

Shaping of Rights: State, *Jati* and Gender

P. S. MANOJKUMAR

Assistant Professor, Department of History, C. Achuthamenon Govt. College, Kuttanellur

The shaping of the perceptions of rights in the society is a laborious task as it involves multidimensional engagements with the social institutions which acts as nerve centers of the society such as family, community (*jati*), State, etc. In many cases, the engagements and confrontations were so pitiful that the persons involved were to lead lone battles against all these institutions. Such situations were intense in the cases in which the struggles were monopersonal. But, such struggles too were important in shaping the perspectives on/f rights, as the collective movements were. For example, the emergence of consciousness on/f rights among the Namboothiris of Kerala. There were collective engagements which tended and worked to satisfy the patriarchal desires of the aspirant Namboothiri males. Many of these engagements were projected as pro-women or women emancipatory movements. But the desires which shaped the agendas of such collective engagements were purely patriarchal and the desired rights were those authorized by the stalwart patriarchs who acted and worked as the patrons of the movement.¹ Whenever activities on the part of women went beyond the authorization of these stalwarts, such activities were seen as aberrations and something which should not be accorded.²

In this paper, attempts are made to trace out the

activities of some women among Namboothiri community, who were not backed up by the stalwart patriarchs—the leaders of reforms among Namboothiris, yet fought their causes and possessed their rights during the early decades of 20th century. These were, though not among the celebrated activities—such as widow remarriages, marriage of younger brothers of Namboothiri families, abandoning of Ghosha, etc.—important in constructing the perspectives of rights among the women among Namboothiris. The demands and the activities to materialize those by these women were very much associated with the everyday lives and thus were mainly focused on sustenance, which the state and *jati*, in different contexts were forced to accept.

Smartavichara of Thatrikkutty

Let us take the context of *Smartavichara* of *Thatrikkutty* to trace out the nature of State–*jati*–gender relations. It happened in the year 1905. This incident is taken as an example because of its relevance as an issue which touched whole of *Keralam*. No part of *Keralam* was put outside the purview of its consideration. (It could also be treated as the first instance when Malabar, Cochin and Travancore were integrated during the colonial period).

The *Smarthavicharam* of Tathrikkutty was an important episode in the history of *Keralam*. Sheeba K.M. who has studied on the *Smarthavicharam* of Tathri has presented the incident as follows:

The incident had obviously created an uproar in all the circles of the community and shook it at its decadent roots. The effects this incident had can be gauged on the basis of the frequent presence it has found in writings of different leanings legal, aesthetic, male chauvinistic/patriarchal, journalistic from the point of women's subjectivity and also from the way this woman got placed in myths and popular beliefs.³

To make the context vivid, it is necessary to understand

the situations in which Tathri's sins were constructed. Such an understanding will help us to portray the probable situations in which a Namboothiri girl was brought up in the late decades of Nineteenth century and early decade of Twentieth century. The total episode of Tathri's *Smarthavicharam* and *Swaroopam Chollal* brought into discussion on the pathetic and insecure situations in which the girls among Namboothiris were living in their houses. The persons who were included in the list of 65 men who had sexual relations with her included her father, brother, brother-in-law and kinsmen. This list of persons,—close relatives as molesters—(though cannot be generalized in/for all families) was an indicator of the alarming situations in which Namboothiri girls were living in Kerala. Tathrikkutty, who still remains in the public discourses of Kerala as a seductive-sexual icon had her first sexual experience—rape—at an early age of around ten. She had recollected it as a painful and fearful experience during *Smarthavicharam*. Rape, compulsion, threatening, blackmailing etc. were used by the molesters to win her consent is evident from the *Smarthavicharam* records.⁴

This study does not intent to go into the details of the *Smarthavicharam* of Tathri⁵ by giving an account of the incidents or tracing its otherwise relevant dimensions. The focus of this study is on how the procedures were on; how the *jati* elements were latent in those; how the *jati* status were recognized and how the recognition was confirmed, communicated and executed. These questions are relevant in the contexts of discussions on hierarchy, power, rights and obligations with respect to the interactions within the *jatis*. Along with these, attempts are also made to delineate how the *Smarthavicharam* of Tathri had imbued in it the modern notions of justice by incorporating opportunities for the victims to prove their innocence; the measures taken to curb the malpractices and bribes associated with the *Smarthavicharam* and the shift in the status of *Sadhanam* after the trial, legally.

