CHAPTER - III

'LAND-OWNERSHIP' UNDER EARLY COLONIAL ADMINISTRATION

(A.D. 1800 - A.D. 1850)

The British East-India-Company took over the direct administration of Tanjore principality in accordance with the Treaty with the Rāja of Tanjore on 22nd October 1799. Tanjore was taken as a District of the Madras Presidency. Cuddalore, which was already in the Company's possession was merged with Tanjore(A.D. 1799) and two collectorates were formed. The Southern division consisted of Tiruvādi, Manārgudi, Pattukkōttai, Nāgore including Nāgappattinam and it was placed under Harris. The northern division comprising of Kumbakōnam, Māya-varam, - including Śirkāli, Kāraikkāl, Dévikkōttai and Cuddalore was kept under the charge of Grant. This arrangement was temporary, for in A.D.1800, Tanjore-region along with Cuddalore was formed into one Collectorate under Harris. In A.D.1801, Cuddalore was transferred


to the Collector of Jagir, modern Chingleput. In A.D. 1805, Trichinopoly was merged with Tanjore. The Districts were again bifurcated in A.D. 1809. 3

The Company at this juncture needed resources and money to finance its activities and meet administrative expenses in the conquered territories. Primarily the Revenue policy of the Company was designed to meet these needs. "Maximum Revenue" from land-owners was its aim. The Company began to consolidate and tried to regularise its revenue. Inevitably, its policy had to be uniform, and the general policy to be adopted had been conceived with the object of safeguarding 'Colonial interest'. Territorial activities of the Company began with the battle of Plassey (1757) and since then steadily intensified. The Company took up the administration of the Carnatic in A.D. 1801. Mysore had been restored to a Hindu Raja. The state of Hyderabad had been roped in by a subsidiary alliance. In the north, the Company was still contending with the Maratha Chiefs, Rajputs

and Sikhs. To meet the financial demands, the Company created a "Funding Public-Debt" and debited India with expenses incurred in England. "In A.D. 1792, it was seven million pounds, in A.D. 1799, ten million pounds; and in A.D. 1844-45, it reached forty-three and half-million pounds." In the conquered areas, the Company had to meet administrative expenses, had to pay its police, its army and public establishments. Designated as "Home charges", a portion of India's revenue was transferred to England under this 'Head'.

These financial implications forced the Company to evolve a revenue-policy, urgently in all its conquered territories including Tanjore. Damaged by 'crude handling', land-holding patterns called for revision in order to ensure regular flow of revenue from Tanjore. Bound by the policy decisions of the 'Superiors', the Fort Saint George unit thought of introducing some form of "Zamindari settlement", - "to fix the responsibility of revenue collection from a single or group of


Villages on a single person.⁶ The policy evolved by Lord Cornwallis namely "The Permanent Settlement" had met with success in Bengal. Hence, a "Zamindari settlement" at Madras too was thought of.⁷ Positive orders had been received to institute the system. The Collectors of the districts were also appraised of the details and instructed to follow prescriptions.⁸ Threats were issued that such officers who fail to carry out instructions would be removed from office.⁹ Inspite of the extra enthusiasm of the higher authorities, even the most sanguine advocates of zamindary were unable to make headway in imposing the new experiment credited with unqualified success in Bengal.¹⁰ It was possible to introduce the new system in the Sarkārs, North-Eastern districts and to a certain extent in South and West. These were known as the "Ancient Possessions" of the Company. In respect of territories like Tanjore and the Carnātic, it was felt that

a thorough knowledge of the resources is a pre-requisite, lest the experiment may result in "too great a sacrifice of the rights of the "States". The collectors, therefore were instructed to obtain information. With a view to ensure "Permanent settlement of Revenue of Tanjore" the Madras-Government attempted to establish "Rights to property under the protection of Justice". In the territory of Tanjore, the Company servants found it impossible to finalise "Land Assessment". With the approval of the Government, Mr. Harris placed the entire District under "Amāni", exempting land-holdings under 'Maneums' and those of Military chiefs. As a consequence "land-ownership patterns" were scheduled under the tenures of Mirāsī (later converted to Ryotwāri) "Ināmdāri" and "zamindāri" of which land-holdings under Mirāsī were extensive arewise.

