

category can be classified as belonging to Patnaik's "top stratum of the peasantry" or "rich" peasants. This group performed some labor, but again its extent varied. Thus, the magnitude of the surplus appropriated by these landowners was determined by the ratio of outside labor to family labor. As for those whose holdings that approached the lower end of this category, they would fit Patnaik's upper-middle peasantry since the holding can be cultivated primarily with family labor and only in some cases would there be a need for additional labor.

The second subgroup was those who owned between one and two *feddans*. This group clearly belongs to the upper-middle peasantry. They exclusively lived off their holding without having to hire out. The size of holding indicates that family labor would have been sufficient to work the land. However, this does not exclude the hiring in of labor in some cases.

Then there were the "owners-occupiers who also work as laborers" with holdings between one and two *feddans*, under one *feddan*, and trees only. Mostly, those households did not exploit any labor but were exploited in varying degrees themselves. It is not easy to categorize those households along clear lines, but it may be safely argued that, as a whole, they fall within Patnaik's "lower-middle peasants" and "poor peasants." Nonetheless, given the size of land for households who owned between one and two *feddans*, it may be said that most of those who belonged to the lower-middle peasantry came from this group. They were primarily self-employed but supplemented their income by hiring out in varying degrees. Patnaik characterizes the lower-middle peasants as not exploiting any labor at all.