

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை

66

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிர நான்

(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

மு. கோபுத் தான் எண். 1362

அரசாணை எண்.

மு. கோபுத் தான் எண். 1362

அச்சகம்

பலவகை

நாள்: 12. 7. 1883

199

மதுகாவலோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது.

ஆவண. கா. 1—18,006--6-9-90.

செப்பனாபுரம் பெயர் 9/1997
 செப்பனாபுரம் தஞ்சை எடுத்தது
 செப்பனாபுரம் தஞ்சை 10/1997
 செப்பனாபுரம் தஞ்சை 12/1997
 செப்பனாபுரம் தஞ்சை 12/1997
 செப்பனாபுரம் தஞ்சை 12/1997
 செப்பனாபுரம் தஞ்சை 12/1997

To 1/362

The Right Honorable W. E. Gladstone
Prime Minister of England

Sir,

The undersigned begs to state that he is a representative of the Shanar Community, a race in Tinnevely, South India.

2. This race the Shanars were according to the literature of the country, and according to the various traditions have been descended from the Old Pandiyar Kings of Madurai, a line of Kshatriya Kings that have ruled over this land.

3. Bishop Caldwell, a Bishop of the S. P. C. in Tinnevely, notwithstanding all these works has scandalized this class, Her Majesty's subjects in India, by a pamphlet entitled "Tinnevely Shanars", which has been a source of great annoyance to this class, for European and other writers very often refer to this, which is very strange when Bishop Caldwell himself acknowledges in the work that he is ignorant of the origin of the race.

4. Since he was a member of the clergy, this class whom he has abused has sent complaints to the Archbishop of Canterbury to ask him to withdraw this work of his ignorance which has been written against one of the most obedient and faithful of Her Majesty's subjects, signed by all the important members of this race in Tinnevely.

Therefore the undersigned begs in the name of all the Shanar Community that your excellency will be pleased to read the enclosed in it (a criticism on Bishop Caldwell's above said work) and to favor the undersigned with a reply expressing your excellency's opinion in the same, that we may submit it to His Grace the Lord Archbishop.

2/13²

of Canterbury that the
the work from the said may demand the withdrawal of

G. Bishop Caldwell.

most excellency's

G. & obedient servant

Rep. Gnanamuttos Nadar

13th June 1883

Palamcottah }

representative of the Shanar Community
District Court

Tinnevely

South India

(True copy)

Rep. G. Gnanamuttos Nadar

representative of the Shanar Community.

2/13²

Public (1883) Deptt

*San Gnanananda The Nadar
representative of the Shanar Community.*

BISHOP CALDWELL
AND
THE TINNEVELLY SHANARS.

By

SAMUEL SURGUNER, B.A.

Printed

By

S. SUBRAMANIA PILLAI,

at his

Chinthamani Yenthra Sala,

Palamcottah.

1883.

Dec? 6. July 83.

CORRIGENDA.

Page 1, line 14, omit *to*.

- " 6, " 25, for *Missioneries* read *Missionaries*.
- " 8, " 4, omit *the*.
- " 13, " 25, for *வருத்தவர்கள்* read *வருத்தவர்கள்*.
- " 17, " 8, " *arise* " *arises*.
- " 20, " 26, " *had* " *had*.
- " 26, " 2, " *be* " *he*.
- " " " " *abduction* " *abduction*.
- " 27, " 1, " *moment* " *moment*.
- " " " 13, insert a full stop after *caste*.
- " " " 28, " *groundthat* read *ground that*.
- " 29, " 15, " *his* " *is*.
- " 37, " 6, " *or odious* read *are odious*.
- " 40, " 18, " *to* " *into*.

APPENDIX.

- " 4, " 17, " *செய்கின்ற* read *செய்கின்ற*.
- " 4, " 23, " *கண்டேன்* " *கண்டேன்*.
- " 5, " 9, " *வகையின* " *வகையின*.
- " 6, " 2, " *காட்டு* " *காட்டு*.

3
BISHOP CALDWELL

AND

THE TINNEVELLY SHANARS.

As it is likely that Bishop Caldwell, who has been in Tinnevelly for nearly half a century, and published books on some of the various subjects connected with Tinnevelly, will shortly go home for good, I think I shall have done a part of my duty if I offer to the Tinnevelly public, while he is still among them, a few brief remarks upon such portions of his writings as may have bearing upon the Shanar caste question—a question which, to say the least, has been handled by him in a manner neither creditable to himself nor satisfactory to his readers.

Exception has to be taken in the first place against the title of his book "The Tinnevelly Shanars". When he wrote the book he was simply the Missionary in charge of Eleyengudi. Of North or West Tinnevelly he knew little or nothing excepting perhaps the high road by which he had once or twice travelled to and from Madras. The Shanars in the North of Tinnevelly, who were scarcely surpassed by any other caste in their genius for trade, did not at all answer to the dark picture of them drawn by Bishop Caldwell. So far back as 1823, i. e.,

twenty-seven years before Bishop Caldwell published his book, a Government servant writing about Sivakasi states that the Shanars "from their reputation and commercial character are styled Naddikals."* Bishop Caldwell's experience of the Shanars had been gathered in the south-eastern corner of the country which, may be roughly stated, comprises but a little less than a quarter of the whole District of Tinnevely. Overflowing with this vast amount of knowledge, he took a long voyage to London, and there published this book which, so far as the Shanars are concerned, being in defiance of truth, and the result in the main of his love of exaggeration, cannot but be regarded by every one who takes the trouble to post himself up in the subject as a monument of his ill-advised hastiness and ignorance, if not of any thing worse. A European Missionary once said in a conversation about the book that he thought Bishop Caldwell ought to have called it "The Edeyengudi Shanars."†

By way of preamble to this book the Bishop says:-
"In the absence of historical records and monuments,
* Properly Nadalkal (I silent in conversation) that is, Rulers of Naads or Districts.

† The Missionary is not quite correct though far more correct than the Bishop; for the title "Shanars" is as inapplicable to the book as the epithet "Tinnevely". See "The Tinnevely Shanars", p. 4.

is impossible to gain satisfactory information respecting the origin and history of the caste. Such particulars as I have been able to ascertain were picked up amongst the ashes of well-nigh extinct traditions." This is honest confession, and the tacit acknowledgment contained in this extract that it has been impossible for him to find out the true history of the Shanar people, and that the information he has been pleased to vouchsafe for the benefit of the world has not been satisfactory to himself, and cannot be satisfactory to others, is to be deeply laid to heart by every one of his readers, and understood before each paragraph and passage where forgetting himself he bursts forth in dogmatic assertions. What, then, must have been the presumption of a man, who, with this scanty and uncertain knowledge in his own mind, has ventured to pose as a Teacher of the world, and boldly asserted that the Shanars are "non-Aryan", "they occupy a middle position between the Vellalers and their Pariahs", "they may in general be described as belonging to the highest division of the lower classes, or the lowest of the middle classes," and so on *ad infinitum*.

In his Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages the Bishop has devoted four or five pages to a discussion of the "original use and progressive extension of the term Sudra." "It is proper to notice here", the Bishop says, "that the title Sudra conveys a higher meaning in Southern than in Northern India.

The primitive 'Sudras' of Northern India were slaves to the Aryans, or in a condition but little superior to that of slaves. They had no property of their own and no civil rights. In Southern India, on the contrary, it was upon the middle and higher classes of the Dravidians that the title of 'Sudra,' was imposed; and the classes that appeared to be analogous to the servile Sudras of Northern India, were not called 'Sudras' but 'Pallas,' 'Parias,' &c., names which they still retain. The application of the term 'Sudra,' to the ancient Dravidian chieftains, soldiers, and cultivators, may prove that the Brahmans, whilst pretending to do them an honour, treated them with contempt; but it does not prove that they had ever been reduced by the Brahmans to a dependent position, or that they ever were slaves, like the Northern Sudras, to any class of Aryans. The Brahmans, who came in peaceably and obtained the kingdom by flatteries, may probably have persuaded the Dravidians, that in calling them Sudras, they were conferring upon them a title of honour. If so, their policy was perfectly successful; for the title of 'Sudra' has invariably been regarded by Dravidians in this light; and hence, whilst in Northern India the Sudra is a low caste man, in Southern India he ranks next to the Brahman, and the place which he occupies in the social scale is immeasurably superior not only to that of the Parias or agricultural slaves but also to that of the un-

slaved low castes, such as the fisher-men and the cultivators of the cocoa-nut and palmyra palms.* The whole of this discussion by the Bishop, so far as it relates to the Dravidians, is nothing but a mass of unadulterated falsehood, which appears to have originated with the Bishop's unsound and superficial knowledge of Tamil,* combined with the imagination of his illogical mind,† which too readily took it for granted that what it found to exist now had existed always, just as it believed, as I have shown above, that what was true of a few Shanars at or about Edeyengudi must be true of each of the Shanars all over the Tinnevely District. The Bishop's illusion may be easily dispelled. However, I am now more directly concerned with the Shanars, and cannot bestow a large portion of my time and space on the topic of Sudras.

