

On the Demographic Structure of Hinduism Census in Colonial Keralam

P. S. Manojkumar
Department of History
Sri C AchuthaMenon Government College
Kuttanellur, Thrissur

Abstract

The paper focuses on how the census of the princely states of Travancore and Cochin and the district of Malabar viewed the Hindu population and what Hindoo was in the census discussions. The paper also views on how the meaning and definition of the term Hindu altered decennially producing more agreeable positions regarding the population content.

Key Words: Hinduism, Religion, Census, *Jati*, Travancore, Cochin, Malabar

Over the usage of the terms for identifying the natives, who were non- Jews, non-Christians or non- Muslims, the confusion sustained among the officials of the governments of the princely states can be traced from the early correspondences. The perplexity of the officials with respect to the new categories of identifications is portrayed at its best in a file generated in 1829, in the Princely State of Travancore.¹ That was the year in which the Survey of Malabar was completed. Prior to the survey of Malabar, between 1816 and 1821, the Surveys of Travancore and Cochin were completed. The survey reports prepared by Ward and Conner carried the term “Hindoos” as a term for identification of people who didn’t belong to the Semitic religions.² But in the file mentioned supra; the state officials were using the term Heathen to denote the natives of Travancore assigning the religious connotations to the term.³

On 24th November 1868, T. Madhava Row, then Diwan of Travancore wrote to the British Resident as follows:

The Hindoo inhabitants of Travancore, in general seriously entertain the impression that the Sircar is too much influenced by a leaning to Missionary views, and that, while the state religion is Hindooism, the state is identifying itself with efforts directed against that religion.⁴

It was in the context of the threat from the British Government at Madras regarding the freedom and life situation of Shanars that Madhava Row wrote the letter. In this letter, as has been rightly observed by M. S. S. Pandian, ‘the Hinduism that was being referred to was

the Hinduism of the elite which would legitimise and affirm the pre-existing relations of power.⁵

Census- the Background

The roots of the census in India are to be found in the first half of the 19th century as an expanding foreign government ought to gather information on the individuals and territory under its control.- says Kenneth W Jones.⁶

Bernard S Cohn has described the contexts for the initiation of Census in India and the operation modalities. He says:

As part of the imperial settlement project after the repression of the Indian uprising of 1857-58, the Government of India carried out a series of censuses which they hoped would provide a cross-sectional picture of the progress of their rule. By 1881 they had worked out a set of practices that enabled them not just to list the names of what they hoped would be every person in India but also to collect basic information about age, occupation, caste, religion, literacy, place of Birth, and current residence... The published census reports not only summarized the statistical information thus compiled but also included extensive narratives about caste system, the religions of India, fertility and morbidity, domestic organization, and the economic structure of India.⁷

As can be seen in the discussion on the Surveys, Caste was a hurdle for the British.⁸ It was not an easy task to internalise the dimensions of caste system and its functioning. The British officers who handled the issue of caste were left perplexed. This perplexity can be traced in the census reports. The problem lay elsewhere. It was 'Hinduism' which created problem for the British officials in understanding the *jatis* and their functions.

The Problem of *Jati* and Census of 1871

The non-homogeneity of the people and the deep rooted disparities among them, understood by Ward and Conner,⁹ were sidelined and a religious consolidation was demanded. This exercise was to evade the confusion posed by the caste structure- something they failed to understand- of the traditional society. Ample proof for this attempt can be traced in the Madras Census Report (1871). The subject of *jati* divisions among the Hindus is one that would take a life time of labour to elucidate. It is a subject on which there is no agreement between two divisions or sub-divisions of the people themselves, and upon which

European authorities, who have paid any attention differ hopelessly. The operation of *jati* system is to isolate completely the members of each *jati* or sub-*jati*; and whatever a native may know of his own peculiar branch; he is, as a rule, grossly ignorant of the habits and customs, or the origin, of those outside the pale of his own section of the community.¹⁰

To evade the problem of *jatis*, in 1869, 'The Madras Town Census Committee' proposed a system of classification. That was adopted in the census of 1871. The system was as follows: The committee started with the assumption that the present Hindu castes must all have branched out from a few parent stems; that from the first there must have been a primitive division of labour, and hence of caste, corresponding to the great division of labour now existing i.e., *Professional, Personal Service, Commercial, agricultural, Industrial and Non- Productive*.¹¹

For arriving at this conclusion they have stated the following: In early times as in the present almost innumerable subdivisions of castes did not exist, and a large number were mere repetitions of castes in another tribe and language. Long separation and infrequent communication have led to insulation so complete that former union is forgotten and intermarriage is prohibited. Another very large aggregate of the population has sprung from a few root castes, simply because of local variations in the mode of labour. Length of time has fossilized minute changes, and new castes have grown up. These also, from an ethnic and social point of view, remain one and the same caste. Not questioning any of these, and keeping all these in mind, the Madras Town Census Committee accepted the divisions of Hindu Community as (1) *Brahmanas*(2) *Kshathriyas*(3) *Vaisyas*(4) *Sudras* and (5) *Out-Castes*.¹²

But when the returns of the census were filed and the Census report was compiled, there were alterations. The census report of Madras Presidency 1871, prepared by W R Cornish, puts it as follows:

The Hindu Religionists have been arranged under four classes in the census return:- First: The Worshippers of Siva- Sivaitees; Second: The worshippers of Vishnu and his incarnations- Vishnavaites; Third: The Worshippers of Lingam- Lingayets; Fourth: Other persons whose religious faith was undefined in the returns- Other Hindus. Aggregate numbers under these respective heads are: Sivaitees- 16159610; Vishnavaites: 11657311; Lingayets: 154989 and Other Hindus: 892068.¹³

It is also appended in this portion that these numbers “include a number of Hill Tribes of the Northern Districts of whom no information as to religious profession was obtainable”

It is clear from the above quoted report that the religion Hinduism, as internalised by the Census committee, lacks clarity. The historically warring or conflicting belief systems or the followers of these belief systems of South India were knotted together by the census committee as a single religion lacked logic. The height of this illogical act is illustrated while interpreting the data. It says:

If two maps were drawn to represent the geographical distribution of the **two great religious divisions** (stress added) of Hindus in Southern India, we should have to shade the extreme south and west with the darkest colour to represent the Sivaite sects, the Northern Tamil and Southern Telugu districts with a medium tint and light shading for the districts known as Northern Circars. To depict with the distribution of Vishnavaites, the process would be reversed, we should paint the Northern Circars in the blackest of the tints and diminish the intensity of colouring towards the extreme south which should be the lightest shade of all.¹⁴

From this reference made in the Census report, it is clear that the British were consolidating distinct belief streams in South India as Hinduism. The above quoted sentences reveal the concentration of sectarian identities- Sivaite and Vishnavaites in different regions of Southern India. The loci of concentration of other sects referred in the report as constituent part of the Hinduism traces Karnataka and adjacent regions to Lingayats. Other Hindus were a genre in the population of South India, who were not able to fix them as a believer of above three sects. This, as stated in the report, has included a number of Hill Tribes of the Northern Districts from whom no information about their religious practices was obtained.