The rules regarding *Smarthavicaram* insist that the petitioners should approach the king and should be asked to do the needful; upon which the king will invite four *mimamsakas* (Scholars in *Dharmasastras*) and a *Smarta* and send them to the house of the complainant. Along with these persons, king should send a *purakoyma* (Brahmin as the representative of the king) presenting him with a shawl. The duty of the *mimamsakas* is to frame questions. The questions should be communicated to the representative and the *Smarta*. During the course of the *vicharam* (trial), the *purakoyma* should, keep silence and sit there, listening the proceedings. When, on occasions, he finds the questions as improper, the shawl is put to ground. Thereupon the questions will be reconstituted. The reporting of the proceedings of trial was the duty of *Smarta*. Once the faultless reporting is done, the *purakoyma* should go out of hall. The *Smarta* was the one to pronounce the *vicharam* if the lady is guilty along with the men who courted her. The king has the duty to settle the lady in some part of the country and provide her with the means for subsistence. King is also bound to excommunicate the men involved and banish them from country.⁶

The textual dictates are followed in the procedures of *Smarthavicharam* is attested by the trial records of Tathrikkutty.⁷ But the records will give us the real dimensions and depths of the diktats. When going through the records, the first thing that captures attention is the involvement of the State in the proceedings of *vicharam*. The entire state machinery was used—including the state exchequer⁸, state offices including the office of *Sarvadhikaryakkar*, tehsil office, police station and the bureaucracy, state buildings etc—to investigate and finalize a petition regarding the chastity of a Brahman woman. The nexus between the *jati* and state was much deeper. Sheeba K.M. observes it as follows:

...the trials had to have the sanction of the Raja. Not only this but the Raja provided the assistance of the officer

Purakoyma and in the final stage, had to give his consent for the pronouncement of the verdict of *Swaroopam Chollal*. At rare instances when an *Illam* was found unable to meet expenses, the Raja was found to even sanction funds. The trials then were not closed community affairs but that which were designed to send larger signals into the society reflecting the superiority of the Namboodiris.⁹

When the textual and procedural accounts pertaining to the *Smarthavicharam* are verified, it can be easily understood that the king/state exercises a superior position in the matter of *jati*. Though the King had a ritually inferior status, it did not prevent him from intervening in the chaotic situation faced by the ritually superior Brahmins. The Brahmins were also content to submit to Kingship in any of the matters pertaining to the *jati*. The situation is very much vocal and explicit in enlightening us about the nature of relations between *jati* and the state.

Observing the nature of intervention and the procedures of intervention of the state in the situation of *Smarthavicharam*, we can trace a fivefold exercising of authority of state over the *jati* (say, *Nambudiris*).

1. The diktats in the *Sankarasmriti* and the act on the part of Brahmins undoubtedly affirm the political superiority of the King/ State. The *jati* status of the King was not a matter of concern. *Sankarasmriti* has explicitly asked to invoke the intervention of the king in the times of chaos and to find solution for the problem and mend it through the agency of the King—the State.¹⁰ During the times of peace too, king was the patron.¹¹ Moreover the period from 1792 is the period of various forms of transitions in *Keralam*—socially, politically and economically. Some changes were drastic, profound and deep rooted. The changes brought about by Marthanda Varma and Dharma Rajah in the State of Travancore and by Sakthan Thampuran in the State of Cochin were strong enough to

