

Narayanrao Topiwala Memorial
Educational Research Series
Volume I

A SOURCE BOOK
OF
HISTORY OF EDUCATION
IN THE
BOMBAY PROVINCE

PART I
Survey of Indigenous Education
1820-1830

Edited by
R. V. Parulekar, M. A., M. Ed. (Leeds)
Principal
Shree Maharani Tarabai Teachers College
Kelhapur

1945

Price Rupees Ten

Sole Agents
THE BOMBAY BOOK DEPOT
New Charni Road, BOMBAY 4

Printed by:

- (1) Pages i to xxix and 1 to 118 printed by
Mr. B. N. THAKAR at the Shri Siddheshwar Press,
Kolhapur, and
- (2) The Title page, Preface, Contents and
pages xxx to xxxi printed by Mr. M. J. PADHYE,
at the Shri Laxmi Narayan Press, Kolhapur

Published by:

Mr. R. V. PARULKAR, M. A., M. Ed. (Leeds),
Principal, Shree Maharani Tarabai Teachers College,
Kolhapur

PREFACE

This first volume of the 'Narayanrao Topiwalla Memorial Educational Research Series' is styled as "A Source Book of History of Education in the Bombay Province, Part I." The volume contains documents selected from the Bombay Secretariat Record Office and they relate to the State of indigenous education in the Province as it prevailed in the years 1820-1830.

Curiosity has been recently aroused regarding the extent of education in India in the pre-British days since the publication of Sir Philip Hartog's "Some Aspects of Indian Education, Past and Present", (O. U. P.). Fisher's Memoir and allied documents submitted to the British Parliament in 1832 and Adam's Report on the Indigenous Education in Bengal recently re-published in full by the Calcutta University, are the only two important documents hitherto available for a critical study of the state of indigenous education in India as it prevailed before the British system took roots in India. The present volume which throws light on the system of indigenous education in the Province of Bombay is the *third* source of information on the subject. Although a short summary of some of the documents published in this volume does appear in Fisher's Memoir, they were not hitherto published in their original full form.

I have written a fairly long introduction to the documents wherein I have tried to present to the reader the most salient features of the indigenous system of education as revealed in the documents now made available for the first time. The facts and figures given in the several documents are weighed and assessed from the point of view of accuracy; and an estimate of the extent of education in the Bombay Province in the pre-British days is also made which, it is hoped, will be interesting and instructive to those who would like to know the past in order to justly assess the present.

A good many documents on educational subjects can be selected for publication from the Bombay Secretariat Records. The documents contained in this volume represent only a fraction of such material. It is my intention to publish at least four volumes which will make available to the student of history and administration of education in Bombay, selected records from the Bombay Secretariat and some of the published records also which are not now easily available for reference. These four volumes will cover a period dating from 1820 to about 1855. They will refer to the Province of Bombay only. It is hoped that these volumes which together will comprise what I am calling 'A Source Book of History of Education in the Bombay Province' will make available to a student of education a good deal of material as food for thought, so that he may interpret facts as he views them and not accept blindly the interpretation given by others. It is out of such efforts that a real history of education in the Bombay Province will see the light of the day.

This volume is the first of what I have called 'Narayanrao Topiwalla Memorial Educational Research Series', in grateful memory of the gentleman (The Late Mr. Narayanrao Anant Desai Topiwalla of Bombay), who first encouraged me to undertake the work which I am partially publishing in the form of this first volume. It was his friendship and patronage that provided opportunities to me for training in research in a foreign University and it was his unstinted support that encouraged me to pursue in the field in spite of worldly difficulties and handicaps. His son Mr. Motiram Narayanrao Desai Topiwalla has continued to extend the same feeling of friendship towards me and it is with his sympathy that I have undertaken the publication of a series of volumes on educational research of which the present volume is the first.

It was in the year 1927 that permission was obtained from the Government of Bombay to search the Secretariat Records. Within a year or two, a good deal of material bearing on education was selected. A long interval of seventeen years has elapsed before a part of the selected material could be published in the form of the present volume. It is hoped that the rest of the volumes will be published without such delay. I must express my grateful thanks to the authorities of the Bombay Secretariat Record Office for their permission to search the Records and also for releasing for publication the documents selected in this volume. Mr. N. S. Nadkarni the former officer and Mr. D. G. Bhide the present officer in charge of the Records have obliged me much by their prompt and willing help.

The University of Bombay has rendered me good help in enabling me to select the records, a part of which is now being published, by awarding a substantial grant for the work. This grant was given as far back as 1927. I am really sorry that for a long time I could not give a practical shape to the work for which the Bombay University had so generously given help as far back as 1927. In the second volume of the series I shall include the rest of the material I have already selected from the Secretariat Records.

Lastly, I must acknowledge the invaluable help which my friend and colleague Prof. B. B. Samant rendered in seeing the book through the Press in all its details. I must admit frankly that it was the assurance of his help that enabled me to bring out this volume which otherwise would have hardly seen the light of the day even in 1945.

CONTENTS

	Pages
Introduction	i-xxix
(1) The Documents	i-ii
(2) Origin of the Enquiry of 1824	ii-iii
(3) How far are the Reports reliable	iii-v
(4) Elementary Schools	v-vi
(5) The Teachers of the Elementary Schools	vi-ix
(6) The Scholars of the Elementary Schools	ix-x
(7) The Course of Instruction in the Elementary Hindu Schools	xi-xiii
(8) The Mode of Instruction in the Hindu Indigenous Elementary Schools	xiii-xiv
(9) The Length of the Course of Instruction in the Elementary Schools	xiv-xvi
(10) Extent of Education	xvi-xviii
(11) Domestic Instruction and Private Tuition	xviii-xix
(12) Female Education	xix-xix
(13) Education of the Cultivating Classes	xix-xxii
(14) Education of the Mahomedans	xxii-xxiv
(15) Education of the Parsee Community	xxiv-xxiv
(16) Education of the Depressed Classes	xxiv-xxv
(17) The Hindu Schools of (Higher) Learning	xxv-xxix
List of Documents	xxxi-xxxii
Section I : Konkan	1-35
Section II : Gujrath	36-60
Section III : Khandesh	61-75
Section IV : Deccan	76-97
Section V : Farish's Report and Minutes by the Governor and his Colleagues	98-110
Section VI : Further Reports on Education	111-118

INTRODUCTION

I The Documents

The documents printed in this volume are selected from the Bombay Secretariat Records (vide the attached List). They consist mainly of reports by high officers of the Bombay Government on the state of education in the province during the years 1820-1830. The reports attempt to describe the system of indigenous education in its various aspects as it existed before the British administration launched its own schemes of education in the Province. They also try to suggest ways and means for its improvement and extension.

The reports may be divided into two groups. The first group forms the major portion of this volume (pp 1-97). These reports were submitted during the years 1824-1825 in response to a letter from Government dated 10th March, 1824, (pp. 109-10) calling upon the officers in the districts to supply information on the existing state of education and ways and means to improve and extend it. A summary of some of these reports was submitted to Government by James Farish Esq., Secretary to Government, in 1825, which is given on pages 98-117. This summary is followed by the Minutes of the Governor and his Councillors (pp. 107-108).

The second group of reports styled ' Further Reports on Education ' (p. 111-118) contains a report submitted to Government by the Registrar ' Bombay Suddar Dewanee Udalat ' on behalf of the Judges at the Adalat who were requested by Government to make a periodical report on the state of education in the Province, after obtaining the information from the district officers. This report is dated 16th October 1829. It is a most valuable document in as much as it covers the whole of the then Presidency of Bombay (except the city of Bombay) and particularly because it furnishes a table of schools, scholars and population of all the districts in the Province. (p. 114).

The second group of reports also contains two reports on education made by Major W. H. Sykes Statistical Reporter to Government of Bombay, probably between 1826-1828. It appears that he submitted these two reports not because he was called upon to do so, but because he was interested in the subject and wanted to acquaint Government with what came under his observation in regard to education while touring the districts. They refer mainly to the districts of Khandesh, Poona and Ahmadnagar.

It will thus be seen that the two surveys made in 1824-25 and in 1828-29, do not include the Presidency town of Bombay. Nor do they cover all the districts of the Bombay Province as it is constituted to-day. A part of the Colaba district was under the Angres; the Raja of Satara had his own territory under him. The district of Karwar was not then a part of the Bombay Presidency. In fact it is difficult to locate the exact boundaries of the districts surveyed in the reports. The district of North Konkan which was not covered in the reports of 1824-25 except for the town of Thana, is surveyed in the Second report of 1828-29. There are certain omissions in the reports of the first survey of 1824-25 (p. 77 para 18) because the returns from certain sub-divisions were not received.

Certain documents referred to in the reports could not be traced and hence it was not possible to include them in the volume. For instance, the " *subjoined list* " (p. 5 line 2) and the " *subjoined statements for 1824 (A & B)* ", (pp. 10-11 para 32) mentioned in the report on South Konkan, the ' *enclosed returns* ' mentioned in the report of the Poona district (p. 84, para 24); the " *accompanying Maratha statements* " mentioned in a Dharwar report (p. 88)-all these are not printed, because they could not be traced.

But the most unfortunate omission is the report on the education in the city of Poona in 1824. There is no doubt that a report on this city was submitted. William Chaplin, the Commissioner in the Deccan, to whom the report on the Poona City must have been submitted in the first instance, gives a summary of the statistical part of the Poona city report in his own summary report submitted to Government (p. 95). However, the original report could not be traced. There is no doubt that the original report on the Poona city would have been most instructive and interesting from several points of view. The report was made only six years after the departure of the Peshwa from the capital city of the Maratha country. There were 222 ' schools ' both for elementary and higher instruction in the city in 1824, and an account of these schools regarding their internal working would have added much to our knowledge of the state of education in those days.

The documents included in the Volume are, so far as is known, *printed in full for the first time*. It must, however, be stated that some of the reports appear in summary form in the *Evidence of 1832*. They will be found in that volume on pages : 421-427 and 470-71, in what is called ' Fisher's Memoir ', which is a mine of information on education in India during the first three decades of the nineteenth century. This Memoir is unequalled in merit from every point of view so far as the history of education in the early years of the British Rule is concerned.

Jervis's Report on South Konkan

Among the reports submitted to Government in 1824, the report on South Konkan (pp. 2-31) prepared by T. B. Jervis employed on a Statistical Survey on South Konkan deserves a very special mention from several points of view. Jervis was not called upon to report on the state of education directly. The Collector of South Konkan who was called upon to do this task took the opportunity to send Jervis's report along with his own brief report (pp. 1-2) for information of Government. It appears, Jervis had interested himself in education of the district soon after he joined his duties in South Konkan in 1819 as Statistical Surveyor. He began to collect statistics of schools, scholars, etc. in 1820. These are printed in supplementary tables to his main report (pp. 12-31). It should be noted that, so far as is known, no one else in India had collected such statistics on indigenous education before Jervis and therefore Jervis deserves special mention as the *first* officer in India who took interest in collecting educational statistics of indigenous schools.

In 1823, Jervis established ' the Native School Society of South Konkan ' what in his own words was ' *The first Society of Natives* ' for the promotion of education and with the help of natives and subscriptions collected from them and from others as well, he opened 3 or 4 schools in South Konkan in 1823. These schools were subsequently helped by the Government of Bombay in cash and in books. It may also be noted that T. B. Jervis was the brother of George Jervis who as the Secretary of the Bombay Native Education Society played a prominent part in promoting the cause of the vernaculars as the media of instruction in this Province. In many respects the Jervis brothers helped the cause of ' native ' education in the early days of the history of British education in Bombay.

The main part of Jervis's report on the state of education was written by him in September 1824 (pp. 2-11). The great merit of this report lies in the fact that it is not a report on the state of education in South Konkan only, but as he himself styles it (p. 2) it is a " Report on the state of education in India ". He has given in this report ' a full, distinct and impartial review of the state and system of education amongst the natives, and of the causes to which the chief defects therein are to be attributed ' (pp. 2-3). It also gives " a brief sketch of the decline and present condition of their Literature and Sciences " (p. 3). It includes an account of the system of education as it prevailed in the Hindoo and Muslim schools both, of elementary and higher learning. It gives details about the modes of instruction in both kinds of schools—Hindoo and Muslim—and the stages of instructions as well.

In fact Jervis's Report on education could stand comparison with the well known Report of A. D. Campbell, Collector of Bellary in Madras (1823) which is so often quoted to give an idea about the internal working of indigenous schools as they were conducted in those distant times.

2 Origin of the Enquiry of 1824

The Bombay Native School-Book and School Society (later on called the Bombay Native Education Society) was brought into existence in the city of Bombay in 1822 as the first non-official body to promote education amongst the ' natives ' of the Province of Bombay. Mountstuart Elphinstone, the Governor of Bombay, was its President and the members were European gentlemen interested in education of the ' natives '. This Society submitted to Government a report in which they pointed out the defects of the indigenous system of education as it prevailed at the time and requested Government to extend liberal financial help for the removal of the defects and the promotion of their object in general. When this application of the Society came before the Government of Bombay, Mountstuart Elphinstone, in his capacity as the Governor, wrote his famous Minute on Education dated 13th December 1823 and it was subsequently discussed in the Governor's Council along with the application of the Society for financial help. In para 17 of this Minute, Elphinstone wrote :

" Inquiries relating to the possibility of providing salaries for teachers out of the *gaum khurch*, or even by a small addition to the fund, and likewise, regarding the possibility of diverting any of the religious or other Maharatta grants, in the manner before attended to, should immediately be addressed to the Collectors, (those in the Deccan through the Commissioner) who may also be requested to send a statement, showing the villages in their district, and the number of schools in each, accompanied by such a general report on the state of schools, as they may have the means of affording. They might, for instance, give a *guess* at the number of boys taught at each, the learning they acquire at each, and the particular classes who attend them, whether only those whose trade requires a knowledge of reading and writing, or otherwise also. Their opinion be likewise solicited as to the persons who could with most advantage be employed as school-masters, and as to any other expedients that may seem practicable for promoting the object at a small expense. I am aware that a reference of this sort is usually fatal to a proposal for improvement, the time of public officers is so fully occupied by current business, that they have little leisure for general inquiries, and commonly lay aside the letter in despair of being able to answer it; while we, equally suffering under the pressure of current business, often allow a long period to elapse before we revive a subject which has been disposed of by such a reference. One important question, however, in the present instance, that of the number of schools and scholars, can be ascertained through the *commavsidars*, and *sheikdars*, with the utmost facility, and on the other, a few reports from intelligent Collectors is all we can

expect. The secretary will also be able, by making the questions distinct and simple in the first instance, and by occasionally repeating the call in cases of delay, to prevent the usual fatality from attending this highly important and interesting inquiry". (*Evidence of 1832 p. 513*).

In accordance with these remarks of the Governor which were endorsed by his Council, the Secretary to Government of Bombay, Mr. Farish, wrote to the Commissioner in the Deccan, to the Collectors and also to the Judges at district head quarters to report on the various questions arising out of the remarks of the Governor. The letter is dated 10th March 1824 and is quoted on pp. 109-110 of this Volume.

The questions on which the officers were required to report were :—

- (1) The number of village schools in their zillahs respectively ?
- (2) What proportion that number bears to the number of villages ?
- (3) What allowances are granted to schoolmasters and from what sources ?
- (4) Whether similar provisions could be made for schoolmasters in villages now without schools ?
- (5) Whether, if small salaries for teachers were allowed to be deducted from the revenues of villages, where they are required, and to be inserted among the village expenses, effectual means could be employed to secure the appropriation of these, and the efficiency of the schools, and what allowances would be sufficient ?
- (6) Whether such charges might not be made upon lands granted from time to time, as sircar warshasans, inams, etc. ?
- (7) Whether there are many religious allowances which, although it might be impolitic to resume them, might by proper management be diverted to this purpose ?
- (8) Whether a payment of money for this purpose might not be accepted in lieu of the religious or other services, for the performance of which lands are often held ?
- (9) Whether any inconvenience would arise from a rule, that after a certain number of years, no person should be entertained as a public servant, unless able to read and write ?
- (10) Also to report generally such observations as they might find occasion to offer on the subject, (*Evidence of 1832 p. 421*).

Such was the force of urgency behind this enquiry which Elphinstone rightly styled as " highly important and interesting enquiry " that the Officers asked to report completed their task in the majority of cases, and Mr. Farish the Secretary to Government was able to submit to Government his summary report under date 10 3-1825, exactly a year after the issuing of his letter of instructions to the Officers concerned. The Deccan reports were submitted later. The Broach, Kaira and Surat Collectors were able to submit their reports of such extensive enquiry which touched every village in their respective districts in July 1824 i.e. in about 4 months' period. The dispatch was remarkable. How far it could have affected the accuracy of the figures collected is another matter.

