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PREFACE

In the present work I have brought together some results of my researches extending over a number of years into various branches of the history and culture of Ancient India and its colonies. Some of the topics taken up in this volume were discussed previously by scholars of undoubted distinction. But it seemed desirable, in view of the importance of the subjects concerned, to deal with them afresh somewhat more fully and critically than heretofore. The subject-matter of the remaining Essays, it is believed, is being treated here for the first time.

Because of the variety of their types as well as the extent and duration of their course, if not for their other qualities, the Ancient Indian chronicles and dynastic lists as well as sacred biographies and ecclesiastical annals should have deserved, it would seem, the serious attention of scholars long ago. Nevertheless it is a fact that a comprehensive and critical account of Ancient Indian Historical literature has yet to be written. Elsewhere I have attempted to fill in some of the chapters of this unwritten volume by contributing critical studies of early biographies of the Buddha as well as of the dynastic chronicles of Kashmir and Bāna’s chronicle of King Harṣa (See Indian Historical Quarterly Vol. XVII, No. 2, June 1941: Ibid. Vol. XVIII, Nos. 3-4, September and December 1942; Ibid. Vol. XIX, Nos. 1-2, March and June 1943; Indian Culture, Vol. I July-September 1942). The same object has led me to describe in the First Essay of the present work the oldest types of Indian historical compositions as revealed in the Vedic literature.
The inscriptions of Asoka, supplemented by the legends of the great Emperor and a few later references, constitute an ample mass of valuable data for reconstructing the History of India at one of the peaks of its civilization. Nevertheless, their interpretation presents numerous difficulties even after a century of study and research. In the Second Essay I have sought to consider the views of a number of scholars regarding various aspects of Indian constitution and administration in the time of the Great Maurya.

For an adequate survey of the social and economic history of Ancient India it is essential to take stock of slavery in a mild form as one of its recognised institutions. In the Third Essay I have attempted to trace the history of this institution from the times of the Vedic Saṃhitās to those of the later Smṛtis. The opportunity has been taken in this connection to draw a complete comparison and contrast between the attitude of the Arthaśāstra and the Dharmaśāstra towards slavery.

Questions regarding the position of the king, the influence of popular assemblies, the king's ownership of the soil and the like, are of fundamental importance from the point of view of the constitutional history of Ancient India. In the bulk of the Fourth Essay I have to examine two important recent interpretations of Hindu theories of the origin of Kingship as well as of the evolution of Vedic monarchy. The remaining portion of this Essay is occupied with the criticism of another view relating to the general character of Ancient Indian monarchy. In the following Essay I have tried to consider two recent views dealing with the much discussed problem of the composition and functions of Vedic Assemblies. Mention may be made in this
connection of the Thirteenth Essay in which I have attempted to discover, from a thorough analysis of Vedic coronation rituals and their dogmatic exposition, the points of constitutional significance embodied therein. A close scrutiny of a new interpretation of three texts usually taken to support the case for the king’s sole ownership of the soil has been attempted in the Sixth Essay.

For a critical and connected account of Ancient Indian administration it is essential that the large number of technical terms and titles with which it abounds should be accurately explained as far as possible. In the Seventh Essay I have endeavoured to unravel the precise significance of a number of such terms and to distinguish, where necessary, between their different connotations at different periods of history.

While the political history of Ancient Bengal has been more or less thoroughly explored in recent years, there are still big gaps left in our knowledge of its economic and religious history. In the Eighth and Ninth Essays it has been attempted to fill two such gaps. In the former case evidence has been culled especially from a number of Ratnaparikṣā works to indicate the mineral wealth of Ancient Bengal. In the latter case a unique terracotta plaque from the old Buddhist shrine at Paharpur has been held on the strength of extensive as well as varied archaeological and literary evidence to illustrate for the first time a well-known ritual of the Śākta cult within the limits of this Province.

The publication of the unique chronicle of King Rāmapāla by the late Mm. Hara Prasad Sastri, which for the first time illumined a dark corner in the late eleventh-century history of Bengal, has given rise to an extraordinarily keen controversy
about the leading actors of that drama. In the Tenth Essay I have attempted to deal as fully and impartially as possible with these figures and to indicate the significance of the revolution in which they played their part.

