WORKING PAPER

Working Paper No.64

CASTE-DISCRIMINATIONS IN INDIGENOUS INDIAN EDUCATION - III: STUDY OF EARLY 19TH CENTURY BOMBAY PRESIDENCY

by

P Radhakrishnan

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
79, SECOND MAIN ROAD, GANDHI NAGAR, ADYAR
MADRAS 600 020

Working Paper No.64

CASTE-DISCRIMINATIONS IN INDIGENOUS INDIAN EDUCATION - III: STUDY OF EARLY 19TH CENTURY BOMBAY PRESIDENCY

by

P Radhakrishnan

Madras Institute of Development Studies

79, Second Main Road, Gandhinagar,

Adyar, Madras 600 020

April 1986

CONTENTS

Preface and Acknowledgement

This study is based on data collected for a larger study of backward classes and reservations in the context of British educational and employment policies from 1800 to 1947, and the politics of reservations from 1950 to the present centering around the special treatment provisions of the Indian Constitution.

In the present series on indigenous Indian education, there will be two more papers on the discriminatory dimensions of indigenous education in the early 19th century Madras and Bengal Presidencies.

The author is grateful to S Guhan, Eugene F Irschick, N Jayaram, CT Kurien, K Nagaraj, S Subramanian, and A Vaidyanathan for their comments on the draft of this part of the study. The author is also grateful to Nagaraj for his help in preparing the Tables, and to GN Rao and D Narayana for their help in obtaining the Census data used in the study.

1 INTRODUCTION

In part I of this four-part study we argued that the institution of indigenous Indian education was founded on the principle of social closure as revealed by the caste-discriminations in this institution, and that the metaphor of a Beautiful Tree employed by Gandhi to describe this institution and the subsequent efforts to vindicate the appropriateness of this metaphor were seriously misplaced.

To set the record straight and to provide an indispensable backdrop to our understanding of the sources, the nature, and the ramifications of the discriminations, in that part of the study we attempted a broad-based descriptive account of the institution in all its characteristics and complexity as could be comprehended from the available data.

Our attempts led us to an analysis of the nature of indigenous schools and the nature and extent of indigenous instruction.

Our analysis of the nature of indigenous schools brought out their important aspects such as habitat, maintenance, and membership.

Our description of the habitat showed the general absence of mural dimension to these schools. We attributed this absence to the attempts of the Hindu legislators to keep the institution unobtrusive, inasmuch as the rise of large buildings and edifices would have rendered prevention of the excluded groups from participation in it more difficult.

Our discussion of the maintenance of the schools showed that communal and state patronage was virtually confined to the education of the Brahmins in the Sanskrit schools and that as a result of this discriminatory patronage instruction

in these schools was free, often along with free board and lodging of the students, whereas instruction in the Vernacular and the Arabic and Persian schools was expensive, often so exhorbitantly as to prevent from effective participation in education majority of even those social groups who were in theory allowed participation in it.

While our statistical delineation of the membership of the schools showed their single-teacher character and small-size, we argued that these characteristics were not necessarily related to each other and that viewed from the perspective of pre-British Indian society, it was in the interest of the teacher to operate alone instead of sharing his profession with others in the same school as in the present schools. For that, the teacher who was always a male, and ideally a Brahmin, clothed, fed, lodged, revered, and worshipped by the society at large, represented his society in both secular and religious spheres as both a disciplinarian and a high-ranking authoritarian.

While our discussion of the nature of indigenous instruction from the perspective of its stages and methods, character and quality, and the prevalence and characteristics of domestic instruction showed its imperfections and inadequacies, our assessment of the extent of instruction showed that despite all disclaimers education had an extremely thin spread in the whole of British India.

Our attempts, in part I, to thus profile the institution, mainly as it existed in early 19th century British India, established a more than <u>prima facie</u> case for our contention that it had a strong discriminatory basis to it[1]. Our analysis, in part II, of the data of the Madras Presidency educational enquiries of 1822-25, substantiated this case in unequivocal terms in terms of the wide differentiations in the access of the principal social groups to the institution of indigenous

education in that Presidency[2]. Our analysis, in the present part, of the data of the Bombay Presidency educational enquiries of 1824-25, will be an extended and a more involuted version of our exercises in part II, and will cover the caste-differentiations in the access to both learning and teaching.

2 CASTE-DIFFERENTIATIONS IN ACCESS TO LEARNING

On caste-differentiations in access to learning in Bombay Presidency, the data available are mainly on elementary schools and partly on domestic instruction and higher learning.

2.1 Elementary schools

The data on elementary schools are, a) on the caste-wise population of boys under instruction, and b) on, what may be termed subject to further explanation, the caste-wise population of boys of school-going age[3]. The former are available in the returns of the Collectors of Ahmedabad, Ahmednagar, Dharwar, Khandesh, and South Concan, and of the Ahmedabad Judge; while the latter are available only in the Khandesh and South Concan returns.

Of these returns, the data in all but the South Concan return were collected by the British administrators as part of their routine work. In view of this, and in view of the other reasons stated in part I, these data cannot be expected to have the rigour and reliability of a scientific survey. The data in the South Concan return were based on elaborate enquiries by Lt TB Jervis, a person actively engaged in the promotion of Indian education even long before the Presidency Governor Mountstuart Elphinstone ordered the educational enquiries. In forwarding Jervis' report to Farish, Secretary to the Bombay government, the South Concan Collector stated that Jervis had already devoted much time and attention to the improvement of Indian education, collected a lot of information on it, and taken great pains in the preparation of the report (Parulekar, 1). In the light of the report under preparation by Jervis, the South Concan Judge refrained from preparing another report and requested the government to refer to Jervis's report. In his letter to Farish, he wrote:

"Jervis' report will be a document containing in every respect the most clear and satisfactory account on the subject of schools, since Lt Jervis appears to have bestowed every possible attention to the subject" (Parulekar, 53). In view of these remarks one would have expected the South Concan data to be free from errors. But, as it turned out, errors in them were the most numerous.

Despite these limitations, however, the data available are of great significance, if not for statistical accuracy, at least for their use in arriving at a detailed estimate of the caste-differentiations in education. And, it is only for attempting such an estimate that these data, presented in Table 1 in the appendix, are used in this study. Since the data presented in the Table are collated from each of the five Collectorate returns[4], they vary widely from the form in which they appear in the returns. In view of these variations a brief columnwise introduction on their presentation will be in order.

2.1.1 Data presentation

Column 2: The ordering of the castes in the Table is alphabetical and differs from the form in which they appear in each of the returns. This change was necessary for collating the data on all the five districts. The caste names spelled in the Table are, however, as in the returns. In some cases these spellings vary widely from the spellings given in standard ethnographic works. The spellings given in the returns are retained in the Table partly for retaining the originality of the data, and partly for receiving response on the likely errors in our understanding and classification of the castes.

Among the castes listed in the returns were found a number of synonyms and sub-divisions, a number of castes of minstrels and mendicants, and of shepherds and herdsmen;

and finally, a number of castes figuring only in the statements on student population and not in the population of school-going age or in the male population in the 1901 Census, also presented in the Table as a surrogate to the population of school-going age. In the Table we have grouped together synonyms and sub-divisions as one cluster of castes, minstrels and mendicants as another, and shepherds and herdsmen as a third cluster. The castes which figure only in the statements on school-going population are not listed in the Table. The data on these castes along with the data on a 'miscellaneous' category given in the Ahmednagar return are presented in the Table against a category of 'minor and unspecified' castes.

Columns 3-4: The caste-wise school-going population and the population of school-going age given in the South Concan return are in ten separate statements, nine for each of the nine taluks, and the tenth for the district as a whole, as an aggregate of the taluk figures. The figures given in most of these statements do not add up to the totals, and these are the errors to which we referred earlier. We have tried to overcome these errors by tabulating from the caste-wise figures given in each of the taluk statements the aggregate figures which we have presented in columns 3 and 4 for the district as a whole.

The data on population given in the return and presented in column 4 are of boys under twelve years of age and not boys of any specific school-going age-group. From these data we could have estimated the population of school-going age; but we have not attempted this on the presumption that the caste-differentiations revealed by the available data could not have been widely different from such an estimate.

Columns 5-6: The school-going population and the population of school-going age in the Khandesh return are for each

of the 18 taluks of the district and for the district as a whole, as an aggregate of the taluk figures, all given in one statement. The data presented in columns 5 and 6 are the aggregate for the district as a whole. This return also does not contain the population of school-going age as such, but contains only the caste-wise number of boys who do not go to school. In the case of those castes without any boys attending schools we have treated the number of boys not going to schools as the population of school-going age, while in the case of those castes with boys going to schools, we have treated the aggregate of the number of boys going and not going to schools as the population of school-going age.

Column 7: The school-going population in the return of the Ahmedabad Collector are for each of the five out of the six taluks of the district, for the Ahmedabad city, and the aggregate of these, all given in one statement. The figures given in column 7 are the aggregate.

Column 9: The school-going population in the Ahmednagar return are for each of the eleven taluks and for the Ahmednagar city. These figures are not given separately in a statement but are mentioned in the returns to the Collector from each of his twelve Kamvisdars. The Collector's return contains a summary of these returns, but this summary is too brief for our purpose. Accordingly, the school-going population presented in column 9 for the district as a whole are tabulated from each of the twelve returns.

Column 11: The school-going population in the Dharwar return are for each of the twelve taluks and their aggregate, all given in one statement; and the aggregate of three other taluks, given in another statement. The figures given in column 11 are the aggregate of the 15 taluks tabulated from these two statements. In the return attention was drawn to the margin for caste particulars of the 531 students of the remaining three taluks of the district. But these particulars are not reproduced in Parulekar's book.