I have tried in the following pages to summarise the information about the various aspects of the Indigenous System and the schools, with comments of my own wherever necessary. I have not tried to summarise the replies to all the queries. Readers interested in the replies to any of the queries are requested to refer to the reports and particularly to the summary of Mr. Farish on some of the Reports (pp. 98-107)

3 How far are the Reports reliable ?

One of the main objects of the Government of Bombay in obtaining the reports from the districts was to ascertain the extent of education among the people as it existed at the time of the enquiry. Unfortunately it has to be observed that in regard to statistics of schools and scholars the reports are not very reliable and hence the extent of education as revealed by the facts and figures given in the reports has to be regarded with much caution. Most of the facts and figures mentioned in the first group of reports pertain to the years 1824-25 and those in the second group, to the years 1828-29, a gap of about four years. One might ordinarily expect much agreement in the statistical information supplied in the two groups of the reports. A slight rise or fall would have been natural. Any abnormal fall or rise must, however, indicate that the facts and figures given in the reports did not truly represent the state of education as it actually prevailed. However the discrepancies observed in the statistics given in the reports may not materially affect a qualitative assessment of the state of education; but they are bound to throw serious doubts on the quantitative aspects of the enquiry.

Let us point out some instances where the reports materially differ in figures. The most glaring instance is supplied by the reports on the South Konkan district. The statistics of schools and scholars collected in 1820 under the supervision of T. B. Jervis for this district are so elaborate (pp. 12-31) that one is inclined to think that they might be fairly accurate. His figures show that the district of South Konkan having about 2240 villages and a population of about six lakhs of souls had in 1820, 86 schools with 1500 scholars. Had it not been for similar figures collected in the report of 1828-29, we would have been unable to say anything definitely about these most disappointing figures of 1820. The second report (p. 114) tells us that in 1828-29 the same district of South Konkan had 281 schools and 6721 scholars. Within less than a decade there is recorded a rise of 300 per cent in the number of schools and more than 400 per cent in the number of scholars !!! No doubt the inclusion of some Missionary schools (p. 112) and a couple of government schools (p. 114) might have contributed to a slight rise, but surely not to the extent shown above.

A scrutiny of the Surat district figures shows a glaring discrepancy in the opposite direction. The figures for 1824-25 for the Surat district as a whole (including the town of Surat) show that there were 204 purely elementary schools with about 6000 scholars. But the report of 1828-29 puts down the figures at 190 and 4164 respectively—a reduction of about 33% in the number of scholars within about 4 years! The case of the Broach district is still more striking. In the report for 1824-25 the number of schools in the district as a whole is shown at 98; in the report for 1828-29 the corresponding number is 26, a reduction of schools to one-fourth of its number within four years! Similarly in the Kaira district a reduction in the number of schools from 141 to 84 is recorded within the space of four years.

A critical comparative study of the figures of schools and scholars in the reports of 1824-25 and those of 1828-29 reveals that the discrepancies noted are not in one direction only. In some cases, the figures in the first report exceed those in the second and in some cases, *vice versa*. All the reports, therefore, have to be read with caution in regard to the figures of schools and scholars and consequently the quantitative conclusions based on them would not represent the true state of things. In most other respects the reports are very instructive.

In the first place the first enquiry of 1824-25 was completed in such a short time that there was hardly enough time to carry on the inquiry with care and patience that it deserved. For instance, the Broach, Kaira and Surat Collectors were able to submit their reports within about 4 months of the Government letter instituting the enquiry. Although others were not so expeditious, the time taken by them was not certainly enough for such extensive enquiry touching every village in the districts reported upon. Think of the slow means of conveyance and the slower despatch of correspondence and you will realise the hurried nature of the enquiry. The 1828-29 report was also not more cautious in this respect.

Secondly, it should be remembered that the enquiry was instituted in the early days of the British Rule under the direction of Government and by Government agency. The Peshwa's rule was just ended and the New Rulers were just establishing theirs. There was an atmosphere of suspicion that whatever Government did was with some ulterior motive for its own benefit. A pertinent statement in this respect is to be found in the report of the Judge at Surat (p. 40 para 13). In connection with the desirability of European superintendence on the new schools proposed to be started in the town of Surat under Government management, the Judge observed: "...there is an objection to the visits of officers of Government, in the fear of exciting jealousy and alarm, in the common idea that Government would not concern itself in any matter in which it had not in view, first or last, its own interest."

The Judge at Ratnagiri in his report (p. 32) refers to the four indigenous schools at Ratnagiri as compared with the two new schools started there under superintendence of T. B. Jervis as 'opposition' schools. Does it not indicate that the public—may be the unthinking section of the public—had not taken kindly to the new move in giving 'improved' instruction at the station?

Support is lent from another quarter to the existence of some sort of suspicion regarding the efforts that were being made by high European officers of the time even in an unofficial capacity. The Bombay Education Society—a private body consisting of European citizens of Bombay—wanted to secure co-operation of the Indians in a scheme to improve and extend education among the Indians of the city. In this connection the Report of the Bombay Education Society for 1821 (pp. 20-26) says:

"It was with great regret, however, the Committee feel themselves compelled to state that the designs of the Society do not appear to meet with that general concurrence among the natives which it was anxiously hoped they would have done. To what causes this is attributed is not easy to say; perhaps not to any one singly so much as to several mistaken notions, which they must trust to time and more favourable circumstances to do away with."

It is also very probable that there existed some suspicion that the new move of Government had some 'religious' motive behind it. The Missions had by that time (1824) started their schools in Bombay, in the two Konkans—South and North—and in the Surat district and they were all in a fairly flourishing condition. Mr. Francis Warden who was then (1824) a member of the Governor's Council and who had taken very important part in the discussions of educational measures, in submitting his evidence to the Parliamentary Committee (1832) observed (Evidence of 1832, p. 278).

"In the consideration of this subject, however, we should never lose sight of the suspicions and alarms which the natives long entertained of our views in promoting education, which they conceived were solely directed to their conversion".

The discrepancies in the estimates of schools and their scholars as revealed in the several reports submitted during the years 1820-1830, were not solely due to hurry or indifference of those who were charged with the enquiry. It was, not to a small extent, due to certain conditions under which 'schools' in those days worked. They were opened and closed, in most cases, according to the needs of particular localities. They were shifted from time to time from one place to another according to the convenience of the teachers and scholars. At times they were kept open for a part of the year, the master following some other profession for the rest of the year for eking out his livelihood. It is reported by the Collector of Broach (p. 42) about the schools in Broach sub-division that "Learning is only pursued in the villages during the prevalence of the rains".

Not only were the 'schools' difficult to count in those days, but it was still more difficult to count the 'scholars'. The Collector of Broach omitted to give the number of scholars in his report and in assigning reason for this omission, said (p. 43)

"In furtherance of the wishes of the Honourable the Governor in Council I have endeavoured to obtain some information of the number of scholars taught at each school, *but this is not to be relied on*, indeed it varies so much from time to time, and is regulated by so many incidental circumstances, that it cannot well be computed in a satisfactory manner".

The Principal Collector of Dharwar while submitting the report on the sub-collectorate 'South of Bheema' (p. 90) expresses his own doubt about the reliability of the figures. He says, "The schools in this division amount by returns received from the talookas to 86, *the number is considerably greater.*" Further on in his 'remarks' on the table on page 90, he mentions his 'suspicion of accuracy' about the figures in the table. Although this is the only instance in the reports where a definite opinion is expressed by the officer saying that the figures were under-estimated, yet the opinion may be taken as being applicable to other reports as well, when it is remembered that the returns so elaborately marshalled in details in some cases, were collected by petty revenue servants who had to do the work as a part of their daily routine which was full of other kinds of legitimate work of their own.

It may be mentioned here that it has not been found possible to collect statistics of Indian indigenous educational institutions and their scholars with a fair amount of reliability even in later years. Enquiries held within a short space showed wide divergencies in figures. An excellent example is supplied in the Punjab enquiry conducted by Government in connection with the Indian Education Commission of 1882. The figures of the first enquiry were challenged and as a result, Government set up a second enquiry of the indigenous institutions. In the second estimate the number of schools increased three times and that of scholars two and a half times (Report of the Indian Education Commission of 1882, p. 621.)

The object of the discussion about the reliability or completeness of the figures of the indigenous schools and scholars given in the reports is, that too much reliance should not be placed on the figures of schools and scholars given in these 'official' reports and they should not be taken to represent a true picture of the extent of education among the people of the Bombay Province in those days. And yet these very 'official' figures are thrown into the scales to disprove any general observations made by responsible officers and others which indicate a wider extent of education at the time than what is strictly warranted by these official figures of schools and scholars. (Vide-Some Aspects of Indian Education, Past and Present by Sir Philip Hartog p. 72). In view of the imperfections and discrepancies in the official figures of the time, it is not fair to take them as a proper measure of the extent of education. We believe that under the circumstances in which education was imparted at the time in general, observations made by responsible persons who had opportunities to see things for themselves are not to be set aside as 'myths', simply because they are not supported by 'official' figures of whose unreliability we have already said so much.

We give below some general observations made about the extent of education in the Bombay Province during a period contemporaneous with the period in which the reports were submitted by the officers.

The following remarkable statement was made by Mr. G. L. Pendergast, a member of the Bombay Governor's Council in his Minute of 1821.

"I need hardly mention what every member of the Board knows as well as I do, that there is hardly a village, great or small, throughout our territories, in which there is not at least one school, and in larger villages more; many in every town and in larger cities in every division; where young natives are taught reading, writing and arithmetic, upon a system so economical, from a handful or two of grain, to perhaps a rupee per month to the schoolmaster; according to the ability of the parents, and at the same time so simple and effectual that there is hardly a cultivator or pretty dealer who is not competent to keep his own accounts with a degree of accuracy, in my opinion, beyond what we meet with amongst the lower orders in our own country; while the more splendid dealers and bankers keep their books with a degree of ease, consciousness and clearness, I rather think fully equal to those of any British Merchant" (*Evidence of 1832*, p. 468).

"There are schools maintained by the natives in almost every village in Candeish" (*Evidence of 1832* p. 296.)

"There are probably as great a proportion of persons in India who can read, write and keep simple accounts as are to be found in European Countries". (Fifth Annual Report (1819) of the Bombay Education Society, p. 11.)

"Schools are frequent among the natives and abound everywhere" (B. E. S.'s sixth report (1820) p.21.)

We do not suggest that these general impressions about the extent of education in the Province of Bombay should be taken at their face value, but to ignore them altogether and to insist on taking the 'official' figures at their face value would be equally improper.

4 Elementary Schools

(1) Their Housing :—In all the reports under consideration, there is no mention of a single school which was held in a house exclusively used for itself. In Gujrath where the schools were at times big,

they might have been held in separate buildings; but this is only a guess. The reports are silent over this point. The only report which supplies details about the places where schools were being held, is the one by T. B. Jervis from the South Konkan district. Of the 86 schools recorded in that survey, 28 were held in temples and the rest, in private dwellings or sheds etc. Six schools were held in the houses of the teachers who conducted them. In some cases, a respectable gentleman in the town or village gave a portion of his house for holding a school. A few schools were held in the sheds belonging to barbers, oilmen or potters. It is not known whether these artisans plied their trades in the sheds simultaneously with the schoolmasters.

(2) **Their Continuity:**—It need not be surprising that the common schools of the time had no houses of their own. They were all purely private ventures, springing up and vanishing according to local demand. A school in any village was not a concern of the village community as a whole. The master got return in cash or kind only from those whose children he taught for the time being. If the payment was not enough, he was free to close the school and go elsewhere. There was no guarantee of the continuity of the school for any long time and hence none thought of having a more or less permanent place for the school.

In this connection the following remarks of the Collector of Poona are worth noting (p. 84) ;

"I have discovered no instance of their (teachers) being hired by or for the village community or paid by it, or from the proceeds of any contribution clubbed for by any but those who expected value in return at the time of its being made. The payment of village schoolmasters by government directly or indirectly has also nowhere been found to have prevailed."

Their Strength:—The average number of pupils per school as revealed in the several reports under consideration may be approximately stated for the major divisions of the Province: Gujrath 35; Konkan 20; Khandesh and the Deccan (including Karnatak) 15. The lowest number recorded is 2 for a school in South Konkan (p. 29) and the highest number 150 for a school in the town of Kaira.

In the towns the schools were bigger. In the city of Poona one teacher taught 25 to 40 boys (p. 95). In the town of Ahmedabad the highest number of pupils in a school was 102, the average number per school being 64 (p. 58). In the town of Surat the average number of pupils per (Hindoo) school was 53 and in Thana it was about 33.

The common schools of the time were one-teacher schools. But in Gujarath where at times the schools were big, mention is made of an assistant who was either a relative of the teacher, a *goomasta* hired for the purpose or a head pupil who was at times exempted from payment of his dues to the school for the service. (vide pp. 49 and 58).

(4) **Their Exclusiveness:**—The only reports which give castes of teachers and of scholars for each school, are those for the South Konkan district and from the city of Ahmedabad. Schools from the town of Ahmedabad do not reveal any cases of exclusiveness based on the castes of the scholars. But the South Konkan reports reveal a few instances showing that the 'communal' aspect of the school was not altogether absent. There were a few schools where the scholars and the master belonged to the same caste (vide cases of schools on pp. 12 and 24) although the schools were the only ones recorded for the villages concerned. There were also a few schools, the only ones in the villages concerned, which were conducted for the benefit of pupils of one community or caste only, although the teachers did not belong to the same caste. (vide cases on pp. 14 & 24). It must, however, be said that as a rule, the common schools were not communal in their working and they were open to all who could afford to pay for their schooling except to those who belonged to the 'low castes' or depressed castes. The schools conducted for the Muslim Community where Persian or Hindustani (Urdu) was taught were, no doubt, exclusively resorted to by Muslim children. But the Hindoo schools were open to the Muslim boys if they wanted to attend them.

5. The Teachers of the Elementary Schools.

(a) **Their Castes:**—Although the majority of the teachers of the common schools of the time were Brahmins, it must be noted that the other castes and communities shared the profession with the Brahmins without any hindrance imposed by custom or tradition. It must also be remembered that the schoolmaster of the time was generally a low-paid individual and it was probably a sort of 'respectability' which tradition gave to the profession that attracted the Brahmin to it and not its actual gains in cash or kind.

In South Konkan according to the report of T. B. Jervis made in 1820, out of the 86 teachers enumerated (p. 30), 64 were Brahmins and the rest belonged to the other castes—Parbhooos, Marathas, Bhundarees, Kunbis (cultivators), Wanis, Shimpis, etc. In Khandesh (p. 70) among the 95 teachers of the Marathi schools, 60 were Brahmins and the rest belonged to the non-Brahmin castes. In Ahmadnagar (p. 77) out of 161 teachers 128 were Brahmins. In Dharwar (p. 85) 138 out of 291 were Brahmins (p. 90).

The following extracts will give an idea of the situation as it prevailed in Gujrath. The Collector of Kaira reports (p. 46) :

"The office of village schoolmaster does not appear to belong to any particular class or member of the village community. The schoolmaster, indeed, is often a stranger generally of the Brahmin and Bania castes".

The Collector of Ahmedabad reports (p. 49) :

" Where the situation is hereditary the schoolmasters are Brahmins, but it does not appear where the office is temporary that other castes are excluded from officiating as such ".

The report for the Ahmedabad town (p. 58) shows that all the 21 teachers there were Brahmins. The report further tells us why a Brahmin was best suited to be a schoolmaster. It says (p. 60) " As far as regards the Hindoo part of the population, this (the Brahmin) seems 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 Brahmin to do this to any person of an inferior caste ".

As against this special ' fitness ' of the Brahmin for the office of the schoolmaster as pointed out by the Ahmedabad Judge, it is worth while noting the remarks of the Thana Judge. He says (p. 35) : " Brahmins are on some account most eligible as being better qualified in regard to learning and influence; but they are again frequently inclined to be indolent and have many ceremonies to perform which might greatly interfere with the business of the school ".

(b) Their remuneration:—All the reports submitted in 1824-25 have supplied information about the remuneration of the schoolmasters, because in the letter (pp. 100-101) from the Government which originated the enquiry, there was a query—what allowances are granted to the school-masters and from what source ?—which the officers were required to report upon. The reports, therefore, supply ample and varied information on this question. It is proposed to give below a brief summary of the information, as it refers to each of the major divisions of the Province.

KONKAN:—In South Konkan the *average* remuneration of a schoolmaster came to Rs. 4 p. m. This was by payment in cash. Besides, the master obtained from each scholar generally about a seer of rice each month and 2 pice on every great Hindu holiday. By these gifts the average remuneration increased to six rupees per month (p. 31). In individual cases, the remuneration was as low as six rupees a year (p. 29). The fixed fee per month per boy was one anna on an average, although it was $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of an anna in some schools.

From the North Konkan information from Thana town only is available (p. 34). At the three Hindu schools the nominal pay of the masters was about Rs. 40 (together ?) including everything.

GUJRATH:—The methods of remunerating the schoolmasters in some parts of Gujraht had peculiarities of their own. The most distinguishing feature was that there was no *monthly* fee or payment in cash as in Konkan. Cash payments were made on different occasions, e. g. at the commencement of education, on the completion of certain stages of instruction and at the time of leaving school. These occasional payments in cash varied from place to place in amount and according to the ability of the parents. Another feature of remuneration was that while in Konkan the payment in kind was made every fortnight or month by each scholar, in Gujraht the scholar offered the gifts in kind *every day*, thus compensating for the absence of monthly payment in cash. An ingenious method was, however, adopted by which the income of the teacher was not allowed to be indefinitely augmented by these daily gifts, when the number of scholars was fifty or more.