The total subscription of the Census committee to the Brahmanical knowledge and social conceptions was attested by Dr. Cornish while explaining the logic of the approach to the religion. Relying upon ‘H H Wilson’s lectures delivered before the University of Oxford- On the Religious Practices and Opinions of the Hindus’ and on Abbe Dubois’ comments on Brahmanical texts, the thesis of C. P. Brown and A.C. Burnell, regarding the conceptual borrowing among the Lingayats from Syrian Christian traditions, and attempting to stream in various traditions of animism, Aryan influence, aboriginal belief systems, Bhuta Worship traditions, etc., Dr. Cornish have attempted to build up a History for Hinduism in his report-

though he apologetically states, “A census report is scarcely the place for a dissertation on religious persuasions of the people”¹⁵.

The religious situation of Hinduism in south India and the population content in it were not conforming to the scholarship of the Census Committee and its head, Dr. W. R. Cornish. He has given a brief statement with respect to the population content of Hindu Religion in Southern India. He writes:

The people classed as Hindus comprise about 92.3% of the whole population. The term ‘Hindu’ includes all the aboriginal and mountain tribes, whether they have caste distinctions or not. Particularly it is impossible to tell in what degree the people of Southern India are of Aryan extraction. The bulk of the people, whether of the hills or plains, are manifestly non- Aryan.¹⁶

This clearly indicates that Dr. Cornish had a strong conviction regarding the Aryan affiliations and affinities to Hinduism. It was based on the sources upon which they relied to approach the society.

Indology and Critiques: the Knowledge Base of Hinduism

Let us look into the base knowledge upon which the census committee relied upon to divide the society on the lines of Vaishnavites, Saivaites, Lingayats and Other Hindus. We can easily trace the scholastic contribution of H. H. Wilson in the formulation of these divisions, as has been attested by Dr. Cornish himself. His works on Hinduism- *Essays and Lectures on the Religions of the Hindus*¹⁷ - which were very popular by the time of census has divided the Hindus’ religions in the same manner. In the first volume of his work, the III Section is the ‘Present Division of the Hindus’. The divisions are figured out as Vaishnavas, Saivas, Saktas, Miscellaneous Sects, etc.¹⁸

The general attitude of the British regarding the Hinduism which brood up from the Indological studies has been summed up by Monier Monier Williams. He says:

The question then arises how such differences of race, language, and social usages have affected religious creed. It is remarkable that with all their diversities the Hindu populations throughout India have a religious faith which, preserved as it is in one language and one literature, furnishes a good evidence of the original unity of the Indo-Aryan immigrants, while it faithfully reflects the present diversified character of the vast country in which it prevails. It is a creed based on an original, simple, pantheistic doctrine, but

branching out into an endless variety of polytheistic superstitions... so has this pantheistic creed rooted itself firmly in the Hindu mind, and spread its ramifications so luxuriantly that the simplicity of its root-dogma is lost in an exuberant outgrowth of monstrous mythology.¹⁹

This attitude towards Hinduism was not same in all reports of the census with respect to the 1871 census. There were attempts to attain a logical footing even in the notoriously illogical contexts. Let us look how the Census report from the Native State of Cochin addressed this issue.²⁰ It was prepared by/under the guidance of the then *DiwanPeishkar* , A. Sankariah, of Cochin.

The God of the Hindu is 'He whom the mind alone can perceive, whose essence eludes the external organs, who has no visible parts, who exists from eternity, even He the soul of all beings whom no being can comprehend.'

The four pure Hindu castes represent the original stock of the human family, gifted with the Sanskrit speech and the Vedic revelation; for the preservation of the purity of which the Brahman priesthood was consecrated at the very commencement..... The holy rites of Hinduism have for their object the propitiation of the Gods and the manes and the removal of the seminal and uterine taints.... The Hindu sects are known as (1) the Saivaites who worship the destructive power personated in Siva above all the other manifestations of the supreme one and who are most numerous in the extreme south and west of India. (2) the Vaishnavaits who assert that the preserver is Vishnu; himself and before and above the other persons of the Trinity; (3) The *Adwaitas* who do not draw any lines of difference between the persons of Vishnu and Siva, but worship them as equals and one, and recognize the caste system as the cheapest and most efficient way of preserving purity of race and of religion; (4) the Lingayats or followers of Basava who are now almost confined to Mysore and who ignoring the trinity and caste distinctions altogether and wearing the lingam or the image of Siva as the one God, may be called the puritans of Saiva Religion; and (5) the Chaitanya sect of Vaishnavites as infatuated in favour of Vishnu as the Lingayets in favour of Siva and represented in the South by the Sanatani families of Eastern coast.²¹

The Cochin State census report was bringing some logical alterations in the modalities suggested by the Madras Presidency Census committee.

But these shifts and divertive tendencies were not without some serious trap pits in it. These pits begin and end in the attempt to build racial definitions to Hinduism. The report claims of the 'four pure Hindu castes' which represents the 'original stock of the human family'. This in a way was an attempt to carve out a racial explanation for Hinduism. The report attempts to bridge the 'pure Hindu castes' with 'original stock of Human family'. It also tends to qualify these 'pure Human castes' who are representatives of the 'original stock' among Humans with the gifts of 'Sanskrit speech and the Vedic revelation'. Another interesting feature which can be traced in Cochin Census report prepared by Sankariah is the attempt to build in the caste system as integral part of Hinduism. In other words it was declaring that Hinduism, whatever it is, have no existence without caste system built into it. Twice this position was emphasized in the report- first by stating 'the four pure castes represent the original stock of the human family' and second by stating that the Adwaitas 'recognize the caste system as the cheapest and most efficient way of preserving purity of race and of religion'. Apart from these, Sankariah was making temples as the centers of Hindu religious experiences.²² Thus the idea of, who the Hindus are or what constitutes the Hindu population is cleverly defined in this report. According to this report, those who are enjoying Varna status (Four pure castes representing the original stock of Human family); using Sanskrit as their language; who have the exposure to Vedic knowledge and have access to temples are Hindus.

In other words, it was suggesting something which was not printed out by the Madras Census Committee. Sankariah, in his report did not incorporate the other hindus, as has been done in Malabar²³ (incorporated in Madras Presidency report). Instead, he was stressing on the importance of Gods in Hindu religion. In the report he says:

Hinduism... consider God as the source of matter and spirit only and less potent and benevolent beings as the immediate governors of the world; and which recognize primordial types of the existing species, and genera in the animal and vegetable kingdoms.²⁴

His classification of the components of Hinduism is God oriented in which each division is seen as a religion. Twice he has used the term 'Religion' when explaining divisions- while explaining Adwaita and Lingayat- to explain and mean each division is a Religion. Thus

according to the Cochin Census Report 1875, Saiva sect is a Religion- so Vaishnavism too is a religion. Adwaita too was seen in it as a religion where as Lingayat and Chaitanya sects were seen as puritan movements within Saiva and Vaishnava religions.