Columns 8, 10 and 12: In the absence of data on population of school-going age in the Ahmedabad, Ahmednagar, and Dharwar returns, we have presented in columns 8, 10, and 12, the percentage of the total male population of each caste in the total male population of all the castes together in each of the three districts, as tabulated from the 1901 Census data of Bombay Presidency. Our purpose in presenting these data is to obtain a broad idea of the relative proportions of the different castes in the total male population of school-going age in 1824-25, as could be inferred from their proportions in the total male population in 1901. We use these data on the following assumptions:

First, at any given time the relative proportions of each of the principal social groups in the total male population of the different castes together will broadly reflect their respective proportions in the total male population of school-going age;

Second, despite numerical variations over the years, the relative proportions of each of these groups in the total male population will remain largely unchanged; and

Third, any changes in the proportions of each of these groups in the total male population of the different groups together would not have been so great as to significantly alter its 1824-25 proportions of the male population in the total male population of school-going age of the different groups together, as would have broadly reflected, in the absence of such changes, in its 1901 proportions in the total male population.

It is generally accepted that those who suffer most due to natural calamities such as flood, famine, and scarcity are the low-castes, the poorer sections of society. This is also evident from the data on relief-claims by different castes in

Gujarat mentioned in the 1901 Census report of Bombay Presidency (Enthoven, 1901, 32). Those who are more prone to migratory movements and to conversions are also the low-castes. As against these, those who are most active in social mobility attempts through sanskritization, protest movements and so on are the middle-castes. Thus, if anything, in the early 19th century the relative proportions of the low and middle castes in the total male population of school-going age would have been greater and those of the high-castes would have been smaller than what the 1901 Census data would indicate.

It will be obvious from the Table that not all the castes of 1824-25 and of 1901 are comparable. This may be due to changes in caste-classification, reorganisation of the districts, changes in caste-names, migration, and even extinction of some castes. In any case, since this incomparability is only in the case of some minor castes, it is not likely to vitiate our analysis; more so, when we are concerned only with the larger aggregates as will be explained shortly, and not with each and every conceivable social unit that may pass for a caste or sub-caste.

2.1.2 Caste classification

Although Table 1 broadly indicates the relative access of the different castes to the elementary schools, the unwieldy size of the Table blurs and dilutes the magnitude of the caste-differentiations in the access. Therefore, for understanding the differentiations in a clear and crystalline form, it is necessary to condense the Table to a more coherent and comprehensible size. This condensation would involve classification of the numerous castes listed in the Table. While this classification necessarily means caste-ranking, our concern here is not to rank all the castes in a fixed hierarchical order, but to classify them into principal social groups.

Of the caste-classifications hitherto attempted the classification by Russell is perhaps the most intrinsic and elaborate as to clearly bring out the differentiations leading to and resulting from the various attributes of the caste system. Although his classification is of castes in the Central Provinces, attempted as early as in 1915, as he himself pointed out, the castes included in it are representative of a great part of India. Hence, it has greater application than to the Central Provinces alone. Further, although only in some places like Bengal and northern India did the Brahmins traditionally accept water from other castes, this does not reduce the importance of his classification based on this criterion. For, the chief merit of his classification lies not in the criterion of acceptance of water by Brahmins but in the broad divisions of castes into the five principal groups and the further occupational sub-divisions in groups 2 and 3 of the various castes whose position may otherwise appear ambivalent. Except for minor differences in terms of traditional ritual and occupational status, the different castes included in the principal groups and sub-groups of his classification have conterparts in a great part of the country. Keeping this comparability in view, and with suitable modifications, we shall adapt Russell's classification for classifying the castes in Table 1. As a first step towards this, we shall present the classification and the typical castes in each group and sub-group as given by Russell:

1 Twice-born and allied castes: Bania, Bhat, Brahman, Gurao, Karan, Kayasth, Khatri, Prabhu, and Rajput;

2 Castes from whom a Brahmin could generally accept water:

2.1 Higher agriculturists: Agharia, Ahir, Bhilala, Bishnoi, Chasa, Daharia, Dangi, Dumal, Gujar, Jadum, Khandait, Kirar, Kolta, Kunbi, Kurmi, Lodhi, Mali, Maratha, Mina/Deswal, Panwar/Rajput, Raghuvansi, and Velama;

2.2 Higher artisans: Brass and metal worker, carpenter, confectioner, copper-smith, goldsmith, and grain-parcher;

3 Castes from whom a Brahmin could not generally accept water, but who were not impure

3.1 Village menials: Barber, bard and geneologist, blacksmith, carpenter, household servant, leaf-plate maker, palanquin-bearer, potter, tailor, village musician, washerman, and waterman;

3.2 Village watchmen;

3.3 Lower agriculturists: Betel-vine grower and seller, gardener, and garland-maker;

3.4 Village-priests and mendicants: Astrologer, hail-averter, musician, wandering priests and mendicants; and

3.5 Village traders and artisans: Acrobat, calico-printer and dyer, carrier, cotton-cleaner, digger, navvy, and salt-refiner, fire-works maker, fowler, and hunter, glass-bangle maker, liquor vendor, oil-presser, painter and picture maker, pedlar, and shepherd;

4 Indigenous tribes; and

5 Impure castes.

As a third category in group 2, Russell first included those menial or serving castes from whom also a Brahmin could accept water. However, he later treated them along with the menial or serving castes in group 3, on the ground that their actual rank was much below that of the cultivators. The carpenters included by him in group 2 were of the 'better class', who generally lived in towns and ranked higher than the carpenters included in group 3 as village menials (Russell, I, 30-75).

As the traditional caste status and caste-based occupational and educational status of Brahmins were incomparably superior to those of other twice-born castes, in our adaptation of Russell's classification we shall treat Brahmins as a separate category within group 1. Of the remaining twice-born castes the traders had a special status in regard to education as their occupations called for at least some knowledge of the three Rs. In view of this, we shall treat the traders also as a separate category within group 1.

Turning to group 2, for at least a couple of centuries now, the five artisan castes of iron-smiths, carpenters, brasiers, masons, and goldsmiths have remained a united group of Panchal in Bombay Presidency, and Panchalar or Kammalar in Madras Presidency, and asserted themselves to be the real Brahmins, by boycotting the Brahmin priests, by employing priests of their own castes, and by adhering to the Brahminic rituals and social practices. To give an example, as early as in 1840 the Board of Revenue in Madras received a 'petition of the Panchalars' purported to have been signed and sent by 32 Panchalars from Salem. The petitioners contented that the Brahmins were a 'mongrel tribe' of low-caste origin and that since the Panchalars alone were the direct descendants of the five Brahma Rishis, they alone should be designated as Brahmins (Bower, 91-5; for a Pune dispute between Brahmins and Sonars, see Wagle). Their affront to the Brahmins and attempts at social mobility have continued until recently in more organised and effective forms. We shall not go into more details here. Suffice to say that if these five castes have thus remained united for so long, there is no reason for us to divide them merely because the Brahmins fansied to take water only from some of them and not from others. Further, the caste-wise population statements in the South Concan and the Dharwar returns also, refer to 'Punchal' or 'artificers of the five denominations' as one caste. In view of these, we shall treat these five castes as one category of higher artisans.

Based on the traditional caste status and occupational status, in group 3 we shall treat the distillers, calico-printers and dyers, and silk and cotton weavers, and oil-pressers as one category; the lower agriculturists as another separate category; and the remaining menial or serving castes as a third category.

While the adaptation of Russell's scheme provides us the broad categories into which the castes in our data could be arranged, it does not offer us the classification itself. The actual classification of the castes in our data calls for identification of the different castes with the categories to which they are supposed to belong. This identification presupposes an understanding of the traditional caste and caste-based occupational status of the different castes. Accordingly, in Table 2 in the appendix, we have presented the relevant details for most of the castes as could be ascertained from different sources.

Enthoven's three volumes on tribes and castes in Bombay Presidency contain the relevant details for most of the castes which figure in our data. Accordingly, we have depended on these volumes as our primary source. Russell's four volumes on tribes and castes of the Central Provinces also contain details of some of the castes. We have depended on these volumes as our main supplementary source. Some of the volumes by Thurston on castes and tribes of southern India, and by Ananthakrishna Iyer and Nanjundayya on castes and tribes in Mysore contain details of a few of the castes which figure in our Dharwar data. We have used these volumes as an additional supplementary source. Some of the Census reports, especially of 1901, and the Imperial and State Gazetteers have also been useful for cross-checking the details. In addition to all these, there are quite a few historical and socio-anthropological works such as of Duff, Ghurye, Hutton, Mandelbaum, Omvedt, Steel, and Weber, which refer to at least a few of the castes which figure in our data. We have consulted them as well.

The castes listed in column 2 of the Table are as in Table 1. Some of the important indicators of the traditional caste status of the different castes are given in column 3,

while details of their traditional occupational status are given in column 4. The categories in the adaptation of Russel's classification to which the different castes belong in terms of their social and occupational status are mentioned in column 5. Since our caste-data cover three linguistic and cultural regions and since they relate to the early 19th century, we do not expect anything like unimpeachable accuracy in our classification, and the analysis of the caste-differentiations in education based on this classification.

2.1.3 Caste-differentiations in relative access

We have presented in Table 3 the caste-wise educational data of Table 1, condensed and classified with the help of Table 2. With a view to facilitating interpretation of this Table, we have also presented, in Table 4, a simple index of the caste-wise access to elementary schools. This index is the ratio of the percentage of each caste in the total student population to that in the total population of school-going age/male population. What seems most striking from these Tables is that, by and large, the relative access of the principal caste-groups to the elementary schools broadly reflected their relative status in the traditional caste and occupational hierarchies. This will be more clear from a discussion of the main findings of the Tables.