" A present consisting of two seers of grain and the weight of four copper pice in ghee is given every fiftieth day by each pupil in rotation to the teacher; but the amount and value of this donation never varies whether the number of pupils be more or less " (p. 42). In the town of Jamboosar *fixed* allowances were given ranging from Rs. 6 to 2½ p. m. paid yearly, a rather unique mode nowhere else observed. In some places ' children being the offsprings of priests are exempted from payment ' (p. 41). In the Kaira district " the boys often beg something for their masters from strangers of rank visiting the villages. " (p. 45).

In the Surat district there is mention of ' service lands produce to schoolmasters ' (p. 38), and in the district of Ahmedabad (p. 51) there is mention of a case of ' *pusaita* or land granted by Patels ' and another of " presents from the villagers ". But details of these items are not available. (Vide also p. 111-Surat district).

But in spite of all these varied modes of payments the schoolmasters in Gujraht did not receive more than others. In the village schools in Surat the remuneration including gifts came to about Rs. 3 p. m. (p. 38) and in the town of Surat, to about Rs. 5 p. m. for a school of fifty scholars. In Broach district ' on an average the schoolmaster got Rs. 20 to Rs. 50 a year according to the size of village (p. 42). ' Even in the town of Broach the emoluments amounted to Rs. 3 to 5 p. m. (p. 43) and the same was the case in Kaira district (p. 44). Even in very large schools (100 pupils or more) the total remuneration seldom exceeded Rs. 150 *annually* (p. 45). But in such schools the master had to take the help of some assistant and pay him from his income.

KHANDESH:—The Khandesh report estimates the average receipts from each scholar (including everything) at 3 annas per month and for each teacher Rs. 3 p. m. (p. 65).

THE DECCAN:—In the Ahmadnagar district the average income of a schoolmaster was Rs. 3 p. m., which the Collector characterised as too little to allow the teachers " to dedicate their whole time and thoughts to their pupils " (p. 76). In this district we meet the solitary case of two schools teaching *gratuitously*, rather an exception in the field of elementary instruction of the time (p. 78). A reporter raises

a wail ' the masters are much distressed to live ' (p. 82). The lowest remuneration recorded is Re. one p. m. (p. 80) and the highest Rs. 10 p. m. (p. 83).

The Poona Collector's report for the district says that in the villages the average contribution of each scholar per month came to from 4 to 8 annas (p. 84); thus with about 15 scholars to teach the master received Rs. 4 to 8 p. m.

In the city of Poona one master taught 25 to 40 children and received from 2 to 8 annas monthly fee from each. (p. 95).

THE KARNATAK:—The information from the Karnatak is interesting in some ways. In the Dharwar *subha* ' the charge for schooling varies from seven and a half annas to one anna per month for each boy; the income of the teacher averages about 4 rupees 6 annas. ' In other parts of the district the fee varied from 4 annas to a rupee p. m. according to the ability of parents or the nature of education (p. 85).

In some parts of the Karnatak it was the practice in those days to teach Marathi along with Canarese and hence teachers knowing both the languages were in demand; and they naturally demanded more pay than others. A teacher demanded 16 to 12 rupees per month to instruct 25 children in Marathi and Canarese, and Rs. 8 p. m. in Canarese alone (p. 86).

We have so far considered the regular emoluments which the schoolmasters were *expected* to get as their dues. In actual practice, however, they scarcely got the full amount (vide pp. 32, 33, & 37). The schoolmaster of the time, however, could claim certain privileges from the community which compensated, not to a small extent, for the smallness of his earning. He was entirely a man of the people whose children he taught. He was always remembered in the hearts and at the hearths of the people. The well-to-do and the rich gave him more than others, both in cash and kind. He could command a meal from the parents of his pupils for mere asking. On marriage ceremonies of his pupils—and these were not rare in those days of early marriage—he received substantial presents and gave his blessings. The Ahmedabad report says (p. 49). " A Schoolmaster is invariably invited to all great dinners in his own caste and besides his fixed and established emoluments, he generally receives considerable presents at Dusserah, Dewally and other great days, from the wealthy inhabitants of his village. It is usual when marriage procession passes by a school, to make small present in money to the schoolmaster, and to obtain a holiday for the boys (p. 58). From the Karnatak a similar practice is also reported (p. 88) where the teacher was remembered with equal love and respect on occasions of joy and festivity.

(c) **The Nature of their Office—Whether Hereditary.**—It is sometimes believed that the village schoolmaster in India was a part of the village government i. e. the school master was one of the *Balutedars* (hereditary servants) of the village community and like other servants he was supported by the village community. So far as the Bombay Province is concerned, the evidence deduced from the Reports does not support this view. The Poona Collector's Report (p. 62), already quoted, makes this point clear and his statement may be taken to apply to all other parts of the Province in a general way.

The Khandesh Collector, however, (p. 64 para, 18) seems to state that there were a few cases where the office of a schoolmaster was claimed as a ' wuttun ' (hereditary right to the remuneration) and that it was sometimes attached to the office of a *Joshi* (astrologer) which was a ' wuttun ', he being one of the *balutedars* mentioned above. In actual practice, however, no part of the remuneration of the schoolmaster was shown to be derived from lands or village expenses (p. 70).

The Ahmedabad Collector (p. 51) in a statement showing emoluments of schoolmasters, mentions at one place " *pusaita* or land granted by Patels " to a schoolmaster and at another place a sum of twenty five rupees is mentioned as " presents from village " to a schoolmaster. As the office of the schoolmaster in these two villages is reported to be hereditary (p. 51), it must be presumed that the villagers had granted these favours to the schoolmasters concerned or their ancestors as a special case, and in no way the custom could be taken as a general feature of the village administration in Gujraht.

The meaning of the word ' hereditary ' as applied to the schoolmaster's office that is often mentioned as such in the Gujraht reports is explained in the following manner:

" The situation of schoolmasters is not I believe in any instance hereditary, although like other professions, it may often be found to run in families ". (p. 44)

" The office of the schoolmaster is not hereditary, properly so called, but as commonly with the Hindoo, the son follows the profession of the father, and thus there are many instances where schools have existed in the same family and place for several generations " (p. 40).

In all the 21 schools in the town of Ahmedabad, the schoolmasters are reported to be ' hereditary ' (p. 53). But the Judge at Ahmedabad (p. 60) explains the situation as follows:

" The office of schoolmaster cannot properly be said to be hereditary. During the time of the Maratha Government, it was generally taken up by those whose fathers had been so occupied, but even then others used to establish themselves in the same line.....Since the city has been under the English Rule, many persons have become schoolmasters whose ancestors were never so employed; and no objection has been taken by the natives to their doing so. "

A report from the Karnatak (p. 89) says: " The office of a schoolmaster is in no place hereditary. "

(iv) **Their Qualifications:**—The teachers who taught in the common elementary schools of the time were required to teach the rudiments of the three R's. Knowledge of the multiplication and other tables in

their long and complicated array was essential to every teacher; but beyond that a tolerably good hand-writing and ability to read simple writing formed the *minimum* attainments of a common schoolmaster. It is not, therefore, surprising that a report from Gujrath says (p. 40): " the masters are ignorant, and in fact, as to knowledge to be gained from books, have as much to learn as the boys themselves." " The ignorance of the present race of schoolmasters " as mentioned in the Judges' Report of 1829 (p. 113, para 42) did not escape the notice of the highly educated English officers who reported on the state of indigenous education of the time (vide p. 46 para: 4). As an extreme case a report from the Karnatak (p. 88) speaks of some teachers who were ' old men who can hardly either read or write ' and who were merely ' objects of charity '.

There was no dearth of men of learning. But these Pundits and Shastrees among the Hindus hardly took to the schoolmaster's profession. They taught higher branches of learning and not the rudiments of the three R's. Even the very best among the schoolmasters were not ' learned ' (Jervis, p. 6). In fact the common schools and the schools for higher learning of the time were in no way organically connected. The former catered for all classes of the community; while the latter instructed only the Brahmin boys. The elementary schoolmasters were invariably drawn from the ordinary run of instructed men and it was therefore possible for other communities than the Brahmins to take to the profession.

It should be clearly understood that those who wanted to prosecute their studies beyond the rudiments of the three R's, did so either by self-study or by serving as apprentices to their fathers or in houses of business or by some other suitable means. None stayed in the common schools for such advanced instruction. Every one who entered the common school left it as soon as he acquired the elementary tools of knowledge i. e. the three R's. Such being the requirements of the time, it must be admitted that most of the schoolmasters, although not well-qualified for higher instruction, were qualified enough to impart the very modest fare of schooling for which the pupils came to their schools.

The schoolmasters in the Karnatak seem to be, at least some of them, men of somewhat higher attainments, as they were expected to teach books in prose and poetry in the spoken languages of the scholars.

(d) Their Availability :—One characteristic of the time which finds expression in most of the reports is the ease with which men capable of undertaking the schoolmaster's office were available everywhere. T. B. Jervis writes about the South Konkan district (p. 6): " In this district there are immense number of teachers who like that class of people in Europe are often men of moderate talents and indigent circumstances." (vide also p. 32). The Thana Judge also makes a similar observation (p. 33). From all other parts a similar abundance of such men is recorded (vide pp. 60, 64, 76, 89).

6 The Scholars of the Elementary Schools

(a) Their Castes : Those who may be interested in the study of castes and their scholars attending the common schools of the time, will find some of the reports very useful. The reports from South Konkan (pp. 12-31) and Khandesh (pp. 70-75) deal with more than 100 castes each. Although the quantitative aspects of these reports may not be reliable, they will surely be useful for a qualitative study of the question. Some other reports also refer to castes of scholars, but the details are brief as compared with those of the two reports mentioned above. Such reports are : Ahmedabad (pp. 50, 53 & 59), Ahmednagar (p. 77), Dharwar (pp. 90-93 & 112), South Konkan (p. 112).

Education of some of the classes and communities as it existed in those days is dealt with elsewhere. Here we may take a very brief survey of the situation. Leaving aside the depressed castes or ' low castes', as they were called, who were altogether denied admission to schools in those days, we find that almost all other castes or communities representing the Hindu society of the time sent their children to the common elementary schools.

A rough estimate from the caste-wise figures of pupils given in some of the reports shows that among the scholars of the Hindu community as a whole, about 30 per cent. belonged to the Brahmin class, the percentage varied from district to district. South Konkan had 40, Ahmedabad 15, Khandesh 33, and Dharwar 25. Considering the fact that the Brahmins form about 5 per cent. of the Hindu community, there is no doubt that they took advantage of the schools to a considerable extent compared to the other sections of the Hindu community.

The other Hindu castes that figure prominently in the number of scholars attending the common schools of the time are the *Wanis* (banias or vaishyas), the Sonars (goldsmiths) and the Prabhoos. The figures of scholars given for the South Konkan district (p. 112) are enough to show that these communities were not at all behind the Brahmin community in taking advantage of the common schools.

In the figures given for the Ahmedabad district (p. 50), the Wanees (Banias) claimed about 1100 scholars as against the Brahmins who sent 400 to schools among a total of about 2700 scholars. The Surat Collector (p. 38) was quite justified when he characterised the Brahmins and Banias as classes ' who learn at any rate '.

The facts and figures recorded in the several reports clearly show that the majority of the scholars in the schools of the time came from the so called ' advanced ' communities. In the South Konkan (p. 112)

alone these communities put together claimed about 70% of the scholars from the Hindu community, although together they formed hardly 10% of the Hindu community. Although, as is already stated, all other sections of the Hindu community (except the depressed classes) did send their children to the schools, the number of their children was small compared to their strength. What held them back from taking advantage of the schools is discussed elsewhere.

(b) **Their Life at School:**—Little information could be gleaned from the reports regarding the life of the children when at school. T. B. Jarvis writing about South Konkan district, however, throws some light on this aspect and makes his remarks equally applicable to both the Hindu and the Mahomedan schools (p.5): "Their hours of attendance at school or any places of instruction are irregular; their holidays exceedingly numerous, and the occasions for absence and neglect of study extremely disproportionate to those in European schools.....a too great fondness and indulgence of their children are failings common to both people".

Although the schoolmaster of old is traditionally known to be a believer in corporal punishment, the reports do not tell us much about the punishments in vogue in the schools of those times. One pertinent remark is found in the report of the Collector of Surat district (p. 37): "The Mehetas or schoolmasters are in the way of applying the cane at times pretty freely." Major Sykes writes about a *government* school at Ahmednagar (p. 118): "Punishments: the school masters use the rattan (cane) only sparingly, otherwise the boys would not come to school". We are inclined to believe that Major Sykes' information that the cane was used 'sparingly' was meant for a government officer by a government schoolmaster. 'Pretty freely' is nearer the truth than 'sparingly' when these are applied to the use of the cane in the schools of the time, whether government or purely indigenous. Readers who may be interested to know the various modes of punishments that were prevalent in the indigenous schools in Bengal may refer to pp. 480-483 of the 'Adam's Reports on Education' published by the Calcutta University in 1941.

Rewards did not obviously loom large in the life of the scholars of the time. The masters could hardly afford to give rewards out of their meagre income, there being no other source of expenditure for such an item. However it is refreshing to note a solitary piece of information on this point from a report from the Karnatak (p. 89): "Parents now frequently give their children a Silver Pen or Inkstand on their attaining a certain proficiency".

The total absence of printed books and the very rare use of manuscripts left the scholars free from the worry of reading lessons which form today the staple of the school instruction. There was much to learn by rote, especially the 'endless' multiplication tables. But the drudgery was much relieved by the common practice of the time by which each scholar was required to teach a fellow-scholar slightly inferior to him in attainments. There were no 'classes', no marks, and no examinations [to pass and no hurdles of standards to get over. Each went ahead according to his own pace and was free to leave the school as and when he liked. In short, life at school in those days, was [not unpleasant, barring the fear of the teacher's cane and the palm of the father who invariably sided with the teacher.

(b) **Their Ages:**—The reports are not quite clear as to the ages of the scholars. But a few remarks thrown here and there may be put together to get some idea of their ages when at school. In the city of Poona the boys generally went to school at 6 or 8 years of age (p. 95). A report from Ahmadnagar district states (p. 82): "The education of clever boys is completed in 4 years between the ages of 8 and 12". T. B. Jarvis in his report on the South Konkan district takes 12 as the *usual upper age limit* although children above 12 did attend schools (p. 12). The Political Agent at Dharwar in recommending free education to poor children from villages suggests that such children should be from those whose age is between 7 and 14. We may infer, therefore, that boys at school in those times were generally of ages from 7 to 12, although those of a lower limit of 6 or an upper limit of 14 might not be wanting among them.

It should, however, be noted that mention has been made at two places of the practice of sending very young children to school "more for the purpose of keeping them out of mischief than for the benefit of learning" (p. 39 para: 6 & p. 88).

(d) **Their Relation with the Teacher:**—There is no doubt that the schoolmasters of old had a larger place in their heart and thoughts for their pupils than those of to-day. The practice of prostrating themselves on occasions before the masters as mentioned in the Ahmedbad report (p. 60) as a mark of veneration was a common one and the Puntjee or the Mehetas (schoolmaster), in spite of his low economic status, was a person of consequence and respectability among the people whose children he taught. Deep respect for the teacher is an ancient sentiment in India and, although it is now on the decline, it had a definite place in the schools of those times. The scholars, on their part, tried to translate their love and respect into action by various ways. Their begging something for the master from strangers of ranks visiting the village has been noted in a report from Gujrat (p. 47). A report from the Karnatak says (p. 88); "On the days of the full and new moon which are whole Holy days the most interested of them employ the labour of the children in their own private affairs, while the more conscientious read and expound to them some moral book". The fact that the master used to get the means of his daily meal directly through the boys and not from a public treasury could hardly fail to bring the teacher and the taught into intimate relation with one another.

7 The Course of Instruction in the Elementary (Hindoo) Schools.

The elementary indigenous school of those times taught the rudiments of Reading, Writing and Arithmetic. This simple course of instruction was in keeping with the attainments of the average elementary teacher and the need of the average scholar. Numerous statements in the reports point out to this modest aim of the schools and they refer to all parts of the Province (vide pp. 2, 34, 46, 63, and 97).

The reports from the Karnatak, however, make mention of some books read in the higher stage of the elementary school. They are: Jayamini, Viduraneeti, Amarkosh, Punctantra, and Someshwar Shatak (p. 93). Some of the scholars were also taught the names of the years and stars, of different points of compass and a variety of songs and verses celebrating the deeds of gods (p. 89).

Arithmetic on its practical side seems to be a strong point in the schools of Gujrath. Some scholars there were taught to "cast up accounts and to draw out bill of exchange" (p.48). It was common in Gujrath to teach questions on simple interest and in the rules of three (p. 5); according to T. B. Jervis, " the Marathas however never seem to have aspired to such an extent of knowledge ". (p. 6).

Writing and reading the common forms of letters and petitions seem to be a common feature of the schools (pp. 34 & 5).