* His knowledge of Tamil can be easily gauged by his writings. Colonel Yule states that the knowledge of the South Indian Vernaculars possessed by the late Dr. Barthelemy was unrivalled or rivalled only by that of Bishop Caldwell. The statement apparently refers to Europeans as a body, and it is to be regretted that in many matters, Europeans, perhaps for want of better men, allow themselves to be led by blind guides. The reader may also like to satisfy himself whether the Colonel is, by his knowledge of Tamil, qualified to pronounce the judgment.

† I do not like to be understood as under-valuing

The classical poetical vocabularies in Tamil were, by Bishop Caldwell's showing, written during the Augustan age of Tamil literature, from about the eighth century A. D. to the twelfth or thirteenth. Let the reader take the two well-known vocabularies *தொகை* and *திருமுருகு* and read the first thirty-three sootrams of the former and the first twenty-seven sootrams of the latter, in *மக்கடபெயர் திருமுருகு*, twice or thrice over: and he will at once perceive that these sootrams are placed in a certain order, and that that order is regulated by the order of the four castes. Sootram 33 in *தொகை* is easily understood to refer to the Sudras, for the name Sudra itself occurs in its body. The corresponding sootram in *திருமுருகு* is still more clear. "திருமுருகு வந்தவர்க்கே யெவலிபூண்டொழுதுகின்ற, வெந்திரவார் தாமே விதித்த குத்திரொன்றும்."† Then the

the labours of Bishop Caldwell. Far from it. Generations yet unborn will have to thank him for his *History of Tinnevely*, *History of the Tinnevely Church*, and *the Comparative Grammar*. It is none the less true, however, that he has been a greater writer than thinker, and that his forte is to compare a dozen Grammars and Dictionaries of as many languages, and to boil down bundles of papers, be they Government records, Missionaries' letters, or copies of inscriptions, into forms of narratives.

† This and the two preceding sootrams in the print-

next preceding sootram 32 in *தொகை* and sootrams 25 and 26 in *திருமுருகு* relate, as might be naturally expected, to the Vaisyas. This name too occurs in the text. He will have then to find out the remaining two castes. Perhaps on a glance at the sootrams above the 32nd in *தொகை* and the 25th in *திருமுருகு* he will at once recognise the Brahmans in the Parpar of sootram 8 in *தொகை* and sootrams 5 and 6 in *திருமுருகு*. The detection of these sootrams is facilitated by the circumstance that the Parpar are now known by both the names *Brahmans* and *Parpar*, and that the Parpar still occupy their rightful position in society. So far, I think, the elimination has been carried accurately and successfully. But then the second class, or Kshatriyas, where are they? Naturally enough they may be expected to be found between the Brahmans and the Vaisyas, that is to say, between the 32nd and the 8th sootram in *தொகை*, and between the 25th and the 6th in *திருமுருகு*. In picking out the particular sootram of the Kshatriyas there is and there must be some difficulty. For at present we see no caste among the Tamilians apparently bearing the name Kshatriyas, or at least occupying a position inferior only to Brahmans and superior to the other castes. So the reader will have to take all the intermediate sootrams, particular-

ed copy appear to have been tampered with. But it does not affect our present purpose.

ly those concerning a class or multitude, and examine them closely with the help of his general knowledge of Tamil literature. On doing this he will observe that the sootram 11 of சிவாகரம் and sootram 7 of திசைநீர் must refer to the Kshatriyas. In தொல்காப்பியம், the oldest Tamil Grammar extant, it is said "அத்தனைத் திமத்துச் சான்றோர் தேவந்தம்...பிறர் பிறந்தினும்". "On the part of Anthanas (Brahmans), on the part of Shandore, and on the part of the rest". இத்தாமணி, one of the first rate standard works written during the Jaina period has the following from the pen of its celebrated commentator தச்சிஞ்செய்யார்: "பார்ப்பார் சான்றோர் உவ்விட்டாருக்கடி...பெயரிட்டார்" "The Parpat and the Shandore assembled together with their followers, and named (the royal child). In தஞ்சைவாணன் கோவை "அத்தனைகையும் சான்றோரும் முன்னிட்டே வரைந்தகொண்டு", "When the marriage was solemnized in the presence of Anthanas [Brahmans] and Shandore." In கம்பராபாபணம்: "அத்தனைர் வணிகர் வேளாண்மாரினர்...சான்றோர்." "Anthanas (Brahmans), Vanikar [Vaisyas], Velalars (Sudras), and Shandore." Instances of this kind can be multiplied *ad libitum*; but those I have given above will be enough to convey an impression that the word Shandore which means *the learned*, or *the intelligent* is used as the name of a class (Kshatriyas), just in the same manner as the word Parpar, which simply means *scarcely*, is applied to a class (Brahmans).

Perhaps it might be asked, If Shandore means *the intelligent*, is it not a name applicable to all castes alike? I may reply by asking, If Parpar means *those who see*, is it not a name applicable to all castes alike? The existence of a class of nouns called காரண இயற்கை explains the use of words like these. In the English version of தகவலம் this class of nouns is explained thus:—அத்தனைர் is likewise காரணம், when used with reference to any pious person, but இயற்கை in the case of Brahmins, for why should they only among the devoutly disposed be thus emphatically designated? Consequently this word also is a காரண இயற்கைப் பெயர் and common to both.

Again, not only the general order of the sootrams, but the expression "இத்த மூக்குவந்தனார்க்கே," "to these three castes," in sootram 27 of திசைநீர், precludes the idea that the name Shandore occurring in sootram 11 of சிவாகரம் is anything but the name of a caste, and that it is by any means applicable to the Sudras. Just as seeing (with the spiritual eye or the Vedast) was considered to be the attribute of only Brahmins, so intelligence or learning was considered to be the attribute or property of only Kshatriyas. Under all despotic forms of Government, the well-being of the people and the prosperity of the country in general depend upon the knowledge and good sense of the king and his lieutenants. The Hindus were so fully alive to this fact that they restricted learning to the Kshatriyas as they restricted certain fixed occupations to each

† Cf. Latin *videns*, I see.

of the other classes. So in குறள் the section on கல்வி (learning) forms but a part of the chapter on அரசியல் (qualities of the king). The commentator பரிமேலழகர் explaining this arrangement, states: "கல்வி, அரசியல் அவ்வரசன் தான் கற்றற்குரியதுக்காகக் கற்றல். அவையாவன, அறநூலும் தீர்த்துறையும் தெரியாமை குதினை படைக்கலம் என்பட்ட இவற்றினால்களும் முதலாகையாம். அரசன் அந்வுடையவனுயிருந்தால் தன்னுயிர்க்கேயன்றி மன்னுயிர்க்கும் பயன்படுதல்குறித்து இது அரசியலுள் வைக்கப்பட்டது. ஆகிலும் யாவர்க்கும் உறுதியைத்தருவதாயினு முதற்புடைமை யினுலே பொதுப்படச்சொல்லுகின்றார்." "Learning, that is, the king's learning of the arts he ought to learn; they are ethics, jurisprudence, and the arts of managing chariot-soldiers, elephant-soldiers, horse-soldiers, and foot-soldiers. This section is placed as a subdivision of the chapter on the qualities of the king, because the king, when he is learned, will be useful to all mankind as well as to himself. But the subject is treated in general terms as it has the excellence of being profitable to all men." In தாலையார் also we meet with the same plan. பதமூர்த்தி, who arranged all the isolated stanzas into parts, chapters, and sections, places கல்வி (learning) under அரசியல் (qualities of the king), and gives this as his reason, that the king, when he is learned, has the power of saving the whole kingdom as well as himself. பழமொழி which is one of the eighteen approved minor works belonging to the period of மதுரைச்சங்கம் (the Madura College) has in our

own days been divided into Parts, Chapters and Sections by சுப்பராயச் செட்டியார். He too adopts the plan of பதமூர்த்தி, and assigns the same reason. He states: "கல்விசெற்றல் அவ்வரசன் கற்கவேண்டியதுக்களைக்கற்றல். அவ்வரசன் கற்காவிடில் தன்னுயிரையன்றி மன்னுயிரையும் பாதுகாத்தல் கூடாமை யின் இது இறைமாட்சியின் பின்வைக்கப்பட்டது." "Learning. It is the king's learning of the sciences he has to learn. This is placed after இறைமாட்சி (the excellent qualities of the king), inasmuch as the king that has no learning cannot protect not only his life but that of mankind." In this section of பழமொழி on கல்வி, the 9th stanza contains an expression which is worthy of a passing notice, that is, "குலத்தடக்கி நல்லறம் கொள்ளர்க்க கொளுத்தல்." "the learned taking the ignorant into their own caste and teaching them." The annotator rightly infers from this expression that the learned constitute a caste. This caste properly means the Shandrove, but secondarily from a religious or other point of view may be taken to signify the learned in its widest sense.

