Importantly, the share of the feudatories in the

76 Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossacks, pp. 256.
77 Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossacks, pp. 249-250.
81 Muslim Reformist Political Thought: Revivalist, Modernist and Free Will, p. 25.
82 Socialist Agrarian Reforms in Soviet Central Asia and Kazakhstan, p. 34.
limited livestock was far greater than desired. This is why 5.52% of kulaks (landlords) in the total population possessed 33.51% cattle wealth, while as 49.22% common peasants possessed just 11-12% cattle stock by 1914.\textsuperscript{84} Due to the primitive means of production, the soil was not fertile. The only available source of manure, pigeon droppings,\textsuperscript{85} was insufficient to compensate the fertility loss. Productivity being inadequate, only 3-5 centners\textsuperscript{86} per-hectare fodder was produced to cater to the annual demand of 1,314 kgs for ten sheep.\textsuperscript{87} Many of the pastoralists were, as such, forced to sell their animals, particularly horses in the foreign markets. Eventually, they transformed from pastoralist to daily wagers.\textsuperscript{88}

Consequently, tenants were stressful following damage to standing crops, food and livestock, besides shrunken yields\textsuperscript{89} and reduced crop areas.\textsuperscript{90} Not surprising, therefore, to see them clandestinely migrating to cities, which sequentially triggered contraction of village population. While Samarkand had a population of 1, 50,000 souls in the 15th century,\textsuperscript{91} it declined to only 10,000 by the early 19th century.\textsuperscript{92} In

\textsuperscript{84} Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from the Early Times, p. 69.  
\textsuperscript{85} Central Asia: A Century of Russian Rule, p. 277.  
\textsuperscript{86} One centner was equal to 100 kgs.  
\textsuperscript{87} Central Asians under Russian Rule: A Study in Culture Change, p.62; Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asia, p. 22.  
\textsuperscript{88} Across Central Asia: A Journey in Central Asia Illustrating the Geographical Basis of History, p. 126.  
\textsuperscript{89} The yield in Turkestan was poor during 18th century, say for wheat, the yield was, on an average, 12 i.e., the yields was in return to the seed sown. At Charkhliq (Lop Nor) it was 15, Aqsu and Uch Turfan 10 to 12, and at Bai (a cold place) 8 to 10.  
\textsuperscript{92} The estimate was given by a Spanish ambassador, Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo to the court of Amir Timur (1336 -1405). As per his statement, “… there was so great a number of people that they are said to have amounted to one hundred and fifty thousand persons, … the city was not large enough to hold them:” Ruy Gonzalez, Narrative of the Embassy of Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo to the Court of Timour at Samarcand, A.D. 1403-6, tr. Clements R. Markham, London: Hakluyt Society Publications, 1859, p. 171; Scott C. Levi, “India, Russia and the Eighteenth-Century
Balkh (in the Khanate of Bukhara), the population dropped from 2,00,000 souls in the 16th century to 2,000 in the early 19th century. Similarly, the pastoralist population of Kazakhs in the Tian Shan Plateau declined by 9% between 1902 and 1912. True feudal excesses contributed to the human exodus to the urban areas but it was not the sole factor for the purpose.

Apropos to above circumstances, the tenants presented the view of a poor lot. An American, John D. Littlepage, wrote, “The peasantry (including both subjected and free cultivators) were being dragged under the police and set down as forced labourers.” A native of Turkestan, Zeki Vilidi Togan, presented a similar view following their execution and persecution by the feudatories in Farghana. For fear of their concerned lord, Nar Muhammad Parvanchi, the tenants of Qurama invoked justice while hanging applications (arizalar) on tress during the reign of Khudyar Khan. The eminent poet of the 17th-18th century, Saiido Nasafi,


Yuri Bregal says that only two quarter of the city (of Samarkand) remained un-inhabited during the 18th century, while after thirty years of Burns, Arminius Vambery estimated Samarkand's population between 15,000-20,000: S. A. M. Adshead, *Central Asia in World History*, p. 177; Scott C. Levi, “India, Russia and the Eighteenth-Century Transformation of the Central Asian Caravan Trade,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, Vol. 42, No. 4, pp. 537-38.


\[95\] The other factors were unfavourable climatic conditions, decline in irrigation water, political instability.

\[96\] *Soviet Empire: The Turks of Central Asia and Stalinism*, p. 176.

\[97\] Parvanchi was one of the highest official in the Khanate of Khokand. He controlled three thousand troops.

\[98\] The territory situated on the right plank of the Anger River, the contributory to the Syr Darya towards north of Tashkent. In the Khokand Khanate, it was a separate administrative unit (vilayat) with centre at Keravchi.

\[99\] It was an age-old practice in Central Asia. The applications for justice were hung on the big tress called chihilitan by Uzbeks or ghaybiran (secret friend) by South Kazakhstanis: Ismati, *Tarih-i-Khudayar Khan*, MS No. SPbO IVAN of Russia, C 440, f. 114b: Cf. *The Life of Alimqul: A Native Chronicle of the 19th century Central Asia*, fn. 23, p. 20.
highlighted the tenant sufferings at the feudal hands in *Bahoriyat* (The Spring Motives) in the following words:

“It is better not to walk along the streets of the rich
From under the imprint of my foot gushes out a bloody spring.”

Similar impressions are conveyed in his other verses:

“The sky is like a torso of the bent of old man
World is like a ravaged village
As the people of the world sucked each other’s blood
The ferment is like a squeezed pomegranate,
Destiny took away water and granary from the streams of the flowering garden,
The soil in the garden is like a torn pocket
In this colourful dress the wealthy man is like a worm wrapped in silk.”

One gathers from above that feudal system was detrimental both to the state and the basic producers. For its obvious ramifications, the state lost its sovereignty by allowing the feudatories to share political power and economic resources. While the state’s own resources shrunk in sequence, the tenants were denied their natural right to produce for themselves; hence, siphoned of their surplus as a pre-requisite to their asset building capacity. On the other hand, the well-to-do class of landed aristocracy sustained on their sweat and blood, and thereby lived a life that had really no compatibility or resemblance with the toiled lot of the tenants.

---