By equating Lingayat and Chaitanya Sects with Puritan Movements²⁵, Sankariah was giving an eye opener to the British administrators by alienating their own social experience and historical knowledge with the Indian experience and thus throwing light on, what the religion in Cochin was.

Thus in the Census report of Cochin 1875, A Sankariah was attempting to redraft the definition laid by the Madras Census Committee regarding the schema of population content of Hinduism and to break up with it by suggesting a new schema, which incorporated into it the entire weight of casteism. Thus the Cochin census report saw Hinduism as a conglomeration of several religions which subscribed to Vedic knowledge; used Sanskrit as their language and had Gods and temples as the center of the religion. In other words, this was a way to define Hinduism as upper caste business.

Census Reports of 1881

The approach to Hinduism got altered in the Imperial Census of 1881. The 1871 census norms designed to find Hindus by searching Saivites, Vaishnavites, Lingayats and Other Hindus were altered and fresh tools were implemented. The Madras presidency census report has presented the matter as follows:

In the religion table there is no division of Hindu sect as Vaishnavite, Saivite and Lingayet as in 1871, but the classification is partially preserved in the returns for caste. The value of returns under these heads is open to question. The major heads are of course the worshippers of Vishnu and those of Siva. But a Hindu sect classification which takes on account of Madhvas, Smartas and Satanis can hardly be of sufficient accuracy for scientific use. These names were, in many cases, entered in the schedules, but in tabulation they were treated as caste distinctions, not as sectarian separations.²⁶

The report has also attempted to distance it from the 1871 conceptualisation of Hinduism by giving weight to the non- conformity of Hinduism to a religion or a race, and giving it an entirely new dimension of a Socio- Political classification, which sounded a serious shift from the Wilson- Williams paradigm²⁷ of Indological Hinduism. It says:

As good deal, might be said, as to the propriety of the use of the word 'Hindu' as a religious classification when applied to the mass of the Southern Indian population. Regarded as a definition of religion or even as a race, it is more liberal than accurate. From the point of view of race, it groups together such widely distinct peoples as true Aryan Brahmans and the few Kshatriyas we possess with the Vellalas and Kallars of the South, the Nairs of the west and the aboriginal tribes of the Southern Hill sides. As a religious classification, it lumps the purest surviving forms of Vedic belief with the demon worshippers of Tinnevely and South Canara. On the other hand, if it conveys no very distinct idea of a Race limitation or a Religious group, it serves fairly as a Socio- Political classification, since it treats as a whole the people who recognize caste, and who are governed by one form or other of Hindu law.²⁸

The Madras Presidency census report of 1881 was an attempt to comprehend the fallacies incorporated in the 1871 census. It was an attempt to bring a decisive break with the scholarship of Indological Hinduism. The rejection of the racial and religious connotations assigned to, in the term was rejected in this report. As can be seen from the above quoted passage, in the census report there was a fresh attempt to see Hinduism as a Socio- Political classification. An interesting development in the 1881 report is that it attempted to build Hinduism in its casteist paradigm as was suggested by A. Sankariah in the Cochin State Census Report 1875, but with a difference that the entire population who conforms to caste norms and submit to it were incorporated into Hinduism.

Census Reports of 1891

The discussion on Hinduism in Census report of 1891 starts with the following remarks:

The difficulty of obtaining a satisfactory definition of Hinduism was discussed at length in the reports on the Census of 1881, but no satisfactory solution was arrived at. In the Punjab, "Every native who, was unable to define his creed or described it by any other name than that of some recognized religion or the sect of some such religion, was held to be Hindu." and similar rule was adopted in the North West provinces. This, of course, would bring all the so called Animistic hill tribes under the head of the Hindus, and the only way to avoid their inclusion is to assert that a person is of the Hindu religion if he

worships any of the recognized gods of the Hindu Pantheon. This solution leaves much to be desired, but in practice these would be no difficulty, so far as this presidency is concerned, in deciding whether any particular deity was or was not a member of the Hindu pantheon.... But the ordinary villager thinks that these august deities concern themselves but little with his affairs and his real worship is paid to Mariamman, the dread goddess of smallpox and cholera, and to the special goddess of his village.²⁹

Relying on the researches of Bishop Robert Caldwell and quoting richly from his article, 'On Demonolatry in Southern India', Tuart has analysed the nature of belief systems. He says:

The devils and tutelary deities... are believed in by all classes of Hindus, from the Brahman downwards. A Brahman, it is true, will not attend the festivals of the village goddess, but if misfortune befall him he will send an offering of grain and fruit, though not an animal for sacrifice. His belief in the *puranic* gods is more real than that of the ordinary cultivator, but both alike ascribe misfortunes to devils and small pox to *Mariamamma* and the difference in their religious ideas is one of degree and not of kind. **The Hindu Religion is, in fact, a mixture of Brahmanical and aboriginal beliefs**, (emphasis added) and the position which either holds in the religion of any particular caste varies with the position of the caste.³⁰

The shift in the positions from Aryan and Brahmanic encoding of Hinduism proposed by the Indological Hinduism to 'a mixture of Brahmanical and aboriginal beliefs' is a leap in the attempts to define not only the ideology of Hinduism but also the population base.

The futility of this approach has been pronounced by C. Achyutha Menon, the Superintendent of Census Operations, State of Cochin. He says:

The term Hindu is of the vaguest possible description..... As a religious classification, it lumps together the most discordant elements- the pantheism of the cultured Brahmins, the polytheism of the matter of fact Sudras, the demonolatry of the low castes and the fetichism of the hill tribes. Viewed in the light of Race again, it groups the Aryans with several non- Aryan races- the Aryan immigrants from the North with the Dravidian settlers of South India and the aboriginal tribes of the hill sides. The term is, however, a convenient one and easily understood as distinguishing a particular section of

the world's population, though it is difficult to point out the universal characteristic connoted by the term, unless it be the recognition of caste as a socio- religious institution.

The Hindus of Cochin are returned as belonging to one or other of distinct sects.³¹ But **the great majority of the Hindus of Cochin are ignorant of the very name of the great Hindu sects** (emphasis added). But enumerators were instructed not to leave the column unfilled, so that Saivism, Vaishnavism etc. were indiscriminately pressed into the service of even such people as the Kadars and the Pulayars, who are quite innocent of the worship of either Siva or Vishnu. Those who had the good sense to say they worshipped both Siva and Vishnu were returned as Smarthas, while a good many others had their religious denomination coloured by the God to whom the neighbouring temple was dedicated. It is clear therefore what value can be attached to returns of this nature....³²