Further, such of my readers as have paid attention to those sootrams in திவாகரம் and நிகண்டு to which I have referred above cannot have failed to notice the double form of the word used to designate the Kshatriyas, namely, Shandrove and Shandavar, (சாஷ்டரோர் சாஷ்டவார்). The only other grammatical form is சாஷ்டரார். The Bishop says that in the

coast of Ceylon the same or a similar caste still exist "bearing a grammatical and intelligible form of the same name 'Shandrar' of which Shanar is etymologically a corruption". Generally in colloquial, and sometimes in classical Tamil, similar words are corrupted in the same manner; e. g., மூன் and மூன்றன் become மூன் and மூன்றன், சோன் and சோன்றன் become சோன் and சோன்றன். All these three nouns Shandrar, Shandrar, and Shandravar, which are derived from the same root சாவு (to be full) and are forms of one and the same word, are used promiscuously in Tamil classical works, and are interchangeable with one another.

Doctor Winslow, however, striving to make a distinction between the seemingly two different meanings of the word சான்றன், derives it in the sense of a caste from சாவு, which means toddy or சா. He is obviously wrong in drawing this distinction which is unwarranted, for in either case the persons denoted by the word சான்றன் are the Shanars or Kshatriyas, learning having been their speciality as much as palm wine. He does not seem to have understood that the word சான்றன் and its synonymes occur in a list of castes between the names of Brahmans and those of Vaisyas, and that the list itself avers that they are not extended to Sudras. Again he was not aware that சான்றன் is employed in Tamil works as the name of a caste, as often as the word பரம்பரன் is. Besides, he did

not perceive that the word சான்றன் except as contained in the form சான்றன் or சான்றன் does not separately appear in the vocabularies as the name of a caste. He did not moreover realise that the word சான்றன், whatever may be its etymology, is capable of assuming all the three forms சான்றன், சான்றன், and சான்றன்.

It may seem not a little singular that while the names of toddy-sellers are given in சிவகாமம் and நிகண்டம், the names of toddy-drawers are not at all to be found in them. The omission is significant. The manufacture of palm wine was not in those days an industry so extensively followed as it is now, probably owing to restrictions placed upon it by Government. It appears to have been only a part of the commissariat department, jealously guarded chiefly for the benefit of the king and his soldiers.

Not only in these bare lists but in classical works generally the makers or drawers of toddy are not mentioned as a caste by themselves, nor are they looked upon as a class of heterodox or low people. A native writer well-versed in Tamil literature states; "கள்ளுண்டவரும், கள்ளுண்ணுவவர்க்கு கள்ளுண்டித்தவரும், கவ்விற்பவரும், சான்றன் டவரோடு பழகினவரும் அனலில்லாத காலம் நரகத்திடை பிடித்து வருந்துவார்கள்." "those who drink toddy, those who make other people drink toddy, those who sell toddy, and those who keep company with those who

(4883) 20/11/44

drink toddy, will suffer everlasting pain in hell." This we see that the anathema is not pronounced upon the toddy drawers, and it is for the evident reason that the so-called toddy is quite harmless when it is extracted, and differs from the பழக்கை or the fermented palm juice as much the same extent as wine differs from grapes. In truth, palm juice was esteemed a luxury fit to be consumed by the Kshatriyas and the Brahmins. It was regarded as the earthly counterpart of the celestial nectar of the gods. The palmyra tree too was deemed as sacred as its juice. "From the multifarious uses of the palmyra and its products the Hindus have dedicated it to Ganesa, and celebrate it as the 'Kalpa tree' or 'tree of life' of their paradise."†

It must be here remarked that the word கெள் the other words similar in signification have now undergone a change like the well-known word தாழ்மல் which, though it originally meant any smell, good or bad, has now been limited in ordinary Tamil only to bad smell. கெள் first meant any juice whether approved or proscribed. Accordingly in கெள்பந்தவெட்டுடல் of கம்பராமாயணம், stanza 25, cow's milk is called கெள். * கெள்நீர்நெய், that is the கெள் toddy or juice produced by the cow. When this difference in the

† Tennant's Ceylon, quoted by Dr. Brudshaw.
* This is the root of the word கெள், a shepherd, கெள், a king, is a different word.

signification of the word கெள் is borne in mind, that sootram in தீவாகமம் which gives the synonyms of கெள்வினாது "toddy sellers" will be capable of communicating valuable information to us. The sootram is "பழையது அயசு பழைய கெள்வினாது". At the very sight of this sootram one cannot help concluding that the Shanars who are கெள்பு § can by no means be included in the class of பழையது. "It is worthy of remark" says Bishop Caldwell, "that the Shanars who extract the palmyra juice which, when allowed to ferment is the ordinary intoxicating drink of the Hindu drunkard, avoid the use of it in its fermented state as carefully as the most punctilious Brahmins."

In regard to occupations we should not forget that many of them have come into and gone out of fashion at different times and different ages, like several other things in the world. "Here I may notice that to be a goldsmith, or a wine merchant, or a banker, was always held as an aristocratic employment in the past time here."†

The history of கெள்நீர்நெய், one of the sixty-

§ On the principle *exceptio probat regulam*, for an explanation of which, see Archbishop Whately's *Elements of Logic*, chapter on *Fallacies*.

† The Madras Mail, August 3, 1882. The Edinburgh letter.

Public (1883) Report

16

three apostles of siva, affords a striking proof of the normal condition and occupation of the Shanars. In the *பெரியபுராணம்* he is said to have been a சாத்திரர். He is represented as having been "an adept in the art of instructing kings in the use of the sharp victory-giving sword," "மன்னர்க்கு வென்றிக் கொடியாட்படை பயிற்சியும் தன்மைத்தொழில் விஞ்சையில் தலைமை காந்தவாரி." His relations also are said to have been military men or warriors: "மறப்படைவாட்களேந்தார்." Even to this day a large sub-division of the Shanars are known by the name of குருக்குப்பட்டையச்சாங்கோர், "the Shanars of the sharp sabre."

Though I have thus far confined myself chiefly to a consideration of the caste of the Shanars, yet those who would form a correct idea of the true state and real occupation of the Sudras will do well to study that small poem *செருமுபுது*, which has been composed by Kambar in praise of the seventy implements of agriculture. Stanzas 8, 10, 22, 24, 25, 30, and 31 are worthy of special attention. If Bishop Caldwell had read sootram 33 of *திவாகரம்* and this single work *செருமுபுது* he would never have been led into such a blunder as he has committed in his Comparative Grammar with respect to the caste of the Sudras.

It may be here inquired, If the Shanars are really Kshatriyas, how came they to occupy a position which

17

appears to be somewhat lower than that of the Sudras? This is easily accounted for. The persecution which a conquered race of rulers suffers at the hands of the conquerors, the disinclination on the part of the conquered race to reconcile themselves to their hard fate, and to rub shoulders with those classes who were but a short time ago their inferiors and servants, and the natural reaction which in such circumstances arise against the conquered race after a few years, these afford satisfactory explanation of the phenomena we meet with in the case of the Shanars. The Bishop says: "In a civilized age, the conquerors may be content with governing and taxing the conquered; but in a ruder age, and especially in a tropical climate, where labour is distasteful, the vanquished are ordinarily reduced to the condition of slaves." It is also useful to bear in mind that, whatever may be the *morgue* of Englishmen at present; there was a time when it was a disgrace for one to be called an Englishman, and a common form of imprecation among the Normans in England was "Do you take me to be an Englishman." On the other hand, the disappearance of the Kshatriyas from their rightful position in society, the coming into power of successive governments which ignored the time-honoured landmarks of caste, and that mysterious yet perceptibly working principle in the relation between masters and servants, which prompts the servants not only to imitate their masters

Public (1883) Sept 16

but to assert that they are their "Masters' caste," or of equal rank with them, are among the chief causes that have contributed to the apparent elevation of the Sudras.