15. T. Venkasami Row: Op.Cit. p.364 "The total area of the entire District was estimated to be 2,393,034 acres inclusive of categories of arable, dry and waste. Of these, about 1,591,925 acres or about 2/3 were under Ryotwari, 612,085 acres about a quarter under Inām and 1,89,024 acres under zamindāri which consisted of thirteen small estates situated on the upland and non-deltaic portion of the District."
It is believed that "Tanjore is the birthplace of Mirāsī". Mirāsī is a "Persio-Arab" name given to a class of land-holders who paid the revenue direct to the Government. Evidently, this term should have gained currency during the rule of the Carnatic-Nawābs (A.D. 1774-1775). We fail to find the term (Mirāsīdar) in the revenue-records of the Marātha Government of Tanjore. Instead "Conabow" is in use to identify this class of land-holders. Kāṇiātchī is the equivalent in Tamil. Harris, the first collector of Tanjore identified the type designated differently as 'Mirāsī', 'Kāṇiātchī' and "Conabow" in the Persian, Tamil and Marāthi languages. The Mirāsīdars had the right to sell or mortgage the entire property or portions thereof without referring to the Government or seeking Governments' permission for such transactions. Proprietary-right is thus assured and the Mirāsīdar's obligation to the


Government is defined in terms of "shares of produce". Hereditary rights are also implied and the legal heir need not seek Government's permission for inheriting the lands. Such privileges have also been confirmed by the Courts of law subsequently.

This system tended to promote "Economic Inequality" - Many of the Mirāsdars were opulent and unscrupulous too. Ever since the days of their first contact with Tanjore, the British officers had noticed the monopoly character in land-ownership controlled by a section of holders. In the year A.D.1800, the monopolistic character was such that "a single land-owner could decide the behaviour of a grain-market in a single Taluk". Harris observes that Extremes of opulence and want could be seen in every village and the effects of the monopoly property could be felt by every family in the country. Some owned lands to the extent of Two-

19. Loc.Cit:


hundred vélis (1400 Acres). Some revenue-records indicate that lands were owned to the extent of two-thousand acres. In A.D.1827, the District collector, in his Report said that the lands of affluent mirāśdārs were scattered throughout the District and usually one mirāśdar in every village owned vast extent of lands even outside the District. This situation is obviously the result of the "Pathakdār-system" a legacy of Marātha rule. Wealth was usurped as far as possible taking full advantage of the opportunities provided. Illegal usurpations by the principal landowners have been condemned by the Commissioners' Report. British administrators like Harris, go to the extent of recommending the abolition of the system. In A.D.1800, the pathakdārs were dismissed and "Thahsildārs" were appointed in their places. They were entrusted with the duty of collecting revenues. This action had the effect of reducing the intermediary

character of the Pathakdārs: - their power and influence as vast estate-owners remained untouched. The Pathakdārs continued as estate-owners under Mirāśi tenure. Along with the traditional Ėkabhōgam owners, they came to occupy thirty-one percent of the total area of land.

The present-day Estate-owners are the descendants of the Pathakdārs, who had acquired land even prior to A.D.1799 and they inherited Mirāśi rights. Vadapāthimangalam Mudaliars, Valivilam Dēśikars, Vândayārs of Pooṇḍi, Thēvars of Ukkadai, Kunnīyūr Iyers, Bāvās of Kulikkarai and Mooppanārs of Kapistalam are examples. Of these the Vândayārs of Pooṇḍi, whose original home is Tondaimandalam (Pudukkōttai), later settled at Pooṇḍi. They were favoured with large estates of land during Marātha rule in appreciation of military service rendered by them. As early as A.D.1775, the Thēvar families of Ukkadai owned landed estates to the extent of thousand

29. Loc.Cit.


acres. Local bards speak of this as "Vēlikku Āyiram Vilai Tharum". The Bāvas of Kuḷikkarai and the Mudaliyārs of Vadapāthismahāgalam were military officers to begin with, and later served the Marātha Government as Pathakdārs. They owned lands to the extent of six-thousand six-hundred and sixty-seven acres and eight-thousand acres respectively.³⁴

British administrators like Harris who understood the evils of the system, suggested a ceiling in land-ownership. Harris said that "the maximum extent that a single land-owner could hold might be fixed at thirty vēlis, which is equal to two-hundred and two and half acres".³⁵ Land in Tanjore, being fertile and the tracts being well-irrigated, even the ownership of twenty-five acres could make an individual very affluent. Had the suggestion of Harris been carried out, "Economic inequality" could have been tackled to a