The schools sadly lacked in aids and material for teaching and learning. The Thana Judge writes (p. 34), " There is an entire want of elementary books. There is little to lead these (scholars) into correct mode of reading, writing and thinking.....Their writing boards and a few meagre manuscripts not unfrequently form the whole apparatus of these places of instruction ". T. B. Jervis writes about the South Konkan schools (p. 5), " For reading they are but ill supplied with means; each boy bringing whatever old papers his parents may have put into his hand, and getting through them, as well as he is able. These are usually found to be copies of letters of the Peshwah, his Mamlatdars and their inferior agents, or perhaps village accounts, or Cauls; and now and then a tale or romance finds its way to the school but is only of service to the owner ". As to the forms of letters they were usually written out by the best writer in the village either for money or as an act of charity and kindness (p. 5).

The Collector of Ahmedabad supplies- (pp. 54-57) a " statement of the various branches of learning taught in the schools within the Ahmedabad Collectorate ". The first stage consists of 15 Anks or lessons. Against the first Ank or lesson it is written, " A scholar on entering the school commences to learn the numerical tables from 1 to 100." Then follow the Anks or lessons 2 to 14 which consist of the various Multiplication Tables of whole and fractional numbers. The fifteenth Ank or Lesson consists of " Addition of whole numbers and addition of quarters ".

" The scholar being found to be perfect in the above 15 lessons, is taught the alphabet and also to read and write. After which he proceeds to learn the different tables of weights and measures." The various tables of time, money, weights and measures are given in detail. Names of numerals from (100) hundred to the one which consists of 1 (one) followed by 28 ciphers are also given along with the tables.

" The scholar is now instructed in moral and religious precepts after which he leaves the school and enters upon business ".

T. B. Jervis has also given a detailed account of the Course of Instruction followed in the Marathi schools in South Konkan (pp. 4-5, para 9).

" A month or even two are usually devoted to the ceremony of tracing the letters श्रीगणेशायनमः; after this come the letters of the alphabet, and the barakuree (बारकुरी) or twelve combinations of consonants with vowels, and the figures which are learnt as far as 100.....They then proceed to Multiplication Tables called Lekhe (लेखे) as far as 10 times 20; after which they write down and commit to memory various tables.....which are multiplication tables of fractional parts by integers; and lastly tables of money, weights and measures. These rudiments, having been thoroughly acquired, the children are said to have got through the Doolukshur (डूलक्षुर) or dust writing and they proceeded to writing on paper, to reading and arithmetic. "

It will be seen that the Ahmedabad Collector puts the mastery of all the multiplication tables (the 15 Anks or Lessons) as the first stage. During this stage, there would be no writing or reading whatsoever, but only memorising the Multiplication Tables. While according to T. B. Jervis the scholars in South Konkan did learn, in the first stage, letters of the alphabet and the twelve combinations of each of the consonants with vowels, together with numerals from 1 to 100. It was only after this stage, that they proceeded to learn the Multiplication Tables. This difference in the contents of the first stage of schooling is fundamental, if it is a true representation of facts. It shows how the schools adapted their teaching to the needs of the communities for whom they catered. The Gujrathi scholars being mostly *Banias* (traders) by caste or profession preferred to have first of all the mastery of the Multiplication Tables which were useful to them in business calculations of all sorts. Mastery of the ' endless ' Multiplication Tables could best be acquired in a school in company with the scholars where the drudgery of memorising was relieved by chorus recitations and help from brother scholars. Knowledge of the alphabet and letters could be acquired individually at home or in a shop by the help of some one, but it was not so with the Multiplication

Tables. The Marathi scholars, as in South Konkan, first learnt the alphabet and the letters and then proceeded to learn the Multiplication Tables, because to them these were not so important as they were to their Gujarathi brothers. The explanation given above is no doubt a guess; but how else can this fundamental difference in the first stage of the school course be accounted for?

The formidable array of the Multiplication Tables (vide pp. 54-55) had a prominent place in the course of instruction in the elementary schools of the time in all parts of the Province, although in Gujarath they monopolised a larger place. Generations after generations of school boys up till recent times spent time and energy in mastering these tables. In fact, when in the new schools opened by Government on ' improved ' plan, these Multiplication Tables were given a subordinate place, the people looked askance at them and thought that the boys were missing the real stuff which they had in former times. It took a long time to get the people reconciled to the new order.

If these Multiplication Tables which the Thana Judge styles as ' the almost endless arithmetical tables, many of them of no practical use ' (p. 34) were really useless, why were they learnt in schools? In fact they were not as useless as they were supposed to be by the European officers who had made the reports. Men who had mastered them in their school days showed remarkable facility in calculating *orally* any sum or problem that confronted them. The modern instructed man would require the help of pen and paper for making calculations even in smaller transactions. Pen and paper were not so easily available in those days, and one of the aims of schooling in those days was to acquire the ability to make *orally*, and in a correct and quick manner, all calculations small or big. The schools met this aim by teaching the Multiplication Tables. Of course, all the tables were not useful always. But for want of books or tables of reference, the scholar had to keep much in his head hoping that everything there might have a turn for use, some time or other. He did not do it half-way; he did it thoroughly, perhaps over-did it. We do not regret the disappearance of the " endless " array of the Multiplication Tables in the modern primary school. Modern conditions of life do not require all of them. What we mean to suggest is this. In condemning them as a part of the course of instruction of those old times, the aspect of the question discussed above should not be left out of consideration. Even today there may be persons here and there who sincerely regret their disappearance. So strong was their hold on the public mind.

The Course of Instruction in the common elementary schools of the times is condemned in the strongest terms by almost all the European officers who had sent their reports. Hardly any one had a good word to say about the System or the Course. T. B. Jervis (p. 3) speaks of it as " not only defective but in many respects pernicious ". The Surat Judge (p. 40) calls it " of the most wretched description "; " nothing can be more contemptible than the instruction given at these schools ". The Judges' report of 1829 (p. 113) says, " vast time is consumed in a most cumbersome mode of learning to read and in attaining the first simple rules of arithmetic—the books read never exceed the relation of some silly stories, and the general writing acquired goes little beyond that of ability to sign a name ".

All these sweeping remarks about the Course of Instruction are from high European officers whose judgment was obviously based on their own ideas about education obtained in the schools of their country where the printing press had long before done its work of sending forth books to be taught and read in schools and to be read thereafter for furthering the knowledge obtained in schools. In India and particularly in the Bombay Province, the printing press had just appeared on the scene. Not a single *printed* book was in use in any of the indigeneous schools of the time (1824). There were some books in manuscript; but they were not available for use in the common schools in the majority of cases. The matter read in most of the schools for perfecting reading was not any *literature* as such, but some old manuscript documents (p. 5) of passing interest. Under such circumstances, the only course open to the teachers and the scholars was to impart some skill in the arts of reading, writing and counting or in other words what was called rudiments of the three R's.

The value of such rudimentary instruction which the common people acquired in the schools could be better appreciated when it is noticed that those whose ' line of life ' required a more extensive or more perfect skill in the three R's. or in one or more of them, did acquire it in their after-school career. It was like the case of a chemist who learnt his chemistry in test-tubes and later made its use in laboratories run on an extensive scale. Ample evidence is available in the reports pointing out to the after-school efforts on the part of the scholars to extend and perfect the skill and knowledge imperfectly acquired at school. The Judges' Report of 1829 (p. 113) speaks of the meagre stock of skill and knowledge acquired in schools and adds, " There are exceptions to this in those castes where after-occupation in life is that of employment as accountants, clerks, or holding government offices, but what is acquired by these classes is not so much learnt at schools as at home or in some house of business. "

Major Sykes says (p. 110), " A little reading and writing only is taught in these schools with a slight knowledge of figures. Children perfect themselves afterwards in life practically, and the duties accidentally thrown upon them determine whether their knowledge is limited to the rudiments acquired in the school or whether it is to be advanced or improved or not. " (see also pp. 3 para: 4; 37 para: 12; 39 para 6; 43; 48; 60 para 2 and 87).

It thus appears that the instruction did not end when the boy left school. He did continue it further to perfection, if and when it was necessary and possible to do so in his after-school career. I believe

this is the most important feature of the system of instruction obtained in the common schools of those days. The knowledge and skill acquired in the school was just the first step. Perfection to any degree was impossible to be attained in schools where manuscript books were very rarely available and printed ones were unknown. The schools just achieved what was possible to be achieved and what was necessary to be achieved.

Was there any material available for such self-study or for such after-school efforts at advancement or perfection? Mention has already been made about books in the Canarese language which some of the scholars in the common schools were taught to read and understand. About the Marathi language, T. B. Jervis writes, (p. 7), " The Hindoos have also a variety of works in the vernacular language, either commentaries or translations of the Poorans, Tales, Dramas and Scientific works, or short and interesting histories originally written in the Maratha language. " There is no mention of such literature in the Gujrathi language in the reports; but such omission need not be taken to indicate that such literature did not exist in that language. The perfectly phonetic nature of the Indian languages derived from Sanskrit must have immensely helped such self-study, for once the letters are mastered, reading is easy.

A whole-sale condemnation of the course of instruction is not, therefore, just and proper. The aim of the course was low compared to what we may have to-day. But considering the circumstances of the time and the needs of the people in those days, the course of instruction in the common schools, certainly does not deserve to be styled as ' useless ' or ' pernicious '.

(8) The Mode of Instruction in the Hindoo Indigenous Elementary Schools—The mode or manner in which instruction was imparted, the steps by which scholars advanced in the skill of reading, writing and counting—these and allied topics are very clearly stated by T. B. Jervis in his report on the South Konkan district (Vide pp. 4-5, para 8, 9 and 10). They need not be repeated here.

To supplement the account given by T. B. Jervis, we quote here an extract from the Report of the Bombay Education Society for 1817 (pp. 20-22).

" On joining a school, the young pupil after having performed the preliminary ceremonies, proceeds to learn, first the vowels, then the consonants and finally the combination of the vowels and the consonants. The operations are performed on a board 12 inches long and 8 inches broad; a white ground being first formed with a kind of pipe clay, the board is covered with sand, or *gulal* which is floor dyed of a purple colour; the forms of the figures or letters are traced with a reed or small wooden style, which, displaying (displacing ?) the sand or coloured floor, leaves the white ground exposed; by drawing a roller over the sand, or by gently shaking the board, these forms are easily obliterated; and by means of grooves in the rollers, ruled lines are at the same time made of any distance from each other required; five or six vowels having been written down on the board, the scholar retraces these forms by drawing his style over the characters which have been written, at the same time pronouncing audibly the name of each, until the forms of the letters given in the lesson have become so familiar that he can write them without a copy and pronounce their names. For the next lesson five or six more letters are put down, which the scholar learns to write in the same manner as before; and thus he proceeds until he has learned to write and read the whole number of vowels and consonants and the combinations of these letters according to his alphabet....

" In the system of education thus briefly detailed, it will be observed that writing and reading are taught together instead of being made different branches of instruction; while tracing the forms of the letters or figures, the scholar at the same time repeats their names, a practice which is followed also when he proceeds to cyphering ".

The most distinguishing feature of the Hindoo system of elementary instruction was, however, what is described by Jervis in the following paragraph (p. 4, para 7).

" In the Hindoo Schools the scholars assist the teacher in the instruction of those children who are less advanced, and who for this reason, are sometimes paired off to ensure a greater facility of communicating; but for the most part they sit without order or distinction into classes and leave their work when called for to assist or instruct their young companions,....."

We shall again quote from the Bombay Education Society's Report for 1817 to amplify what Jervis has stated :

" But what chiefly distinguishes the Hindoo Schools and which has been so well adopted in the National System (of Dr. Bell in England) is the plan of instruction by the scholars themselves. When a boy (the girls are never taught to read and write amongst the Natives of India) joins the school, he is immediately put under the tuition and care of one who is more advanced in knowledge, and whose duty it is to give lessons to his young pupil, to assist him in learning, and to report his behaviour and progress to the master. The scholars are not classed, but are generally paired off, each pair consisting of an instructor and a pupil. These pairs are so arranged that a boy less advanced may sit next to one who has made greater progress, and from whom he receives assistance and instruction. When however several of the elder boys have made considerable and nearly equal progress, they are seated together in one line and receive their instruction directly from master; by these means the master has sufficient leisure to exercise a vigilant superintendence on the school and of enquiring with the progress made by each pupil under his instruction ".

During the early years of the 19th century, Dr. Andrew Bell and Joseph Lancaster introduced a system of instruction in England which is commonly known as "The Monitorial System or the Madras System". The central idea behind the system was 'instruction of scholars by scholars'. The teaching scholars were called 'Monitors'. Under this system of *cheap* instruction, England made a very great advance in the instruction of her people. It is generally admitted that Dr. Bell got the idea from what he observed in the indigenous schools at Madras and hence the system was called the 'Madras System'. Mr. Lancaster got the idea from Dr. Bell. That the system of instruction (the Monitorial System) introduced in England by Lancaster and Bell in the early years of the 19th century was of the Indian origin is admitted in many contemporary documents. The following extract from a Despatch dated 3rd June 1814 from the Court of Directors to the Governor General in Council of Bengal (Selections of Educational Records, Part 1, p. 23) is typical:

"The mode of instruction that from time immemorial has been practised under these masters has received the highest tribute of praise by its adoption in this country, under the direction of the Reverend Dr. Bell, formerly Chaplain at Madras and it is now become the mode by which education is conducted in our national establishments, from a conviction of the facility it affords in the acquisition of language by simplifying the process of instruction".

In the reports now under consideration, a reference is made by William Chaplin, the Commissioner in the Deccan, to 'the Lancaster System being originally of Hindoo origin' (p. 97). T. B. Jervis recognises that Lancaster "formed his schools on the same (Hindoo) principle" (p. 6). He was so much convinced about its utility that he declared: 'The Hindoo system is good so far as the expense is concerned and that indeed is a great object.....In respect to every point of economy, it would be folly to deviate'. (p. 5).

Jervis did not stop at praising the economical aspect of the system. In a private school at Ratnagiri started under his superintendence in 1823, i. e. a year before he recorded his opinion, 140 children were taught by *two* teachers, the number of pupils per teacher in the school being 70 (p. 32). It was possible for one teacher to look after such a large number of scholars, because the mode of instruction was surely the indigenous principle of tuition by scholars. Those responsible for the opening of government elementary schools in the several districts of the Presidency throughout the years 1826 to 1855 had adhered to the same principle of instruction in assigning teachers to the schools. The great majority of these schools were one-teacher schools and that was possible because the teacher was helped by scholars in instructing the scholars. The statistics given on page 114 of this volume shows that in 1828-29 there were 25 Government schools with 1315 scholars yielding roughly 52 pupils per teacher on an average. In 1855 the number per teacher in Government elementary schools in the Province was 68 (Mass Education in India, R. V. Parulekar, p. 18). This large number of pupils entrusted to one teacher was possible because through all these years scholars' help was taken by the teachers. "Then came the regime of the Department of Public Instruction in Bombay. The ideals of school administration were suddenly changed. Efficiency rather than expansion which the former authorities had in view, was held up as the ideal of primary educational administration" (Mass Education in India, p. 18). As a result of this new policy, the number of scholars per teacher was gradually reduced, so that in 1881 it stood at about 23. Obviously the old mode of getting help from the scholars was discarded in the name of efficiency. That is why a mode of instruction which India had been following for centuries could not promote the education of her people; while the same mode with some modifications but without deviating from its economic value was able to help England to make a vast advance in bringing the benefits of education to her people in a short space of a few decades.

9 The Length of the Course of Instruction in the Elementary Schools

The length of the school course or the period of time which a scholar normally takes to complete the course, is one of the most important features of a system of education. Except where education has been made compulsory for all children, the spread of education—of whatever quality it may be—in a country will generally depend upon the time which is normally considered as necessary for a child to complete the prescribed course. Suppose the normal strength of a school is 100. If five years be the normal length of the school course, every year the school is expected to send out 20 instructed scholars; if it be 3 years, the number of such scholars will be 33; and if 2 years, the number will be 50. This calculation is, no doubt, theoretical. In actual practice it may vary to some extent; but the main proposition propounded will certainly hold good. Therefore, to understand the spread of education amongst a people for whose children a school system is conducted, it is not enough to know the number of pupils under instruction in a given year or its percentage to population, but the length of the school course also. The information supplied in the reports on this point is meagre; but whatever is available, is of great importance.

The Collector of Ahmedabad reporting on the schools in his district says (p. 48), "a boy whose education is not intended to be very extensive, seldom remains at school longer than a year or year and a half, but those who are designed to receive a more liberal education attend the school for about *three* years." The report for the city of Ahmedabad states (p. 59) that "each pupil was supposed to remain in the school (for) *three* years." In the report from the Surat District a table is supplied (p. 38) which

gives an analysis of children learning in schools with the period of time for which they learn. The period ranges from 12 months to 3 months. One-third of the total number of children is shown as learning for 12 months, while about half, for four months. (The correct interpretation of these figures is left to the reader).

The Collector of Khandesh recommended that Government should give an allowance to teachers for teaching poor boys. Regarding the period for which such an allowance should be paid, the Collector says (p. 82) : "Four years, if the scholar has attained by that time 12 years, if not, till he has attained that age; but if he should not go to school till 10 years of age or afterwards, then only three years seem amply sufficient."