Greater access of twice-born castes: In all the five districts, the twice-born castes as a group had the greatest access to instruction in elementary schools. For, as may be seen from Table 3, their percentages in the total student population were about 59 in Ahmednagar, 27 in Dharwar, and between 49 and 63 in the remaining three districts, whereas their corresponding percentages in the population of school-going age/male population were only about 6, 4, and between 11 and 15. Stated differently, as may be seen from Table 4, in Ahmednagar, the proportion of the twice-born castes in the

Table 3: Students by principal caste-group and population in Bombay Presidency, 1820-25

Sl. no.	Principal caste/ category	South Concan S	South Concan P	Khandesh S	Khandesh P	Ahmedabad S	Ahmedabad P	Ahmednagar S	Ahmednagar P	Dharwar S	Dharwar P
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Twice-born castes										
1.1	Brahmins (18)	588	11974	486	2086	410		1042		861	3.40
		39.12	10.16	30.21	5.72	16.30	5.46	48.65	4.15	25.35	
1.2	Traders (25,27,49,54,82)	81	3436	292	1765	1156		215		46	
		5.39	2.92	18.15	4.84	45.95	3.77	10.04	1.21	1.35	0.38
1.3	Others (17,26,64,67)	183	1644	14	79	22		1		7	
		12.18	1.40	0.87	0.22	0.87	5.70	0.05	0.37	0.21	0.36
	Total	852	17054	792	3930	1588		1258		914	
		56.69	14.48	49.22	10.78	63.12	14.93	58.73	5.73	26.91	4.14
2	Castes from whom a Brahmin could generally take water										
2.1	Higher agriculturists (2,32,37,38, 44,47,57,66,72)	202	53071	363	17713	635		261		1856	
		13.44	45.05	22.56	48.60	25.24	14.02	12.18	42.34	54.64	45.30
2.2	Higher artisans (4,35,48,63,71)	185	3937	116	1203	68		135		115	
		12.31	3.34	7.21	3.30	2.70	3.70	6.30	3.10	3.38	2.47
	Total	387	57008	479	18916	703		396		1971	
		25.75	48.39	29.77	51.90	27.94	17.72	18.49	45.44	58.02	47.77

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
3	Castes from whom a Brahmin could not generally accept water										
3.1	Distillers, Calico-printers and dyers, silk and cotton weavers; and oil-pressers (9,14,20, 24,43)	103 6.72	8592 7.29	64 3.98	1069 2.93	85 3.38	1.68	155 7.24	2.36	226 6.65	3.47
3.2	Lower agriculturists (52,70,75,79)	17 1.13	26 0.02	-	289 0.79	-	1.03	-	4.40	-	0.03
3.3	Menials (1,3,5,6,10, 11,13,22,23,28,33,34, 41,46,69,76,77)	58 3.86	8723 7.41	156 9.70	2022 5.55	39 1.55	13.44	69 3.22	13.53	33 0.97	18.00
	Total	176 11.71	17341 14.72	220 13.67	3380 9.27	124 4.93	16.15	224 10.46	20.29	259 7.62	21.50
4	Tribals (7,12,40,42, 61,68,78,80)	4 0.27	774 0.66	-	5065 13.90	-	27.71	-	6.85	2 0.06	6.72
5	Impure castes (8,15,16,19,29,36, 50,51,53,58)	-	14028 11.91	-	2517 6.91	3 0.12	10.13	-	12.26	6 0.18	5.63
6	Muslims (60)	47 3.13	8284 7.03	74 4.60	1837 5.04	68 2.70	11.44	123 5.74	5.38	113 3.33	12.94

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
7	Others (21,30,31, 62,65)	28 1.86	338 0.29	36 2.24	692 1.90	- 	 0.56	23 1.43	 2.65	62 1.82	 0.46
8	Not ascertained (39, 45,55,56,59,73,74,81)	7 0.47	2900 2.46	-	-	-	 0.30	-	 -	31 0.91	 0.07
9	Minor and unspecified (83)	2 0.13	71 0.06	8 0.50	107 0.29	30 1.19	1.08	118 5.51	1.40	39 1.15	0.73
	Total	1503 100.00	117798 100.00	1609 100.00	36444 100.00	2516 100.00	100.00	2142 100.00	100.00	3397 100.00	100.00

Note: S and P as in Table 1; serial numbers in brackets in column 2 are of castes in Table 2, included in each category. Blanks refer to nils.

Source: Tabulated from Tables 1 and 2.

Table 4: Index of caste-wise access to elementary schools in Bombay Presidency, 1820-25

Sl. no.	Principal group/ category	South Concan	Khan-desh	Ahmed-abad	Ahmed-nagar	Dharwar
1	Twice-born castes					
1.1	Brahmins	3.85	5.28	2.99	11.72	7.46
1.2	Traders	1.85	3.75	12.19	8.30	3.55
1.3	Others	8.70	3.95	0.15	0.13	0.58
		3.91	4.57	4.23	10.25	6.50
2	Castes from whom a Brahmin could generally accept water					
2.1	Higher agriculturists	0.30	0.46	1.80	0.29	1.21
2.2	Higher artisans	3.69	2.18	0.73	2.03	1.37
		0.53	0.57	1.58	0.41	1.21
3	Castes from whom a Brahmin could not generally accept water					
3.1	Distillers, Calico-printers and dyers; silk and cotton weavers; and oil-pressers	0.92	1.36	2.01	3.07	1.92
3.2	Lower agriculturists	56.50	0	0	0	0
3.3	Menial or serving castes	0.52	1.75	0.11	0.24	0.05
		0.80	1.47	0.30	0.52	0.35
4	Tribals	0.41	0	0	0	0.01
5	Impure castes	0	0	0.01	0	0.03
6	Muslims	0.44	0.91	0.24	1.07	0.26

Source: Tabulated from Table 3.

total student population was about ten times more than their proportion in the male population of school-going age/male population. In Dharwar it was about 7 times more. In the remaining three districts it was 4 to 5 times more.

Although the Tables also indicate that within the principal group of twice-born castes the relative access varied from caste to caste, this cannot be a significant observation. For, as we shall see shortly, most of the boys of all the twice-born castes were instructed in the three Rs, and that of them many were instructed at home and not at schools.

Partial access of middle-castes: In all the five districts the access of the higher agriculturists and artisans was incomparably lower than that of the twice-born castes. The percentages of the higher agriculturists and artisans in the student population were 28 in Ahmedabad, 58 in Dharwar, and between 18 and 30 in the remaining three districts, whereas the corresponding percentages in the total population of school-going age/male population were 18, 48, and between 45 and 52. Thus, it was only in Ahmedabad and Dharwar that their proportions in the student population were higher than their proportions in the total population of school-going age/male population, whereas in the remaining three districts they were much lower.

It is, however, relevant to point out that in all but the Ahmedabad district the artisans had an edge over the agriculturists: The percentages of the artisans in the student population were 3 in Ahmedabad, and between 3 and 12 in the remaining four districts, whereas their corresponding percentages in the total population of school-going age/male population were 4, and between 2 and 3. As against this, the percentages of the agriculturists in the student population were 25 in Ahmedabad, 55 in Dharwar, and between

12 and 23 in the remaining three districts, whereas their corresponding percentages in the total population of school-going age/male population were, 14, 45, and between 42 and 49.

Thus, while in Ahmedabad and Dharwar the proportions of the artisans in the student population roughly corresponded to their proportions in the total population of school-going age/male population; in the remaining three districts they were 2 to 4 times more. As against this, it was only in Dharwar that the proportion of agriculturists in the student population roughly corresponded to their proportion in the total population of school-going age/male population, and it was only in Ahmedabad that the former was higher than the latter, whereas in the remaining three districts it was much lower.

Zero access of low-castes: The castes of category 1 in group 3, viz. the distillers, calico-printers and dyers, silk and cotton weavers, and oil-pressers had an access roughly corresponding to that of the higher artisans. However, of the remaining two categories in this group, in all but one district the lower agriculturists had no access at all; and in all but two districts the access of the menial or serving castes was too insignificant. Therefore, the castes in these two categories need to be treated along with the bottom-groups.

These bottom-groups were the tribals and the 'impure' castes, whose percentages in the total population of school-going age/male population in the districts of Dharwar, South Concan, Ahmednagar, Khandesh, and Ahmedabad were 12, 13, 19, 21, 38 respectively. It is difficult to say what proportion of the tribals had been 'Hinduised' by early 19th century. But, even assuming that they were totally out of the mainstream of Hindu society, there still remained a large number of 'impure' castes, accounting for 6 to 12 per cent of the

total population of school-going age/male population who were totally excluded from education.

2.1.4 Caste-differentiations in absolute access

In the fore-going analysis we tried to bring out the caste-differentiations in indigenous education in terms of the relative access of the different castes to the elementary schools as revealed by their percentages in the student population compared to those in the population of school-going age/male population. The differentiations were, however, far greater than these percentages would reveal. This will be evident from a fresh look at the differentiations in terms of the absolute access of the different castes as revealed by the percentages of their students in the total male population of school-going age. These data, available for only two of the districts, are presented in Table 5.

As may be seen from the Table, in the Khandesh district the percentage of students in the total population of school-going age was significantly high only among the twice-born castes. In fact, in the case of these castes the access to education was a lot more than even these percentages would reveal. For, as we mentioned earlier, irrespective of what the data reveal, majority of the boys of all the twice-born castes were instructed in the three Rs through both the schools and the domestic instruction. We may, therefore, conclude that the access of the twice-born castes as a group to the elementary schools was to the full extent they sought it.

Of the remaining castes, it was only among the numerically small higher artisans, the distillers and allied castes, and the menials that the percentage was of some significance. As it is only too obvious, this significance is precisely because of their tiny size. Among the numerically large higher agriculturists the percentage was too low as to be of any significance; while among the tribals and the impure castes the zero access again indicates their total exclusion.

Table 5: Caste-wise student population as percentage of the population of school-going age, Bombay Presidency, 1820-25

Sl. no.	Principal group/ category	South Concan			Khandesh		
		SP	PSA	%	SP	PSA	%
1.1	Brahmins	588	11974	4.91	486	2086	23.30
1.2	Traders	81	3436	2.36	292	1765	16.54
1.3	Other twice-born castes	183	1644	11.13	14	79	17.72
	Total	852	17054	5.00	792	3930	20.15
2.1	Higher agriculturists	202	53071	0.38	363	17713	2.05
2.2	Higher artisans	185	3937	4.70	116	1203	9.64
	Total	387	57008	0.68	479	18916	2.53
3.1	Distillers, calico printers and dyers, silk and cotton weavers; and oil-pressers	101	8592	1.18	64	1069	5.99
3.2	Lower agriculturists	17	26	65.38	-	289	0
3.3	Menials	58	8723	0.66	156	2022	7.71
	Total	176	17341	1.01	220	3380	6.51
4	Tribals	4	774	0.52	-	5065	0
5	Impure castes	-	14028	0	-	2517	0
6	Muslims	47	8284	0.57	74	1837	4.03
	Total	1466	114489	1.28	1565	35645	4.39

Note: SP: School-going population; PSA: Male population of school-going age. Blanks indicate nils.