---


great extent. Unfortunately, ignoring the suggestion of Harris, the Government admitted the claims of the land-owners without reserve. There were Mirāsdars of different cadres, at one extreme owning just two and half acres and at the other in possession of more than two-thousand five-hundred acres of land. Many were in possession of landed estates ranging in extent between thirty-five acres (about five vélis) to seventy acres (about ten vélis). 36 This fact is substantiated by the Wallace Report of 1805, which records: "The landed property of these provinces (Tanjore and Tiruchy) is divided and sub-divided in every possible degree. There are properties of four-thousand acres, four-hundred acres, forty acres, and one acre". 37 A total of 62048 land-owners are reckoned of which 17,149 were brahmans, 42,442 were Śūdras including native christians; and 1,457 were muslims. 38

36. Ibid.

37. Mirāsī Paper: Extract from Wallace Report on Tanjore (8.9.1805) p.97. In all, the British Government recognised in this District in A.D.1807, a total number of 62048 land-holders from petty to the highest. Revenue was derived from these 62048 land-owners (Ref. Committee Report of 1807) p.1.

Referring to the pre-valence of 'Communal-form of ownership', Baden Powell says that "this group of land-lords in common" is another that had entered the Mirāsi tenure. As said earlier the dominant race claimed the proprietary right in the whole village "cultivable or waste". The British decided to break this pattern of indigenous ownership and slowly introduce private responsibility. The Samudāyam, Arudikkarai and Ėkabhōgam were first relieved of "communal ownership". In the Palabhōgam villages, each portion or share of village-land, was cultivated and separately enjoyed by one or more mirāsdars of the village. In this village, the Mirāṣdar was responsible for the cultivation and revenue of his share only. In Ėkabhōgam villages, lands were held by an individual mirāsdar. The statistical details of these three types of villages (number and distribution) are as follows:

40. Supra: Chapter II
42. Ibid: Loc.Cit.
43. Ibid.
a) Samudhāyam Villages
b) Pulabhūgas
c) Ėkabhūgas

Though keen on introducing 'Permanent Settlement' in the Madras Presidency, (Tamil areas) the British were unable to score complete success. In some districts, there were military chiefs called "Pōligars". They were owners of vast estates (Pālayams). A section of the Poligars who resisted British occupation were annihilated. Their lands were confiscated. There was another section loyal to the British. The Government made effective use of them since introducing "Permanent Settlement". The loyal Poligars were converted into zamindars (proprietors of Estates). To them, the government granted "Sanad-I-Milkiyat-I-Istimrar" (The title deed of perpetual ownership). The total extent of land, thus brought under the 'Permanent Settement' arrangement was one-third of the area under the control

Political change and Agrarian tradition in South India (Mittal-Publications, 1986 Delhi-110035) Chapter IV.

of the Presidency - Government.\textsuperscript{46}

In the Tanjore district, there were thirteen smaller estates, controlled by military - chieftains of whom one was a brahmin. We had already made a reference to them.\textsuperscript{47} The British Government was able to make permanent settlements of revenue with them. Thirteen "Zamindary - Estates" were created.\textsuperscript{48} A Tabulation dating A.D. 1793 informs that the total amount of rent payable by all thirteen estates was Rs. 23,223.64, the total number of villages under these Estates being 251 and the total extent acres being 191,633.\textsuperscript{49} The bigger estates at the time of British-acquisition were, "Gandharvakkōṭtai", "Pāppānādu" 'Kallakkōttai', 'Śendamaṅgalam' and 'Silātore'.\textsuperscript{50} Though the Company recognised these estates under the "Zamindari -tenure", these were actually settled under Regulation - XXV


\textsuperscript{47} Supra : Chapter II


\textsuperscript{49} Appendix - I

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
of 1802.\textsuperscript{51}

Regulation XXV of 1802 suggests the following implications.

a) Property becomes vested with the landlords and their heirs and law-ful successors for ever. (Section 2).

b) Section 6, speaks of the payment of 'Péshkush' and recovery of arrears and no remission is allowed.

c) Section 7 reads "If the revenue is not paid, personal property first and then the land may be sold and transferred for ever".

It is to be noted that nothing is said about the Ryots (tenants) particularly about saving their rights, except so far as the grant of 'patta' and "Receipt for rent paid" (section 14).\textsuperscript{52} The total amount of 'Péshkush' too remained unaltered. The total number of villages remain the same and the total area under cultivation had not been increased.

Regulation XXV purports to "Grant" on behalf of the Governments' Permanent property in all time to come.