What C. AchyuthaMenon has written, portrays the real situation of the knowledge of the people regarding Hinduism. The natives were ignorant of 'the great Hindu sects', which were conceived by the British administrators because these categories did not confirm to the everyday lives of the natives. The belief in a Brahmanical god- may it be Siva, Vishnu or anyone in the pantheon- was mandatory to be a Hindu. The report attests that the vast majority of people who were polytheists filed the returns according to their whims and fancies relying on personal likes and dislikes are attested by the report. The lack of genuineness of the Census is evident from the inclusion of the aboriginals and Pulayas who were not the subscribers to their beliefs in Siva and Vishnu as Saivites and Vaishnavites. AchuthaMenon's report explicitly pronounced the bogus nature of the 'Hinduism'. He was not willing to construct the enumeration documents as per the dictates of the British administrators. According to him, those categories suggested by the British were neither according to the belief systems nor conforming to the everyday lives of different sections of society. The report expressed the frustration and intolerance in accommodating the diverse segments of the society, which were hitherto denied common social platforms ideologically and pragmatically, into Hinduism; the criticism raised was relevant from the point of everyday life situations and experiences. Hinduism, according to AchyuthaMenon, is relevant in the sense that it acts as a 'convenient term' to denote 'a particular section of the world's

population'. This attitude is clearly a rejection of the scholastic, administrative and native attempts to accord a racial and religious status to the term, Hinduism. It sees in Hinduism nothing more than a term representing the people of a peculiar portion of world. Further, by saying "it is difficult to point out the universal characteristic connoted by the term, unless it be the recognition of caste as a socio- religious institution", AchyuthaMenon like A. Sankariah, his predecessor in the post, was asserting the importance of caste system rather than the use of this 'convenient term' in representing the society of Cochin State.

Through this report C. AchyuthaMenon was registering the dissent to the framing up of Hinduism as per the dictates of the British, which in every sense did not conform to the everyday life experience of people.

The report from Travancore states the following:

The value of the returns under these heads is open to question. The major sects are of course the worshippers of Siva and Vishnu. The return is not of much value in Travancore, for the true Travancorean is seldom a bigoted sectarian. The distinction is understood to some extent among the Brahmins, but is not well known among the bulk of the remaining Hindu Population. I had therefore, to draw the attention of the enumerators to this fact, by a footnote in our specimen schedule thus: 'Nairs and other Malayalees generally are neither Saivites nor Vaishnavites... the enumerators should therefore, take good care not to make the entry under column 3 without fully ascertaining the fact from the householder. The result quite justified the opinion. Out of the 1871864 Hindus in Travancore, only 547462 or 29% of them returned themselves under the several sects. The remaining 71% returned themselves under 'Not Stated'; not because they were obstinate and would not admit their sects, but because they were mostly innocent of what their sectarian religion was.

There is also a reason to believe that the difference between sect and caste has not well understood, the vernacular words used for them in the schedules being, 'Mathabhedam' and 'Jati'.³³

The attitude of NagamAiya was same as that of C. AchyuthaMenon regarding the incorporation of the religious sects suggested by the Census committee to obtain returns. In order to get a real picture, a bold step was taken in Travancore as per the direction of NagamAiya. In Travancore, as in other parts, the census officers didn't take compulsory

returns regarding the religious sect of the people. The basic knowledge regarding the society was applied and the result was very positive, which attested to the vision of Achyutha Menon regarding the subject that ‘the great majority of the Hindus of Cochin are ignorant of the very name of the great Hindu sects’. Nagam Aiya, posing the documentary evidences states that 71% of the ‘Hindu’ population of Travancore was ignorant of the matter viz; to which religious sect they belong. Nagam Aiya has pointed out that only some Brahmins had the knowledge regarding these sects and that the people belonging to Nairs and other *Malayalees* were neither Saivites nor Vaishnavites. Thus Nagam Aiya was categorically stating that the divisions suggested by the Census authorities were purely Brahmanical in its orientation. He has also contributed the important information that the people were not in a position to understand the vernacular words used in the schedules for religious sects and caste-*mathabhedam* and *jati*. This indicates that the words which were used in intellectual circles as part of criticisms, debates and in titles of books had not filtered into the public consciousness and discourse.³⁴ Thus, the haziness which the public had, in filing the returns on religion was, as Nagam Aiya has stated, was ‘because they were mostly innocent of what their sectarian religion was’. In other words, people were asked to subscribe to a certain view of themselves, which they did not really have.

Nagam Aiya was making it simple to state his thesis on Hinduism by pushing aside the majority of people from its domain. He was simply stating that if Hinduism is something a religion, it is of the people who are aware of what it is. By stating that the people including Nairs and other Malayalees are neither Saivites nor Vaishnavites and they are unaware of the sectarian religion and that only the Brahmins have the knowledge of these, he was affirming a position that Hinduism is something a Brahmins’ business. This has been explicitly stated by him. In an attempt to redefine Hinduism in Brahmanical Casteist orientation and thus to take a rupture from the all-inclusive ‘convenient term’ status of Hinduism, Nagam Aiya states:

Hinduism is the prevailing faith in Travancore. It is coeval with the colonization of the country itself. Hinduism in India is ancient beyond the count. What is Hinduism is a question that has been often asked, though never satisfactorily answered. To such a question, my answer would be that it is ‘Brahminism’, and that answer would itself require to be defined. I would, therefore, attempt to roughly indicate the meaning and scope of a Brahmin’s religion. In the first place, a Hindu is born, not made. This remark is true

throughout all the castes of Hindus. All the different castes aspire to lead the religious life of the Brahmin.... These hyper-trophic beliefs show the direction towards which the Hindu religious mind gravitates. Hinduism is thus synonymous with Brahminism.³⁵

To make his Brahmanical position smooth and clear, NagamAiya focuses his discussions on the ritual status and religious duties of various segments of Hindus. He notes:

A Brahmin's faith means and includes, in the widest acceptance of the term, the study of and belief in the Vedas and sacred scriptures; of the *Smritis* as the code of laws; the observance of the 16 ceremonial or rites called *ShodasaKriyas*, belief in the incarnations of the God head; worship of gods and goddesses in the temples and belief in their achievements as recorded in the *Puranas*; belief in visits to places of pilgrimage; bathing in holy waters and the daily bathing itself; and belief in expiatory and propitiatory ceremonies; belief in *mantrams*, fasts and feast; belief in caste distinctions; worship of the *ritis* or manners of ancestors; belief in the transmigration of souls and law of Karma; belief in the acts of *punniam* and *papom*.... special veneration for the cow; belief in omens... belief in horoscopy, astrology etc. These would form the main articles of faith of a true orthodox Hindu. The lower order of 'Hindus' may believe in all these, practicing but very partially the religious duties of the Brahmin when we go down the scale of the Hindu caste-system, and descend to such castes as the Paraiyahs and the Pulayyas, we find in them only a very fractional observance of Hindu rites and ceremonies.³⁶