It is a historical truism to assert the intimate relation between the archaeology of Greater India and that of its home-land. So close indeed is this contact that frequently the key to the interpretation of the former is to be found in the latter. On the other hand the types of antiquities represented by the former are often helpful in throwing light upon the characteristics of the latter. In the Eleventh Essay I have sought to identify in the light of various Indian Śilpaśāstra texts a unique temple-type referred to in a Cambodian inscription of the ninth century A.D. In the following Essay the various types of Lokeśvara images found in Indo-China have been compared, as far as possible, with their prototypes on the Indian soil.

It has often been the fashion to divide the history of India into a number of broad chronological periods. While ordinarily these divisions are characterised as 'Hindu,' 'Muhammadan' and 'British,' they are sometimes given as 'Ancient,' 'Mediaeval' and 'Modern.' A still greater diversity of opinion exists as regards the dividing-line between the different periods. In the Fourteenth and concluding Essay these different views have been subjected to a close scrutiny and an attempt has been made to arrive at the proper solution.

Of the fourteen Essays comprised in this volume, the third part of No. I (Vedic Historical Traditions), the second and third parts of No. IV and lastly No. V (On the Nature and Functions of Vedic Assemblies) and No. XIII (Vedic Cere-
monies of Royal and Imperial Consecration and their Constitutional Significance) are published here for the first time. The remaining Essays (or parts of Essays) appeared in various Journals and Proceedings of learned Societies during the last twenty years and are now brought out in a revised and up-to-date form. Thus the Third Essay was published in the Calcutta Review, Third Series, Vol. XIV, February 1925. The first part of the Fourth Essay appeared in the Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. I, Nos. 2-3 (June and September 1925) and the Sixth and Second Essays in Vol. II, No. 1 (March 1926) and Vol. VI, Nos. 3 and 4 (September and December 1930) of the same Journal. The Seventh Essay is made up of four parts published respectively in Proceedings and Transactions of the Fourth All-India Oriental Conference (Allahabad 1928), Proceedings and Transactions of the Sixth All-India Oriental Conference (Patna 1930), Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume (Madras 1936) and Proceedings and Transactions of the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference (Trivandrum 1940). The Eighth and Tenth Essays originally appeared in Bengali, the first being contributed to the Festschrift (Haraprasad Samvardhana Lekhamalā Part II, Calcutta 1339 B.S.) presented to the late Mm. Pandit Hara Prasad Sastri by his friends and admirers on his 75th birthday, while the latter was published by the Divya Smṛti Samiti as the writer's Presidential Address at the Third Annual Session of the Divya Commemoration Celebration in 1343 B.S. The Fourteenth Essay was published in the Modern Review, Calcutta Vol. XLIX, No. 4 (April 1931). The Eleventh Essay, which was read by the writer at the Eighth International Congress of Historical Sciences

I have to apologise to my readers for the number of misprints (especially as regards transliterations from the Sanskrit) which has crept into this work. The more serious of these errors have been corrected at the end. It is also regretted that there has been some want of uniformity as regards the transliteration of Indian proper names.

My acknowledgments are due to the editors of various periodicals and *Proceedings* of learned Societies from which many of these Essays as above-mentioned have been reproduced, to the Directors and staff of the Calcutta Oriental Press Ltd. for the uniform courtesy extended to me throughout the printing of this work, and to my son Mr. R. K. Ghoshal, M.A., for the preparation of the Index.

In conclusion it is my earnest hope that the following pages will form the starting-point of fresh discussions facilitating a closer approach towards solution of the numerous knotty problems of Indian and Greater Indian History and Culture presented in this volume.