A report from Dharwar recommends that in order to induce the parents of poor children to send them to school, Government should compensate them for the loss of labour of their children. About the period for which such compensation should be paid, the report says (p. 89) : "To compensate to them the loss of their child's labour, I would recommend a small remission to be made to each ryot during the time that his son is at school. This would only be required for three or four years, for in that time a boy of this class would learn as much as is required for him to know".

A significant remark is found (p.82) in a report from a subdivision (Shewgaon) of Ahmadnagar. "The education of clever boys is completed in 4 years, between the ages of 8 to 12; those of medium talents in 6 years, and the dunces (if any) in 8 years."

It may be deduced from the information stated above, that to complete the course of instruction that was in vogue at the time, a period of three years was considered sufficient in Gujrath and 3 to 4 years in Khandesh and the Deccan.

The report for the Ahmedabad district states that although scholars attended the school for three years if they wanted to have a "very extensive" education, some of them who were satisfied with a 'modest' education, left the school after attending for a year or a year and a half. It thus appears that what is now-a-days called 'wastage' did exist in those days also. But there is a good deal of difference between the 'wastage' problem of those times and that of the present time. Then a scholar left the school earlier, because he was content to have a smaller range of instruction than what the school provided for those who stayed for the full period. Now the scholar leaves the school earlier, either because of detention or of his economic inability to continue his instruction further. The former case was a case of choice, the latter is a case of compulsion. The former scholar left school with a feeling of optimism, hoping that what he had got from the school would not only be of immediate use to him, but it would help him to acquire further knowledge and skill. The latter scholar leaves the school with a sense of defeatism pure and simple. Such being the difference in the outlook of the two types of scholars, it will be seen that the case of the former scholar did not constitute a case of what is now called 'wastage'. In fact it was a case of two stages within the same course of instruction, both stages in a way had their own aims and objects. Some went to the school with the object of completing the first stage of a year or a year and a half only; while others went there to complete the second or higher stage of three years. Both were 'instructed' in their own way and acquired as much 'instruction' as was necessary for their needs in life or in other words, both were 'literate' from the eyes of the society of the time. Of course the definition of literacy was not co-extensive with the one now in vogue in this country. In fact it could not have been so. For, literacy takes a broader definition as education widens its scope. This fundamental difference in the ideas and ideals about education in the two stages of the society, divided by a century, must be borne in mind when we try to gauge the spread of education in its relation to the number of schools and scholars.

"It is possible that some may belittle the short range of instruction provided in the common schools of those times. But such people should know that even in England contemporary ideas about the course of instruction and the length of the course were in keeping with those in this country. Mr. Whitbread while introducing his 'Parochial Schools Bill' in the British Parliament in 1807 provided a course of two years' free schooling for all poor children between the ages of 7 and 14, in reading, writing and arithmetic. A little later Bell and Lancaster, the protagonists of the 'Monitorial System' in England, planned and practised such a small-range course in their schools. Bell considered that an attendance of two years was abundantly sufficient for any boy and Lancaster went still further and declared that the average length of time necessary to complete a boy's schooling was one and a half to two years. (History of Elementary Education in England and Wales, C. B. Birchough, (pp. 45, 51 and 54).

It is not in older times only that this idea of short-range course of primary education was in vogue. Even in modern times, there are countries which are having such a course for their masses. The Dutch East Indies and Indo-China have actually in practice a primary course of three years, while China in its struggle for removing the blot of illiteracy has thought it fit to introduce in its primary education system a one-year course for boys above 10 years of age. (Literacy in India—R. V. Parulekar, p. 121).

We thus see that a scholar from Gujrath who stayed for a year or a year and a half in school did go out as an instructed or literate person as well as one who stayed for three years. Although the maximum

length of the school course was *three* years, considering these two different groups of scholars—one staying in the aggregate for a shorter period of a year or a year and a half and the other, for three years, we may for practical calculation take it that the average length of time of the School Course in Gujrath was 2 years. A school with a strength of 100 boys in Gujrath, could, therefore, send out annually about 50 'instructed' or 'literate' boys. (Vide para 1, above).

In Khandesh, the Deccan and the Karnatak the *maximum* length of the school course appears to be *four* years as against three in Gujrath. Although there is no mention of some scholars leaving earlier than the maximum period of four years,* there is no doubt that such scholars must have been there and not in small numbers. For the schoolmaster had to be paid in cash and kind for every month's stay at school and those who were not in need of 'extensive' education, must have left earlier as in Gujrath. We may, therefore, take it that in those parts of the Province—Khandesh, the Deccan, the Karnatak—and even in Konkan, the *average* length of the school course was *three* years, as against two years in Gujrath.

This difference of one year in the maximum and the average length of the school course in Gujrath and the rest of the Province, could be justified on several grounds. In Gujrath, the schoolmasters were mostly 'hereditary' i. e., the profession ran in their families for generations. This must give the masters, some sort of 'efficiency' and even a sort of 'training' in general. In Gujrath, in most cases, the payment of grain was done daily by the scholar. It was in the interest of the teacher that the boy attended daily and thus there was a check on the irregularity of scholars. In the other parts, the gift of the grain was fortnightly or monthly. In Gujrath the payment of cash was made, in general, according to the stages of instruction attained by scholars. It was a sort of "payment by results". The master was naturally keenly interested in bringing the pupils to each stage of instruction as quickly as possible. The schools in Gujrath were larger in strength than in other parts of the Province and, therefore, more permanent and possibly more efficient than elsewhere. Lastly the greater stress on the acquisition of the skill in counting than on reading and writing, was a point in favour of a shorter course of instruction in Gujrath.

10 Extent of Education.

We shall now try to ascertain the extent of education—whatever be its range and quality—in the Province on the basis of the information supplied in the several Reports under consideration. An idea of the extent of education can be obtained in several ways. Percentage of literates to the total population is now-a-days the standard by which the extent of education is measured. But this standard is not available to us here, because nowhere in the reports, do we get information about the number of literates or instructed persons. Another method is to find out the proportion of scholars actually under instruction to the total number of children that ought to have been in schools, or in other words, the percentage of children attending to those of school-going age. This method does not give us a correct idea about the real extent of education when there is much 'wastage' in the school system, as at present in India. But in a system where 'wastage' did not exist or if it existed it was negligible, the proportion of children attending to the total children that ought to be in schools, is a very reliable standard of measuring the extent of education in any country or its parts. Fortunately the reports supply us with facts and figures which enable us to get at the proportion of children attending to the total children of school-going age. If we get the population figures of any district, we can find out the total number of children who ought to attend schools provided we know the average age-range of school children and the average length of the school course. At an earlier place we have assumed that the children at school were generally of ages between 7 and 12. What is the proportion of such (7-12) children to the total population? As we are here considering a state of society of 1824-30, we shall do better to seek help from a source which is equally old. Sir Thomas Munroe, in a similar calculation in Madras in 1822 (vide Evidence of 1832, p. 45) calculated that children between the ages 5-10 were one-ninth of the total population. We can, therefore, safely assume that children of 7-12 in the Bombay Province also were one-ninth of the total population. The next question that we have to tackle is this: the 7 to 12 age range represents a stay of five years in the school, or in other words, a normal course of instruction of five years. We have already assumed that in the Bombay Province, the average length of the school course was of 2 years' duration in Gujrath and of 3 years' length in the rest of the Province. In order to get at the necessary proportion of children that ought to be in school to the total population, we have to make a proportionate reduction in the figure $\frac{1}{9}$. It will be ($\frac{1}{9} \times \frac{2}{5} = \frac{2}{45}$) for Gujrath and ($\frac{1}{9} \times \frac{3}{5} = \frac{1}{15}$) for the rest of the Province. But as *boys* only were sent to schools and not girls also, we have still to reduce these new proportions by half in order to get the proportion of *boys* only of school-going age to the total population. The requisite proportion therefore for *boys* only will be ($\frac{1}{45}$)th for Gujarat and $\frac{1}{30}$ th for the rest of the Province.

We shall next take the figures of population and of boys attending schools given on page 114 from the Judges' Report of 1828-29 and apply the above-mentioned proportions arrived at for Gujrath and for the rest of the Province. The result is shown in the following table:

* See, however, Bankapoor p. 87.

Divison of the Province	Total Population	Boys that ought to be in schools	Boys actually in schools.	Proportion of boys attending to the total boys who ought to be in schools.
1	2	3	4	5
The Deccan (Poona, Ahmednagar & Khandesh.)	1536000	51200 (Pop. $\times \frac{1}{30}$)	9700	1 in 5
Gujrath	1408000	31300 (pop. $\times \frac{1}{45}$)	11700	1 in 3
Konkan	1143000	38100 (Pop. $\times \frac{1}{30}$)	9400	1 in 4
The Karnatak (Dharwar)	794000	26400 (Pop. $\times \frac{1}{30}$)	4300	1 in 6
Total	4881000	147000	35100	1 in 4

N. B.—(1) The proportions mentioned here are for boys only.

(2) It must be made clear here that the above calculations refer to the figures of scholars supplied in the 1828-29 report for each district. At another place it is shown that the figures of schools and scholars of the indigenous schools were as a rule under-estimated and moreover the figures of pupils, who were under ' domestic instruction ', are not accounted for at all in the reports. There is no doubt that the proportions given above are on the whole underestimates of the true state of the extent of education. To what extent they are so, is left to the readers themselves.

The above table shows that in the extent of education as measured by the proportion of boys at school to the total boys of school-age, Gujraht led the Province in 1828. In the extent of education as measured by the standard of literacy percentage as it existed in 1921, a hundred years after, Gujraht also led the Province by a good length. Its percentage of literacy was 14, as against 9 for the Province as a whole. The present has its roots in the past in education as in so many other spheres of life.

At several places in the report, the reporting officers have tried to give a numerical extent of education as measured by the standard of the proportion of scholars (boys) under instruction to total number of boys of school-age. Let us try to examine some of these attempts. T. B. Jervis reporting upon South Konkan district in 1820, (pp. 30-31) estimated that there were 129000 boys " under 12 years " and of them 1500 attended schools. Therefore he observes " only one eightieth part of the boys receive education " The population of South Konkan district as recorded in the report of 1828-29 is 656000 (p. 114). Assuming it was the same in 1820, the male population comes to 328000. Thus 129000 boys are nearly 40% of the total population. Does the Reporter mean that every boy from one to 12 years of age ought to be in school? The calculation of the proportion, ' 1/80 ' is obviously a glaring miscalculation.

The Khandesh report of 1824 (p. 75) gives the total number of boys (attending and non-attending) of school-age as 37000. The population of Khandesh in 1828-29 (p. 114) was 377000. Assuming that 188000 were males, the percentage of boys of school-age taken by the reporter is $(3700/188000 \times 100)$ about 20%. Even taking the whole lot of boys of 7-12 years of age as boys of school-going age, the percentage ought not to have exceeded 5 or 6. We have seen that Sir Thomas Munroe calculated the percentage of boys of school-age (5-10) to the total population at 1/18. The Reporter is more cautious than T. B. Jervis, and yet his estimates are about four times over-estimated.

An interesting piece of calculation " in regard to the proportion of children taught at school " on the basis of population is supplied by the Thana Judge (p. 34). The population of Thana was taken to be 15000 and the number of children estimated at one-third. Half of them being boys, their number was taken to be 2500. The number of boys attending being 380, out of 2500, the proportion arrived at was 1 in 7. It is obvious that if the boys of ages 1 to 12 were all taken to be of school-going age, the proportion will hardly come to one-third of the male population !!

When one reads these very extravagant calculations made by responsible officers to show that the extent of education in several districts and towns was very low, one cannot help concluding that these officers were out to show that the state of education was very very low, and therefore Government must take up the question in hand. The motives were excellent, but the methods of calculations to prove their case were certainly not commendable.

We now give some figures which the Reporters themselves have given regarding the proportion of boys attending to the total boys who ought to attend. As the figures of the population of the places are not given nor are they available, we give the figures without comment

Town	Proportion of boys attending	
Surat	1 out of 4 (Hindoos) 1 out of 10 (Muslims) 1 out of 5 (Parsees)	p. 39
Ahmednagar	1 out of 3	p. 78

There is one interesting piece of information supplied by the Khandesh report which gives us some idea about facilities provided for education, (p. 70). In 18 talookas of the district, there were in all about 65000 houses, out of which 21000 houses were in villages that had schools. This means that about one-third of the houses had facilities for education. At another place the Khandesh report says (p. 61, para 3) that for every 22 villages in the district there was only one school. The former method of giving the number of houses which had school facilities gives a truer and a brighter picture than the one based on the statement " one school for 22 villages "; and both the statements are found in one and the same report.

Before closing this section it is worth while noting the exceptional position of the district and town of Surat revealed by the statistics supplied in the Report for Surat District and town in 1824 (pp. 38-40). The Surat town had 62 Hindu and Muslim elementary schools with 2700 scholars. Besides there were 86 schools of higher learning (including religious) in which there were 800 boys (or rather men) learning. Excluding the city there were 129 schools with about 3000 scholars. The total number of scholars in the elementary schools alone in the whole of the district including the town comes to 5700. The corresponding number of scholars given in the 1828-29 report is, however, 4164. And that is taken in the calculations made when we arrived at the proportion ' one in three ' for Gujrath as a whole, in the statement given above. If the 1824 figures are taken for the Surat district alone the proportion will come to a very high figure pointing out that almost all boys got some education however imperfect it might be from a modern point of view. And it is worthy of note that even to-day, although Gujrath as a whole leads in literacy in the Province, the Surat district leads others in Gujrath. The passage of a century has not taken away the lead of Surat in the extent of education as compared with other districts of the Province.

(II) Domestic Instruction and Private Tuition.

The figures of schools and scholars and the various proportions of scholars to population etc. given in the reports are based upon numbers ascertained by the officers or their subordinates in the years 1820-1830. Domestic instructions i. e. instruction imparted by the father, uncle, brother or some other near relative to the children in the home is not taken into consideration by the reports. Similarly the reports do not include figures of pupils under private instruction, i. e., instruction by private tutors who did not open a school as such, but taught a few children whose parents engaged them for that specific work.

The neglect of recording any figures of pupils undergoing such types of instruction in the report is possibly due to the fact that Government asked the officers to give information about ' schools ' and their ' scholars '. Children under domestic or private instruction do not come under the category. (Vide Government letter dated 10th March, 1924, pp. 109-110). This omission is unfortunate from the point of view of a fairly correct appraisal of the extent of education among the people. That the extent of such instruction provided at home instead of in a school was not small at least in some parts of the country adjoining the Bombay province of those days, can be seen from a report from the Collector of Cannara (modern Karwar district of the Bombay Province) submitted in a similar enquiry of schools and scholars instituted in Madras almost simultaneously with that in Bombay. The Collector of Cannara observed " In Cannara education is conducted so much in private that any statement of the number of private schools and of the scholars attending them, would be of little or no use, but on the contrary, rather fallacious, in forming an estimate of the proportion of the population receiving instruction " (Evidence of 1832, p. 415). The fact that the district of Canara was later on separated from Madras and attached to the Bombay Presidency and thus included in ' Konkan ' clearly shows that Canara had an organic relation with Konkan in social customs and traditions, and it would not be wrong to presume that in Konkan at least ' private ' instruction must have predominated as in Canara.

It should be noted that in those distant times, the only thing to teach was a modest mastery of the rudiments of the three R's; and this could easily be done by the father in his spare time. An hour a day was enough for such instruction. There were no books to read, no arithmetical examples to be solved, no history, no geography. This practice is prevalent even today in instructed families in places which are distant from a school.

Let us now find whether the reports now under consideration give any indication of this type of instruction existing in the Bombay Province in those days. The Collector of Ahmedabad reported (p. 16) that the Banias of some villages instructed their children themselves. The Poona Collector observes (p. 84) " the Coolurni's (village accountant) family is the best educated in every village, and the instruction is usually acquired from their fathers or uncles ". From the Dharwar side a report says (p. 87) " Parents desirous of accelerating the education (elementary) of their children engage puntojees (masters) at home".

One peculiarity of the indigenous [system of the times was that those who aspired to higher learning— Knowledge of Sanskrit language and literature—did not generally receive elementary education in the common schools. In fact, the two systems, elementary and higher, seemed to thrive independently of each other. Those who aspired to higher learning usually acquired their elementary instruction at home. Such aspirants were no doubt Brahmin boys. The pupils of the common schools, in most cases, did not take to higher learning. When they left school they entered into life straightway, Adam in his Reports on Education in Bengal has noted this peculiarity of the indigenous system. There is no reason to believe that the Bombay Province was an exception to this practice. It is possible to deduce evidence confirming the existence of this practice in the Bombay Province. In the Khandesh report (p. 71) 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 p. 80) out of 77 Brahmin scholars 30 were learning higher branches and 47 in elementary schools,] i. e. 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 at elementary schools was a necessary qualification for learning higher branches. The Khandash report also (p. 72) 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, they must have been under instruction of some sort, domestic or private. It was not the Brahmins alone who saw to it that their boys did learn the three R's any how—whether in schools or by domestic instruction—, but other classes, called the 'advanced classes' today, did somehow manage to teach their boys. The Surat Collector (p. 38) was aware of this fact when he did not include the boys of the Brahmin and Bania communities in his scheme of bringing more boys under instruction, for he observed that these classes (Brahmins and Banias) "*learn at any rate.*" Wherever the reports give numbers of the boys of those 'advanced' communities, as not attending any school, it may be taken for certain that they were receiving some instruction by some means other than a regular school. For instances of such boys reference is invited to the tables in pages 30-31; 72-75.