Source: Tabulated from Table 3.

The South Concan data indicate that compared to Khandesh the twice-born castes had a lower access. This, however, is a distortion of the truth and has to be explained by the limitation of the data on population of school-going age, which, as we have already seen, also include a large number of children below the school-going age. The data also show that compared to Khandesh the lower agriculturists had almost a total access. This again is in the nature of a statistical lie due to the tiny size of the group as may be seen from the Table itself. But for the variations which these distortions show, the situation in South Concan was broadly similar to what obtained in Khandesh. It might have been much the same in the remaining districts also, though we do not have any data on them.

2.1.5 Gloss on caste-differentiations

Although the data thus clearly bring out the caste discriminations in indigenous education as revealed by the differentiations in the access to schools, it is relevant to note here that in his lengthy introduction to the Bombay Presidency educational documents of 1824-5 brought together for the first time in their original full form, Parulekar attempted to gloss over those discriminations. He did this in terms of a number of contradictory assertions which we shall examine briefly.

Referring to the elementary schools in general, he asserted that as a rule they were not 'communal' in their working and that "they were open to all who could afford to pay for their schooling except to those who belonged to the 'low castes' (Parulekar, xiii, emphasis added).

It must be only too obvious from his assertion that in his desire to wish away one of the extreme forms of caste-discriminations as expressed through the intensely exclusive character of indigenous schools, Parulekar refused to acknowledge the numerous excluded 'low castes' as part of the Indian

society. This apart, his understanding of 'communalism' in education (or caste discriminations as we have put it) even in relation to the social groups other than the low castes was too naive. For, not all castes who in theory had access to education had it in practice, and even if they had some access it was not adequate enough to ensure their effective participation in education. It is in this context that we should remember that the expensiveness of the so-called popular education in elementary schools in contrast to the gratuitous higher learning of the Brahmins served as a limiting-factor and reinforced the caste-based drive against literacy of the bottom groups. As we have already discussed this issue in part I, in the context of both the significance and the economics of education, we shall not dwell on it again.

Referring to the schools in the Ahmedabad town, Parulekar further asserted that these did not reveal any cases of exclusiveness based on the castes of the scholars (Parulekar, xxii). It is true that the return of the Ahmedabad Collector, or for that matter that of the Ahmedabad Judge on the Ahmedabad town, does not refer to exclusion. This absence of reference to exclusion, however, cannot be construed as absence of exclusion itself. The returns did not report on exclusion precisely for the reason that they were on the prevailing education among certain castes and not on the lack of it among certain others. When the Ahmedabad data on school-going population of the different castes are supplemented by data on the male population of the different castes as we have attempted in this study, we see exclusiveness in its stark form.

Finally, referring to schools in South Concan, Parulekar admitted that there were a few instances of the 'communal aspect' (Parulekar, xxii). In point of fact, however, there were not just a few instances as he would have us believe. On the contrary, the entire system of elementary

education in the district was the communal aspect writ large. One of the manifestations of this was the total absence of schooling among a large number of castes in all the nine taluks of the district. The number of such castes varied from 26 out of 39 in the first to 30 out of 41 in the last taluk. The total absence of schooling among all these castes might not have been the result of deliberate exclusion. But, exclusion either directly through the caste injunctions, or indirectly through the expensiveness of education and poverty of the people might have kept a large number of these groups out of the schools. For, as Jervis repeatedly mentioned in his report on South Concan, these castes were generally "the poorest, most ignorant and most wretched of the whole population" (Parulekar, 24,27,30,33,36,39,42,45,48,52).

Another, and perhaps more important manifestation of the communal aspect was in the caste-based segregation of the teachers and students in the several schools. In nine statements on "schools and teachers", Jervis reported the details of the location of each of the schools within each taluk, and name, caste, residence, and salary of the teachers employed in each school. In another nine statements he reported the caste-wise enrollment of the students in each of the schools referred to in the statements on schools and teachers. Data collated from these two set of statements as presented in Table 6, provide us ample evidence on these segregations. For the obvious reason of abstraction, data at the district level cannot fully capture the nature and extent of segregations at the school and village levels. All the same, the data presented in the Table do give us some broad indications.

As may be seen from the Table, the caste-segregation took on the form of both the teacher's choice of his students, and the student's choice of his teacher. Of these, the former needs to be placed in the context of the importance of the

Table 6: Students by caste by caste of the teachers

Students \ Teachers	Brahmins	Traders	Other twice-born castes	Higher agriculturists	HA	Distillers	LA	Menials	T	Muslims	Others	Total
1.1 Brahmins	545 92.69	-	13 2.21	24 4.08	-	5 0.85	-	1 0.17	-	-	-	588 100.00
1.2 Traders	67 82.72	11 13.58	3 3.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	81 100.00
1.3 Other twice-born castes	141 77.05	-	37 20.22	-	-	-	-	5 2.73	-	-	-	183 100.00
2.1 Higher agriculturists	147 72.77	2 0.99	10 4.95	23 11.39	-	15 7.43	-	1 0.49	-	-	4 1.98	202 100.00
2.2 Higher artisans	143 77.30	-	28 15.14	3 1.62	-	2 1.08	-	2 1.08	-	-	7 3.78	185 100.00
3.1 Distillers and allied castes	70 69.31	-	2 1.98	-	-	6 5.94	-	3 2.97	-	-	20 19.80	101 100.00
3.2 Lower agriculturists	10 58.82	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 41.18	17 100.00
3.3 Menials	38 65.52	-	7 12.07	-	-	3 5.17	-	6 10.34	-	-	4 6.90	58 100.00
4 Tribals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 100.00	4 100.00
6 Muslims	15 31.91	-	10 21.28	-	-	-	-	1 2.13	-	16 34.04	5 10.64	47 100.00
7 Others	1 3.57	2 7.14	6 21.43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19 67.86	28 100.00
Total	1177 78.78	15 1.00	116 7.76	50 3.35	-	31 2.08	-	19 1.27	-	16 1.07	70 4.69	1494 100.00

Note: HA = Higher artisans; LA = Lower agriculturists; T = Tribals. Blanks indicate nils. Since impure castes do not figure in the data either as students or as teachers, serial no.5 is excluded from the Table. Source: Tabulated from Parulekar, 22-52.

indigenous school teachers. We have already discussed this in general in part I. But, to note it briefly, in traditional Indian society teaching was perhaps the most revered profession. While its importance as a source of material rewards was not inconsiderable, it was its importance as a source of social influence, especially control over the socio-cultural life of the illiterate masses which really mattered. It was the realization of this influence which prompted the Brahmins to exert the greatest control over this profession; to zealously guard it from others. While it was again this realization which prompted them to teach not only their own boys, but also those of the other 'clean' castes, in their choice of the non-Brahmin students the communal element was not altogether absent. For that, for the reasons of religious injunction and religious charity within the Brahmin castes, a Brahmin could not ordinarily decline to teach any Brahmin boy who sought him as a guru. This was however not the case with teaching of non-Brahmin boys. While economic and other material considerations might have figured prominently in the choice of the non-Brahmin students, ritual purity and caste-ranking of the students also played an important role. These factors together explain why the Brahmins taught virtually all their boys themselves, and also most of the boys of the other twice-born castes and of other relatively more 'pure' and 'respectable' castes like the higher agriculturists and artisans, but only a relatively small proportion of the boys of the lower castes.

It is, however, in the student's choice of his teacher that the communal aspect was more pronounced. As may be seen from the Table, while the Brahmins taught the boys of other castes, they refused to have their own boys taught by non-Brahmin castes, so much so that virtually the Brahmin boys (93%) were taught by Brahmins themselves. The other twice-born castes also had their boys taught mostly by Brahmins and

partly by themselves, but not by castes which ranked lower than them. The hold of caste was not too tenacious on the instruction of Sudras castes, especially the lower-ranking ones in group 3. Other religious groups, Muslims and Jews (7:Others) had relatively less to do with the caste-Hindu teachers. The Jews taught not only most of their own boys, but also some of those of the Muslims and of the castes in group 3, and also the few tribals.

2.2 Domestic instruction

Our discussion in part I of the prevalence and characteristics of domestic instruction in the three Presidencies clearly showed that such instruction was only a higher-echelon prerogative, as a supplement or alternative to instruction in the common schools.

Of the prevalence of domestic instruction among the Brahmins in Bombay Presidency, Parulekar observed that it was at home and not in schools that elementary instruction was received by those who aspired to higher learning and that such aspirants were undoubtedly the Brahmins (Parulekar, xiv). Drawing upon data available in some of the returns, he reiterated these observations and concluded that Brahmin boys of instructable age seldom remained uninstructed and that all that their absence from common schools implied was that they were being instructed at home:

> In the Khandesh report the table given supplies the information that in the schools of higher learning there were 311 Brahmin scholars; while in the elementary schools the Brahmin scholars numbered 486. This means that for every 5 Brahmin boys in the elementary schools there were 3 in the schools for higher learning. In one of the Talukas of Ahmednagar district (Parnair) out of 77 Brahmin scholars 30 were learning higher branches and 47 in elementary schools, ie. for every 5 boys in the elementary schools there were 3 in the higher schools.

> Such a high proportion of the scholars learning higher branches would hardly be possible if attendance as elementary schools was a necessary qualification for learning higher branches. The Khandesh report also shows that there were about 100 boys of the Brahmin class who did not go to school. Now it is well known that the Brahmin boy of school-age hardly remained without some sort of instruction however poor he might be. The only conclusion we can draw, therefore, is that these Brahmin boys if they did not go to school,... must have been under instruction of some sort, domestic or private (Parulekar, xiv-i).

The detailed observations of the Poona Collector on higher learning among the Brahmins which we reproduced in full in the context of our discussion of the places of instruction in part I, also reveal the wide prevalence of domestic instruction among the Brahmins. So also the remarks in the Dharwar return that "wealthy individuals engage private tutors who are versed in Shasters at home and pay them annually from 50 to 200 rupees proportioned to their abilities" (Parulekar, 142).