GREATER INDIA SOCIETY,  
Calcutta,  
24th March, 1944.
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The Beginnings of Indian Historiography

1. III: VAMŚAS AND GOTRA-PRAVARA LISTS OF VEDIC LITERATURE

The ceremonies of the Vedic sacrificial ritual, which form the entire subject-matter of the later Sanhitās and the Brāhmaṇas, almost necessarily implied a long succession of teachers through whom they were handed down from the most ancient down to comparatively recent times. It is to the period of the Brāhmaṇas which exhibit the first systematic expositions of the sacrificial ceremonies that we can trace back the oldest genealogical lists (vaṃśas) of Vedic teachers and their pupils. The Vamśa Brāhmaṇa forming a separate branch of the Sāmaveda school has a vaṃśa consisting of not less than sixty names beginning with a teacher called Vaiśrava and traced back through its last human teacher Kaśyapa to the gods Agni, Indra, Vāyu, Mrtyu, Prajāpati and Brahman the Self-existent One. Two separate vaṃśas are found in the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa (iii, 40-42 and iv, 16-17) likewise belonging to the Sāmaveda school. One of these has fifty names beginning with Brahman and ending with Vaipaścita Dāṛhajayanti Gupta Lauhiteya, while the other consists of fourteen names only, beginning with Indra and ending with Sudatta Pārśārya. The Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad, forming the concluding portion of

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, has two vamśas (Ibid., n, 6 and iv. 6) of fifty-eight and sixty names respectively, which agree with each other in several parts. The list begins with Pauṁśa and ends with Brahman. The Brhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad (vi. 5) has another vamśa consisting in the Kāṇva recension of two lists, one of fifty-two names and the other of forty-eight only. These lists of which the first thirty-six have all names ending in metonymics agree with each other up to a teacher called Sāṁjñiviputra beyond whom they diverge into separate branches. This has been plausibly explained on the supposition that Sāṁjñiviputra united two lines of teachers, one of which is traced back through Vāc (the Goddess of speech), Ambhiṣṭi (the voice of thunder) to Āditya (the sun), while the other is carried back through Prajāpati to Brahman. To illustrate the character of these vamśas, it will be sufficient to quote one example, that of the shorter list in the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa which we give below in Oertel’s translation [JAOS., vol. xvi, Part 1, 1894, pp. 214-15]:—

"Verily thus Indra told this udgīta of the Gāyatrīsāman, the Upaniṣad, the immortal, to Agastyā, Agastya to Iṣa Śyāvāśvi, Iṣa Śyāvāśvi to Gauśūkti, Gauśūkti to Jvalāyana, Jvalāyana to Śatīyān, Śatīyān to Rāma Kṛtujātya Vaiyāghrapadya, Rāma Kṛtujātya Vaiyāghrapadya to Saṅkha-Śābhṛavya, Saṅkha Śābhṛavya to Dakṣa Kātyāyani Ātreya, Dakṣa Kātyāyani.

2 For the two lists in the Kāṇva recension, see Max Müller’s tr. of the Upaniṣads, Part II, SBE., vol. xv, pp. 118-120, 185-188. For comparison with the parallel versions in the Mādhyaṇḍina recension as well as for comparison of the two first-named vamśas, see Ibid., 118-120m and pp. 186-187m.

3 For the list in the Kāṇva recension, see Max Müller, op. cit., pp. 225-227. For comparison with the Mādhyaṇḍina version, see Ibid., p. 224p. The second list is wanting in the Mādhyaṇḍina text, but a very similar one is found in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, x. 6. 5. 9.

4 Max Müller, op. cit., p. 230.
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Atreyā to Kaṁsā Vārakya, Kaṁsā Vārakya to Suyajña Śāṅḍilya, Suyajña Śāṅḍilya to Jayanta Vārakya, Jayanta Vārakya to Janaśruta Vārakya, Janaśruta Vārakya to Sudatta Pārāśarya."

We may next mention a vāṁśa given at the end of the late Śāṅkhāyana Aranyakā of the Rg Veda. This consists of eighteen names beginning with Guṇākhyā Śāṅkhāyana and ending with Brahman, the Self-existent One. Lastly, we may refer to the Mundaka Upaniṣad of the Atharva Veda which opens with a short list of seven teachers beginning with Brahman and ending with Saunaka Mahāśāla.