Such conditions prevailed till A.D. 1831-32. In A.D. 1855, the "Péshkush" was fixed as Rs. 25,336.50; but the number of villages and extension of lands in these estates remained the same. This condition continued upto A.D. 1865. In 1865, the Government authorised the issue of "Istimar sannads", on the existing 'Péshkush', of "such of the poligars as agreed to have their uncertain tenure converted into permanent settlement." Many Poligars accepted the offer.

The total area under 'Inám tenure' was 612,085 acres, a little more than one-fourth of the total area of lands in the District. 'Máneum lands' granted by Hindu Rájas were also settled under 'Inám tenure'. 'Inám' implied "Revenue-free lands". They have been granted under royal "Sáśanas", and made "by kings directly for and by the authority of kings".

53. Ibid.
zamindars too had granted śāśanas before getting organised under Permanent settlement. Lands granted by them in Tanjore (Māneums) were in the form of whole villages on portions thereof. The zamindars of Pāpānād, Gandarvakkōttai, Āthivotti and Pālayavanam had granted many such śāśanas. Such grants have been mostly for the upkeep of religious and charitable institutions, individual beneficiaries being mostly brahmīns. Introduction of the Permanent-settlement deprived them of the right of granting 'Ināms', since such grants implied "exemption from land-revenue".

If grant was of a whole village, it was known as "Dehaut", and treated as "major Inām". If the grant pertained to some lands in a village, they were known as "Minor-Ināms".

The "Inām grants" varied according to the quantum of benefit intended to be conferred on the grantee. They were classified as (a) Sarvamānyam (b) Ardhamānyam and (c) Strotem. Under the head "Ināms", three categories are listed namely (1) Inām proper (2) Lands on which revenue has been assigned in lieu of ready-money-

61. Ibid., p.104.
62. Sarvamānyam: Supra Chapter II.
allowances to native religious institutions (3) Lands belonging to private estates of late Raja called "Mukhāsa". Most of the grants made by Marātha rulers come under "Inām proper". These were endowments to religious and charitable institutions and to learned brahmins. 'Māneums' under service-tenures, and those granted for the maintenance of tanks and irrigational channels were included under this 'Head'.64 Among these endowments made to "Chathrams" by Marātha rulers were more liberal.65 Many such institutions were also patronised by the British and the aggregate number of these institutions during the Company-rule were six-hundred and ninety-four. These included sixteen by Marātha-rulers, 'Choultries' endowed by private individuals, and minor charities like "Tāppēr pandal" (intended to supply water to travellers by road, particularly during summer). The total extent of lands endowed to these institutions under 'Ināms' was 54,043 acres. They were all re-affirmed


65. Supra: Chapter II.
under Inām rules. 'Tables' given hereunder illustrate
the distribution pattern.

**TABLE - I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Rajas</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chathrams in which the distribution of meals to bona-fide travellers was unrestricted.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chathrams in which the distribution of meals to bona-fide travellers was limited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-Pandals - General</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-Pandals-for the use of travellers only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II

**CHART SHOWING TOTAL EXTENT OF CULTIVABLE LANDS, HOLDINGS AND WASTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANGES</th>
<th>CULTIVABLE EXTENT</th>
<th>HOLDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Northern Range</td>
<td>11588.83</td>
<td>4953.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Southern Range</td>
<td>8056.9</td>
<td>15265.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANGES</th>
<th>WASTE</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Northern Range</td>
<td>1819.52</td>
<td>1393.5</td>
<td>1958.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Southern Range</td>
<td>1580.21</td>
<td>913.7</td>
<td>2493.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


68. Ibid.
Under 'Personal Ināms, the British settled 264504 acres of land. The British also confirmed the endowments to religious institutions. The total extent of land under these categories is reported to be 104,168 acres. Statistical details of this category is given in Table-IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of land</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Old Jodi Payable to Government</th>
<th>Additional quit-rent imposed by Inām commissioner</th>
<th>Quit rent Payable to Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Rs.</td>
<td>Rs.</td>
<td>Rs.</td>
<td>Rs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments of Religious institutions</td>
<td>104,168</td>
<td>2,28,882</td>
<td>13,278</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments of charitable institutions</td>
<td>54,043</td>
<td>1,28,156</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ināms for maintenance of irrigation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Ināms</td>
<td>264,504</td>
<td>4,17,826</td>
<td>60,597</td>
<td>1,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ināms for police service enfranchised</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>422,969</td>
<td>7,75,441</td>
<td>77,474</td>
<td>2,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides categories listed in the Table, granting of small 'Māneums' of about 'one Kāni' (1. 33 acres) of land to each of the families of Village priest, Village accountant, Carpenter, Supervisor of Irrigation, had been in vogue in pre-British days. These "Māneums" were held from the king free of Mēlvāram. The servants cultivated these lands themselves and lived on the produce. After assuming power, the British assigned lands to compensate cash-payment to kānam, kāvalgars, Talayāries and Village-headmen. The annual value of the assignments to kānam is estimated at Rs.108,429. The Company undertook a survey in the year A.D.1807. It redesignated former private ryots (Kudi-Kānam) as "Kānam". The assignments to 'Karnams', were resumed in A.D.1820, and they were paid in cash. The Reports of the District-Collectors show that in the collection of Public-revenue, there were corrupt and irregular practices. Besides, bribes were received.