NagamAiya's vision on Hinduism is explicit in itself. He saw Hinduism as Brahminism; nothing more or nothing less. With such an attitude, NagamAiya professed Brahmanical religious practices as the bed rock of rituals and rites in Hinduism. As pointed out above, pitting Hinduism with the Brahmanical rites, rituals and attitudes as its base, NagamAiya, and the Princely State of Travancore were taking an ideological position to push the majority of people away from the fold of Hinduism. He drew a clear cut dividing line between belief and practice and has upheld the practice as the sole criteria to understand who is faithful. To him, the necessity of the knowledge of the religion and understanding in the belief structure and practice system were important categories in approaching Hinduism as a religion. He has also

carefully loomed the textures and fabric of Hinduism with the spin threads of Brahmanic knowledge, ritual, rites, practices and belief systems by evading all other streams of religious looming there in. To put it in other words, NagamAiya promulgated a position that Hinduism as a religious system is the possession of the Brahmins and the people who were included in the Nair and other Malayalee castes are out of the purview of this religion. The reverberation of the position is evident when he says about the non-observant nature of the people who forms the outer circle of the caste system with respect to the Hindu rites and rituals. By taking a position that “the lower order of ‘Hindus’ may believe in all these, practicing but very partially the religious duties” NagamAiya has categorically stated that the people down the caste lines are not performers of religion but are only believers. Thus according to him, the believers of Hindu system, who lack knowledge regarding the religion and who are non-observant of the religion, are thus not part of the religion. They were merely believers of an ostentatious system of beliefs and practices. At the same time, that he was enthusiastic to incorporate them into the Hindu caste fold is evident from his words. Thus a dividing line in between Hinduism as a religious system and Hindu caste system can be seen in the words of NagamAiya. As an officer representing the Princely state of Travancore, he was pronouncing the stance of the State itself. Moreover, the report has certain claims as that of the nature of the very state itself. It claims that the prevailing faith of the state is Hinduism. The very connotation he has suggested to Hinduism as Brahminism makes the stance very clear that he was advocating for Travancore as a Brahmanical state. Thus when it is taken holistically, NagamAiya and through him the State of Travancore sought to see Hinduism/ Brahmanism as the operative force of the state. It was a conceptualization regarding the business of the state. Through the claim that the State is Hindu/Brahmin, the state was running down the message that the non-Brahmin elements of the society has no role in the functioning of the State.

Census Reports of 1901

The 1901 Census report of Madras Presidency took safe positions on Hinduism by stating the following:

A Hindu was defined to be one who worshipped any of the recognized gods of the Hindu pantheon. The forest and hill tribes, however, are well known to be

undergoing a slow process of Hinduizing, or rather Brahmanization, as a result of their contact with the Brahmanic customs.³⁷

It in a way was authenticating the ideological position of the Census commissioners of two important princely states of the region regarding Hinduism as Brahmanism. The diversity and non-conformity among the people logged into Hinduism was the theme addressed in the Cochin Census report. It has recapped the positions of the previous census reports regarding the distinctive delineations which can be traced out in the diverse groups who were bound to the common platform of Hinduism. It says:

But as regards the institutions and ceremonies according to which worship is carried on, since the diverse elements of the community are not of one race, and to belong to the Hindu population as a whole. Different systems prevail in the different sections of the community, which may be brought under the following four classes:

1. The pure Aryans, consisting of Brahmans and Kshatriyas amongst whom Hinduism predominates.
2. The mixed Aryan and Dravidian castes which include the Ambalavasis and high caste Nayers, amongst whom Hinduism and Demonolatry have equal share.
3. The pure Dravidians amongst whom Demonolatry predominates.
4. The Pulayans and Paraiyans, ethnically more akin to the aborigines, who have but nominally become Hinduized.³⁸

The census report 1901, of Travancore was in a way taking forward the arguments of NagamAiya, the previous Census Commissioner to new plains. It was not suggesting a new definition but reaffirming the suggestions in the previous census report regarding Hinduism as Brahmanism, and takes the discussion to a higher plain of Brahmanic practices and knowledge systems. It says:

There are in Hinduism two distinct cults, the exoteric and esoteric, the one preparatory to the other. The esoteric as expounded and taught in the Smritis, the Puranas and the Tantras, includes the ordinances, worship, rites ceremonies and formulae (mantras) imposed by the authority and intended to train and guide the whole nature of man according to the varying stages of his evolution in reference to his visible as well as to his invisible environment...

The esoteric phase represents a higher stage when knowledge of the supreme one and harmony with His will is acquired by Yoga or meditation. This is revealed in the Veda and the Upanishads which to Hindu, constitute a store house of eternal spiritual truths not finally disclosed at once but left to be gradually opened out in the regular course of evolution. In this stage of Hinduism, the outer obligations prescribed by the exoteric cult are said to fall away as the man united to the law becomes a law unto himself.³⁹

N. SubrahmanyaAiyar, as said earlier, was going over with the opinions of previous Census Report. He was giving fresh ground to reaffirm the view point that Hinduism is Brahmanism. According to him, the knowledge in Sanskrit or the subscription to the rituals and rites were not necessary to attain Hinduhood or Hindu religious experience in its full. The census report submitted by the State of Travancore has suggested the attainment of an abstruse phase for this. The gateways for the attainment of this cryptic level were the knowledge encapsulated in the Vedas and Upanishads.

Through these attitudes, the Native States of Cochin and Travancore were upholding the omnipotence of the Brahmanic knowledge, texts, rituals and rites. The complete subscription of these states to Brahmanism echoes the oft quoted lines by Bhoja Raja on Brahmins:

*daivādhīnam jagatsarvam,
mantradhīnam tvadaivatam
tanmantram brāhmanādhīnam
brāhmanō amamadevatā.*⁴⁰

A point that is not to be missed in this discussion is the completion of a cycle. When the reports of Census from 1871 to 1901 are analysed, a gradual development, with full thirst to possess Hinduism can be traced on the part of the Census Commissioners of the Native States of Cochin and Travancore, who happen to be members of Upper Castes. The serious challenges they were unleashing, against the enumeration criteria with respect to the filing of returns of 'Hindus' proposed by the Census directorate/ Committees in each censuses, was not because they challenged the basic ideology motivating the grouping of Hindus- *ie.*, the Brahmanical knowledge encapsulated in the Vedas, Upanishads, Puranas, etc.- but the formulation of Hinduism as an encapsulating structure which pulls diverse elements of society, which hitherto were never given par a social space or allowed to be in the vicinity of the social segments which were holding the power and rights to hold the proceedings of Census. The British attempts to launch the enumeration processes in the Madras Presidency