shackle the holds of Brahmin supremacy existed in *Travancore* and *Kochi*.¹² These political interventions along with the Mysorean interlude¹³ have paved the ways for the shifts in the political and social positioning of Brahmins and Kings. Thus by the end of 19th century and the beginning of 20th century, there happened a transition in which the social, political and economic dependency of the Brahmins became so deep.¹⁴ Though their dependency upon kings was an established fact,¹⁵ the religious upper hand they maintained through their ritual status was illustrated by some scholars¹⁶ relying on the description of Samuel Mateer.¹⁷ But, in reality the descriptions reiterates the dependency of Brahmins, even for food on the State. Mateer has cited the acts of Rajah of Travancore while welcoming *Azhvanchery Thamprakkal*.¹⁸ *Azhvanchery Thamprakkal* was viewed as the chief of the Namboodiries, though he possessed no distinct jurisdiction over them.¹⁹

2. The King/ State was the sole authority to intervene in the matters of *jati*. The *jati* elders were permitted to take all decisions pertaining to the *jati* rules- be it an addition, annulling, and departures from the existing rules. But though they and the body in which they were members function as the agency to determine the alterations had full rights over the decisions, it should had to be authorized/ sanctioned by the King/State. There is an important occasion within the course of *Smarthavicharam* of *Tathri* which substantiates this argument. The occasion is of the meeting called by the Rajah of Cochin on the 9th of Edavam, 1080 (1905 May 22nd) at *Thrissivaperur* (Thris-sur) in which the elders and prominent persons among the Namboothiri Brahmins were present and the decisions were taken on the hitherto unknown and unheard *puru-shavicharam* (summoning and trying the males whom *Tathri* had stated as courted with her).²⁰ The proceedings clearly recognize the authority of the King over the Brahmins and the elders. Prominent members recognized the

fact that the King has the right to order them.²¹ Further, the proceedings note of the meeting is a document which substantiates the full authority of the *jati* council to decide on the matters pertaining to the *jati*. The decision to conduct the *purushavicharam* was taken according to the sanction given for the same by the *jati* council. When the King/ State felt it necessary to take advice on specific matters pertaining to the entire *jati* relations, social relations etc. they summoned the Brahmins and did so.

3. The above mentioned decision to conduct *purushavicharam*, taken at the *Thrissivaperur* council of Brahmins clearly indicates the unbound authority of the King/ State to intervene into the customs, traditions and even the texts. It also indicates that the King enjoyed the power to direct the *jati* council/ elders to revise, reformulate, delete or even add norms to the texts or practices, provided the *jati* elders/ council declared it permissible. This could also be seen as a clever tactics on the part of the State to shield its decisions which would have invited the wrath of the dominant sections in the society. The point is that there were occasions in History when the *jati* elders/ councils acted according to the demands of the State.

4. Though the elements of intervention and some sort of compulsion could be traced from the dominating King/ State when *jati* sanctions were sought for the smooth conduct of state matters, it could be noted that utmost attention and neutrality was maintained when it came to matters related to problems within the *jati* and of the persons within the *jati*. This neutrality and attention- within the scope of legality and norms of the age- could be traced in the *Smarthavicharam* procedures. The involvement of the *purakoyma*, who himself was a Brahman- a knowledgeable person regarding the procedures of *Vicharam* is concerned- with rights to dissent is clearly an indication of the use of jurisdictional power and neutrality of the state. On certain occasions, in the matters in which the King

decided to stay off from the council, neither he nor his representatives attended it. On such occasions, the reports of *jati* councils and the decisions taken by the elders were called for. There was such an instance associated with the *Smarthavicharam* of Tathri. After the *vicharam* and *Swa-roopam Chollal* (pronouncement of guilt and declaration of excommunication of the guilty people) there was a system of giving *pampu*²² for those who pleaded before the Smartha by making donations at his temple²³ and after performing certain rituals.²⁴ In this case, after the *swa-roopam chollal* Moothamana Bhattathiri issued *pampu* to Sucheendram Temple favouring two members of Mallissery Mana (Parameshwaran Namboodiri and Madhavan Namboodiri) at Guruvayur.