As in the case of the Brahmins, among the other twice-born castes also domestic instruction seems to have widely prevailed. Thus the observations of Parulekar again:

> It was not the Brahmins alone who saw to it that their boys did learn the three Rs anyhow -- whether in schools or by domestic instruction --, but other classes, called the 'advanced classes', today, did somehow manage to teach their boys (Parulekar, xlvi).

This is also indicated by the remarks in some of the returns which we mentioned in part I. To refer to them again, the remarks of the Surat Collector that children of Brahmin and Vani castes learn in any event, made in the context of his expenditure outlay for extension of education from which he excluded these groups; and of the Ahmedabad Collector that "the few Vanees who reside at some of (the Mehwasee villages) either instruct their children themselves or else send them to a relative at another village where they are put to school" (Parulekar, 64, 84).

2.3 Higher learning

If access to domestic instruction was concentrated within the principal group of twice-born castes to the exclusion of others, access to higher learning was concentrated within the Brahmin castes alone to the exclusion of even the other twice-born castes. In fact, as we mentioned in part I, though the Kshatriya and Vaisya castes were in theory allowed access to Vedic education, there is hardly any trace of their participation in it to any significant extent, and from the earliest times it had become a Brahmin monopoly.

Of the concentration of higher learning within the Brahmins in Bombay Presidency, in early 19th century Duff wrote that "all Mahratta learning, except simple reading, writing and arithmetic, is confined to those Brahmins who study the Sanscrit language, in which only their sacred writings are composed" (Duff, I, 23). In his educational return, the Dharwar Collector also mentioned that knowledge in "Vaids, Shasturs and Pooranas" was confined to the Brahmins (Parulekar, 138). The statement of schools and scholars in the Khandesh return also reveals that it was confined to them. For, of the 313 students of higher learning in that district, all the students with the exception of two Muhammadans were Brahmins (Parulekar, 117).

Although we do not have enough data on the spread of higher learning among the Brahmins, there are enough indications that it was wide. For instance, in late 18th century Forbes wrote that "many of the Brahmin youth are instructed in astronomy, astrology, and physic; and acquire some knowledge of the civil and religious laws" (Forbes, I, 55).

In his report on South Concan Jervis stated that probably at least a tenth of the Brahmins who attained manhood

visited Benares, where there were about 250 houses of Concan Brahmins and various schools for the instruction of Hindus which were under Concan teachers (Parulekar, 11). The Dharwar Collector further reported that for instruction in higher learning Brahmins were engaged as private tutors and that if the circumstances of the parents did not permit, they sent their sons to serve some learned Brahmins who in return gave them instruction gratis (Parulekar, 138).

The earlier mention of the fairly large number of students under instruction in the Khandesh district itself is a clear indication of the wide spread of higher learning among the Brahmins. Stating that there were several 'Pundits and Josees' who gave instruction in Sanskrit and in the laws and the ceremonies of religion, the Surat Judge reported that within his jurisdiction there were 66 students receiving instruction from 18 teachers (Parulekar, 65). Further, the return of the Kamvisdars of the Ahmednagar Collector show that in Ahmednagar district there were at least 37 schools for astronomy, medicine, sastras, vedas, and so on. Of the two returns which gave details of the students one mentioned that the students were three Brahmins studying astronomy in one school, while the other mentioned that they were 30 Brahmins studying Vedas in four schools (Parulekar, 122-33). Finally, drawing upon the 1832 Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company, in his introduction to the Bombay Presidency educational documents Parulekar stated that with as many as 164 schools of higher learning out of a total number of 222 schools, "the City of Poona broke the record for its abundance of schools for higher learning", and that this was not surprising considering that for a century the House of the Peshwa, the Brahmin ruler had its abode in this city (Parulekar, lxii).

3 CASTE-DIFFERENTIATIONS IN ACCESS TO TEACHING

The caste-differentiations in indigenous education revealed by the data on access to the various types of learning are also clearly reflected in the data on access to teaching. Since higher learning was confined to the Brahmins, it must be only too obvious that access to its teaching was also confined to the Brahmins. This is also evident from the Khandesh return showing that all the 75 teachers teaching the various branches of Hindu learning were Brahmins (Parulekar, 116). The nature of access to teaching in elementary schools was only slightly different.

As may be seen from the data on the caste of the teachers presented in Table 7, all the teachers in the Ahmedabad city, and virtually all the teachers in the districts of South Concan and Ahmednagar, and about half the teachers in the Dharwar and Khandesh districts were Brahmins, that too despite the fact that the Brahmins as a group accounted for only about one-twentieth of the total population.

The sway of the Brahmins was, however, not confined to the schools in these few districts. For instance, the Kaira Collector remarked that the schoolmasters in his district were "generally of the Brahmin and Banian casts". The Kaira Judge remarked that the schoolmaster was "always a Brahmin". The Ahmedabad Collector reported that "where situation is hereditary the schoolmasters are Brahmins" (Parulekar, 79,82,83).

Although some of the teachers were drawn from the non-Brahmin castes, their proportion was not very significant, and there is no evidence that they "shared the profession with the Brahmins without any hindrance imposed by custom or tradition" as Parulekar would have us believe (Parulekar, xxiii). If they had free access to the profession, their

Table 8: Teachers by caste in Bombay Presidency, 1820-25

Sl. No.	Principal group/ Category	South Concan	Khandesh	Ahmed-abad	Ahmed-nagar	Dharwar
1.1	Brahmins	61 71.76	63 55.26	21 100.00	132 81.99	118 43.54
1.2	Traders	2 2.35	-	-	3 1.86	-
1.3	Other twice-born castes	6 7.06	-	-	4 2.48	-
		69 81.18	63 55.26	21 100.00	139 86.33	118 43.54
2.1	Higher agricul-turists	7 8.24	24 21.05	-	5 3.10	143 52.77
2.2	Higher artisans	-	-	-	6 3.73	-
		7 8.24	24 21.05	-	11 6.83	143 52.77
3.1	Distillers and allied castes	2 2.35	-	-	1 0.62	-
3.2	Lower agricultu-rists	-	-	-	-	-
3.3	Menials	2 2.35	2 1.75	-	1 0.62	1 0.37
		4 4.71	2 1.75	-	2 1.24	1 0.37
4	Tribals	-	-	-	-	-
5	Impure castes	-	-	-	-	-
6	Muslims	3 3.53	19 16.67	-	8 4.97	9 3.32
7	Others	2 2.35	6 5.26	-	1 0.62	-
		85 100.00	114 100.00	21 100.00	161 100.00	271 100.00

Note: Blanks indicate nils. Since the report of the Ahmedabad Collector does not contain caste-break up of the teachers, the data on Ahmedabad are only for Ahmedabad city, taken from the return of the Ahmedabad Judge. Data on Ahmednagar include teachers of higher learning also.

Source: Tabulated from, Parulekar, 22-49, 99, 116-7, 121-134, 146-8.

share in it and in the total school-going population would have been far greater. The absence of a free-access is also evident from the following remarks of the North Concan Judge:

> Brahmins are on some accounts most eligible as being better qualified in regard to learning and influence but they are... frequently inclined to be indolent and have many ceremonies to perform which might greatly interfere with the business of the school... and in order to have efficient persons the situation of schoolmaster should be an employment open to any one and everyone (excepting the low casts) who chooses to resort to it as a means of getting a living (Parulekar, 58-9).

The remarks of the Ahmedabad Judge also indicate such absence:

> (As) far as regards the Hindoo part of the population (Brahmins) seem to be the class best suited to the duty; for by their usages, a scholar is required highly to venerate his instructor and on several occasions to prostrate himself before him, and it would therefore be very inconsistent for the son of a Brahmun to do this, to any person of an inferior cast (Parulekar, 96).

4 CONCLUSION

In the foregoing analysis we tried to bring out the caste-discriminations in indigenous education in the early 19th century Bombay Presidency as revealed by the data on the caste-differentiations in access to both learning and teaching. Our analysis has shown the twice-born castes at one end of the spectrum, with full access to elementary instruction through both elementary schools and domestic instruction, and among them the Brahmins with exclusive access to higher learning and virtual monopoly over the entire institution of education. At the other end, it has shown the tribals and the 'impure' castes with total exclusion from the institution. Between these two extremes, it has also shown the various 'clean' castes among the Sudras, with partial or limited access to elementary instruction.

The differentiations in access to education which were evident from the data, are, however not so naive as we tried to summarise above. For instance, among the intermediate castes there were wide variations in the relative access of the agriculturists across the districts. Two explanations seem plausible for their relatively low access in South Concan, Khandesh, and Ahmednagar. The first is that unlike the artisans and other smaller groups, the agricultural castes in general are numerically very large. As the socio-economic and occupational conditions of the members of these castes vary widely, those who gained access to learning might have been mainly from the affluent stratum.

For the second explanation we need briefly look at two other educational reports on Bombay Presidency, by Major Sykes, Statistical Reporter to the Bombay government, presumably prepared on his own initiative and submitted to the government during 1826-27[5]. In these reports Sykes bemoaned

the general ignorance of the bulk of the people despite what he felt, the "aptitude, sprightliness and intelligence" of the children of all castes, and dwelt at length on the need for improvement and extension of education (Parulekar, 189-95). Stating that whatever education existed was confined to the Brahmins and the Wanis, in the first report he attributed this general ignorance to one of the societal mechanisms which worked against the literacy of the bottom-groups and to which we made some brief references in part I:

> It might have been supposed that the pressure of inconveniences and the risk of loss attending their constantly recurring arithmetical computations, whether in settling their assessments with Government, in ascertaining the amount of their produce or in computing its saleable rate to insure a profit, or in their money transactions with each other would have stimulated some families of the past or present generations to have pursued steadily a course of instruction for their children, which by its example and the visible beneficial results attending it would have originated a thirst of knowledge and advanced the march of intellectual improvement. The Soodarh however is led to believe by the wily Brahmins that letters and science are not within his province and the farmer is content to go on mastering his arithmetical difficulties with the assistance of his fingers (Parulekar, 189; emphasis added).