and the nearby Native States began with subscription to Indological Hinduism, rather to say – the Williams- Wilson model, which entirely subscribed to the Brahmanical scriptures as the bed rock of Hinduism. Upto that point, Hinduism was acceptable to the native authorities. But the British administrators and Census authorities in their blindness, or lack of capacity to understand the socio- political realities prevalent in society which was managed by the caste system and the latent pride in them due to the power they wielded as the administrators, were forcing their paradigms for investigating the accounts of people belonging to Hindu faith which were not acceptable for the Census Commissioners of Native States. These non-conformities which escaped as some deep sighs as in C. AchyuthaMenon (“It is clear therefore what value can be attached to returns of this nature”) and which made NagamAiya to challenge (“the enumerators should therefore, take good care not to make the entry under column 3 without fully ascertaining the fact from the householder.”) were based on the population content amalgamated by the Census directorate of British Government in India. But through the 1891 and 1901 reports of censuses conducted in Cochin and Travancore, the authorities of these States attempted to thwart the designs of the British authorities to promulgate Hinduism as a conglomerate of diverse and detrimental factions of the society into a common loom. To an extent, the efforts of NagamAiya and C. AchyuthaMenon did gain success is attested by the affirmation the Census report of Madras Presidency gave in 1901 census report regarding Hinduism, which accepts Hinduism as a simple category that it is a belief system centering the Hindu Pantheon. Taking the arguments of NagamAiya and AchyuthaMenon ahead, M. SankaraMenon and N SubrahmanyaAiyar, the census commissioners for the 1901 census of the States of Cochin and Travancore respectively, attempted to push out majority of the people out of the purview of Hinduism. We can also see that in the thirty years from 1871 to 1901, there were rapid shifts in the attitudes of the British regarding Hinduism. It can be seen that the British officials who were in charge of planning the census, changed their authorities on Hinduism in the span of 10 years. From H. H. Wilson to Bishop Caldwell, we can see a row of authorities on ‘Hinduism’, who had conflicting views on Hinduism as a religion.

Census Reports- a Terrain of Contestations

A path breaking leap in the discussions on Hinduism in Keralam happened with the Census report of 1911, submitted by the Native State of Cochin. Rejecting the modalities of

five categories⁴¹ suggested by the Census Commissioner of India, for verifying the Hindu elements in the population, C. Achyutha Menon has argued the following:

These tests do not appear to be decisive in so far, at least, as **Malayali Hindus**⁴² (emphasis added) are concerned. An Iluvan or Kammalan is undoubtedly looked upon as a Hindu on the coast, but he has none of the privileges mentioned, except worshipping the great Hindu gods in his own way, and he also causes pollution not only by touch but also by proximity. The position of Paraiyan and Pulayan on the other hand is different from that of an Iluvan or Kammalan; there is nothing in common between the beliefs, ritual and practice of the former and those of the latter, much less those of the Brahman or the Nayar. It will be more in keeping with the fitness of things from a religious stand point to separate the classes noted below from the Hindu community between them and those who were returned as animists is but shadowy from a religious point of view.

Kanakkan- 7527; Parayan- 8356; Pulayan- 72,787; Pulluvan: 110; Valluvan- 502; Vettuvan- 5261; Total- 94543

Even when they are so separated, the rest of the community is far from being a homogeneous one from a religious stand point but it will stand one test, the only one that appears to me to be applicable in the case of Malayali Hindus, namely, the recognition of caste as a socio- religious institution.⁴³

The report reaffirms the importance of caste which is seen as an integral part of the 'Malayali Hinduism'.

The changing location in the conceptualization of Hinduism is once again traced in the report of 1921 of Madras Presidency. Though it reaffirms the claims of the casteists, the report adds a location of nationality into the definition of Hinduism. It says:

For the word 'Hindu' implies not only certain religious beliefs but also a certain nationality and almost necessarily a certain social organization. In 1881 it was stated in the Madras census report that the term "Hinduism includes all those who recognize caste and who are governed by one of the systems of Hindu Law." In other words it includes practically every Indian who owns no allegiance to any other definite creed. A term so elastic naturally cannot imply any definite creed or system of morality and in fact it is the

custom of his caste rather than his religion which determines the moral standard of the ordinary Hindu.⁴⁴

Imagining Hinduism as a 'certain nationality' reflects a discussion which had acquired attention and popularity during the years of the 2nd decade of 20th c., which acquired institutional form along with the call for *swadeshi*, *swaraj* and *swathanthratha* in that decade and publication of series of articles and books and establishment of institutions in/ from the third decade of 20th c. The situation has been traced by Manu Goswami. He argues:

... Such organicist visions of nationhood derived their affective force from a specific conception of Hinduism as "more than a mere system of theology and ethics"... As the perceived substance of indigenous practices and institutions, Hinduism had "developed directly into a unique universality" that was at once "national and universal"... Swadeshists transposed a specific Hindu religious-philosophical schema- one that emphasized the originary unity of organic wholes and apparently discrete parts- onto the terrain of everyday political contention. They thus provided explicit philosophical-religious content to popular nativist understandings, condensed in conceptions of India as Bharat, of the relationship between nation, territory, history, and personhood.⁴⁵

The Madras Census Report of 1931 has presented some epochs in the march of formulating Hinduism. Reiterating the National paradigm of Hinduism, as in the report of 1921, the 1931 report has cited the case of Primitive tribes as follows:

The frontier between animistic and tribal religions and Hinduism has never been drawn and never could be. Traces of Hindu influences can be detected in every tribal religion practiced in Madras... It is the catholicity of Hinduism which is its greatest weapon when it meets animistic creeds. A great number of 40%, in the number of persons returned as tribal by religion is notable at this census. With advancing communications, increasing immigrants and plain settlers, a weakening proportion is to be expected. The fall this time goes far beyond the actual facts. The attitude of the ordinary Indian is that any Indian, not a Muslim or Christian, must almost necessarily be a Hindu.⁴⁶

The Census report of Cochin, 1931 also presented the acquisitive character of 'Hinduism'. It says:

In the census of 1921... Animism was... replaced by 'Tribal Religions'. Imperial table XVI shows that no figures have been entered under Tribal Religions at the present census so far as Cochin is concerned. The omission was deliberate and not the result of any oversight. As a matter of fact, all the selected tribes in imperial table XVIII are primitive enough to be classified under the heading Tribal Religions. But with very few exceptions they were returned as Hindus in column 4 of the schedule. For these classes, including the hill tribes of the Kadars and Malayans, have been in contact with their more sophisticated neighbours of the plains and open country for a sufficiently long period for them to have acquired an indefinite position on the outskirts and border land of Hinduism. And a kind of negative recognition as Hindu out-castes has been extended to these tribes from olden times. It must not be forgotten in this connection that Hinduism, though non-proselytizing is in a sense acquisitive.⁴⁷

The 1931 Census report of the Native State of Cochin has in it a revelation. It says:

Among those placed in the lower grades of Hindu society, it is a movement for the purification and elevation of their religious rites and practices; while those born in the higher grades reveal a growing indifference in all matters connected with religion. Thus the depressed classes are being persuaded to give up their degrading rites and practices, and temples or *BhajanaMatoms* where in they could pray and offer worship like the caste Hindus, have been erected in some of the colonies opened for them by the government...But when we turn to Brahmanas and Kshatriyas, the Ambalavasis and Nayars, and the other so called caste Hindus, to whom religion was, of old, 'like an all embracing heavenly canopy, like an atmosphere and life element, which is not spoken off, which in all things is pre supposed without speech' we find a remarkable change of outlook which, if difficult to applaud or commend is easy enough to understand and explain. To the generality of English educated persons, religion is now a matter of utter indifference or unconcern, and its rites and practices are a mass of superstition to be derided and condemned by all right thinking people.⁴⁸