The interesting fact was that there was a communication sent by Dewan Vencata Row to the Resident on 12th June 1827 as follows:

A nambudiri named Trivickraman came to me some time ago and showed an order under the signature of certain legislatives Nambudiris, directing him to take his oath by ordeal in the Pagoda at Soochindram to prove that he is innocent of the crime he is accorded of having committed in the house of another Nambudiri. I informed him of the positive prohibition that exists in the country with regard to oath by ordeal... I beg you will be pleased to write to the Dewan of Cochin to direct the Namboory inhabitants of that country to change their mode of proving the innocence of the persons accused of any crime by adopting some other measures instead of ordering them to take their wrath by ordeal.²⁵

There was also a communiqué from the Minister of Consultation in 1844 referring to the ghee ordeal which states that “the Governor in Council observes with satisfaction that the Rajah of Travancore has characterized the Ghee Ordeal as an improper and uncivilized practice, and

that His Highness has disclaimed all further intention of preparing its revival.”²⁶

It was after all these decisions on the part of the State of Travancore and the communication to the King of Cochin, that the *Smarthan* Moothamana Bhattathiri issued *pampu* to Parameshwaran Namboodiri and Madhavan Namboodiri. Thus it could be seen that the *pampu* was issued for an ordeal which did not exist at the time of the issuance of the *pampu*. That was a clear case of cheating for two reasons: (1) A *Pampu*- as an order given to a person who was found guilty—had the status of an order to keep the existing orders of the *Smarthavicharam* in abeyance till the person in question proves his innocence at Sucheendram temple. The existing orders were kept in abeyance till the person in question performed the trail of ordeal. While issuing the *pampu*, Moothamana Bhattathiri was fully aware of the fact that this *pampu* was of no use as the government of Travancore had banned the custom. Thus by issuing *pampu*, the *Smarthan* Moothamana Bhattathiri was letting the excommunicated Parameshwaran Namboodiri and Madhavan Namboodiri to enjoy a bail period. (2) Further, neither the *Smarthan* Moothamana Bhattathiri was involved in the trial of Tathri nor did he try to obtain sanction from the King to issue *pampu*.²⁷

This created dissatisfaction and ignited rage among the *Namboodiris* of *Thrissivaperur Yogam* and they filed petition before the King.²⁸ King decided to keep out of such a council and asked the members to decide and intimate the decision taken.²⁹ The decision to block Moothamana Bhattathiri and his family and others who associated with him in the act of issuing *pampu* was taken in a *jati* council of the elders and other prominent members, with the consent of, but in absence of the King or his representative. This indicates the nature and level of autonomy the King/State had given to the *jati* councils.

5. Lastly, but most importantly, a matter to be understood is that, though the King/ State stood as the settler of disputes/ patron in the times of peace, he dictated nothing. It is to be understood that the King/ State owned everything- including the persons and the offices assigned to them. This is explicitly pronounced on occasions when such expressions of possession were necessary. Take for example how the King had addressed the *Smaartan*. In the first official letter sent to him asking him to conduct the *Smarthavicharam* of Tathri, the *Smarthan* was addressed as *Nammude Pattachomayarkk*.³⁰ Though these factors were latent in the expression and exercise of the deliverance of the power, the autonomy of the *jati*- through the agency of the elders of *jati* or *jati* councils- to consider the matters of dispute or settling of chaos were preserved. The King/ State, though was involved and worked to mend everything regarding the *jati*, preserved a role of witness for him.

It is also to be considered that in certain aspects with respect to the rights of woman in question- Tathri, the State has gone beyond the diktats of the *Sankarasmriti* norms. As can be read in the orders issued, government has categorically shifted her position from that of a 'degenerated woman' as suggested by the *Sankarasmriti* norms to that of an independent woman. The recognition of this status by the State was important.