In the second report he also attributed this ignorance to "the absence of instructors in the first instance and in the next to the poverty of the people disabling them from profiting by instruction unless afforded to them gratuitously" (Parulekar, 192). Most of the educational returns of 1824-25 also indicate that agricultural castes in general were reluctant to send their children to schools due to poverty, expensiveness of education, and lack of leisure. We referred to these problems in the context of both the significance and the economics of education discussed in part I.

The relatively better access of the agriculturists in Dharwar was probably due to the fact that bulk of them were Lingayats, a hierarchically ranked cluster of castes with widely varying socio-economic and occupational conditions, and could be explained in terms of the heterogeneity and earlier egalitarian ideology of this group. Similarly, the relatively better access of the agriculturists in Ahmedabad was probably due to the fact that bulk of them were the Kanbis or Patidar who rose in the social scale since the early times of British rule, and could be explained in terms of the social mobility of this group. We are, however, not in a position to offer more details here on either of these groups.

Of the castes in group 3 of our classification, the distillers with educational access were the Bhandarees from South Concan. As it is well known, in the traditional Indian society distilling was a low-status occupation, just above the occupations of the impure castes; and in south India the occupational counterparts of the Bhandarees, the Nadars and the Tiyyas, were treated as 'higher polluting' castes, a designation which carried with it various social disabilities including exclusion from the institution of education. Considering these, and the fact that by concerted efforts both the Nadars and the Tiyyas have made tremendous advance in their social status, the relatively better educational access of the Bhandarees could perhaps be explained in terms of their social mobility drive. We are not in a position to offer more details on this group either. For the theme of this study, suffice to say that the access to elementary education of some of the groups which were not ordinarily expected to participate in the institution of education indicates only some of the manifestations of the attempts at mobility in traditional Indian society, and not any benign attributes of the institution itself.

It is, however, important to note that throughout its survival the institution retained all its discriminatory characteristics. This is evident from some of the subsequent educational returns submitted to the Bombay government. For instance, the second annual report on government Maratha schools in Poona submitted in 1839 indicates that about 70 per cent of the nearly 3000 students were from the twice-born castes, especially the Brahmins (Parulekar and Kakshi, 205). In 1840 the Khandesh Collector reported that in the 95 schools for the "vulgar branches of learning" with 1450 students, only males and only males of the higher castes received instruction and of them Brahmins and Vanis accounted for about one half (Parulekar and Kakshi, 107-8).

A little before these reports, in 1838, Postans made the following observations on Native Education Society's schools in Bombay:

> Strict rules exist in the institution respecting the rank of the students, the sons of tradesmen being inadmissible (sic!), or any below the caste of a Purvoe, or writer. Half-castes are equally excluded, the objection in this case being to the inferred "outcaste" condition of the mother. It is impossible to consider this exclusive system as other than an evil, in an institution which should be generally beneficial to all classes; but I was assured that unless such restrictions existed, the wealthy and influential would withdraw their sons from a scene which they could only consider as one of the most degrading pollution (Postans, 55).

Her observations point up the strong discriminatory basis of the institution of indigenous education even in its truncated form. It is the recognition of this discriminatory basis and the great political gains from it to the imperial interests which prompted the British flirtation with the filtration theory of education in India for about the first half a century of its educational policy. Of this, more in a subsequent study.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Students by caste and population in Bombay Presidency, 1820-5

Sl. no.	Caste/Community	Scuth Concan S	Scuth Concan P	Khandesh S	Khandesh P	Ahmedabad S	Ahmedabad P	Ahmednagar S	Ahmednagar P	Dharwar S	Dharwar P
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Agasa; Madiwal/ Dhobee/Pureet	1 0.07	515 0.44	-	99 0.27	-	0.16	-	0.51	-	0.60
2	Agree	3 0.20	1218 1.03	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Ambi; Ambig/Kabbaligar/Kabber	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.77
4	Badig/Sootar	9 0.60	1170 0.99	-	241 0.66	13 0.52	1.27	9 0.42	1.02	-	0.17
5	Bahuroopi/Bajania/ Bava/Bhavaya/Bhaveenee/Bhuradee/ Bhute/Byragee/Das; Deodas/Dombari; Kolhati/Doure Gosavi/Garoodee/ Ghadsee/Gondalay; Gondalee/Gosai; Atit/Gosavi/Gosseir/ Heezada/Helaver/ Jogi/Kiliket/Manbhow/ Nandana/Sadhu	-	650 0.55	6 0.37	110 0.30	9 0.36	1.85	-	0.73	4 0.12	0.74
6	Beldar/Khaloo/Odd/ Patrut/Paturwat/ Vudar	1 0.07	38 0.03	-	27 0.07	-	0.11	-	0.86	-	1.59
7	Berad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.14
8	Bhambhi	-	-	-	-	-	0.12	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
9	Bhandaree/Ilgar/ Kalal/Kalun	78 5.19	6599 5.60	-	22 0.06	-	-	-	-	-	0.15
10	Bharwad/Dhangur/ Gadri/Gaolee/ Golla;Gollar/Hana- baru/Khatic/Kuncha- vakkal/Kuruba/Lad/ Rabari/Shungur	1 0.07	3060 2.60	3 0.19	315 0.86	-	4.20	-	4.80	14 0.41	10.23
11	Bhat; Bahrot/Charan	-	17 0.01	3 0.19	55 0.15	8 0.32	0.60	-	-	-	-
12	Bheel	-	-	-	4354 11.95	-	0.35	-	1.76	-	-
13	Bhoee	-	389 0.33	-	166 0.46	-	0.43	-	0.09	-	0.14
14	Bhowsar;Chippa/ Nilari;Rungaree/ Putwagurry	-	-	15 0.93	189 0.52	85 3.38	0.60	22 1.03	0.15	36 1.06	0.74
15	Bhungee/Halakkhor	-	-	-	1 Neg.	-	1.60	-	-	-	-
16	Boorood/Medar	-	143 0.12	-	2 Neg.	-	-	-	-	-	0.37
17	Brahmakshatri	-	-	-	-	-	0.16	-	-	-	-
18	Brahmin/Goluck/ Goojratee/Juwul/ Kast/Koodalee/ Nagar/Shenwee	588 39.12	11974 10.16	486 30.21	2086 5.72	410 16.30	5.46	1042 49.65	4.15	861 25.35	3.40
19	Chambhar/Dalgar/ Jingur/Mochee	-	1663 1.41	-	184 0.50	3 0.12	2.56	-	1.84	2 0.06	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
20	Chettri/Khatri/ kshatri	-	-	-	-	-	0.39	-	0.10	-	0.62
21	Christian	-	172 0.15	-	-	-	0.56	-	2.65	-	0.46
22	Durjee/Simpy	44 2.93	317 0.27	112 6.96	615 1.69	4 0.16	0.89	69 3.22	0.44	13 0.38	0.47
23	Gabeet/Kharva/ Kharvi	7 0.47	1475 1.25	-	-	-	0.14	-	-	-	-
24	Ghanchi/Mharatta Telee/Telee	5 0.33	1514 1.29	24 1.49	588 1.61	-	0.69	33 1.54	0.95	35 1.03	-
25	Goojur	29 1.93	241 0.20	-	-	-	-	10 0.47		12 0.35	-
26	Gurav/Bhaveek Gurav/Mharatta Gurav/Wajantree	2 0.13	905 0.77	1 0.06	58 0.16	-	-	-	0.29	-	-
27	Guzratee	-	-	15 0.93	38 0.10	-	-	36 1.68	-	-	-
28	Hajam;Valland/ Nai/Nahvee	3 0.20	958 0.81	6 0.37	428 1.17	-	1.30	-	1.08	-	-
29	Hulsar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	0.05
30	Jain	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62 1.83	-
31	Jew, Telee	26 1.73	133 0.11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	Kachhia	-	-	-	-	61 2.42	0.46	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
33	Kachia;Chunara/ Lonari/Upper; Chunara	-	-	-	-	-	0.29	-	0.09	-	0.59
34	Kaikadi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.10	-	-
35	Kansar/Kasar/ Kasar Bangareewala/ Kasar Kazaree/ Tambut/Tambutkar	80 5.32	793 0.67	10 0.62	71 0.19	26 1.03	0.17	50 2.33	0.49	13 0.38	-
36	Katkaree/Katkaree Gaore	-	79 0.07	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	Kharak/Khetree/ Khutree	12 0.80	19 0.01	6 0.37	16 0.04	50 1.99	-	14 0.65	-	-	-
38	Kharak	-	-	-	-	-	0.13	-	-	-	-
39	Khathi	-	-	-	-	-	0.30	-	-	-	-
40	Kolee/Dongur Kolee/Sonkolee	4 0.27	501 0.43	-	590 1.62	-	25.11	-	3.69	-	-
41	Koombhar	1 0.07	1259 1.07	-	123 0.34	18 0.72	2.29	-	0.76	-	-
42	Koraver	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 0.06	0.58
43	Kostee/Hatgar;Jad/ Judhree/Padmasali/ Salee/Salvi	18 1.20	479 0.41	25 1.55	270 0.74	-	-	100 4.67	1.16	155 4.56	1.96
44	Kunbee/Goojur Coonbee	-	8839 7.50	-	264 0.72	524 20.83	13.13	212 9.90	2.08	-	0.06