Situations in Travancore during the third decade of twentieth century have been detailed in the Census Report 1931. It says:

The only religious movement which originated in Travancore is the socio-religious revival started by SreeNarayana Guru, a spiritual leader of the *Ilavas*. He established several temples on the west coast intended primarily for the *Ilavas*, but open to all classes of people without distinction of caste and creed. He also trained a number of Sannyasins to carry on religious propaganda on the lines chalked out by him. When he found that some *Ilavas*, not satisfied with the progress of his new movement, showed a tendency to secede from Hinduism and embrace Buddhism, he proclaimed the doctrine, 'One Caste- One Religion- One God for man.' As a result of the swami's teachings the *Ilavas* have realized the iniquity of the treatment accorded to them and other depressed classes by the High Caste Hindus in the name of religion, and set on foot a movement to establish the right of all Hindus, irrespective of caste, to enter temples and worship god, a right now denied to the so called untouchable castes.⁴⁹

The 1931 census reports of the Native States of Cochin and Travancore and the Madras Presidency pronounced the situations of the respective areas. It can be understood from these reports that there was a huge inflow of tribal people and the 'depressed classes' into the folders of Hinduism. Though there were options for the tribes to file returns with respect to their religion under the head 'Tribal Religion', most of them opted for 'Hinduism' as their religion. The nature of Hinduism as an acquisitive religion was accepted by the States of Cochin and Travancore. The shift in the claims of these States with regard to Hinduism is evident from these reports.

Placing the Debates

An analysis of the Census reports on 'Keralam' suggests some interesting matters regarding the state of Hindu religion in Keralam. At the outset it should be stated that there was nothing in Keralam like the Hindu religion, which contemporary society experiences and understands. Most of the people, even those who dealt with issue of Hinduism in the Census reports were unaware of the nature of Hinduism or to put it in another words, what it was. This can be understood from the shifts in the definition given to it throughout the Colonial Census period. It was in this context that, as Kenneth W Jones has put it, the definition of

Hinduism changed every ten years. As has been pointed out elsewhere, there was an ambiguity among the people regarding the nature and content of Hinduism. This, which the census commissioners states as ambiguity, really stemmed out of the lack of knowledge regarding this religion. The fact was that, most of the people were unaware of such an identity, which means they did not have the identity as Hindus prior to the imposition of Hindu identity by the launching of census. It was because of this, that the Census commissioners of the native states continuously objected the designs of British investigative modalities. British officers, out of their enthusiasm to tackle the issues of caste and relying on the Indian model of Heathenism- Hinduism, were trying to build Hinduism as a common platform for all those who were out of the fold of the religions known to them. But the census commissioners of Native States, who happened to be the members of upper castes, objected the designs of the British to invoke a common platform for all the people who lacked a religion which the British understood. The base of the objections raised by the Census commissioners of Native States was that such a platform was not a historical reality. Kenneth W Jones has delineated the situation. He says:

Another difficulty arose in relation to the definition of 'Hindu', namely the question of whether or not certain untouchable castes should be included within the Hindu community or should be listed separately. This question was raised in the Punjab census of 1868 but was not satisfactorily settled... The division of castes into religious groups would become a standard element in future census reports.⁵⁰

The caste structure, in the everyday lives of native states, was not merely a structure of groupings based on the principle of division of labour. It had other deep connotations with the social hierarchy, power, and knowledge systems encoded in professional skills, ritual content, universal outlooks invigorated by belief structures and nature of ritual delivery. The personal and collective identities in the society loomed large within the castes, which also differed among themselves in their ontological settings and material outlooks. These differences were not taken into account while setting up an investigative modality to ascertain the Hindu elements of Society. An interesting development happened in the native states of Travancore and Cochin (to an extent also in Malabar) during the period from 1871 to 1931 in the forging of Hinduism as a structure of caste hierarchy. Whether it was a process viewed by Kenneth W Jones- "The division of castes into religious groups"- is doubtful. Along with the attempts

to push aside the castes having lower status out the fold of Hinduism, there were attempts on the part of upper castes to contain the caste structure upholding the belief of lower castes' people in Brahmin gods. The attempts to carve out Hinduism with a caste orientation having a domination of upper caste elements can be traced out right from the commencement of Census itself. Out of the fancy to carve out Hinduism as a synonym for Brahmanism, early census commissioners of these states had written a lot, in that regard. Some of them even stated that the social groups from Nairs, down the line in caste system, have no space in Hinduism. Hinduism was taken by these States as synonym for Brahmanism. It was not taking to account these circumstances and facts that the scholar like Kenneth W Jones has stated that the **Travancore and Cochin were Hindu states** (emphasis added) located in the Malayalam language area on the south-western coast.⁵¹

The 1931 census reports present a different picture in which the tribes, (Hindu out castes) and the depressed classes (Pulayas, Paraiyahs, Vettuvass etc.) were incorporated as Hindus. In the census report of Travancore, it is even stated that, the Ilavas had realized the iniquity accorded to them and other depressed classes by the High Caste Hindus and that they had set on for a movement to establish the right of all Hindus to enter temples and worship god, which was denied to them at that time. The Cochin State census report presents a situation which portrays the pressure from the people who were hitherto, placed outside the domains of common social platforms. In this sense, it should be logically understood that the construction of Hinduism in Keralam was maintained through the inclusionist and exclusionist paradigms. Both paradigms were simultaneously at work. The upper caste people who in their capacity as office bearers of the Native States' governments were working to make reports so as to convince the Superior British authorities that Hinduism is Brahmanism and the people who lay out of the genre of Brahmanism and its beliefs and practices, literally do not have any space in Religion. They were attempting to build Hinduism as a domain for the upper caste segments, pushing aside the multitudes of people who were out of the Brahmanic fold belief wise, ritual wise and practice wise. But, the pull on the part of the people who were placed in the lower ranks of the socio- religious systems as designed and informed by the caste system for Hinduism was evident. The people, who were enlightened about the social and political spaces which could be amassed in/ by the socio- political contexts of colonialism, began to claim the individual and collective identities provided by the construct of Hinduism. It was seen as an open platform, which hitherto was not a social

experience. It was this conceptualization, which made the advocates of Hinduism in the lower caste ranks, views it as a platform which will thwart all social impediments. But the looming of the Hinduism in Keralam, especially in the Native States was in the lines of containing the hierarchy as designed by the upper caste elements of the society. Thus though it emerged as a loose undefined and unstructured construct, Hinduism, - which was historically getting forged- inculcated within it the ethos and constructs of caste structures.

Notes and References

¹B. No: 5; File No: C- 16404/1829- Central Archives, Thiruvananthapuram.

² For the discussions regarding the discussions and constructions over and on the Hindoo population in the Survey Reports, see P. S. Manoj kumar, 'Formation of Hindu Religious Identity in Kerala: A Study of Socio-Religious Movements (1792- 1936), Kannur University, 2016 (Unpublished Ph D Thesis).