In the letter from Sarvadhikariakar to the Sub- Magistrate, Chalakkudy, it is categorically stated that:

... the woman after the *Swaroopam Chollal* is at full liberty to act as she likes to that government has no authority or justification whatever to consider that she is one who is under any restraint. She is woman who has got full liberty of her person and property and the only reason for the requisition and necessary precautions should be taken to see that in as much as she has confessed to her immoral

intercourse with so many persons of various positions in life, there may perchance be persons who moved by violent passions may be tempted to do her harm. So, all that we want to do is to render her such help as everyone is justified in expecting from the government when the safety of ones person and property is apprehended. You will therefore see that the police or anybody else do not consider her to be one who is under any restraint or who has lost her liberty of action. She may freely move about whenever she likes and there is no need for anybody to escort her or to do any such thing.³¹

Establishment of the Right over the Property of Husband

The significance of the historic life of Uma Antharjanam has been discussed by the present author earlier.³² Uma who was born in Narippatta Mana was married to Cholayil Parameswaran Namboothiri. She had two kids- one female and one male- in that relationship. As was the custom among the Namboothiris, Parameswaran Namboothiri had his second marriage which created tensions in the marital relationship of Uma and Parameswaran, which culminated in the abandoning of husband's house by Uma along with the kids. There were several attempts on the part of the male members of Cholayil and Narippatta Manas to appease her and bring her to the lines of the families, but she opted to annul the relation.

When they found they could not make her to submit to their demands, her family members and in laws decided to break the ties of relationship with her completely. The breaking up of the ties of relationship with Uma was not merely the ousting of the lady out of the household. It involved the annulling of relations through legal settlements in which Uma and Cholayil Mana were parties. An agreement was drawn in between them in which Uma was given landed assets and the custodianship of her daughter where as she had to handover her son to Cholayil Mana

annulling all her claims and rights over her son. Settlement was done at the registrar office. There as per agreement, she handed over the male child into the hands of an elder lady of the house of Parameswaran Namboothiri.³³

Though the life of Uma Antharjanam was discussed in an entirely different light in a judgement tone by the reformers among the Namboothiris, like V. T. Bhattathiripad, the life of Uma in total was repeatedly demanding change in the patriarchal attitudes towards women and their roles as decision makers of their lives and agents of change.³⁴ Her break from the families by receiving share in the property and getting it recorded in registry department, thus making it official, itself was something which created change in the Namboothiri community. The very agreement which authorized her rights over landed properties denied her the right over her male child and made her daughter loose her right to the enjoy her access to her father and paternal kins shows the intensity of patriarchal mentalities existed among the Namboothiri families in the life and times of Uma Antharjanam.

Madhavi Antharjanam Case

Madhavi Antharjanam was married to Govindan Namboothiri of Malika Illam situated at Peruvanna Amsam of Kozhikkod. Govindan Namboothiri as per the tradition among Namboothiris got married again and abandoned Madhavi Antharjanam. There upon, Madhavi Antharjanam filed a petition before Sub Divisional Magistrate on June 30th 1932 praying the court to direct her husband to make provisions for her sustenance. When the court summoned Govindan Namboothiri, he submitted before the court that he married another woman only for begetting children. He also agreed before the court he would provide the provisions for the subsistence of Madhavi Antharjanam. Madhavi agreed to this settlement and the petition was dismissed.³⁵ But the agreement was violated by

Govindan Namboothiri. There upon, she again approached the court for orders sanctioning maintenance.³⁶ The case was taken for hearing on 29th July 1932. The court on that day pronounced its judgement directing Govindan to make a monthly payment of an amount of Rupees four to Madhavi as maintenance amount.³⁷

The case filed by Madhavi Antharjanam seeking orders for maintenance from her husband Govindan Namboothiri was the first of its kind in Malabar among Namboothiris. The attempt on the part of Madhavi to seek justice in her marital relationship through court was a bold move in that age. She surpassed the families involved and the caste stalwarts to solve the injustice she met in the marital relationship and sought the intervention of state to solve her problem. This very act shifted the position of marriage and marital relationship, which were hither to the matters of family and caste to those pertaining to state. The very act of Madhavi, approaching the court for solving marital issues and the outcomes there upon gave an assurance to the destitute women abandoned by husbands regarding their maintenance by the husbands.