Sudras have now-a-days very freely dubbed themselves *சாத்திர*, and this is one of the various causes of confusion to those who are not sufficiently versed in Tamil literature. This extension in the meaning of the word which once denoted the Kshatriyas is perhaps not more unlawful than the extension in the meaning of the words *சாத்திர* and *சாத்திர* which denote the Brahmins, so as to include Protestant padres of all castes, even Pallars and Pariahs not excepted.

A popular fallacy which is closely connected with this subject may be here noticed, namely, the fallacy of concluding that whatever is found to be Sanskrit in origin has originated with the Brahmins. This is Sanskrit, and therefore it is a peculiarity of the Brahmins is the drift of many arguments in the writings of Bishop Caldwell as well as in those of almost all other Europeans. It is inconceivable how Sanskrit could be the peculiarity of the Brahmins if it was once the vernacular or mother language of all the four castes and the outcasts. Europeans, in their ordinary dealings with natives, meeting generally with the two classes Brahmins and Sudras, imagine that the Brahmins are Aryans, and the Sudras, non-Aryans. From

this at once they jump at the conclusion that whatever is not now seen to be connected with the Brahmins is non-Aryan in its origin. If Bishop Caldwell has adopted this line of argument in declaring the Shanars to be a non-Aryan tribe, the passages I have already cited to show that the Shanars are Kshatriyas will perhaps be found to serve as a sufficient answer. But occasionally we are confronted with other reasons. Bishop Caldwell says, for example, in one place: "The essential unity of all the Dravidian dialects argues the unity of the race." But elsewhere he remarks; "The Brahmins of the several language districts have virtually become distinct castes; but," he adds, "they are all undoubtedly descended from one and the same stock." When the Brahmins are thus disintegrated, who can say that the Kshatriyas cannot be? If Bishop Caldwell had seen the Shanars when they were more famous than the Brahmins for their general knowledge as well as their knowledge of Sanskrit, I think he would not have hesitated to affirm that the Shanars were descended from the same stock as the Brahmins.

As I have already pointed out, the Brahmins among the Dravidians were, until about 300 years ago, never popularly known by the name of Brahmins. Precisely in the same manner the Kshatriyas also were never commonly designated as the Kshatriyas, although the two lower classes bore the names of Vaisyas and Sudras. If in such circumstances the Par-

Public (1883) Sept 11

Par are Aryan in origin, the Shandore too may be Aryan in origin, though both the cases may appear to be on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle.

The Parpar are now possessed of certain peculiarities which show them to be Aryans; the Shandore too, making allowances for peculiarities which may have been and which are ever likely to be lost with the loss of a kingdom, have certain customs and usages which mark them out as Aryans. Abstinence from beef and from intoxicating liquors, prohibition of the remarriage of widows, and the rules regarding their dress and jewels, are a few of the points of agreement in the customs of the Shanars and in those of the Aryan Kshatriyas now admitted to be such.

There is still another argument which is seen in the works of Bishop Caldwell. He says: "There is no tradition extant of a warlike irruption of the Aryas into Southern India, or of the forcible subjugation of the Dravidians," and therefore he concludes that it was the Brahmans who as colonists and instructors first established themselves in the Tamil country and introduced Aryan civilization into it. Here also the data for the conclusion are insufficient. It is not in the first place necessary that the Kshatriyas, wherever they went, should have wantonly made a display of their pugnacious qualities. Recourse was then had

as it is now, to the Logic of Kings only when the means of persuasion of ordinary mortals had been employed and exhausted. Again, when we consider the national or rather tribal disposition of the Brahmans and that of the Kshatriyas, the Brahmans are less likely to go abroad in search of foreign countries than the Kshatriyas are. Rama's expedition, moreover, is said to have passed through Southern India both on its way to, and on its way from, Ceylon. Arjuna is reported to have visited it in the course of his *dig-vijaya* tour, and married the daughter of a Pandian king.* Subrahmonya is represented as having established himself with a large number of followers on the east coast of Tinnevely. In Ceylon, the Bishop says, a colony of Aryans (he does not say Brahmans) settled long ago, and the Ceylonese themselves admit that this part of the continent had been aryanised before they took possession of that island. When we bear in mind all these facts we cannot help concluding that, in the ancient times referred to, there were many convenient opportunities for a colony of warriors to settle in Southern India. The Bishop writes elsewhere: "Even

* The Bishop seems to have been much puzzled by the name *Manipura*. Before the present town of Madurai was founded by the Pandiyan Kings, their residence was at Manavoor; *manavur*, and this name is capable of being easily corrupted into Manapoora or Manipoora.

Public (1883) Sept 11

22

as early as the time of the composition of the Mahabharata, the Tamraparni was visited by pilgrims and adventurers from Northern India, who bathed in its waters and settled on its banks." "If any of them (the Pandya kings of Madura) were Kshatriyas as is sometimes alleged, it can only have been at the very outset, when a Government was first instituted by the North Indian settlers at Korkel, in imitation of the regular governments of Northern India." It has only to be added that the Shanars are the descendants of the "adventurers" and "the North Indian settlers" alluded to in these passages.

Bishop Caldwell seems to have once thought that the Demonolatry of the Shanars was an evidence of the non-Aryan origin of the Shanar people. This circumstance loses its point when the Bishop himself confesses that "a similar superstition respecting goblins and demons will be found to exist all over India." But he adds that the demonolatry of the Shanars is "systematic." This is a question of fact, and so far as my knowledge goes, the worship of demons is systematically practised by all castes alike with more or less demonstration. In respect of number, the demons of the Brahmans appear to be more numerous than those of the Shanars. Even if it were conceded that the Shanars are more systematic in their worship of the devils than the other castes, it would not prove either that the demonolatry of the Hindus owed its

23

origin to the Shanars or that the Shanars are a non-Aryan tribe.

In fact, religious enthusiasm has always been capable of evolving any mode of worship out of any religion, and there can be no doubt that the so-called devil-dancing is one of the many phases of the idolatry of Hinduism, when we remember that Salvationism claims to be recognised as a part of Protestant Christianity at the close of the 19th century, and that men and women among the Jews had got into the habit of dancing on occasions of feasts and festivals about 3,000 years ago. See Judges, chapter XXI, and II Samuel, chapter VI.

The Bishop, however, subsequently modifies his dictum and writes: "In every part of Southern India, and I believe in Northern India as well, sacrifices are systematically (italics not his) offered to the village goddesses." See his lecture on Tinnevely and the Tinnevely Mission.

"A few of the Demons," says the Bishop, "are forms of Cali, connected with a debased and comparatively modern development of the Brahmanical system itself; and as such, they are known by a different name, 'Ammen,' or mother. Of these Ammens or mothers the most potent and dreaded, with the largest bevy of attendant fiends, is Bhadra Cali; and her the Shanars seem to have been taught to con-

sider as their mother, and themselves as her children, placed under her especial tutelary protection." I shall here refer to only one of the many points in this remark which invite criticism. On reading this, one cannot help thinking that a foregone conclusion and a want of reflection have evidently prevented the Bishop from drawing an inference which readily suggests itself to the ordinary reader, and it is the more surprising that the inference did not at once occur to the Bishop, seeing that he is by his profession well-versed in the meanings of expressions such as "Children of light", "Children of God", "Sons of Belial", &c. Bhadra Kali is the Bellona of the Hindus, and to a native who is acquainted with the fact that the Brahmins are called "the children of Brahma", and that the Sudras are said to be "the children of the Goddess Earth" the expression "children of Kali" can have but one meaning, viz, Kshatriyas. These expressions are founded on the Law of Heredity, or on the belief that children inherit the qualities of their parents.