Hence, the Company introduced cash-payment of salaries with pension and retirement benefits. It had been the practice to remunerate hereditary kāvalgārs (Rural watch and ward) with land-grants. The "Talayārī-īnāms" that existed in A.D.1814 were "enfranchised" by the Īnām Commissioners later. Thus "Service Īnāms" disappeared. The "Mukhasa" (Private estates of late Rāja of which His Highness Serfoji retained at 'Cession of the province') were wholly exempted from payment of revenue. However, they paid a small police-fee, water-tax levied for dry-cultivation converted into wet with the aid of Government water and local cess. Such landed-estates are classified as "Enfranchised Īnāms" in Government records. The bulk of lands comprising this category is wide-spread in two Taluks of Tanjore and Kumbakonam. The total extent of land under this category is 34,591 acres made up of one hundred and thirty-three villages of royal-family and fifty-five hamlets. The TABLE given here-under furnishes details of ownership of the Rāja's estates.


75. Ibid.
### TALUKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TALUKS</th>
<th>Number of VILLAGES</th>
<th>Number of HMLETs</th>
<th>Detached pieces of land</th>
<th>TOTAL AREA ACRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TANJORE</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUMBAKONAM</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>7,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYAVARAM</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIYALI</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAGAPATNAM</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRUTHURAIPOONDI</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANNARGUDI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATTUKOTTAI</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,591</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEMPLE AS LAND-HOLDER:**

The District of Tanjore has many Hindu-temples. Nowhere else in Tamilnadu can we find quite a large number of temples crowding a small area. There are about 10,542 temples spread over fourteen-districts in Tamilnadu of which about 1,809 temples are in the Tanjore district. Among these, the origin of twenty-four could be traced to the age of the Pallavas, four-hundred to those
of the Chōlas, and the rest to the Nāyak and Marātha periods. 76 Many of these temples possess extensive and valuable endowments. The practice of gifting lands to temples (Dēvadāna) had already been referred to. 77 This was very popular during Chōla rule. The Nāyaks and Marāthas did not disturb the endowments already made during the Chōla rule. The religious temples were economic forces and proved to be powerful. Temple endowments are classified under three 'heads' namely (a) Original endowments in the shape of "Ināms" (b) Assignments of land-revenue in lieu of ready-money payments; to which institutions were entitled under treaties and engagements. (c) Mīrāsī or Ryot-wari lands, that is, those paying revenue to government of which right 'Proprietary-occupancy' is vested in the temples. 78 Endowments under the first 'head' have been by Native-rulers, and those under the second, represent endowments in money made by them. There is no information on record as to how lands comprising the third came under "Proprietary occupancy" of the temples.


77. Supra : Chapters I and II

Evidences available suggest that they might have been given by individual Mirāsdārs. 79

The extent and value of land-endowments in aggregate under heads (a) and (b) are as follows: 80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent ACRES</th>
<th>Revenue in Rs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) 1. Original Ināms</td>
<td>97,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assignments in lieu of Ready-Money payments</td>
<td>38,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135,880</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lands assigned in lieu of ready-money allowances to native religious institutions include Hindu temples and Muslim mosques. They were drawing "money allowances" from the treasury under "Treaties and Engagements". The following Table shows the statistics of these assignments. 81

79. Mirāsī Papers : (Ellis papers, P.M.R.) p.257.
81. Ibid., p.679.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Institutions and Individuals</th>
<th>Amount of Money Payments (Rs.)</th>
<th>Extent of land assigned (Acres)</th>
<th>Assessment thereon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu Temples</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1,46,802</td>
<td>38,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamindars or Individuals holding pension for religious service</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9,356</td>
<td>2,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,56,158</td>
<td>41,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of endowments in Ryotwari land is not ascertainable. The Governments' revenue in land averaged to Rs.1,64,311. Reckoning and matching the revenue with the rates that prevailed, the extent of land could be given approximately as 40,000 acres.