Thus it should be understood that the 'reformation' among the Namboothiris and the transformation among them were not processes instigated merely by/ through the initiatives of Yogakshema Sabha, Unninamboothiri and the influential stalwarts of the movement like V. T., MRB, Muthiringott or the people who worked with them. There were active engagements on/ from the part of the women for transforming their everyday life situations and to find remedies for the incidental problems they met. These engagements were out of the purview of the agendas set by the stalwarts of the mainstream movement. Women like Tathri, Uma and Madhavi and those like them, who engaged Brahmanical Patriarchy from the plains of everyday lives, were challenging its *pativratya* norms in various dimensions and were attempting to disintegrate the

highly patriarchal spaces, thus finding the spaces which could accommodate them too. The attempts which have been cited above, about which discussions are made and those attempts similar to these, by the women as agents, which are snubbed into forgetfulness and swept out from the historical discourses are to be revisited to know about the unsung heroines in the domains of social reformations.

Notes and References

1. P.S. Manoj kumar, 'Malayali Hindu Patriarchy: Gender and Jati' in *Social Orbit*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 2016, pp. 114-141.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 119-124.
3. Sheeba K.M., 'Some Aspects of Women's Consciousness Among Namboodiris in Keralam in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries', (Unpublished M.Phil Dissertation), Centre for Historical Studies, SSS, JNU, New Delhi, 1995.
4. SVR Bundle No: 9.
5. Smartha vicharam records (henceforth SVR) with respect to the trials of Tathrikutty are kept in the Ernakulam Regional Archives.
6. N.P. Unni, *Sankarasmrti (Laghudharmaprakashika)* (hereafter Sankarasmrithi), Ashtamadyaya (8th Chapter), pp. 119-122 and pp. 259-262.
7. Smartha vicharam records (henceforth SVR) with respect to the trials of Tathrikutty are kept in the Ernakulam Regional Archives.
8. Cited by Sheeba K.M., 'Jati, Sexuality and the State: The Changing Lives of Namboodiri Women in Keralam in the Twentieth Century', (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis), Centre for Historical Studies, SSS, JNU, New Delhi, 2002, p. 88.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Sankarasmrithi, VII Chapter.
11. The role of King as the patron of the Brahmins is attested by the acts of the rituals associated with the temple for which the resources are met from state exchequer. See CF No. 294/ 1855- 68 File No: 355/1855 dtd 1855; File No: 2118/ 1865 dtd 1.12.1865; File No: 1007/1868 December 1868; No. 5205/ 1868 December 1868 kept in the Trivandrum Central Archives. In the letter written by the Dewan to the British Resident, it has been recorded as the expression of the Rajah of Travancore: "utmost possible exertions will be used to prevent all unnecessary or wasteful expenditure in connection with the approaching moorajepem, ceremony as has

done on the last occasion though His Highness feels that he cannot, under existing circumstances, discontinue any part of a ceremony performed by a succession of His Highness' predecessors. (file No: 5205/ 1868 December 1868)