If we have now to judge the historical value of the vāṁśas, we must admit at the outset that the highest links in the chain consist of names of deities like Agni, Vāyu, Indra and, last but not the least, Brahman. But the remaining and by far the more considerable portions of these lists consist of human teachers. On general as well as particular grounds the names and succession of human teachers may be accepted as a historical fact. It is now generally admitted that the period of the Brāhmaṇas from the very nature of their subject-matter and the range as well as variety of their literature must have extended over many centuries. To this must be added the fact that many of the names of teachers in the main portions of the lists are actually quoted as authorities in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa and similar

6 See SBE., vol. xv, p. 28.
7 Cf. M. Winternitz, History of Indian Literature, vol. i, pp. 194-195:—
"We are compelled to assume a period of several centuries for the origin and propagation of this literature. .........The sacrificial science itself requires centuries for its development." Cf. also Ibid., p. 302.
texts. What is more, some of these personages are evidently singled out as taking an outstanding share in the development of the doctrine. Without therefore going so far as to say with Max Müller that "with the exception of the highest links in each chain of teachers the lists have an appearance of authenticity rarely to be met with in Indian compositions," we may state that they certainly reach a high degree of historical probability. It has, however, not been possible as yet to fit in the long and formidable lists of the vaṃśas into the Vedic chronological scheme.

We may pause here to indicate the importance of the part played by the late Brāhmaṇa schools of the Sāma Veda and the Yajur Veda in the creation of the vaṃśa lists. In the Brāhmaṇas of the Rg Veda and the Atharva Veda, as in those of the Sāmaveda and the Yajurvedas, individual teachers are often cited as authorities on various parts of the ritual. But neither the Aitareya nor the Kauśitaki Brāhmaṇa belonging

8 Cf. Zimmer, op. cit., p. 299:—“Die Rolle abschließender Autorität der genannten Personen für die einzelnen Texte ergibt sich aus der Häufigkeit und Art der Anführung ihrer Meinungen, durch die diese als unwidersprochen und endgültig erscheinen.” He justifies his statement by the example of Yājñavalkya who is quoted eighteen times in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa as compared with nine quotations of the next frequently cited teacher Aruṇi and who twice figures as the last and the most conclusive of a triad of quoted authorities. He also refers to Śaṭyāyani who is quoted seven times in the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa as compared with Baka Dālṭhya and Brahmandaṭṭa Cāṅkīrīṇeya who come next with two quotations each.


10 Thus as Zimmer, op. cit., p. 297, points out, Kauśitaki is cited fourteen times and Pāṇiṅgaya nine times in the Kauśitaki Brāhmaṇa, while several times Kauśitaki follows Pāṇiṅgaya in the order of authorities cited. For the references see also Keith, Rg Veda Brāhmaṇas, HOS., vol. xxv, p. 24v.
to the Ṛg Veda school, nor earlier Brāhmaṇas of the Śāmaṇa, nor even the earlier portions of the Ṣatapatha Brāhmaṇa, have preserved vamśa lists. It is only in the late Brāhmaṇas of the Śāmaṇa and later portions of the Ṣatapatha Brāhmaṇa that the oldest vamśas have as yet been found. Probably the growing scepticism about Vedic sacrificial ritual, of which we have indications in the Brāhmaṇas themselves and which was to culminate in the revolt of Buddhism and Jainism, led the priestly authors of the late Brāhmaṇa texts to justify themselves with the weight of formidable authority going back to the gods.  

In the later Vedic texts of the Gṛhyasūtras the lists of teachers are brought into relation with the domestic ritual. Among the daily duties binding on the Snātaka (would-be householder) and the Gṛhaśtha (householder) are included bathing and Vedic study. An essential appendage of these ceremonies or of one or other of them is the tarpana rite.  

The tarpana consists in satiating deities, sages and manes with offerings of water. To take one example, Āśvalāyana Gṛhya-śutra (iii. 4. 1-5) begins with a list of thirty-one deities, Prajāpati, Brahmaṇa, the Vedas, the Devas, the sages and so forth, to whom the water should be offered by the householder. Then follows a list of sages consisting in the first instance of a group of twelve names which have been identified with those of seers