It may be pointed out in passing that William Adam in Bengal (1834-36) and Sir Thomas Munroe in Madras (1826) have both admitted the existence of domestic or private instruction on a fairly extensive scale in their reports on the state of indigenous schools. It is only in the enquiries made in the Bombay Province on the state of indigenous education that such type of instruction is altogether ignored by the reporters except by casually mentioning its existence at one or two places as mentioned above.

Let us conclude by quoting an extract from ' A history of English Elementary Education by Frank Smith ' (p. 36).

" It is important to realise that the school of today does much for the child that in former times was done by the family, the church and the occupation. Education is never synonymous with schooling and the further back we go the more important does this distinction become. In consequence, we can never measure the educational provision of the past by merely recording the number of schools and scholars. Many children who never went to school got a sound education in other ways ".

12 Female Education

It must be admitted that in the year 1824 when the Reports were obtained from the districts, there is no mention of a female scholar attending any of the common schools of the Province. This is by no means due to hurry or omission. The common schools of the time were meant for boys only.

In the nine Talookas of the South Konkan district where detailed statistics of each school are given, there is a remark for each of the nine Talookas—" That there are no females educated ". The only redeeming feature recorded is contained in the following statement of T. B. Jervis when after stating that no females received education in the district he added " if we except a few that are taught in the families of the principal Moosalmans. " Whether a similar practice prevailed in the families of the principal Hindoos cannot be ascertained in the absence of any record to that effect.

That the common Schools of the time were meant for boys only could be seen from some of the remarks in the Reports. " Native custom excludes females from the advantage of education " (p. 35) " Schools strictly speaking are confined to the education of boys ". (p. 44).

13 Education of the Cultivating Classes

The great majority of the people in India (and the Bombay Province is not an exception) consists of persons whose main occupation is the cultivation of the land. Some may be proprietors of the land which they cultivate; others (tenant-farmers) may be employed in cultivating land which does not belong to them but which they hire from others. Some may be mere labourers who help in the cultivation and receive wages in cash or kind. These persons— the cultivating classes—no doubt formed the great majority

of the population in 1824 and even in 1944 they still hold the ground as the great mass of Indian population. The well-being of this class is the well-being of India. It was so in the past and it is still so today. What about these cultivating classes? How far did they take to education? Were the schools open to them? What attitude did they exhibit towards the acquisition of instruction as imparted in the common schools of the time? Were they keen on education, and yet could not get it for any reason whatever? These and similar other questions are worth investigation. The reports do give us some insight into the several questions raised above.

This great cultivating class is spoken of in the reports as the *Kunbi*, or the *ryot*, irrespective of the part of the province or of the castes to which it belonged. (In South Konkan a separate community as 'Koonbee' (p. 30) is shown in the Report for the district and this community residing in Konkan even today is named by that word—'Kunbi' or "Tillori Kunbi" as a distinct community). Reference to the education of the Kunbi—the cultivator class—in the several reports gives the impression that this class as a whole in the majority of the districts was very backward in education.

Let us first look to the brighter side of the picture. From Gujraht, the Collector of Kaira (p. 46) says: " The cultivators attach considerable importance to education, and many patedars and respectable Coonbees are well-versed in reading and accounts which gives them the weight in their village, and many avail themselves of their knowledge by carrying on trading transactions simultaneously with agricultural pursuits. Some of them understand business so well as to be the bankers of the surrounding community ". Further on he says " with the exception of Coonbees, few but Brahmins and the trading classes are educated ". The Broach Collector writes (p. 43): " individuals do acquire even in this body (agricultural classes) a degree of information which is surprising and which fits them for many purposes of general use which could not at first be expected from their education ".

The Collector of Poona writes: (p. 84) " If there is a Puntjee in a village the better sort of *Ryots* (peasants) in all the neighbouring villages take advantage of his presence, and their sons or at least one son of the family to be instructed by him in reading, writing and arithmetic ".

" In so far as regards the will to learn it is surprising how extremely fond parents are of getting their favourite and cleverest sons taught. I can myself speak to the liberality of several rich Coonbees of my acquaintancewho have hired Puntjees to live in their villages, paying them a certain monthly sum for coming there at their request and for educating their children, yet allowing them to teach the other village boys on the usual monthly allowance ".

The Kunbee or the great cultivating class was not unrepresented in the scholars of the time. There was hardly a school near his residence where the Kunbi child did not attend. In fact in two of the places where the numbers of kunbi children are given, they are not low. The Ahmedabad district figures (p. 50) show that out of 2973 scholars in the district, 524 were 'Koonbees' and in the Report of the Judges (1829, p. 112) out of 6721 scholars in the schools of the South Konkan district, the Kunbees stood second with 1729 scholars, the Brahmin community stood first with 2034 scholars.

In the Khandesh Tables, a long list of the number of scholars of different castes is given (p. 70 ff.) but among them the caste Coonbee is not given. But there is a caste shown as 'Sudr' (Shudra) which possibly indicates the cultivating class. The number of their children shown as attending schools is 357 out of 2022. Here also the number stands second, the first being that of Brahmins which is 486 out of 2022.

The information given above about the number of scholars from the Kunbee (cultivator) classes as a whole, shows that this class, so far as the number of scholars under instruction was concerned, was next to the Brahmin community, undoubtedly the most educated community of the time. But these numbers sink into insignificance when the strength of the population of the Brahmin and the Kunbee communities is taken into account. Definite figures of those times about the proportion of the population of the Brahmin community to the Kunbi (cultivating) community as a whole, is not easily available. However an indication is supplied by the Khandesh figures (pp. 71-72) of scholars attending and not attending according to castes. As can be seen, 'Sudr' in Khandesh is taken as representing the great cultivating (Kunbee) community. The figures are as follows:

Caste	Number of boys attending school	Number of boys not attending school	Total	Percentage of boys attending to the total boys
Brahmin	486	1363	1849	26
Sudr	357	17076	17433	2

It is pointed out elsewhere that a considerable number of non-attending Brahmin boys might be under what is called 'domestic instruction'. If that be so, the contrast between the education of the Brahmin boys and that of the Sudr (cultivator) becomes all the more glaring.

The conclusions to be drawn from these discussions are:—

(1) The Kunbi or the the cultivator community, taken as a whole, (irrespective of the actual caste or sub-caste to which it belonged) was very backward in education.

(2) That all schools were open to the cultivating classes without let or hindrance and yet the community could not take advantages of the schools to the extent of the strength of its population. Only the well-to-do of the community, and there number was small, took advantage of the schools of the time.

(3) In Gujrath, at least in some parts of it, the class was comparatively better off in education, possibly because there was a greater number of well-to-do people in that class in Gujrath.

(4) That the community was not slow in appreciating the benefits of education and struggled wherever possible to educate their children at more than ordinary sacrifices.

What was it then that held them back from taking advantage of the schools of the time in numbers that were commensurate with their strength? The Reports abound in references to the causes of this inability of the cultivating class as a whole to educate their children. The main cause given is the dire poverty of this class. It was neither the custom, nor the tradition, nor the unwillingness of the higher castes to give them education, but their appalling poverty that stood in the way. Some quotations in support of this view may be given here:

A report from Ahmedabad says (p. 57): " There are several classes of persons, such as *Koonbees*, *Malees*, *Kachiyas* and others, who in consequence of inability to bear the expenses, do not send their children to obtain instruction..."

Typical quotations from the Ahmednagar Report (p. 80) run thus:—" It has been ascertained by enquiry made in each village (Parnair Talooka) that few (or none) of the *Koonbees* will send their children to school, even should Government bear the whole expense, as those people say they cannot dispense with the services of their boys after they are able to go about. Some of the *Patails* and upper class of *Meerasdars* would willingly have one boy in each of their families taught, but even they acknowledge they would not be disposed to send all their sons to school on any terms."

" Very few *Koonbees* could afford to send their sons to school even were they to be taught gratis, because the children as soon as they can walk, are made useful in the house and fields and the elder boys hired out to tend cattle, weed and watch fields etc., for which they get a rupee or two per month, and which assists the family. Without such aid the poorer *Koonbees* would not be able to rear their children " (p. 82).

" The *Koonbees* and others who support themselves and families by manual labour would not send their children to learn on any terms—*Patails*, *Brahmins*, *Wanees*; etc. would no doubt do so if additional schools were established, as their sons have leisure, whereas those of the poorer classes have no time to think of education " (p. 83).

A report from the Southernmost side (Ranebennur) of the Dharwar District says (p. 89):—

".....not that there is any disinclination to it (education), on the part of the Natives, poverty is the great drawback, particularly amongst the cultivating classes. A Ryot must not only pay the Schoolmaster, but he must lose the labour of his child, which is valuable to him from the most tender age. A child of six years tends the cattle, and very soon after it is able in many ways to assist in his father's farm; should this child be sent to school a boy must be hired, at for two to three *pagodas* per annum, besides his food and lodging... I conceive therefore that every inducement should be held out to induce them to educate their children. To compensate to them the loss of their child's labour, I would recommend a small remission to be made to each Ryot during the time that his son is at school ".

Such suggestions to help the ryots by Government contribution to compensate for the loss of labour of their children over and above a free education, are made by other officers as well, who felt deeply about the poverty of the people which held them back in education in spite of a will to have it. (Collector of Surat District, p. 37; para : 14. Collector of Khandesh, page 65, para : 22)

Lastly we quote from Major Sykes :

" The schools in the district are very limited in number and thinly attended. Even the trifling remuneration of a few annas for each boy per month demanded by the teacher would bear so heavy upon the mass of the people that few *cultivators* can afford to send their children to learn " (p. 118).

"the *Koonbees* are far from wanting intelligence, they are not slow in observing, they are ready in communicating, and the rational of an agricultural process is frequently explained with a simplicity and effect which we might not always meet with in the educated English farmer; there would not be any difficulty in teaching the *Koonbee* provided the instruction were gratuitous and that the farmer could spare his children ".

It is interesting as well as instructive to quote here from an article on ' Education of the Tillori Kunbis ' by Rao Saheb D. J. Kulkarni, published in the ' School World ' of Balgaum-May-June 1944 issue:

" The greatest handicap in the way of the Tillori Kunbi children is the dire poverty of their parents. A child of school-going age is a great asset to its parents. The child can give them substantial help in their work by looking after the cattle or goats and doing a hundred odd jobs for them, when they are busily

engaged in their farm work. In many cases, the child can serve at somebody's house in the village and thereby not only earn its own livelihood, but also add a pittance to the meagre purse of the parents. In such circumstances an ignorant and illiterate guardian like the Tillori Kunbi can hardly be expected to sacrifice the immediate gains, however small, of the family to the remote advantage which the education of the child may bring in the distant future. Is it any wonder that Kunbi parents who are put to an immediate loss in the event of their children attending school, seem to take no interest in their education?" (These Tillori Kunbis number about 3½ lakhs out of a population of 14 lakhs in the Ratnagiri district alone).

How close is the similarity between this observation made about the Kunbi's education in 1944 and those already quoted from the reports of about 1824. The passage of a century and a quarter has hardly changed the conditions affecting the progress of education among some of the Kunbi or cultivating classes of this Province. The great lesson that we have to learn from what was said about education of the children of the 'Kunbi' community (cultivating class) in 1824 and again in 1944, was this. Mere opening of free schools and enforcement of compulsory attendance may not help us in bringing the children of the poor to schools. Whether we will or not, we must fully recognise the maladjustment between the forces used for uplift and the economic forces which govern the life of the people. Ways and means must be devised which will allow the children of the poor to come to the free schools without forcing them to sacrifice altogether their little contributions to the meagre means of maintenance of their families.

(14) Education of the Mahomedans

The Mahomedans had their own educational needs as distinct from those of the Hindus. Being intensely religious, they desired to acquire the ability to read the Koran written in Arabic. Persian was the language in which the Muslim culture and literature were mostly stored and the Mahomedans naturally used Persian as the language of instruction in those schools which were attended by Mahomedan scholars. Even the elementary instruction in these separate schools was acquired through Persian and the schools were often called 'Persian' schools. Persian was not the spoken language (mother tongue) of the Mahomedans. It was therefore a hard task which a Muslim boy had to face when he approached the Ustad (master) for elementary instruction.

This special difficulty of the Muslim boy is mentioned at some places in the reports. The Collector of Khandesh in advocating separate schools under Government patronage for Mahomedans urged that the period for which the master should be entitled to an allowance for each scholar should be longer than that for the master of a Marathi school "on account of the greater difficulty of acquiring a knowledge of a foreign than of a native language" (p. 64). The word 'foreign' does not appear to be appropriate when applied to Persian so far as the Mahomedans are concerned; but the sense of the writer was that the Muslim boy was not taught through his mother-tongue in the 'elementary' school of the time. He had therefore to spend more time in the school as compared to a Hindoo boy who learnt in his mother tongue. As against this disadvantage, the Muslim boy had some advantage over the Hindoo boy. Persian was a highly cultivated language as compared with Marathi, Gujrathi or Canarese of the time, and therefore, the Muslim boy, if at all he was able to complete his 'elementary' education, was a better instructed boy than a Hindoo boy in general. In this connection the Judge at Ahmedabad writes (p. 60) " the education of a Mahomedan boy being altogether superior in every way to that of a Hindoo, is never completed in less than five years (the Hindoo boy completed his own in three years).

Although for reasons given above, the education of a Muslim boy learning in a 'Persian' school was expected to be more solid than that of a Hindoo boy, in actual practice, however, the Muslim boy did not often get the stuff he ought to have got. The Judge at Thana referring to the Mahomedan schools in the town writes (p. 34) : " There is scarcely a particle of science or useful knowledge taught, almost the whole of the attention of the pupils being directed to the reading of the Koran in Arabic and the formulas of the Mussalman religion ". The Judge at Surat writes (p. 39) " With the Mochummudans almost all the children are taught to repeat by rote sentences of the Koran, but it is only with the rich or higher ranks that the education is thought of. With the exception of those who study the law and qualify themselves for employment under Government, there are very few others who can do more than read a little Persian; or rather perhaps I should say, that can even do that".

Although the special schools for the Mahomedans are called 'Persian' schools, Arabic was also taught in them. The Ahmadnager Collector (p. 70) mentions " Persian with smattering of Arabic " as the staple of the Mahomedan schools in his district. In the Dharwar district (p. 91) the schools for the Muslims are styled 'Persian' and the highest attainment of the scholars in these 'Persian Schools' was the ability to read 'Kurema etc.' Persian books.

What about Urdu, the professed mother-tongue of the Muslims? It appears certain that in most parts of the Province in those times (1824), the Muslims spoke in their homes a language which was not the mother-tongue of the people of the majority community. This language might have been a modified form of Urdu according to the localities where the Muslims lived. As soon as the Muslim stepped out of his house and met the people around him, he had to resort to the language of these people and generally the Muslims in villages and even in towns spoke the languages of the people around them so well that one

could hardly find any difference in the accent and fluency. But all the same they did speak a kind of Urdu in their homes.

Had Urdu any place in the education of a Muslim boy at the time in this province? It is difficult to answer this question with any definiteness from the evidence supplied in the reports. However, we give below the few references to Urdu or Hindoostanee or Hindoostani Ordoozaban (p. 7) as it was then usually called. T. B. Jervis in his report referring to the Mahomedan literature in South Konkan writes (p. 7) "They (the Muslims) have few books in Persian and fewer still in Arabic, but they have a great variety of tales and poetry translated from Persian into Hindoostanee or originally composed in Hindoostanee." Whether such 'Hindoostanee' literature was studied in the Muslim schools in the district cannot be said with certainty. Again T. B. Jervis while recommending free schools under Government patronage for Muslims of South Konkan says, (p. 10) that "instruction in Hindoostanee should be confined chiefly to towns of the Talookas and to zilia schools". This points out to the use of Urdu or Hindoostanee in the Muslim elementary schools in South Konkan at least. The Dharwar report (p. 85 para: 2) states that there were five schools where Persian and Hindoostanee were taught. In the Boharas' College at Surat (p. 39) which was a place of higher instruction "the scholars are taught in classes by some Arabic work being explained in common Hindoostanee by the Moulavee". These references to the use of Hindoostanee in the elementary and higher institutions show that Hindoostanee or Urdu had a place in some of the Muslim schools, although it may not be as prominent as that given to Persian in some respects.

Not only did the education of the Muslim boy learning in the common Muslim schools require more time for its completion as compared with that of the Hindoo boy, but it was also costlier. The remuneration of a Muslim teacher on the whole was far higher than that of a Hindoo one. The report from the town of Thana (p. 34) says that the Muslim boys were required to pay highly for their education in the schools exclusively meant for the Muslims. The report from Ahmedabad city (p. 60) says that in the Mahomedan schools of lower grade (Arabic was taught in the higher grade) "the usual payment by each pupil is half a rupee monthly, but from some it is made as high as from two to ten rupees for the same period". Besides the gifts to the teacher were also substantial. This was perhaps due to the scarcity of teachers capable of teaching Persian and Arabic. The Khandesh report (p. 64) says "It will be necessary to make some separate provision for the Mahomedan portion of the community, who, when they study at all, prefer the acquisition of Persian and Arabic, a knowledge of these languages being essential to an attainment of their literature, religion and the laws. There are but few learned Mahomedans now in this Province (Khandesh) and it may therefore be difficult to procure qualified masters.....".