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
45	Kurani	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.07
46	Laman;Lambani/ Bhusari;Bhusari Karkhaude/Kongadi/ Wanjaree	-	40 0.03	26 1.62	84 0.23	-	-	-	3.97	-	0.75
47	Lingayat/Lingawant/ Lingayat Gurav/ Lingayat Jungam/ Lingayat Wani	8 0.53	1019 0.87	-	-	-	-	-	0.60	1777 52.31	39.22
48	Lohar/Otaree	-	83 0.07	1 0.06	170 0.47	-	1.50	-	0.51	-	0.07
49	Luwhana/Lohanane	-	-	-	44 0.12	25 0.99	-	-	-	-	-
50	Machigar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.32
51	Mahar/Dhed	-	11136 9.45	-	2295 6.30	-	5.85	-	7.59	-	1.39
52	Mali	17 1.13	26 0.02	-	263 0.72	-	0.32	-	4.40	-	-
53	Mang/Dher/Dhor	-	56 0.05	-	35 0.10	-	-	-	2.83	4 0.12	3.50
54	Marwaree	-	4 Neg.	10 0.62	21 0.06	51 2.03	-	62 2.89	-	-	-
55	Mawaicur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31 0.91	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
56	Meet Gaore	-	1039 0.88	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
57	Mharatta	179 11.91	41976 35.63	-	-	-	0.30	35 1.63	39.66	67 1.97	4.68
58	Mharatta Butkee	-	951 0.81	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
59	Mharatta Goolam	-	1484 1.26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
60	Musulman/Attar/ Bagwan/Butkee/ Daldee/Dhuwad/ Durwesee/Fakeer/ Goolam/Jungur/ Kalwantee/Koja/ Momin/Muniar/See-dhee/Saikulgar/ Telee	47 3.13	8284 7.03	74 4.60	1837 5.04	68 2.70	11.44	123 5.74	5.38	113 3.33	12.94
61	Pardy	-	-	-	107 0.29	-	-	-	-	-	-
62	Parsee	-	26 0.02	3 0.19	26 0.07	-	-	-	-	-	-
63	Punchal	1 0.07	4 Neg.	-	-	-	-	-	-	64 1.88	2.01
64	Purbhoo/Purbhoo Pathare	181 12.04	735 0.62	-	-	-	-	1 0.05	-	-	-
65	Purdeshee	-	7 0.01	33 2.05	666 1.83	-	-	23 1.07	-	-	-
66	Reddy/Redder	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 0.35	1.34
67	Rajput/Girasia	-	4 Neg.	13 0.81	21 0.06	22 0.87	5.54	-	0.08	7 0.21	0.36

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
68	Ramoshi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.48	-	-
69	Rawal	-	5 Neg.	-	-	-	1.18	-	-	-	-
70	Sathwara	-	-	-	-	-	0.71	-	-	-	-
71	Sonar/Sonee	95 6.32	1887 1.60	105 6.53	721 1.98	29 1.15	0.76	76 3.55	1.08	38 1.12	0.22
72	Sudr	-	-	357 22.19	17433 47.84	-	-	-	-	-	-
73	Sunrekuree/ Surekuree	7 0.47	105 0.09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
74	Suronde/Surowde/ Surwude	-	98 0.08	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
75	Tambolee	-	-	-	26 0.07	-	-	-	-	-	-
76	Taru	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.09	-	-
77	Telugu Banajig/ Bellagar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 0.06	0.12
78	Thakur/Takoor/ Sarga Thakur	-	273 0.23	-	14 0.04	-	-	-	0.92	-	-
79	Tiglar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.03
80	Vaghri	-	-	-	-	-	2.25	-	-	-	-
81	Wadwal	-	174 0.15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
82	Wani/Komtee	52	3191	267	1662	1080		107		34	0.38
		3.46	2.71	16.59	4.56	42.93	3.77	5.00	1.21	1.00	
83	Minor/Unspecified	22	71	8	107	30		118		39	
		0.13	0.06	0.50	0.29	1.19	1.08	5.51	1.40	1.15	0.73
	Total	1503	117798	1609	36444	2516		2142		3397	
		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Note: S: Students; P: Population of boys under 12 years of age for the year 1820 in the case of South Concan; boys of school-going age for the year 1824-25 in the case of Khandesh; and male population for the year 1901 in the case of other districts. Neg: Negligible. Blanks indicate nils. Data in col.9 also include students of 38 Sanskrit schools not given separately.

Source: Tabulated from Parulekar, 22-52, 82, 85, 116-134, 146-150; Census of India (Bombay Presidency) 1901, Vol. 9a, Table VIII.

Table 2: Castes by traditional socio-occupational status

Sl.no. in Table 1	Caste	Traditional status		Classification
		Social	Occupational	
1	2	3	4	5
1	Agasa,,Madiwal/ Dhobee/Pureet	Rank very low, just above the impure castes.	Washermen	Menials
2	Agree	Accept Kacchi/Pakki food from Brahmins, Prabhus, and Vanis (lowest caste); Vanis, the highest caste to take water from them; rank with Maratha Kunbis.	Husbandmen	Higher agriculturists
3	Ambi, Ambig/ Kabber/Kabbaligar	Rank very low, just above the impure castes.	Fishermen, boatmen, palanquin-bearers; prostitution of women chief means of livelihood for unmarried and divorced women	Menials
4	Badig/Sootar	Rank with higher artisans	Carpenters	Higher artisans
5	Bahroopi/Bhavaya	Resemble Maratha Kunbis in appearance and religious practices.	Strolling dramatic players	Menials
	Bajania	Accept food cooked by all but Dheds, Mochis and allied castes.	Ministrels and rope-dancers.	
	Bava	Synonym for Byragee	Religious mendicants	
	Bhaveenee	Accept food cooked by Marathas; some Marathas accept food cooked by them.	Men temple menials; some strolling players and drummers; women given for 'ritual prostitution'.	
	Bhuradee	Synonym for Doure Gosavi; do not accept kachhi/pakki or water from any caste lower than Marathas; claim to be Marathas Kunbis put out of caste.	Religious mendicants	

1	2	3	4	5
	Bhute	Religious order recruited from Brahmins and Marathas; eat with Marathas in the same row.	Religious mendicants	
	Byragee	Hindu ascetics, mostly Vaishnavitas; Brahmins accept water; respectable Hindus accept food cooked by them; fairly good social status.		
	Das;Deodas	Religious order recruited from different Hindu low castes and Lingayats	Religious medicants; Some hereditary temple servants; women given for 'ritual prositution'.	
	Dombari;Kolhati	Sub-division of Jogis	Tumblers, beggars; largely depend on prostitution of women.	
	Garoodee	-	Itinerary jugglers, snake-charmers and beggars.	Menials
	Ghadsee	-	Hereditary musicians; play on drums and pipes	
	Gondalay;Gondalee	Rank lower than Marathas who do not eat with them.	Religious minstrels recruited from various castes.	
	Gosai, Atit/ Gosavi/Gossein/ Heezade	-	Religious medicants	
	Helaver	Low castes above the impure castes	Hereditary beggars; prostitute unmarried women after dedicating to Maruthi.	
	Jogi	-	Religious mendicants.	

1	2	3	4	5
	Kiliket	Rank below the Kabbaligar and above the Vudar and Koravar from whom they do not eat.		
	Manbhow	-	Religious mendicants	
	Nandana	Sub-caste of Jogis		
	Sadhu	Synonym for Byragee		
6	Beldar/Khaloo/odd/ Patrut/Vudar	Rank below the cultivating and above the impure castes.	Masons, navvies, earth and stone-workers.	Menials
	Paturwat	Closely resemble Maratha Kunbis; eat food cooked by them.		
7	Berad	Lowest well known caste from whom they eat food is Kabbaligar; highest well known caste who eat, drink, or smoke with them is Korava	Fowlers, and hunters; women given for ritual prostitution.	Tribals
8	Bhambhi	Impure caste	Village Menials	Impure caste
9	Bhandaree/Ilgar/ Kalal/Kalun	Bhandarees and their sub-divisions Kalal and Kalun take Kachhi and pakki from Brahmins; Vanis, and Marathas; rank below the Maraths; Ilgar in Dhawar rank just above the impure castes	Distillers and Liquor-vendors	Distillers
10	Bharwad	-	Shepherds and herdsmen	Menials
	Dhangur	Claim a fairly high social status below that of Kunbis.		
	Gadri	A synonym for Gadaria; a sub-division of Dhangur.		
	Gaolee	Sub-division of Dhangur		
	Golla;Gollar	-	Wandering cowherds and medicine sellers	

1	2	3	4	5
	Hanabaru	-	Cowherds and milk-vendors	Menials
	Khatic	Sub-division of Dhangur; very low social status, just above the impure castes, and impure in some places	Earlier sellers of sheep and goat; later mutton-butchers and vegetable-vendors	
	Kunchavakkal	-	Wandering buffaloe-traders	
	Kuruba	-	Shepherds and herdsmen	
	Lad	Rank below the Kurubas and eat food cooked by them	Killing sheep and selling the flesh	
	Rabari	-	Herdsmen	
	Shungur	A sub-division of Dhangur	Wool-weavers	
11	Bhat; Bahrot/ Charan	Maratha Bhats resemble and rank with Maratha Kunbis; Rajputs eat at the hands of Rajput or Gujarat Bhats known as Bahrots or Charans.	Bards and genealogists	
12	Bheel	Rank above the impure castes	Peasants, field-labourers, Hunters and gatherers.	Tribals
13	Bhoee	Highest castes which eat and drink with them are Kunbis, Sutars, Tambolees, and others of similar standing.	Palanquin and litter-bearers	Menials
14	Bhowsar; Chippa/ Nilari; Rungaree/ Putwagurry	Rank higher than most of the weaving castes and no stigma of impurity attached to them.	Dyers and calico-printers	Dyers and calico printers
15	Bhungee; Halal-khor	-	Scavengers, night-soil carriers, basket-makers.	Impure castes
16	Boorood; Medar	Rank higher than Mahars and Mangs with whom they do not eat.	Bamboo workers	

1	2	3	4	5
17	Brahmakshatri	Claim Kshatriya status	Writers	Twice-born castes
18	Brahmin	Rank highest	Priests and teachers	Twice-born castes
19	Chambhar/Dalgar/ Jingur/Mochee	Touch like that of Mahars and Dhors defiling to caste-Hindus	Leather workers	Impure castes
20	Chettri/Khatri Kshatri	Claim Kshatriya status	Hereditary silk and cotton weavers	Silk and Cotton weavers
22	Durjee/Simpy	Brahmins do not accept water; rank below the cultivating castes	Tailors	Menials
23	Gabeet/Kharva/ Kharvi	Brahmins officiate as priests; in Gujarat claim Rajput descent	Fishermen and sailors	Menials
24	Ghanchi/Mharatta Telee/Telee	In Gujarat rank almost equal to Sutars and Calico-printers	Oil-pressers and sellers	Oil-pressers
25	Goojur	Immigrant merchants from Gujarat	Traders	Twice-born castes
26	Gurav/Bhaveek Gurav/Mharatta Gurav/Wajantree	Fairly good social position; take food only with Brahmins; wear sacred thread	Temple minstrels	Twice-born castes
27	Guzratee	Presumably Gujaratee Banias	Traders	Twice-born castes
28	Najam;Valland/ Nai/Nahvee	-	Barbers	Menials
29	Hulsar	Rank with Mukris, above Mahars and below Halepaiks	Agrestic serfs	Impure castes
32	Kachhea	Said to be Kunbi and Koli cultivators who took to garden crop cultivation; all but a few Brahmins eat Pakki prepared by them.	Garden crop cultivators and vegetable sellers	Higher agriculturists
33	Kachia;Chunara/ Lonari/Upper	Rank almost equal to Vudar	Salt-makers; shell-lime burners;cement-makers;masons;stone-cutters	Menials
34	Kaikadi	Rank below Kunbis and above	Basket weavers	Menials