"The grand national festival of the Shanars, the only day throughout the year which they keep as a holiday—that which they consider in a special manner the day of rejoicing appointed for Shanars—is the first day of the solar month of Adi. This according to the Hindu Astronomy is the first day of the Sun's southern course—the summer solstice, but of this cir-

cumstance the Shanars know nothing. No people can be more utterly ignorant of astronomy than they are. In so far as they are concerned, the first of Adi is celebrated as a festival because Ravana, the Raeshasa king of Ceylon, on that day carried off Sita the wife of Rama, the hero-god of the Brahmins. Ravana's prime minister, Mahodara, is believed to have been a Shanar; and to this day the Shanars glory in the historical position gained for once by a member of their caste, and rejoice over Rama's grief and Ravana's joy!" Here with a large mark of exclamation the Bishop has justly crowned his inconclusive and foolish argument. The festival is a fact. But the Bishop says the Shanars do not know that it is the day of the Summer Solstice, they are so utterly ignorant of astronomy, and therefore that cannot be the reason of the festival in so far as they are concerned. Does the Bishop then mean that the Shanars are such proficients in history, in ancient history, that they remember that Mahodara was their caste fellow and that he gained a victory over the Aryan hero, and through the non-Aryan Raeshasa King? If so it would be highly interesting if he had said, to give effect to his syllogism, how many of them recollected these historical or mythological facts. Did he mean to say that none of the Shanars were aware of the object of the festival? If they were all ignorant, did their ignorance prove that the festival was not cele-

brated in honour of the Sun's entering upon his southern course? Was he satisfied that the abduction of Sita by Ravana took place on the 1st day of Adi? Had he not heard that on the self-same day Sita was recovered by Rama, and that in commemoration of that important event this festival was observed? Do not the Brahmans keep the very same day as a high day? All these considerations aside, what could be the reason for the exultation of the Shanars, if Mahodara was only a prime minister of the despotic Rakshasa king? The Bishop's argument seems to me to be an illustration of the dangerous pitfalls into which even an intelligent mind may be occasionally betrayed when it allows itself to be blinded by some prejudice or pet theory.

I shall at present allude to only one more statement made by the Bishop. "The Shanars, as a class," are "the least intellectual to be found in India." "I am confident that none can be compared with the Shanars for dulness of apprehension and confusion of ideas." My readers must be well aware of the intellectual capacity of the Shanars, and I fear, therefore, they will not hesitate in this case to give the lie to the Bishop. Perhaps he may be a disciple of that eminent divine who held that there is no harm in uttering white lies. There may be no harm. It is nevertheless true that a lie that may be as white as snow in the United King-

dom is apt to assume the darkest hue the moment it is imported into India. A European Missionary who had long been connected with educational institutions in the Tinnevely and Tinnevely Districts once said that he was of opinion that Shanar students were more sharp intellectually than students of any other caste. A few respectable native gentlemen some among whom are Brahmans have also several times expressed their conviction that the Shanars, as a class, are endowed with more powerful faculties of mind than the other castes. But methinks the process by which the Bishop arrived at his notion is curious. The Seras, the Cholas and the Pandiyas were Shanars or Kshatriyas by caste. Mr. Nelson writes in his Madura District Manual, Part II., page 31; "With regard to the assertion so commonly made that the Pandiyas belonged to the Vellala caste, it is observable that tradition is at issue with it, and declares that the Pandiyas proper were Kshatriyas, but they were accustomed to marry wives of inferior castes as well as and in addition to wives of their own caste; and some of their descendants born of the inferior and irregularly married wives were Vellalars, and after the death of Kun or Sundra Pandya formed a new dynasty, known as that of the pseudo-Pandiyas. Tradition also says that Arayanayaga Muthali, the great general of the 16th century, was dissuaded by his family priest from making himself a king on the ground that he was a Vellalan, and no

Public (1883) 10/11

Vellalan ought to be a king. And looking at all the facts of the case, it is somewhat difficult perhaps to avoid coming to the conclusion that the reason assigned for his not assuming the crown was the true one." Again in Part III, page 104, "As Rama died leaving no issue, Arya Nayaga intended at first it is said, to have himself crowned king of the Southern countries; but he was laughed out of his project by a Guru, who pointed out to him that it was the business of a Vellalan to till the soil rather than to wear a crown, and that men's prejudices would be shocked by seeing one of Arya Nayaga's caste seated on the throne." From a glance at the poetical vocabularies *Sarasa* and *Sesha* it would be evident that the three kings above mentioned were *Kahatriyas*, their names being placed between the names of Brahmins and those of Vaisyas in close connection with that *sootram* which, as we have seen, refers to the *Kahatriyas*. Classical Tamil and Sanskrit works say that they were *Kahatriyas*. Tradition states that they were *Kahatriyas*. Brahmins have admitted that they were *Kahatriyas*, and Sudras have freely acknowledged that they were *Kahatriyas*. Still as it pleased Bishop Caldwell to make them any castemen but Shanars, their intellectual sharpness did not at all interfere with his estimate of the intellectual dulness of the Shanars. So also in another place he states: "The language has been cultivated and developed with immense zeal and

success by native Tamilian Sudras; and the highest rank in Tamil literature which has been reached by a Brahman is that of a commentator. The commentary of Parimelalagar on the Kural of Tiruvalluvar (a Pariar! but the acknowledged and deified prince of Tamil authors) is the most classical production which has been written in Tamil by a Brahman." In this passage the Bishop has had the pleasant task of metamorphosing a great Shanar into a rare Brahman, and therefore his idea of this Shanar's mental calibre could not modify his opinion of the un-paralleled intellectual dulness of the Shanars.

Writing about Parimelalagar he states in his History of Tinnevely: "The date of this writer is unknown, but he is believed by some to have lived in the Karisalkadu, or black cotton soil country, in the northern part of Tinnevely. In the Northern Tamil country I have always heard Parimelalagar represented to have been a Brahman, but some Pandits in Tinnevely—not themselves Shanars—maintain that he was a Shanar guru. Others assert that he was neither a Brahman nor a Shanar, but a Vellala." Here, in my humble judgment, it appears that the Bishop has been guilty either of negligence or of a want of candidness, not to say any thing about the bad taste in which he has unnecessarily introduced the words "not themselves Shanars" perhaps to indicate self-interest which

India (1883) 10/11

is one of the fallacious tendencies of all minds, that of the Bishop included. Let me, however, for the present charitably suppose that the Bishop has been guilty only of negligence, inasmuch as it appears from the tenor of his narrative that he, who, as the historian of Tinnevely, ought to have made all the inquiries he could in all parts of the country, had, until the time when he wrote the history, left the Karikal region unexplored. A short account of the Karikal region appeared in the *Madras Standard* of 1st November 1881.

The remarks I have made above may render it needless for me to enter into an examination of the statements made by many other writers, who have borrowed their information at second or third hand, and who are probably not able to give an account of the facts, if any, that is in them. Yet it may not be out of place here to notice the works of some writers who at one time or other have been too closely connected with the district or presidency to be overlooked.

Doctor Cornish, who compiled the Census report for 1871, seems to be the most important of these writers. At the very commencement of his chapter on caste he says: "The subject of caste divisions among the Hindus is one that would take a life-time of labor to elucidate. It is a subject upon which no two divisions, or sub-divisions, of the people themselves are agreed, and upon which European authorities have

have paid any attention to it differ hopelessly." Then he gives the following estimate of the value of his own Report: "Many learned missionaries and native officials acquainted with the habits and customs of the people have been consulted, and their opinions collated on definite questions, but the replies, as a rule, have been so contradictory as to raise suspicion in regard to the value of the testimony." Let us descend into particulars. "The Shanars of Tinnevely," writes a reverend missionary, "have just now had their heads turned by an absurd tract written to prove that the Shanars are descendants of the great warrior caste. They do not merely mean that they were the original kings of the soil, but that they are descended from the Aryan Kshatriyas."