³The present researcher has no aim to analyze the entire document at this instant. The sole purpose of invoking the document is to present the fact that at a point of time in Keralam, the word Heathen was used officially to denote a section of population into its fold. The category Hindoos, though was in currency, was not used by the native officials to denote population categories. It is also to be noted that the non- Christian, non- Jew, non- Muslim sections were not officially assigned with any homogenous religious identity. Even when the word Heathen was used, it was used with caution separating Nairs from the Heathens. Thus it should be understood that the homogenous religious identity creation was a late process and officially it was recognized and accorded at least after 1829.

⁴R. N. Yesudas, *The History of the London Missionary Society in Travancore, 1806- 1908*, Keralam Historical Society: Trivandrum, 1980, p.44.

⁵M. S. S. Pandian, 'Meanings of 'colonialism' and 'nationalism': An essay on Vaikunda Swami cult' in *Studies in History*, 8,2, n.s., 1992, p. 178.

⁶Kenneth W Jones, 'Religious Identity and Indian Census' In N. Gerald Barrier, *The Census in British India- New Perspectives*, New Delhi: Manohar Publications, 1981, pp. 77.

⁷Bernard S Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996, p. 8.

⁸P. S. Manoj kumar, *op.cit.*

⁹Benjamin Swain Ward & Peter Eyre Conner, *Memoir of the Survey of the Travancore and Cochin States Vol 1*, Thiruvananthapuram, Keralam Gazetteers Department, 1994 and Ward & Conner, *A Descriptive Memoir of Malabar*, Thiruvananthapuram: Keralam Gazetteers Department, 1995.

¹⁰Quoted from Madras Census (1871) Report, Chapter XI, in William Logan, *Malabar Manual Vol 1*, New Delhi: Asia Educational Services, 2000, p.108-09.

¹¹*Ibid*, p.109.

¹²*Ibid*.

¹³W.R.Cornish, *Report on the Census of the Madras Presidency, 1871 With Appendix Containing the Results of the Census Arranged in Standard Forms Prescribed by the Government of India*, Vol 1, p.90.

¹⁴*Ibid*.pp. 90-91.

¹⁵*Ibid*.p. 91.

¹⁶*Ibid*.p. 61.

¹⁷Reinhold Rost (ed.), *Essays and Lectures on the Religions of the Hindus by H.H. Wilson*, (2 Vols.) London: Trubner & Co., 1861 & 1862. First Volume titled as *Sketch on the Religious Sects of the Hindus* (1861) and second Volume titled as *Works* (1862).

¹⁸*Ibid*.pp. xi-xii.

¹⁹Monier Williams, *Hinduism*, New York: Pott, Young & Co., 1877, pp. 10-11.

²⁰A. Sankariah, *Reports on the Census of Native Cochin, Taken on the 6th Karkatakam 1050/ 20th July 1875*, Madras: Scottish Press, 1877.

²¹*Ibid*.pp. 25-26.

²²*Ibid*.p. 30.

-
- ²³Prepared and submitted by Mr. Macgregor, Collector of Malabar- This has been incorporated in the Census Report of Madras Presidency prepared by Dr. Cornish and can be read in the pages from 345- 352.
- ²⁴A Sainkariah, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
- ²⁵For a detailed discussion on Puritanism, refer John Coffey and Paul C H Lim (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge university Press, 2008; Francis J Bremer, *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: OUP, 2009.
- ²⁶Lewis Mclver, *Imperial Census of 1881, Operations and Results in the Presidency of Madras*, Vol 1, Madras: Government Press, 1883, p.35.
- ²⁷Quoted from Madras Census (1871) Report, Chapter XI, in William Logan, *Malabar Manual Vol 1*, New Delhi: Asia Educational Services, 2000, p. 108-09.
- ²⁸Lewis Mclver, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
- ²⁹H. A. S. Tuart, *Census of India, 1891 Volume XIII, Madras, The Report on the Census*, Madras: Government Press, 1893, pp. 56-57.
- ³⁰*Ibid.* p. 59.
- ³¹According to the Enumeration tool prepared by the Census Committee, returns were to be obtained conforming to seven divisions as proposed. These seven divisions were: Smarthas, Saivas, Vaishnavas, Madhvas, Lingayets, Saktas and Yathas.
- ³²C. AchythaMenon, *Report on the Census of Cochin 1891 AD- 1066 ME Part I*, Cochin: Government Press, 1893, p. 52.
- ³³NagamAiya, *Report on the Census of Travancore Taken by the Command of H. H. the Maarajah on the 26th February 1891/ 16th May 1066 ME Along with the Imperial Census of India*, Madras: Addison & Co., 1894, pp.326-327.
- ³⁴See for example the title of the book of ChattamiSwamikal, written in 1890 was *Krithumatachedanam*. The term 'Matham' and 'Jati' were used in various contexts by Socio- Religious reformers as Sri Narayana Guru.
- ³⁵NagamAiya, *op. cit.*, pp.327-328.
- ³⁶*Ibid.*, pp.328-329.
- ³⁷W. Francis, *Census of India, 1901 Volume XV, Madras Part I, Report*, Madras: Government Press, 1902, p.39.
- ³⁸M. SankaraMenon, *Census of India, 1901 Volume XX, Cochin Part I, Report*, Cochin: Government Press, 1903, p.29.
- ³⁹N. SubrahmanyaAiyar, *Census of India, 1901 Volume XXVI, Travancore Part I, Report*, Trivandrum: 'Malabar Mail' Press, 1903, p.103.
- ⁴⁰From *Champu Ramayana* of Bhoja Raja.
- ⁴¹It says, Do the person concerned: (a) Worship the great Hindu Gods (b) Enjoy the right of entrance to Hindu temples and shrines (c) Receive the ministrations of Brahman priests (d) Possess sufficient worthiness to give water to caste- hindus (e) Cause pollution by touch or proximity
- ⁴²P. S. Manojkumar, *op.cit.*
- ⁴³A. AchyuthaMenon, *Census of India, 1911 Volume XVIII, Cochin Part I, Report*, Cochin: Government Press, 1912, p.21.
- ⁴⁴G.T.Boag, *Census of India, 1921 Vol XIII, Madras Part I Report*, Madras: Government Press, 1922, p.57.
- ⁴⁵Manu Goswami, *Producing India: From Colonial Economy to National Space*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004, p.256.
- ⁴⁶M. W. M. Yeatts, *Census of India, 1931 Vol XIV, Madras, Part I, Report*, Calcutta: Central Publication Branch, Govt. of India, 1932, p318.
- ⁴⁷T. K. SankaraMenon, *Census of India, 1931 Vol XXI, Cochin, Part I, Report*, Ernakulam: Govt. Press, 1933, p. 232.
- ⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 334.
- ⁴⁹Rao Sahib N.KunjanPillai, *Census of India, 1931 Vol XXVIII, Travancore, Part I, Report*, Trivandrum: Govt. Press, 1932, p. 335.
- ⁵⁰Kenneth W Jones, *The New Cambridge History of India III. 1, Socio- Religious Reform Movements in British India*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, p.154.
- ⁵¹Kenneth W Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 79.