But the Muslim boy living in the midst of communities who did their daily transactions in the language other than his own mother-tongue, had to acquire the ability to read and write that language if and when he took to avocations where such acquirements were necessary. He therefore did take advantage of the common Hindoo schools of the time and learnt along with Hindoo boys the language of the locality. In some places where the Muslim population was sparse and unable to muster sufficient number of boys for a school, the Muslim boy had no alternative but to join a Hindoo school, if he was intent on having any schooling.

In the district of South Konkan in the count taken in 1820 (p. 30), for every Muslim boy learning in a Muslim school, three learnt in the common Hindoo school. In Gujrath this mixing of the Muslim and Hindoo scholars in the common schools is more prominently stated in the reports (pp. 44 & 48).

In the district of Khandesh, the Deccan and the Karnatak, the Muslim boys did attend the Hindoo schools, but not so prominently as in Konkan and Gujrath.

Let us now try to give an idea of the extent of education among the Muslims as compared with the Hindus, wherever figures given help us to have a comparative view. The report of 1828-29 (p. 112) for South Konkan states that out of 6721 scholars, 1127 were Muslim scholars. The total population of the district is shown to be 660000 (p. 114). Thus it is seen that roughly there was one scholar per 100 of the population as a whole. Assuming that the Muslim population of the district in those days was 7% (the same percentage today holds good for the Ratnagiri district), it would come to about 42000 and the number of scholars recorded is 1127. Thus there were 2.5 Muslim scholars for 100 Muslim population. This great advantage over the Hindoo community *taken as a whole* which the Muslims of South Konkan had in those days, appears to be due, among other things, to their willingness to resort to the common elementary schools conducted by the Hindoos. It was also due to the absence of the dragging force of caste complexes from which the Hindoo community greatly suffered. Moreover, the Muslim community in Konkan had sea-faring and trading traditions from the past and the mass of the community *as a whole* was perhaps somewhat better off economically than the mass of the Hindoo community.

In Ahmedabad city the Muslim scholars were 7% of the total scholars (pp. 58-60). In the Ahmedabad district (excluding the city) they were 2 per cent. In the Surat town (p. 38) it is reported that the proportion of boys attending out of total boys was 1 out of 10 for Muslims and 1 out of 4 for Hindoos. The percentage of attending scholars to the total boys of school-age as given for Khandesh (pp. 70-73) was 12 for Muslims and 8 for non-Muslims. In the city of Ahmadnagar (p. 75) the Muslim scholars formed 16% of the total scholars. In Dharwar the Muslim scholars were about 3 per cent of the total scholars, although the Muslim population was about 7% of the total population (p. 85). The general impression created by looking into the available figures is that the Muslims of Khandesh, the Deccan and the Karnatak did not

take as much advantage of the common Hindu schools as their brothers in Konkan and hence they were not able to command that advance in education which the Konkan Muslims showed.

T. B. Jervis gives interesting information about the 'System of Mahometan education' as it was in vogue in the schools in South Konkan (p. 5):

" In the Mahometan Schools, they go through the ceremony of reading the Bismillah for a day or two; they then proceed to the letters, and their combinations, which half accomplished they atonce go to the Chapters of the Koran on praise and prayer, and rest of that Book after it; after this they take any book that may fall in their way, but the books they read are chiefly religious books, for writing they have generally badly written copies, which in some few schools they copy after the Hindoo method (see para 9 on pp. 4 & 5) but almost invariably copy after the European method, with this difference only, that they write on boards, with a white or bluish ground, prepared with chalk or paint. They sit in classes sometimes, which appears to originate, not in any attempt at order, but to distinguish boys more advanced, from others less so, that their instruction may be paid for at a higher rate. The teacher usually teaches every child as in English but it sometimes happens nevertheless in large schools, that a boy very much advanced beyond his companions assists his Teacher. For writing they copy extracts of the Koran..... "

There were higher schools of learning among the Mahomedans as among the Hindoos where Arabic was the main subject of study as also Persian. Higher branches of knowledge were studied in these schools. T. B. Jervis speaking of ' General Science ' makes a funny remark (pp. 7-8) " As for the Mahometans they are generally of opinion that the fields of Science are all within the comprehension of the Koran; and the least resemblance to it, is certainly not to be found in any works in this country ".

One remarkable Muslim institution for higher learning existed at Surat (p. 39). It was a College for Boharas. The College was maintained from private funds at an annual cost of about Rs. 32000. Arabic was the language taught and the number of Bohara scholars ' among whom are several grown-up persons ' numbered 125. The scholars came from all parts of India. It was, no doubt, an object of pride not only for the Boharas but for all the people of Western India.

(15) Education of the Parsee Community

It is only in the report on the City of Surat that we come across definite information about the Parsees (pages 38-41). The following information may be noted:

(1) " The Parsees generally send their children to the Hindoo schools, but as with them (Hindoos) education with the greater part is thrown aside immediately that the boy attains an age to be of any use by his labour;—there is however amongst the Parsees comparatively a greater number that can write, though most unintelligently than amongst the other classes ".

This last remark recorded 120 years ago when the Parsees were not an advanced community to the extent they are to-day (see the remark about early withdrawal of children) is very significant. The subsequent progress of the community to a pitch of economical and intellectual advancement which places the community as one of the most advanced (perhaps the most advanced) communities of India, shows that a wider spread of modest measure of education amongst many, is more conducive to the subsequent advancement of a community than a fuller measure of that commodity given to a few. The Parsees were found most *literate* Indian community according to the Surat Judge in 1824: it is the most literate Indian community today. The parties who quarrel over the question of ' quality ' vs. ' quantity ' in the early education of a people, may well learn a useful lesson from this record of the Parsees written 120 years ago.

(2) The Parsees got their general education with the Hindoo boys in the common schools; but for ' instruction in the ceremonies and forms of religion ' they had separate schools which in the town of Surat were 11 in number with 355 Scholars. (p. 38). One of the eleven schools had 135 scholars (p. 39)

(3) It should be noted that in the statistical tables for the Ahmedabad district and town, among the communities which sent their children to school, there is no mention of the Parsee community. Possibly, few had spread to that district. In the report from the Broach town (p. 44) the Judge says " Andaroos among the Parsees are also competent teachers " along with the Brahmins who were " most fit for the situation ". In the Khandesh tables (p. 72) there is mention of one Parsee scholar attending school, but he attended a ' Persian ' school for the Muslims. In South Konkan district in 1820, in the Malvan Talooka there were three Parsee boys who did not attend any school (p. 28). Their ages were somewhere between 1 to 12. But this was sufficient for the Reporter to stamp this community along with others whose children did not go to schools as ' generally the poorest, most ignorant and most wretched of the whole population ' (p. 26). Such are the ways of ' official ' reports. None escapes in the grind when his turn comes !

(16) Education of the Depressed Classes.

On the whole it may be definitely stated that in the indigenous system of education prevailing before the Missionaries and the British administration started their own institutions, the depressed (or untouch-

able) classes had no access to schooling. They were, as a rule, not allowed to attend the indigenous schools whatever might be the caste or creed of the teacher. Tradition held them back with an iron hand, allowing no exception under any circumstances whatever. In this prohibition all castes joined hands and the Brahmin was only one of them.

We shall now refer to the very few observations from reports which pertain to this question. For the South Konkan District, T. B. Jarvis has given statistics of scholars for the whole district in nine very elaborate tables for the nine Talookas. Not a single scholar from the Mahars and Chambhars, the main body of the depressed classes from Konkan, is found to be in the schools of the time, although out of a reported number of 130,000 boys of 1-12 years of age, nearly 13,000 belonged to these two communities (p. 31). So also in those tables where castes of scholars attending are enumerated (p. 50 for Ahmedabad District; pp. 71-72 for Khandesh and for Dharwar p. 92), no instance of a depressed class (scheduled class as they are now called) scholar attending school seems to have been recorded. An enthusiast may however scrutinise the numerous castes which are enumerated and convince himself of the truth or otherwise of this statement.

The Collector of Surat in his report (p. 37) says "Among the boys at school are to be found occasionally the children of all classes, coolies, Rajpoots, etc. except *Dhoorias* who never send their children to school". Is 'Dhooria' a depressed class?

The Kaira Collector reports (p. 46): "All castes but the lowest attend the school promiscuously"; does the 'the lowest' refer to the depressed class?

The report from Thana town is very interesting in this connection although the information supplied therein does not refer to the indigenous schools but to Government and Missionary schools which existed in that town in 1824.

In the town of Thana there was a school entirely run at Government cost at which "all castes are permitted to attend except Manooras (?) and Parwaries (Mahars?)". Of one of the two 'charitable' schools run by the American Missionaries, it is said "The Parwaries (Mahars?) sit outside of the school room in the verandah". Even the great missionaries in those days dared not break the tradition of not allowing these classes to sit inside the school-room along with other boys. Major Sykes visited the two Government schools in the city of Ahmadnagar (1826 or so) and he observed (p. 118): "Low Casts: There were not nay low cast children in the schools, although I am not aware of attendance being interdicted".

The Thana Judge's report further observes, in regard to the situation of a schoolmaster under Government patronage (p. 25), that the situation of a schoolmaster should be an employment open to any one and every one *except the low-cast*. From the same officer (The Judge at Thana) comes a suggestion to establish a school or two for these classes at Government expense (p. 33): "But it strikes me that a school (if not two) for the education of children of the lower castes if supported at the expense of, and countenanced by Government might be introduced with great advantage to the children of those inhabitants of the place, who at present from prejudice and custom are excluded from the means of obtaining knowledge and not allowed to frequent those schools where native boys of higher castes are in the habit of gaining instructions". Whether the above mentioned 'lower castes' are to be taken as the depressed (untouchable) classes only or they are meant to include some other castes also, cannot be said with certainty. The surmise is that they mean the depressed classes only.

There was, however, one bright spot which indicated hope for these classes. In the Judges' report of 1829 (p. 112) it is mentioned that in the South Konkan District among the 6721 scholars attending schools in the district, there were *three Mahars*. But these three obviously belonged to one or more of the new schools "at Bankote and Hurnee (Harnai) under the management of Missionaries".

(17) The Hindoo Schools of (Higher) Learning

The Hindoo Schools of Learning in Western India were (or even today they are) called *Pathashalas*. In Bengal a Pathashala is a school for elementary instruction and a *Tol* is one for higher learning. This difference in the terminology is worth noting to avoid confusion in comparing notes with Bengal.*

Hindoo Higher Learning in Literature or Science was taught through the medium of Sanskrit and both the teachers and the scholars entirely belonged to the Brahmin community. Although the Shastras (Laws of Conduct) fully allowed the Kshatriya (warrior class, such as the Marathas in Maharashtra) and the Vaishya (the trading castes such as Wanis and Banias) to share in such higher learning, these two communities had gradually lost interest in the actual study of higher learning, perhaps because they were too busy with their own professions, and the Brahmins had the field of higher learning solely confined to themselves. Thus at the time of the Reports (1824) and even long before that, the schools of higher learning and that learning itself were found to be the monopoly of the Brahmins. The common elementary schools of the Hindoos were theoretically open to all castes except the 'untouchables'. But the schools of higher

*Report on the State of Education in Bengal (1835-1838) by William Adam, (edited by A. N. Basu 1941), Calcutta University, is a mine of information pertaining to indigenous schools, both elementary and higher.

learning were open to Brahmins only, especially those where the Vedas and allied 'religious' subjects were pursued. Although the Reports do not show any trace of a 'non-Brahmin' studying any branch of higher learning for which the medium was invariably Sanskrit, there might have been, perhaps, a few cases of highly-placed 'non-Brahmins' from the two sister communities – the Kshatriya and Vaishya – who might have taken to the study of *belles-lettres* to a degree. But it must be admitted that this is only a guess, no proof for this being available in the reports.

Higher Learning, through the medium of Sanskrit, was pursued through two agencies. First, a regular school or a place of instruction (a Pathashala) conducted by some Brahmin well-versed in one or more branches of learning, second, what may be called 'private tuition'. Some well-to-do person engaged the services of a learned man to teach his son or sons and a few neighbouring boys or relatives. The former were usually *free* institutions where the instruction was *gratis*. In the latter agency the tutor was paid for by the employer. The former mode was the common one; the latter not so.

The custom of imparting higher learning *gratis*, was of very ancient origin among the Hindoos; and even today, if we meet with a purely indigenous centre of higher learning (these are very rare now-a-days) we shall find the same spirit of gratuitous teaching prevailing there. Such is the force of tradition among a tradition-loving people.

T. B. Jervis in his report on the South Konkan district alludes to this custom (p. 9) with a note of surprise and unfortunately fails to understand the spirit of the custom.

"Respecting native science, I beg to report to Government a curious but important circumstance communicated to me by a learned Shastree when speaking of native College at Poona, that it is altogether against the spirit of the Shastur and completely in opposition to the practice of the Brahmins, to impart the knowledge they acquire. They do indeed communicate knowledge to some few, but the greatest draw-back to such instruction is that they are forbidden to receive pay from their pupils by the same law".

This statement seems to suggest that a learned Brahmin would be committing a breach of the sacred law if he imparted his knowledge to some one by accepting return; if he taught many from whom he could not accept fees, he would not be able to do some other job for his maintenance; therefore, he chose to teach very few at times without fees and left himself free to earn his bread by some other means. Thus the custom of *gratuitous* instruction came to be a drawback or hindrance in the wider spread of higher learning, as Jervis appears to suggest.

The true spirit of the sacred law in enjoining upon the learned to impart instruction *gratis* could be better understood by the following extract from the Report of the Collector of Ahmadnagar. Writing on the same subject (p. 76), he says: "The whole of the Seminaries in which the Vedas, Shartras and Astrology are studied are supposed to be taught *gratis*, in obedience to the injunction laid down in the Sacred Law Books of the Hindoos, which inculcate as one of the first duties of a learned man, that he should communicate his knowledge to his fellow creatures".

When the sacred Laws enjoined that the learned must impart instruction *gratis*, at the same time they did impose on society the sacred duty of supporting such learned men by gifts, so that they might be kept free from the worry of earning their livelihood and thus devote their time and energy to teach *gratis*. The instruction was to be gratuitous because no one, who had not the means to pay, might be prevented from the acquisition of knowledge. In fact the society was also enjoined to help the students under instruction as well. This arrangement, therefore, which was made by the Law Givers of the Hindoos, was meant for facilitating the spread of learning and it could not in any way be the great drawback to such instruction as Jervis seems to suggest. How the injunction of the laws actually worked in practice is well illustrated in the following extract from the Report of the Collector of Khandesh (pp. 64-65):

"It is not usual for teachers of the Hindoo Sciences to require anything, as a matter of right, from their scholars; they consider it a charitable act to give instruction in such branches of knowledge and in return trust to the *elemosynary* gifts of the charitable, as well as of their scholars, who, though not bound to give, always do make such offerings as they can, and at all events, in all cases, perform such menial offices, in the family of the instructor, as Brahmins may perform. The scholars also who study the highest department of Hindoo literature, are generally children of the poorer class of Brahmins who themselves live upon charity. To such it is no disgrace to beg and sometimes therefore it is to be found that the whole of the students as well as the master live by donations which by daily circuit of the town and occasional peregrinations about the neighbouring country, they may be able to acquire".—The Collector styles this custom "which is, as it were, interwoven with the feelings of the people." Such was the mighty hold of this ancient custom made sacred by the passage and practice of centuries:

Not that the condition of these learned men who taught the higher branches of learning *gratis* was in any way opulent. It was never so in the past. For, 'Plain living and high thinking' was the motto of their life and it was this spirit of selflessness in the cause of spreading knowledge abroad that the teacher of ancient as well as of old days commanded reverence from the people—poor and rich—and drew from them voluntary gifts which enabled him to lead a life of moderate comfort or at least one above wants. During the time of the Maratha Rule a number of Hindoo Rajas, Sardars and other men of riches,

used to support these learned men with presents and gifts and particularly with what was commonly called 'Daxina' (gift in cash) on various occasions of religious ceremonies and festivals. The well-known 'Daxina' Fund of the Peshwas which amounted to several lakhs was annually distributed among learned Brahmins who assembled at Poona every year. In the year of the Report (1824) this Daxina was much reduced by the new Rulers, keeping it to about 35000 rupees for annual distribution; and a spirit of indifference to the acquisition of higher learning was just spreading among the learned and their would-be students. It was to this low state of higher learning throughout the Province and particularly in the district of South Konkan that Jervis refers when he writes (p. 7) "It is much to be lamented, however, that in proportion as the patronage of the Peshwa and all the Hindoo princesses of Malwah fell off, the number of those who understood the language (Sanskrit) well, has sadly decreased. The money which the first Maratha Rulers applied to the reward of eminent talent and industry (meaning 'Daxina') and which kept up a spirit of hope in those who were studying the language, was in later years withheld altogether, or most disgracefully perverted to the support of the minions of a profligate and superstitious Court. In the last Peshwa's Government this was particularly the case, and the Brahmins of the present generation *taken collectively as a body*, are ignorant in the extreme".