11 For some evidence about disintegration of the Vedic religion in the Brāhmaṇa period, see Keith, Ṛg Veda Brāhmaṇas, pp. 25-26.
12 For different views of the relation of tarpana to bathing and Veda study, see Oldenberg, SBE., vol. xxix, pp. 120-121.; P. V. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, pp. 668, 695.
of various *mandalas* of the *Rgveda*. Then comes a number of sages including teachers of *sūtras*, *bhāsyas*, etc. as well as Kahola, Kauśitaki, Aitareya, Āśvalāyana and so forth who are teachers well-known to the *Brāhmaṇa*, *Aranyaka* and related works.\(^{13}\) Similar, but not identical, lists are found in other *Grhyasūtras* and even in one *Dharmasūtra*.\(^{11}\)

A great gulf separates these late lists from the *vamsās* of the *Brāhmaṇa* texts. In the older lists the human teachers were evidently regarded as historical personages whose names and order of succession it was necessary to record correctly as proof of genuineness of the teaching. In the later accounts, the teachers have risen to the rank of semi-divine personages to be venerated along with groups of deities and manes. It was therefore no longer necessary, as the above examples testify, to transmit the names in genealogical succession. The lists in fact consist of a jumble of ancient as well as modern teachers from the remote times of the *Rg Veda* to the late period of the *sūtras*. It is characteristic of the looseness of these later accounts that even the teachers’ names are needlessly duplicated.\(^{13}\)

Next to the *vamsās* and other lists of teachers in the Vedic texts may be mentioned the family genealogies indicated by

\(^{13}\) For a summary of the above list, see Kane, *op. cit.*, pp. 690-91.

\(^{14}\) See *Śāṅkhyāyana Grhyasūtra*, iv, 9-10, tr. *SBE.*, vol. xxix, pp. 121-123; *Śāmbhavya Grhyasūtra* quoted, Weber, *Indische Studien* xv, 154; *Hiranyakesi Grhyasūtra*, ii, 19, 20; *Baudhāyana Grhyasūtra*, iii, 9; *Bheradvāja Grhyasūtra*, iii, 9-11, also *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*, ii, 5 etc. For discrepancies between these authorities, see Kane, *op. cit.*, pp. 692-693.

\(^{15}\) Cf. the duplications Kauśitaki and Mahākauśitaki, Paṅgīya and Mahā-paṅgīya, Aitareya and Mahāaitareya, Audāvāli and Mahāaudāvāli—in the *Āśvalāyana Grhya* list above referred to.
the terms 'gotra' and 'pravara.' These may roughly be translated as 'family' or 'lineage' and as the illustrious ancestors who have contributed to the credit of the same.16 Gotra in its technical sense occurs already in an Atharva Veda text (v. 21. 3) where it clearly means 'a group of men connected together by blood.' References to pravara under the name ṛṣeya and to pravara sages are found in some texts of the Rg Veda.17 Systematic lists of gotras and pravaras, however, make their appearance only in the late Śrautasūtras, those handy manuals that were composed in later times for dealing with the great mass of the Śrauta sacrifices.18 By way of illustration, we quote below from the excellent work of P. V. Kane (op. cit., p. 490) the gotra and pravara divisions of two of the most renowned families, the Bhṛgus and the Āṅgirasas, as given in these ancient authorities:—

"The Bhṛgus are of two sorts, Jamadagnya and non-Jamadagnya. The Jamadagnya Bhṛgus are again two-fold, Vatsas and Bidas (or Vidas), the non-Jamadagnya Bhṛgus are five-fold, namely Ārṛṣiṇas, Yāskas, Mitrayus, .

16 Kane, op. cit., p. 497, explains the connection between gotra and pravara as follows:—"Gotra is the latest ancestor or one of the latest ancestors of a person by whose name his family has been known for generations, while pravara is constituted by the sage or sages who lived in the remotest past, who were most illustrious and who are generally the ancestors of the gotra sages or in some cases the remotest ancestor alone."