"One of their proofs is the existence of a gold coin which is called popularly 'Shanar cash' owing to its having a † cross which resembles a Shanar's palmyra pole, which is well-known to be a Venetian coin, having the Latin D u x upon it, and a figure of the Doge of Venice, and one of the Virgin." With all deference to this "reverend missionary" I am led to think that he has worn his own head too lightly not to lose. His assertions contained in the first part of this extract are so vague that no notice need be taken of them here, especially after the remarks I have already made with reference to the writings of Bishop Caldwell. It

is not easy, too, to conceive how the existence of the gold coin can be alleged by the Shanars to be one of the proofs that they are descended from the Aryan Kshatriyas. It may at best prove only that some of their ancestors have been kings. Again, it is not clear what the reverend missionary means by his "Shanar palmyra pole." The cross to which he refers seems to have a greater resemblance to the *Sanyasi's* (native ascetic's) wand than to any pole in the possession of a Shanar. There are also a thousand and one other things which may be said to be more or less similar to the cross on the coin. This being so, why should the coin, the Venetian coin, be called after the name of the Shanars? The name சிலுவை itself had already been in the country, and if the object meant by the word 'Shanar cash' was nothing but the Venetian coin, the intelligent people of the country could have easily made out the pole and called the coin 'Siloovai cash'. If the 'Shanar cash' is found by the reverend gentleman to be none other than the Venetian coin, what does he think about the *குட்டை*, *குட்டை*, *குட்டை*, *குட்டை*, *குட்டை*, *குட்டை* and several other coins which are said to have once existed in the country? If the reverend gentleman will be good enough to say with what European coins he has identified any or all of them, it may be easy for me to decide how far he has allowed himself to be carried away by his wild theories. For I have seen some of the coins myself. Doctor Rott-

ler, in his dictionary published in the year 1834, defines *செருட்டை* as a "gold coin having the impression of a toddy man." In 1862, Doctor Winslow referring to this coin says it is a "*செருட்டை* said to have been invented by a man of the *செருட்டை* caste." From these two authorities it would appear that there was in 1834, a coin which actually bore the figure of a toddy man, and that even in '62 there was no question about the existence of a Shanar coin, but that Doctor Winslow was only doubtful whether it was really invented by a person of the Shanar caste. I have also in the course of my own inquiries met with men of all castes who say that they have seen the true Shanar coin with their own eyes. A Eurasian gentleman from Bangalore testified to his having seen a true Shanar coin at Bangalore about 40 years ago. From all the foregoing circumstances I think I can safely say, without laying myself open to the retort of having had my own head turned, that it is highly probable that in days gone by there was a true Shanar coin, and that the Venetian coin came to be styled 'Shanar coin' by illiterate people in consequence of the partial resemblance it bore to the genuine one. If *குட்டை*, *குட்டை* and *குட்டை* have taken their names, as Rottler and Winslow define them, from the several figures they bore, it is just that *செருட்டை* also should have been so called after the figure of the toddy man it bore. On more than two or three occasions I have had shillings

Public (7883) 1944

presented to me in the place of 8 anna pieces, and once a man offered to me a florin supposing that it was a rupee. Marco Polo who visited China at the end of the thirteenth century recorded the fact that paper money was then current in the Celestial Empire. But during the last hundred years or so even antiquarians thought that Marco Polo was mistaken, and that no paper money could have been in use then. Sir Pope Hennessy, however, produced a specimen of the paper money in question, about a year ago, and set their doubts at rest.

Then Doctor Cornish adds: "The proofs advanced generally by these caste historians are pretty much on a par with the specimen above given. They satisfy or convince the particular caste for whom they were composed, while other classes of the community treat them with scorn and disbelief." It is very likely that this piece of information also has been given to him by the "learned missionaries" and the "native officials," consulted by him. I can then in my turn tell him and his readers that many respectable and intelligent gentlemen of almost all castes have told me that they are quite convinced that the Shanars are Kshatriyas. A Brahman gentleman who is well-versed in Sanskrit writes to me to say that it is entirely true that the Shanars are Kshatriyas. And now to the matter of common sense I may ask the Doctor to read the "caste literature" of the Shanars himself and then to

say whether he treats it with "scorn and disbelief."

The Doctor writes at page 141 of the first volume of his report: "The kings of Southern India in ancient times made no claim to descent from the warrior castes." The Doctor alone has been a stranger in Southern India who has not known the fact that the kings did make claim to descent from the warrior castes, and that their claim was universally admitted.

Again at page 162, the Doctor speaks of the "Palm cultivator castes (Shanars)" and of "the various castes engaged in palm cultivation." I do not object to the expression "palm cultivator castes," but why should "the various castes engaged in palm cultivation" be styled "Shanars" is a mystery to me. Even in the southern districts of this Presidency Pariahs, Mussalmans, Vellalars, and Vadoogars are here and there engaged in the cultivation of palm trees. It is, however, no doubt a matter for congratulation to the Shanars that it has not yet fallen to the lot of the venerable Doctor to write a Census Report for the whole of Asia. If it ever should, as the palm-leaf palm, not to speak of the other species of palm, is said to be found native along the entire northern shores of the Indian Ocean from the mouth of the Tigris to New Guinea, he would, at a stroke of his pen, transform all "the various castes engaged in palm cultivation" into Shanars, and laconically add that the peculiarity of any one of them is "more or

less" found among "all the Shanar tribes." The following are a few of the statements which are absolutely false, and for which the Doctor's own prolific imagination or that of his irresponsible and irrepressible "learned missionaries" and "native officials acquainted with the habits and customs of the people" is to be held answerable.

"The Shanars of Tinnevely and the south of the peninsula are also called *Ilavar*." The Shanars and the *Ilavars* are two distinct castes.

"In the Tinnevely District they are divided into five families, but these intermarry." They do not intermarry.

"The Shanars are every where a hard-working, industrious people, eating freely of flesh and fish and drinking the toddy and spirit they extract from the palm trees." They do not extract any spirit from the palm trees, nor do they drink toddy or fermented palm juice. Bishop Caldwell has said that the Shanars avoid the use of the fermented palm juice "as carefully as the most punctilious Brahmans."

"The sexual relations are extremely loose within the caste (*Tirar*), and similar customs are more or less common amongst all the Shanar tribes." "The relations of the sexes and their (Shanars') religious development are just those of all aboriginal people."

Whether the religious development of the Shanars

is aboriginal, Aryan, Semitic, or all three at once, may be gathered by the reader from what I have already said about the demonolatry of the Shanars. But the Doctor cannot be sufficiently condemned for his wild assertion about the relations of the sexes among them. Comparisons or odious, or I can here tell the reader which class in Southern India, or which sub-division of which class in Southern India is most notorious in this respect. I shall therefore for the present content myself with the counter assertion that the Shanars—I mean, the Shanars proper, not the Doctor's Shanars—as a whole, are one of the chastest classes, if not the chastest class, in all South India. Any person who has a personal knowledge of the Shanars will find himself constrained to admit that the relations of the sexes among them are as rigid as among any class or race on the face of the world.

The only other writer whom I shall now notice is Mr. A. J. Stuart. In his "Manual of the Tinnevely District" he writes: "The Kshatriyas are suspected to be mostly Shanars who are fond of arrogating to themselves titles which imply a higher place in the social scale than that assigned to them by the general accord of other castes. There is, however, a Rajput colony in the district, namely at Rajapoliem in the Srivilliputtur Taluk." Without even whispering in the ears of my reader that there is no Rajput colony

Public (4883) Sept 44

at Rajapoliem, I shall dispose of this remark summarily with the observation that the language here used is too strong for one who has done nothing but pin his opinions to the sleeves of others. He ought to have found it very convenient to think by a proxy, for eulogising Bishop Caldwell he says that he has laboured among the Shanars as a missionary for upwards of thirty years, and there can be no better authority than he. I need not say here that years alone are not a sufficient guaranty of truth or wisdom. Truth is truth though it may happen to be uttered by a baby, and falsehood can never become truth simply because it emanates from the mouth or pen of a Mathiaselah. It has to be conceded that, during his long stay in Tinnevelly, the Bishop must have had many opportunities of knowing the truth with regard to the origin and history of the Shanar race. But if the reader finds, on an examination of Bishop Caldwell's works, that in spite of his tall talk and ponderous tomes, he has succeeded in discovering only the mare's nest, he will agree with me in thinking that the Bishop has made a worse use of a considerable part of his invaluable talent of time than the man in the parable who was good enough to remember that to bury his talent in the ground would be attended with no loss of energy in himself, and do no harm to any of his neighbours.

Now, my dear reader, before I conclude these re-

marks I wish to draw your attention to the consequences, past, present, and future, of these writings of Bishop Caldwell. The immediate result of his "Tinnevelly Shanars" in Tinnevelly was a disgraceful and dangerous schism in the Tinnevelly Church. The reader, especially if he is a Christian, may shudder to be told that such a serious and deplorable division in the camp of the Tinnevelly Church has been the outcome of Bishop Caldwell's unwise and shortsighted policy, yet I can assure him that I am satisfied it has been so. If Bishop Caldwell had been a wiser man even after the publication of his "Tinnevelly Shanars" this lamentable rent in the once beautiful and growing Church of Tinnevelly could have been easily averted.

Referring to this schism the learned author of "The Trident, the Crescent and the Cross" says: "Caste prejudices seem to have originated this movement. A number of Shanar converts wished to uphold their caste distinctions. The missionary in charge of the station (Nazareth) resisted the tendency; the schism followed as the consequence of his opposition."

Yes, the Converts wanted to uphold their caste only when it was wantonly insulted by Bishop Caldwell.