How far these remarks about the last Peshwa are justifiable, it is not possible for us to say. One thing, however, has come to our notice while looking into the unpublished documents relating to the 'Daxina' in the Bombay Secretariat. Among other merits of the recipient, the fact that he conducted a school for higher learning was kept in view and such a learned man received a bigger amount of Daxina than one who might otherwise be equally learned. The document referred to is to be found in the Bombay Secretariat Records G. D. Vol. 73 of 1824 (pp. 13-16). It is a letter dated 2nd November 1824 addressed to William Chaplin Esq. from H. D. Robertson (Commissioner?) at Poona. The letter refers to an extra amount of Rs. 400 to be paid to one Shastree 'Witul Oopade' of Pandharpur and observes: "This payment can hardly be said to rank in that of Daxina but a compensation in lieu of a large grant which this person was wont to receive from the Paishwa on account of his eminent merits and *expense in instructing scholars at Punderpore*".

This solitary document of 1824 clearly proves that in distributing Daxina among the learned Brahmins, special consideration was given to the fact that the Shastree concerned had to spend from his own pocket in instructing scholars. It was a sort of grant-in-aid for higher learning from Provincial Revenues on modern lines.

At the time when the Reports were submitted, it appears that, in some cases at least, the teachers of higher learning were not well-off. A Report from the town of Sangamner in Khandesh says (p. 80):

"Even in the town of Sangamner the Teachers of the Vedas etc. are obliged to work at something else for their bread, and the consequence is they neglect their scholars". How far such distress was extant in other parts of the Province, it is not possible to gauge.

It may be relevant here to point out that the old ties of religious conduct were losing their hold with the change of Rulers; and it was just at this time that the Educational Survey was made. Jervis puts down this dawn of new order in the following words: "The Mahomedan power can scarcely be said to have existed after the fall of Tipoo, and the Brahminical influence has certainly declined with the late Peshwa. Whatever restraints these particular Governments might have put upon their subjects, it will be admitted that they ceased to operate with their existence; and it is universal reproach to our Government that the influence of men of wealth and character, has ceased to be efficacious in the preservation of order and *religious observances* enjoined by custom or the written law".

Let us now look into the record of the extent of schools or centers of higher learning in the Province that existed at the time (1824).

Jervis has given us a masterly account of the general system of lower and higher education, their modes of operation, their scopes and various other aspects (pp. 4-8). But he does not give an account of the number of seminaries for higher learning, nor of their scholars in South Konkan. In fact were it not for his general remarks on this subject, one would be inclined to believe that they hardly existed in South Konkan. He however has some most glowing words for the Brahmins of Konkan so far as their learning and intelligence were concerned. He says (p. 7) "*Of Hindoo Literature in the South Concan*: We come next to the consideration of the Literature amongst the Natives of this Province (Konkan). The Hindoos have an immense variety of Sanskrit works from the Rigveda, the peculiar study of the Brahmins on the Western coast of India, and which is the most difficult of all the four grand divisions of sacred literature, through all the range of Sciences, Philosophy, and Grammar, to the easier and more entertaining works of poetry and fiction. This country (Konkan) has been always famed for the eminent statesmen, expounders of law, religion and science, which it has furnished to all India. It is probable that at least a tenth part of the Brahmins [who attain to manhood, visit Benares, and it is there that the most learned Shastrees acquire the rudiments of Sanskrit (N. B. there are about 250 houses of Concan Brahmins at Benaras and there are various schools in that city for the instruction of Hindoo in Sanskrit which are under Teachers of this country)]. A community which had such a glorious past and which even at the time of the report is reported to be able to send one-tenth of its adult male members to Benares for the study of

higher learning, must have, at the time of the report, sufficient number of centres of higher learning either of the pathashala type or of domestic instruction.

The Gujrath Reports are generally silent about the schools of higher learning or of their extent. This is probably due to the fact that the Reporters did not take notice of them. But the Report for the Town of Surat (p. 38) makes mention of " Several Pundits and Josees who give instruction in Sanskrit and the laws and the ceremonies of religion. The number of these Pundits is stated at 18, and they have about 66 scholars ".

In Khandesh 75 out of a total of 189 schools were for teaching some of the higher departments of Hindu Science (p. 61) whose masters ' exact nothing ' (p. 63). The provision seems to be rather ample as compared to that of elementary institutions. From statistics given on pp. 70-71, it appears that the branches learnt comprised ' Ved, Shastr, Jotish, and Wyed ' and they claimed 311 Brahmin scholars as against 486 Brahmin scholars under elementary instruction.

In the city of Ahmadnagar there were 16 schools ' for the study of the Vedas, Shastras and Astrology ' as against 13 for Marathi. In the district there were 21 such schools as against 114 for Marathi. The Collector was keen on having a couple of more schools for Vedas and Shastras and 2 for Medicine (p. 76).

The City of Poona broke the record for its abundance of schools for higher learning. And this is not surprising, for only six years had elapsed since the Peshwa's rule came to an end in that city where for a century the House of the Peshwa, the Brahmin Ruler of the country, had its abode. Out of a total of 222 schools in the city, 164 were for ' Vedas, Shastras and Science ' as against 53 schools for elementary instruction in Marathi. (*Evidence of 1832, p. 429*). [Strange as it may appear, in the very heart of the Maratha Government the teachers of the higher learning were paid decent salaries and the Shastric injunction of ' gratis ' instruction seems to have been forgotten at least in some of the schools.

" Children commence the study of the Vedas at eight years of age. If of moderate abilities they would require 12 years' study, or if of poor abilities perhaps 22 years. The best teachers receive per month 60 rupees; the second best, 50; the third, 40 rupees. One master can teach ten children at once when they are a little way advanced. Teachers of astronomy, physic or anatomy (medicine ?) receiving after the rate of Rs. 100, 75 or 50 each per month, according to their abilities. The teachers of the Shastras are paid after the same rate, and the scholars require the same time to attain the proficiency, viz., for 12 to 22 years ". (*Evidence of 1832, p. 429 **)

This practice of accepting decent salaries for teaching higher learning in Sanskrit which one notices in the seminaries of the city of Poona is quite in contrast to that which prevailed in the city of Ahmadnagar where all such schools were taught gratis (p. 78). The third city in which such schools or centres are reported to exist is the City of Surat. But there is no mention of the fact whether the teachers of the higher learning did receive salaries or not.

When the Poona (Hindoo) College was opened in 1821 by the Bombay Government at an annual cost of about Rs. 15000 (appropriated from the Daxina Fund of the Peshwas), the practice followed in Poona was adopted and the Professors appointed were given salaries as follows: " The Principal Rs. 100, Five Professors of Shastras Rs. 60 p. m. each; ten assistants at Rs. 20 p. m. each " (*Evidence of 1832, p. 431*).

The new Rulers followed the custom of paying these learned Shastrees on the scales shown above which were not in any way more liberal than what their brothers had already been accepting. This was no doubt contrary to the spirit of the injunction of the Hindoo Codes of conduct. One wonders how this practice began. Perhaps the Shastrees at Poona were so exceptionally learned that scholars coming from distant parts of the country gladly paid them these ' presents ' with greatest willingness without any demand as if they were voluntary gifts and not fees. Or perhaps the Shastrees at Poona were so much accustomed to comforts and the good things of the world that they had no other alternative but to demand high fees not minding the rule of ' gratis ' instruction, for the time being. Or the learned Teachers might have received such decent remunerations from gifts or *Daxina* in cash from some Sardars or rich men who lived in Poona not in small numbers. Whatever may be the truth; a new era was dawning at Poona in the field of higher (Hindoo) education. Any way the Brahmins in Konkan did not like the Poona system as is shown by what ' Bapoo Agashe ' told to T. B. Jervis (p. 9).

Outside the city of Poona, in the district, the system followed was more of engaging ' Private Tutors ' than of regular schools, although the latter were not wanting. The following quotation from the Report of the Collector of Poona is very interesting, as it describes what this system of instruction by private tutors was and also how the Shastrees still existed who gave instruction gratis.

* The above extract is taken from " Minutes of Evidence Taken Before the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company, I Public (1832), (Referred to above as Evidence of 1832). This has to be done because the original report on the state of education in the city of Poona which was made in 1824 along with other Reports which are printed herewith, is not available. The above quoted summary of that Report was however submitted to Parliament and hence it has been possible to have it here. Chaplin's Report also gives a summary (p. 95 paras 13 and 14) of the Report on the city of Poona (missing). The first para (13) refers to the schools of higher learning, but it seems to be incomplete at the end. The reader, however, should refer to this para as it gives names of the branches studied and some other points worth noting ".

"Many rich men hire private Tutors for teaching their boys Sanskrit. Many of those schoolmasters who teach Sanscrit and instruct their scholars in the learning and sciences recorded in that language, would with more propriety be termed private Tutors. It is the custom for a rich man to hire a Tutor of this description, who usually resides with him for the instruction of his sons; but if they are not numerous enough, or they are all of them not of a proper age or capacity for receiving the instruction of the preceptor, both for the sake of emulation and from motives of religious charity, there are several intelligent youths of a poor neighbour's or friend's family invited to attend the daily course of lectures and instruction gratis, - several heads of families also occasionally club their means to hire a good tutor for the common instruction of their sons. In both of the above cases no stranger boy is admitted without the express sanction of those who employed the Tutor - other instructors hold schools gratis - these are either men of rare ability and eminence in particular branches of learning, and in their circumstances above the necessity of taking a reward for their labours, or they are poor men of slender capacity and ability who are glad to trust to the gratitude of the scholars, who, if they demanded a stipulated reward or salary would perhaps prefer paying a little higher for the superintendence of a better teacher, or would not learn at all. The great Shastrees who teach gratuitously hold their schools in their own houses. The poor ones where they can, in their own, or the house of the scholar they expected the greatest present from. These explanations will account for the number of scholars exhibited, in many cases, in the return, bearing so small a proportion to the number of schools. It is remarkable that there are no teachers of Physic and Surgery" (p.84).

The S. M. Country reports do not supply us with any specific information about numbers of schools or scholars under higher instruction. However the following two quotations are interesting:—

"The Vaidis, Shasturs and Pooranas are not taught at any of these (the schools enumerated) schools, such knowledge being confined to Brahmins who are engaged as private tutors or if the circumstances of parents do not allow it, they send their sons to serve some waidieka or other learned Brahmin who in return for such services gives them instructions *gratis*". (p. 85).

"It is customary for youths to go and serve Pundits who understand the Shasters and thus they learn from them. Wealthy individuals engage private Tutors who are versed in Shastirs at Home and pay them annually from 50 to 200 rupees proportioned to their abilities" (p. 57).

What has become of these great Shastrees - these men of deep learning? Very few are now left who still cling to the old tradition of learning and teaching. A new order has come over the Brahmins. The learning is now acquired on European lines and the idea of 'gratuitous' instruction has altogether disappeared from the scene in the case of those who have learned the Sanskrit Lore on new lines. Let us close this account of the Hindoo Schools of Learning as they existed in about 1824, by quoting an extract from Jervi's report which gives clear indication of what the new generation of Brahmins was about to do at the time of the report in order to adapt their life to the new conditions which were just coming into existence.

"... there are yet a few Brahmins (in South Konkan) who understand the most abstruse writings; but the great falling off in the condition of this class who used in some way or other to find a livelihood under the former (Peshwa's) Government, but almost led to the total neglect of learning. Its attention is now directed rather to agricultural pursuits, and the petty offices under our Government either in the Revenue or Judicial line, and for these occupations a very moderate stock of knowledge is considered requisite" (p.7).

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

No.	Description	Reference to the Volume in the Bombay Secretariat.	Pages in the printed Volume.
Section I : Konkan			1-35
1	Letter dated 14th September 1824 from the Collector of South Konkan to the Secretary to Government regarding education in his district	G. D. Volume 63 of 1824 pp. 427-436	1-2
2	Letter (Report dated September 1824 from Lieutt T. B. Jervis employed on a Statistical Survey of S. C. on the state of education in India with special reference to the Bombay Presidency.	G. D. Volume 63 of 1824 pp. 437-502	2-11
3 4	Statistical Tables (Ten) of indigenous schools in the South Konkan Collectorate prepared by Lieutt. T. B. Jervis	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 131-150	12-31
5	Letter dated 4th September 1824 from the Judge of South Konkan Adawlat to the Secretary to Government, regarding education at the Sudar Station (Ratnagiri)	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 155-161	32-32
6	Letter dated 13th November 1824 from the Judge, North Konkan Court of Adalat to the Secretary to Government regarding education at the Sudar Station (Thana)	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 187-204	33-35
Section II : Gujrath			36-60
1	Letter dated 29th July 1824 from the Collector of Surat to the Secretary to Government regarding education in his district	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 207-217	36-38
2	Letter dated 30th September 1824 from the Judge, Court of the Udalat, Surat to the Secretary to Government regarding education at the Sudar Station (Surat)	G. D. Volume 63 of 1824 pp. 509-526	38-41
3	Letter dated 2nd November 1824, from the Collector Broach to the Secretary to Government regarding education in his district.	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 219-227	41-43
4	Letter dated 2nd November 1824 from the Judge, Court of Udalat, Broach, to the Secretary to Government regarding education at the Sadar Station (Broach)	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 231-235	43-44
5	Letter dated 27th July 1824 from the Collector of Kaira to the Secretary to Government regarding education in his district.	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 163-177	44-47
6	Letter dated 27th September 1824 from the Judge at Adalat Eastern Zillah North of the Muhee (Kaira Town) to the Secretary to Government regarding education at the Sadar Station (Kaira)	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 179-186	47-48
7	Letter dated 20th September 1824 from the Collector of Ahmedabad to the Secretary to Government regarding education in his district.	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 93-100	48-49
8 9 10 11	Appendices Nos. 1-4 attached to the report dated 20th September 1824 from the Collector of Ahmedabad (vide No. 7) regarding education.	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 104-105; 109-123; 125-128	50-57

No.	Description	Reference to the Volume in the Bombay Secretariat	Pages in the printed Volume.
12	Letter dated 17th Feb. 1825 from the Judge, Court of Udalat Ahmedabad to the Secretary to Government regarding education at the Sadar Station (Ahmedabad), together with a statistical table regarding schools in the town.	E. D. Volume No. 1 of 1825 pp. 427-436	57-60
13			
Section III : Khandesh			61-75
1	Letter dated 21st September 1824 from the Commissioner in the Deccan, Poona, to the Secretary to Government, forwarding a letter to the Commissioner dated 20th August 1824 from the Collector Khandesh (Dhoolia) regarding education in Khandesh, together with statistical tables respecting schools in Khandesh.	G. D. Volume 92 of 1825 pp. 239-278; & 281-296	62-75
Section IV : Deccan			76-97
1	Letter dated 18th August 1824 from the Collector of Ahmadnagar to the Commissioner in the Deccan (?) regarding education in his district together with abstracts of reports on education from the several sub-divisions of the district.	E. D. Volume No. 1 of 1825 pp. 263-423	76-83
2	Letter dated 20th July from the Collector of Poona to the Commissioner in the Deccan regarding education in his district.	Do	83-85
3	Letter dated 23rd Aug. 1825 from the Political Agent, Dharwar, to the Commissioner in the Deccan regarding education in the S. M. C.,	Do	85-88
4	together with abstracts of reports from the Mamlatdars on schools and education.		
5	Letter dated 2nd August 1824, from Mr. Stevenson from Ranebennur Sub-division of S. M. C., to the Principal Collector & Political Agent (Dharwar) regarding education in his sub-division.	Do	88-90
6	Statistical Tables regarding education in the Dharwar Sub-division.	Do	91-93
7	Letter dated 20th November 1824 from the Commissioner in the Deccan to Secretary to Government summarising the reports from Khandesh, the Deccan & S. M. C.	Do	94-97
Section V : Farish's Report			98-110
1	Report (1824-25) of Mr. Farish, Secretary to Government, summarising the reports received on the state of education etc. from the several offices.	G. D. Volume No. 92 of 1825 pp. 297-375	98-107
2	Minutes (1824) by the Governor and his Colleagues on the report on education submitted.	Do	107-109
3	Letter dated 10th March 1824 from the Secretary to Government to the Commissioner in the Deccan (Copies to Collectors etc.) asking for reports on Education.	G. D. Volume 63 of 1824 pp. 333-340	109-110
Section VI : Further Reports on Education			111-118
1	Report dated 16th October 1829 from the Registrar Bombay, Sudur, Dewanee Udalat on the state of education in the Presidency summarising the reports from the Collectors etc.	J. D. Volume 181 of 1829 pp. 214-221	111-114
2	Major Sykes' First Report on education (1826)	R. D. Volume 154 B of 1826, pp. 201-212	115-116
3	Major Sykes' Second Report on Education (1826-30).	J. D. Volume 14/207, pp. 58-61	116-118