1	2	3	4	5
35	Kansar and allied castes	Rank with Sonars	Copper-smiths	Higher artisans
36	Katkaree/Katkaree	Eat from all but Mahars, Mangs and allied castes	Fowlers, hunters and gatherers	Impure castes
37	Katree/Khetree/ Khutree	Rank with Marathas	Husbandmen	Higher agriculturists
38	Kharak	Eat with Kunbi and Sutar; neither eat flesh, nor drink liquor	Husbandmen	Higher agriculturists
39	Kathi	NA	NA	NA
40	Kolee/Dongur Kolee/ Sonkolee	Rank below the cultivating and above the impure castes	Agricultural labourers, husbandmen; fishermen	Tribals
41	Koombhar	Rank below the cultivators	Potters	Menials
42	Koraver	Rank above the impure castes	Gypsies	Tribals
43	Kostee and allied castes	Rank below the cultivating and above the menial castes	Weavers	Weavers
44	Koonbee/Goojur Coonbee	All Ahmedabad Kunbis addressed as Patidars, a title of distinction; consider themselves superior; eat only from Brahmins	Husbandmen	Higher agriculturists
45	Kurani	NA	NA	NA
46	Laman/Lambani and allied castes	Rank below the cultivating and above the impure castes	Carriers	Menials
47	Lingayats and subdivisions	A community of castes occupying a range of positions in the social scale; as a group rank very high	Husbandmen	Higher agriculturists

1	2	3	4	5
48	Lohar/Otaree	Eat kachhi/pakki with Marathas, Malis, Vanis, and Dhangurs; Malis, Kolis, Dhangurs, Nahvis et al eat with them	Blacksmiths and metal workers	Higher artisans
49	Luwhana/Lohanane	Immigrant traders; claim Vaishya status	Traders	Twice-born caste
50	Machigar	Impure caste	Fishermen	Impure caste
51	Mahar/Dhed	Impure caste	Village menials	Impure caste
52	Mali	Rank lower than the ordinary cultivators	Florists and gardeners	Lower agriculturists
53	Mang/Dher/Dhor	Lowest among the Hindus	Leather workers	Impure castes
54	Marwaree	Name commonly applied to Banias from Marwar; consider to be representing the Vaisyas	Traders	Twice-born caste
55	Mawaicur	NA	NA	NA
56	Meet Gaore	NA	NA	NA
57	Mharatta	Claim Kshatriya status; but rank and file from the Mharatta Kunbis, and only aristocracy rank as Kshatriyas	Husbandmen	Higher agriculturists
58	Mharatta Dutkee	Impure caste	Agrestic serfs	Impure caste
59	Mharatta Goolam	NA	NA	NA
61	Pardy	-	Fowlers and hunters	Tribals
63	Punchals	Artificers of the five denominations	Artisans	Higher artisans
64	Purbhoo/Prabhoo Pathare	Claim Kshatriya status	Originally supposed to be militia; later scribes	Twice-born castes

1	2	3	4	5
66	Raddy/Redder	Rank with the Lingayats	Husbandmen	Higher agriculturists
67	Rajput/Girasia	Claim Kshatriya status	Hereditary militia/ landlords	Twice-born castes
68	Ramoshi	Earlier listed as a criminal tribe	Dacoits/Robbers	Tribals
69	Rawal	Lowest social status; short of being untouchables	Drum-players and village watchmen	Menials
70	Sathwara	-	Brick-layers, field labourers/husbandmen	Lower agriculturists
71	Sonar/Sonee	Rank equal with or above the cultivating castes	Gold and silver smiths	Higher artisans
72	Sudr	Presumably Maratha Kunbis	Husbandmen	Higher agriculturists
73	Sanrekuree/ Surekuree	NA	NA	NA
74	Suronde/Surowde/ Surwude	NA	NA	NA
75	Tambolee	Fairly good social position on account of the important nature of occupation	Betel-vine cultivators and vendors	Lower agriculturists
76	Taru	-	Boatmen/Petty traders/husbandmen	Menials
77	Telugu Banajig/ Ballagar	Respectable social position	Petty traders	Menials
78	Thakur/Takoor/ Sarga Thakur	-	-	Tribals
79	Tiglar	Low-caste Sudras equal to Pallis	Gardeners and betel-vine growers	Lower agriculturists
80	Vaghri	-	Hunters/gatherers	Tribals
81	Wadwal	NA	NA	NA
82	Wani/Komtee	Claim Vaisya status	Traders/shopkeepers	Twice-born castes

Note: NA : Not ascertained
Source: Compiled from various ethnographic, socio-historical and anthropological works referred to in the text and in the bibliography.

NOTES

1 See, P Radhakrishnan, 'Caste-discriminations in indigenous Indian Education - I: Nature and extent of education in early 19th century British India', MIDS Working Paper No.63, April 1986.

2 See, P Radhakrishnan, 'Caste-discriminations in indigenous Indian education - II: Study of early 19th century Madras Presidency', MIDS Working Paper (forthcoming).

3 As we mentioned in part I of this study, the educational data available in the Bombay returns are only for boys. Hence throughout this study, the student/school-going population and population of school-going age/population referred to are only of males.

4 Data on school-going population given by the Ahmedabad Judge are for the Ahmedabad town. The Ahmedabad Collector's return covering the whole of Ahmedabad district are also include these data. Therefore only the latter used in the Table.

5 Syke's reports are also reproduced in Parulekar's book. These reports are undated; but the second report indicates that both the reports were prepared during 1826-27. In this report, which is a continuation of the first, Syke referred to his visits to the two government schools at Ahmednagar on March 7, 1827, and the two Poona schools on May 16, 1827 (Parulekar, 193-4).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

BM Bhatia
'Growth and Composition of Middle Class in South India in 19th Century', The Indian Economic and Social History Review', Vol.II, No.4.

H Bower,
Essays on Hindu Caste Calcutta, Calcutta Christian Tract and Book Society; 1851.

Satish Chandra,
'Social Background to the rise of the Maratha Movement During the 17th Century', The Indian Economic and Social History Review, Vol.X, No.3.

Bernard S Cohn,
'The Role of the Gosains in the Economy of 18th and 19th Century Upper India', The Indian Economic and Social History Review, Vol.I, No.4.

VD Divekar,
'Survey of Material in Marathi on the Economic and Social History of India', The Indian Economic and Social History Review, Vol.XV, Nos. 1 to 4.

James Grant Duff,
A History of the Mahrattas, 3 vols., London, Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1826.

RE Enthoven,
Census of India, Vol.IX, Part I, Report, Bombay, 1901.

———,
The Tribes and Castes of Bombay, 3 vols., Bombay, 1920-2.

James Forbes,
Oriental Memoirs: A Narrative of Seventeen Years Residence in India, 2 vols., London, Richard Bentley, 1834.

GS Ghurye,
Caste and Race in India, Bombay, Popular Prakashan, 1979 (First published, 1932).

Government of Bombay,
Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, Vol.IX, Part I, 1901.

———,
Gazetter of Bombay State, Dharwar district, 1959.

Government of Maharashtra,
Maharashtra State Gazetteers, Ahmednagar district, Bombay, 1976.

JH Hutton,
Caste in India: Its Nature, Functions, and Origins, Bombay, Oxford University Press, 1977 (first published, 1946).

The Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vols. V, VIII, and XI, 1908.

LKA Iyer, HV Nanjundayya
The Mysore Tribes and Castes, Bangalore, 1928-35.

Ravinder Kumar,
'Rural Life in Western India on the Eve of the British Conquest', The Indian Economic and Social History Review, Vol.II, No.3.

David G Mandelbaum,
Society in India, Bombay, Popular Prakashan, 1970.

Ellen E Mcdonald,
'The Growth of Regional Consciousness in Maharashtra' The Indian Economic and Social History Review, Vol.V, No.2.

Gail Omvedt,
Cultural Revolt in a Colonial Society: The Non-Brahman Movement in Western India: 1873 to 1930, Bombay, Scientific Socialist Education Trust, 1976.

RV Parulekar,
Survey of Indigenous Education in the Province of Bombay (1820-1830), Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1951 (first published, 1945).

RV Parulekar, & CL Kakshi (Ed),
Selections from Educational Records, (Bombay), Part III, 1826-1840, Asia Publishing House, 1957.

David Pocock,
Kanbi and Patidar: A Study of the Patidar Community of Gujarat, Oxford, 1972. Clarendon Press, 1972.

Postans,
Western India in 1838, 2 vols., London, Saunders and Otley, 1839.

Neil Rabitoy,
'Administrative Modernization and the Bhats of British Gujarat, 1800-1820; The Indian Economic and Social History Review, Vol.XI, No.1.

RV Russell,
The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India, 4 vols., Delhi, Cosmo Publications, 1975 (first published, 1916).

A Steel,
Summary of the Laws and Customs of the Hindu Castes Within the Dekhun Provinces of the Bombay Presidency, Bombay, 1827.

Edgar Thurston,
Castes and Tribes of Southern India, 7 vols., Delhi, Cosmo Publications, 1975 (first published, 1909).

NK Wagle,
'A Dispute Between the Pancal Devajna Sonars and the Brahmins of Pune...', in NK Wagle (Ed) Images of Maharashtra: A Regional Profile of India, London, Curzon Press Ltd., 1980.

Max Weber,
The Religion of India: The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism, USA, Free Press, 1962.

****