Another result of his writings is that the feelings

Public (4883) Sept 4

of all the Shanar people of South India, whether they Christians or not, have been unnecessarily offended. Even the Bishop's fonderer curses him behind his back. Almost all the Christian Shanars have been led to look upon European missionaries with distrust and sometimes with hatred. Intelligent Hindu Shanars have no confidence in them, and consequently there is no friendly feeling between them. From this state of things and from various other signs of the times it appears to me not to augur well for the peace, unity, and growth of the Tinnevely Church, if Bishop Caldwell does not hasten to make amends for the incalculable injury he has inflicted upon the Shanar race either by his *cacothres scribendi*, or in trying to do what he perhaps once thought to be his duty according to his own lights.

Bishop Caldwell's works have thrust the Shanars to a position of unenviable notoriety, and every villain of a scribbler now-a-days ventures to write as if he were quite convinced of the Non-Aryan or aboriginal origin of the Shanars, their degraded condition, and a thousand and one other points which are far from being complimentary to the Shanars.

And last of all, in consequence of Bishop Caldwell's works, certain classes of Christians have been taught to regard caste as a quasi-sacred institution which is respected and made much of even by Europeans.

Missionaries, and therefore they now cleave to it with a degree of attachment and tenacity which is seldom met with even among Hindus. Christians are thus divided, while caste, alas! is gaining ground every day.

I shall now bring these observations to a close. Compelled by circumstances, I have made a feeble attempt to perform a duty which has not been pleasant to myself. I do not, however, for that reason desire the reader to treat my remarks with indulgence and forbearance. If he does me simple justice I shall feel myself exceedingly happy. "Poetry, Geography, Moral Essays, the divers subjects of Philosophy, Travels, Natural History, books on Sciences, and, in short, the whole range of book-knowledge is before you; but there is one thing always to be guarded against, and that is, not to admire and applaud any thing you read, merely because it is the *fashion* to admire and applaud it. Read, consider well what you read, form your own judgment, and stand by that judgment in despite of the sayings of what are called learned men, until fact or argument be offered to convince you of your error. One writer praises another; and it is very possible for writers so to combine as to cry down and, in some sort, to destroy the reputation of any one who meddles with the combination, unless the person thus assailed be blessed with uncommon talent and uncommon per-

severance." If the reader will follow this sound advice given by William Cobbett, he will be once in a position to exclaim with him: "This, as far as I recollect, was the first emancipation that has assisted me in my reading. I have, since that time, never taken any thing upon trust: I have judged for myself, trusting neither to the opinions of writers nor in the fashions of the day."

APPENDIX.

திவாகரம், மக்கட்பெயர்த் தொகுதி.

8. பார்ப்பார் பெயர்—ஐயர் வேதிய ருபிறப்பாளர், மெய்
யர் மிக்கவர் மறையோர் புகார், அத்தனார் அலோ ரு
தொழிலாளர், செந்திலுளர்ப்போ ருயர்த்தோ ராய்த்தோர்,
சுதிவருணர் வேதபாசகர், விப்பிரர் தொழுருலத்தோர் வே
ய்வியாளர், முப்புகிலோர் முனிவரென்றிவை, தப்பில் பா
ர்ப்பார் தம்பெயராகும்.

11. அறிவுடையோர் பெயர்—சான்றோர் மிக்கோர் நல்ல
வர் மேலவர், ஆய்ந்தோ ருயர்த்தோ ராரியருலகென, வாய்
ந்த வான்தோ ரறிவுடையோரே.

32. செட்டிசுதன் பெயர்—இப்பர் பரதர் வைபவர் கவிப்
பர் எட்டிய ரிளக்கோக்க னேர்த்தொழிலர் பசுக்காவலர்,
ஒப்பினுய்கர் வினாஞர் வணிகரென், மத்தகு கிரேட்டிகள்
செட்டிகுதன்பெயரே.

33. காராளர் பெயர்—வினாஞர் சூத்திரர் பின்னவர் சதுர்
த்தர், வணமையர் வேளாளர் மண்மகன்புதல்வர், வார்த்தைத்
தொழிலோர் வண்களம ருழவர், சீர்த்தவேளின் வாழ்தர் கா
ராளர்.

நிகண்டு, மக்கட்பெயர்த் தொகுதி.

5, 6. மறையாளர் பெயர்.

7. அறிஞர் பெயர்—சான்றவர் மிக்கோர் நல்லோர் தகுதி
யோர் மேலோ ராய்த்தோ, ரான்றவ ருலக மேதாவிய ரறி
ஞர்க்கு பெர்.

Index (1983) Page 44

25, 26. வைபவப் பெயர்.

27. இந்த மூக்குவத்தனார்க்கே யெவல் பூண்டுபெறு
கின்ற, வெந்திலாளர் தாமே விதித்த மூத்திர சென்றும்.

The reader might at first blush suppose that these sootrams are mere skeletons of dry bones, but he will understand that each of them may serve as a definition if he will read them as a similar sootram in which is generally read by commentators.

மகவுரை பதிக மணித்தனா அந்நகம், புறவுரைத்
தனை புனைத்தனா பாயிரம்.

பாயிரங்கூறப்பெற்றார் தன்குபேசியவற்றைப் பெயர்
கற்பகங்கூறிய தென்னையெனின் இப்பாயிரம்பதிகமாயி
ய புறவுரையாற் றந்தனாக்கப்படுவதென அந்நின்று
யாதவனியாய்நுள் ளுரைக்கப்படுவதென்பதிகாரணத்தி
னாலே விளக்குதலினால்.

The sootram பழையத் துவசர் படுவர் கல்வியுள் must
be interpreted in the same manner.

Words are said to be fossil history, and the reader will find that each of the words in these sootrams contains a history in a nut-shell of the class which is employed to denote.

The occupations of the four castes are given in the following sootrams.

இவாகரம் பல்பொருட்டிட்டத்தொடு பெயர்
தொகுதி.

78. அத்தனை ரறுதொழில்வகைப் பெயர்—ஒத லோதவி
ததல் வேட்டல் வேட்டித்தல், ஈத வேற்ற வென்றிமுலைகை,
யாதித்தாலத்தந்தனாறுதொழில்.

79. அசு ரறுதொழில் வகைப் பெயர்—அரசாறு தொழி
லோதல் வேட்டல், புனாதிப்பெரும்பாற்புரத்தல்தல், ச
னாயுபடைக்கலக்கற்றல் விசயம்.

80. வணிகரறு தொழில்வகைப் பெயர்—வணிகரறு தொ
ழிலோதல் வேட்டல், ஈத அளவு பகக்கால் வானிகம்.

81. வேளாள ரறுதொழில் வகைப்பெயர்—வேளாளாறு
தொழி அழவு பகக்கால், தென்னிசின் வானிபுந்ருபிலவம்
காருகவினை, பொள்ளிய விருபிறப்பாளர்க்கெவல்செயல்.

The reader may satisfy himself which of the four
castes had any of the "learned professions" assigned
to them.

காலடியார், 15ம், அடிகாரம், 2ம், பாடல்:
சான்றான்மை சாயலொழுக்கியை மூன்றம்
வான்றோப் குடிப்பிறந்தார்க்கல்லது—வான்றோயு
மைதவழி பெற்பபடா அபெருஞ்செயல்
மெய்தியக்கண்ணுற் பிறர்க்கு.

இவ்வுரைவையார் says:
தரையே யாகுமா தீராம்பு குக்கற்ற
அவளவே யாகுமா அண்ணலியு—மேலைத்
தவத்தனவே யாகுமா தான்பெற்ற செல்வம்
குலத்தனவே யாகும்குணம்.

காலடியார், 35ம் அடிகாரம் 1ம் பாடல்
கப்பிகடவதாச் சாலை தன்வாய்ப் பெயினும்
குடிபெயினைப் போவர்க் கோழிபோன்—மீக்க

India (1883) Report

4

கனம் பொதித்த அல்லித்துக் காட்டினது மேற்கு
மனம் புரிந்தவாறே மிகும்.

This chapter on சித்மை and chapter 16 on மேன்ம
ககர் are to be specially recommended to be carefully
studied by the reader. The மேன்மக்கள் or noblemen
are the Kshatriyas or Shandore. In திவாகரம் the
Kshatriyas alone are called மேலவர்; and in திசை the
Brahmans are named மேற்குவர் while the Kshatriyas
are termed மேலவர். This chapter on மேன்மக்கள் is
one of the seven chapters of அரசியல் according to the
classification of பதமரூர்.