There are temples which own more than six-thousand acres of land. Some of the temples own between two-thousand five-hundred and four-thousand acres of land and yet others more than thousand acres. The Thiagaraja temple at Tiruvārūr for example, owned six-thousand acres.
The temple at Védāranyam at one point of time is said to have owned about twenty-three-thousand acres of land. The vaidyanathaswāmy temple at Valtheesvaran koil of Sirkāli Taluk had been richly endowed by the Nāyak king Achyuthappa. It owned lands to the extent of sixty-one thousand-five acres of wet and thousand-one hundred and seventy-six acres of dry-lands. The Thiagarājaswāmi temple at Thirukkuvalai had thousand four-hundred acres, and that at Kīvalūr owned about two-thousand four-hundred acres. The Sattanāthaswamy temple at Sirkāli, the temple of Rājagopālaswāmi at Mannārgudi and the Needamāṇgalam temple should all be included in this category.

Along with temples can be cited the 'Maths' (Mutts). The origin of these religious institutions are traceable to the Medieval period. The Dharmapuram-Math
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was founded in A.D.1561, and is richly endowed with two-thousand acres of land. The 'Math' at Thiruvāduthurai is said to have been established by Nāmisivāyamūrthi at an unknown period! It owns twenty-five thousand acres of land in the Tirunelvelly district (Tamilnādu) and one-hundred acres in the Madurai District (Tamilnādu). In Tanjore proper, the total amount of land owned by this Math amounts to three-thousand acres only. The Tiruppanandāl math founded by Gnanasambandha-Desikar (some 400 years ago) has in its possession two-thousand five-hundred acres of land. However, the landed properties of the "samārtha Math" (Sankara-Madam) at Kuṇbakoṇam are not considerable.

Before the commencement of the East-India-Company's rule, native-Governments exercised a close control over the activities of the Maths and Temples. Temple-authorities were empowered to sell and purchase lands under certain regulations. The mortgaging of temple-lands was regulated. The supervision of such activities of the temples was done by brahmin land-lords, as well

87. Ibid.,
88. Ibid., p.216.
as by other land-owning communities of higher castes as noted earlier.\textsuperscript{89} After assuming charge of the governance of Tanjore country, the Company did probe into the affairs of the temples though not in as systematic a fashion as the earlier rulers. To begin with, the Company tried to check certain abuses in the administration of temples. The attempts to regulate temple-properties and funds followed in due course. In A.D.1801, the Board of Revenue pointed out the appropriation of large portions of temple-funds by the super-intending brahmins. The Board instructed the collectors to prevent grave abuses in temple-management.\textsuperscript{90}

Misappropriation of temple-funds continued and is evidenced by the observations of collector Wallace.(A.D.1814). He reports number of such offences committed by the members of the temple committees. Even instances of Heads of Maths (Tampurâns) selling lands of the Math for self-promotion are reported. Such misappropriations have ruined the reputation of religious—


\textsuperscript{90} Tanjore Records. Vol.3177 (9.1.1801) "Letter from the Board of Revenue regarding \textit{abuses} in Temple-Management", p.7.
institutions. Wallace enlightened the Government by emphasizing the urgent need of regulating the officers, temple-authorities and other concerned servants of the Government. He argued that since Maths and temples are public institutions, they should be brought under Public-regulations and control. Rules and Regulations were drafted to control management of some देवस्थानम. In A.D.1815, temple-lands were rented out to some mirāśdars of particular villages for a term of two/three years for a fixed amount payable to the pagodas on condition that they should pay the revenue to the Government and manage the affairs of the pagodas according to 'Māmool (Convention). Under this scheme all the temple-lands including "Sarvamānyam" were rented to affluent mirāśdars. The Government regularly received its share of admissible revenues, whether 'Quit rent' or of other categories. But the Mirāśdars took full advantage of the opportunity and increased their wealth further.
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Though they were "Tenants of the temple", by virtue of their social status as big land-lords, they sub-let these lands and enjoyed the produce of the temple-lands. Such a situation continued till the end of the Company's rule. The Company's administration too, failed to check the affluent enriching themselves further at the expense of the temple. The affluent land-lords were gaining social and economic status. The problems of fixation and collection of revenues continued to be as elusive as ever. The British in Tanjore experienced difficulties and had to pick up the gauntlet.