12. P.K. Gopalakrishnan, *Keralam Samskarika Charithram*, Trivandrum: Keralam: Bhasha Institute, 1976, pp. 343-344; p.397.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 369. Also see N.M. Namboothiri, Vellayude Charithram, Sukapuram: Vallathole Vidyaapeetam, 1998 for details on what the effects of Mysorean Interlude was on the existing socio- political and economic situations.
14. The Migration of Brahmins and upper jati people to Cochin and Travancore following the invasions of Mysore rulers and the insecurity brooded among the native Brahmins of Travancore and Cochin following the socio- political and economic curbing of the Brahmins by Marthanda Varma in Travancore and Shakthan Thampuran in Cochin necessitated this dependency.
15. "The charitable institutions which serve out a scanty fare just enough to prevent the Brahman from starving are maintained in respect to the sacerdotal character and in the spirit of fostering talent and morality"—A. Sankariah, *Report on the Census of Native Cochin*, Madras: Graves, Cookson & Co., 1877, p.32.
16. Susan Bayly, *The New Cambridge History of India, IV. 3: Jati, society and Politics in India from the Eighteenth Century to the Modern Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p.77-78.
17. Samuel Mateer, *The Land of Charity: A Descriptive Account of Travancore and its People*, London: John Snow & Co., 1871, pp. 168, 170,181-182.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 167-168. Those acts on the part of the King of Travancore can in no way seen as acts by king rendered upon a Brahmin, for *Azhvanchery Thamprakkal* being a Brahmin. It was rendered by the King as the office of *Azhvanchery Thamprakkal* was much honoured. The prostration and felling to feet of *Azhvanchery Thamprakkal* by the King had a very different meaning for the fact that the Rajahs of Travancore never fell on the feet of the Brahmins whomever they met.
19. A. Sankariah, *op. cit.*, p.34.
20. SVR Bundle 7- File No: 141B.
21. The word used by the Brahmins to denote the note from King is *kalpana* which means order. They acknowledge the right of the King to deliver orders upon them- which itself is an act acknowledging the superiority.

22. Letter of consent from *Smarthan* for trial of ordeal at Sucheendram Temple.
23. SVR Bundle No: 3- Explanation filed by *Smarthan* Moothamana Bhattathiri on 1081 Dhanu 16th.
24. SVR Bundle No: 3- Explanation filed by Pazhayatha Somayaji of Brahmaswam Madom and others on 1081 Vrishchikam 22nd.
25. File No C. 15887/ 1826, dated 12th June 1827- Memorandum from the Dewan of Travancore; Central Archives, Trivandrum
26. File No C. 15887/ 1826- Ghee Ordeal- Correspondence; Political Department- No.225 dated 6th July 1844; Central Archives, Trivandrum
27. SVR Bundle No: 3- Explanation filed by *Smarthan* Moothamana Bhattathiri on 1081 Dhanu 16th.
28. SVR Bundle No: 3- Copy of the petition filed by Thrissivaperoor Vadhyan Nambudiri and others dtd 1081 Dhanu 8th.
29. SVR Bundle No: 3- Correspondence from Kottaram Sarvadhikaryakkar dtd 1081 Dhanu 14th.
30. SVR Bundle 7- File No: 141B. *Nammude* used in this letter is not to be taken as a token of intimacy or dearness. The nature of the letter is highly official and the letter is highly precise and matter of fact. In the letter, nothing more than what the *Smarthan* should do, is stated. The tone of the letter is highly commanding and gives the full weight of a communication from a power center to the subordinate. Because of these reasons, it could be rightly assessed that the King/ State was expressing its power of possession over the person to appoint him to the post of *Smarthan*.
31. VR Bundle No: 6- Letter from Sarvadhikaryakkar to the Sub Magistrate, Chalakkudy dtd 1905 July 14th.
32. P.S. Manoj kumar, *op. cit.* 119-124.
33. V.T. Bhattathirippad, *VTyude Sampoorinna Kruthikal*, Kottayam: DC Books, 2010, pp.322-328.
34. P.S. Manoj kumar, *op. cit.*
35. *Mathrubhumi Weekly*, Vol.10, Issue 16, 11th July 1932.
36. *Mathrubhumi Weekly*, Vol.10, Issue 18, 25th July 1932.
37. *Mathrubhumi Weekly*, Vol.10, Issue 25, 12th September 1932.