தொல்காப்பியம், பொருளதிகாரம், கற்பியல், 5-வது
குத்திரம்;

அத்தனார் திறந்தது சான்றோர் தேனத்தம்

அத்தமிழிதற்பிற் பிறப்பிற் திறத்தினும்.

செவகதிந்தாமணி, நாமகளிலம்பம், 361-வது பாடல்:

கூற்றமஞ்சுக்கொன்னுனையேடுகினியானு

மாற்றமஞ்சுமன்னியகற்பியம்மடவாரும்

பொற்றித்தத்தபுண்ணியர்க்குடிபுகழோனைச்

சேற்றத்துப்பிற்செவகனைக் கே பெயரிட்டார்.

கச்சினர்க்கினியாருரை: திவாகரம் மடவாரும் விரும்

புகழ்கொன்னுத்தபார்ப்பார் அரங்கோர்வளவுட்டோருக்க

கச்சேற்றத்துப்பிற் புகழோனைச் செவகனைக் கே பெயரிட்டார்

என்க.

தஞ்சைவாணன்கோவை, வரைதல், 366-வது பாடல்:

செவகனை விண்ணவந்து அத்தனையுஞ்சு

ன்றோனையு முன்னிட்டு வரைத்ததுகொண்டு

தக்கனடோ மெழ்த்துநல்.

5

26

சேலார்புனல்வையகூழ்த்தஞ்சைவாணன்கொன்றாறையினம்
சேலானென்பிறர்வேட்டவாயர்மனம்பெண்ணிவின்
பாலாரமளியும்பாற்கடலானது பங்கயக்கண்
மாலாயினனிவனுத்திருவாயினன்மாதருமே.

கம்பராமாயணம், வடித்தகாண்டம், திருவயிடேகப்
படலத்தில்:

அத்தனார்வணிகர்வேளான் மரபினராலிதாட்டுச்

சத்தனியுயத்துவளந்சுடையனையனையசான்றோ

ருய்த்தனமடிபெமென்னுமவகையினருவரிநான

லத்தனிராமன் கோயிலமங்கலத்துரிமைமாக்கன்.

This stanza is not found in the printed copy, for
the process of expurgation is now rather too freely
practised by different sects on their own sectarian
principles. In the old cadjan manuscript kept at pre-
sent in Bishop Sargent's C. M. S. Library, the second
line reads சக்கரனைய instead of சுடையனையனைய, in
some other manuscripts the line runs சத்தனியவரும்வள்
ர்த சக்கரனையசான்றோர்.

நாலடியார், 22ம் அதிகாரம், 6ம் பாடல்:

சுடையாயார் தட்டிற் கருகனைய ரேனை

பிடையாயார் தெங்கி னையர்—தலையாயர்

சென்னரும் பெண்ணெபோன் றிட்டாரான் றிட்டதே

தொன்மை யுடையார் தொடர்பு.

10-ம் அதிகாரம், 6-ம் பாடல்:

தஞ்சை வேதிகைச் சுற்றக்கொட்ட புக்க

படுபனை யன்னர் பலர்தச்சவாழ்வார்

Index (4883) 10/1/66

செய்து கொடுத்த கண்காணிப்புக் குழுக்கள்
கீழ்க்கண்டவற்றைப் பற்றி.

20-வது அக்டோபர், 5-ம் பாக்டல்:
தலைவரவர்கள் அந்தியோகாவுக்கு
செல்லவல்லவா? பொருளில்லாத—தொல்லைப்பி.
பெரும்பொருள்களையும் கல்வி வாகனம்
பெயர்ந்திருக்கும்.

பெரியபுராணம், ஏனென்தான் தாய்நாடு புராணம்;

2-வது பாக்டல்:
வெளிக் குடும்பத்தினர் அங்கு வந்தால்
குழக்கங்கள் தான். தானே குழக்கம் இல்லாமல்
வாழ்க்கை நடத்த முடியுமா? பொருள் இல்லாமல்
வாழ்க்கை நடத்த முடியுமா?

3-வது பாக்டல்:
தான் மைத்திரித்தான். தொண்டன் வந்தான்.
கண்ணன் வந்தான். நல்ல மைத்திரித்தான்.
மூன்று பேர் வந்தால் படைப்பித்தான்.
தன்மைத்தான் வந்தான். பிறர் வந்தான்.

12-வது பாக்டல்:
புறப்பட்டபொருள் கட்டிப் போட்டுத் தான்.
விற்றபொருள் கட்டிப் போட்டுத் தான்.
மறப்பட்டபொருள் கட்டிப் போட்டுத் தான்.
தொறப்பட்டபொருள் கட்டிப் போட்டுத் தான்.

38-வது பாக்டல்:
தந்தையார் குழந்தையாகக் கட்டிப் போட்டுத் தான்.
பொருள் கட்டிப் போட்டுத் தான்.

மதம் வந்தால் சொல்லி வரக் குறித்தவர்களைத் தேர்
பதிலாக முன் வரவுபார்த்துத் தனித்திரு.

"மகா கலியாணிய கம்பர் வேளாளர் மேற்பாடிய
எனமுபது." 8-ம் பாக்டல்.

தொழுகுலத்தித்தான். தொழுகுலத்தான்.
தொழுகுலத்தான். தொழுகுலத்தான்.
தொழுகுலத்தான். தொழுகுலத்தான்.
தொழுகுலத்தான். தொழுகுலத்தான்.

10. வேதியர் தருவார் குலமும். விற்றவெந்தர் பெருங்குலம்.
தெய்வம் படைத்தவன். தெய்வம் படைத்தவன்.
தெய்வம் படைத்தவன். தெய்வம் படைத்தவன்.
தெய்வம் படைத்தவன். தெய்வம் படைத்தவன்.

22. மட்டிக்குத் திருமாய். மட்டிக்குத் திருமாய்.
மட்டிக்குத் திருமாய். மட்டிக்குத் திருமாய்.
மட்டிக்குத் திருமாய். மட்டிக்குத் திருமாய்.
மட்டிக்குத் திருமாய். மட்டிக்குத் திருமாய்.

24. அடுத்தித்தான். அடுத்தித்தான்.
அடுத்தித்தான். அடுத்தித்தான்.
அடுத்தித்தான். அடுத்தித்தான்.
அடுத்தித்தான். அடுத்தித்தான்.

25. வெறுப்பதெல்லாம் பொய்யினையே வேளாளர் மெய்யு.
வெறுப்பதெல்லாம் பொய்யினையே வேளாளர் மெய்யு.
வெறுப்பதெல்லாம் பொய்யினையே வேளாளர் மெய்யு.
வெறுப்பதெல்லாம் பொய்யினையே வேளாளர் மெய்யு.

30. வெறுத்தால் அகியோகம். வெறுத்தால் அகியோகம்.
வெறுத்தால் அகியோகம். வெறுத்தால் அகியோகம்.
வெறுத்தால் அகியோகம். வெறுத்தால் அகியோகம்.
வெறுத்தால் அகியோகம். வெறுத்தால் அகியோகம்.

8

See also திருநாட்டுப்பதமம், stanza 18.

118:—
அதேபோல முதலியார் "தொண்டைமண்டலத்தை விடத்
தென்நாடு வடகிழக்கு நோக்கம் வந்திருக்கும்படியான
புறநாடுகளைவிடக் குடும்பங்கள் முதல் பெருந்தொண்டை
தொண்டைப்பட்டத்திலுள்ள தொண்டைமண்டலத்தை
விடப் பெரியவை வல்லியல்புடையவையும் முதல் தொண்டை
தொண்டை" என்பார்.

In his "Geographical and Statistical Memoir of Tinnevely" Mr. Thomas Turnbull writes: "In times of remote antiquity this province formed part of the great Pandian dynasty, the capital of which was Madurai; and was divided into principalities and states, denominated Naads, governed by a noble race of Chettin Princes, whose title and designation was Maha Chakrawarti Pandi Rajah; their government was monarchical and despotic, each possessing an internal government, independent of one another; their succession was hereditary." The rulers of the Naads were called Nadans or Nadalkal.

Public (250) Sept:
12th JUL 1833 321 am + A.
Book

BY G. D. M.
Petition

from Y. Guanamattukadar
Representative of the
Shanar Community
of Tinusselly.

7402594/13

No.

1362

Dated 13 June 1893

Received 10 July 1893

Enclosure - the Book

SUBJECT.

Praying that he
may be furnished with the
opinion of J. M. on his work
a Bishop of Caldwell and
the Tinusselly Shanars.

Order 12 July 1893 V: 1362/44
The Govt. decline to

For

forward this petition

JW.

gm.