17 Ibid., ix. 97. 51; viii. 102. 4; i. 45. 3 etc. Cited in Kane, op. cit., pp. 479. 486-87.

18 Such lists are found for example in the Śrautasūtras of Aivalayana, Pt. ii. vi. 10-15, (Bib. Ind. ed., pp. 875-885). Bandhāyana (Bib. Ind. ed., vol. iii, pp. 415-467). Āpastamba, xxiv, 5-10, (Bib. Ind. ed. pp. 268-277). Besides the above Zimmer, op. cit., p. 6, quotes the Śrautasūtras of Kātyāyana and Laugāksi. while Kane, op. cit., p. 483, cites the Śrautasūtra of Satyāśādha Hiranyakeśi xxi, which gives the same list as Āpastamba Śrautasūtra with a few changes.
Vainyas and Sunakas. Under each of these subdivisions there are many gotras, on the names and numbers of which the Sutrakāras are not agreed. These divisions of Bṛhas are given here according to Baudhāyana. Aṇustamba has only six of them, as he excludes Bīdas from this group. According to Kātyāyana, Bṛhas have twelve subdivisions.

"The Āṅgirōgana has three divisions, Gautamas, Bharadvajas and Kevalāṅgirāsas; out of whom Gautamas have seven subdivisions, Bharadvajas have four and Kevalāṅgirāsas have six sub-divisions, and each of these again is subdivided into numerous gotras. This is according to Baudhāyana. Other Sutrakāras differ as to the sub-divisions...."

The gotras and pravaras were intimately connected with the social and religious system of the Vedic Aryans from an early period. To take a few examples, marriage was forbidden not only within the same gotra but also within the same pravara. As regards inheritance, property of a person dying without issue was vested in his near sagostras. Consecration of the domestic fire was preceded by invocation of one's gotra and pravara ancestors. In the ceremonies of tonsure and investiture with the sacred thread, there were minute differences of detail according to different gotras and pravaras of the boy's family.19 It might therefore be thought that the genuineness of these lists was beyond question. Unfortunately the Śrautasūtras which are our primary sources contradict themselves not only as regards numbers of gotras, but also the names, numbers and order of succession within the same gotra.20 From this it appears that there was no unanimity even as regards the number of the original gotras. In the appendix of his work (pp. 1263-1266), Kane, while giving after Baudhāyana a classified list of forty-

19 For details and references, see Max Muller, op. cit., pp. 203-204; Kane, op. cit., pp. 481-483 and p. 491.
20 For a number of striking examples see Kane, op. cit., pp. 480, 490, 495.
nine pravara groups and the gotras among which they are distributed, notices some striking divergences in the lists of Āśvalāyana, Āpastamba and Satyāśāṭha. In his German translation of Āpastamba Śrutasūtra, Caland gives (Ibid., vol. III, pp. 409-411), as an appendix to the pravaraśāṭha, parallel lists of Rṣi genealogies from Āpastamba and Baudhāyana. When Zimmer (op. cit., pp. 6-7) says with regard to these lists, "Dass sie sich widersprechen oder denselben Namen in mehreren Gruppen bieten, kommt nur vereinzelt vor," we must accept his view with great modifications. Even Puruṣottama, author of the Pravara-maṇjarī which is the leading authority on the subject in later times, is quite emphatic about the discrepancies. 21 It would seem that a very long interval separated the beginnings of the gotra and pravara divisions from their systematic arrangement in the Śrutasūtras. Whatever that may be, we may safely conclude that these old genealogical lists have a substratum of historical reality.

21 See Kane, op. cit., p. 483.
2. THE GĀTHĀS AND NĀRĀSAMSIS, THE ITHIHASAS AND PURĀNAS OF VEDIC LITERATURE.

However authentic the genealogies of the Vedic religious teachers and the Vedic lists of gotras and pravaras might be, they would form at best a skeleton of historical compositions properly so called. A more definite approach to history is marked by some ancillary branches of learning known to the Vedic times, to which we now refer. These are the gāthās and the nārāsamsis which may be roughly translated as ‘epic song verses’ and ‘songs in praise of heroes’ respectively. Already in a passage of the late tenth book of the Rgveda (Ibid., 85, 6), gāthās and nārāsamsis are mentioned as distinct but evidently allied types of composition, though elsewhere gāthā is used in the more general sense of ‘song.’ The Atharva Veda, (xv, 6, 3-4) mentions gāthās and nārāsamsis as the last and evidently the least important of a series of enumerated texts. The daily study of gāthās and nārāsamsis (or nārāsamsi gāthās) following that of the Rk, the Yajus, the Sāman, the Atharvāngiras and other texts is enjoined upon the householder in solemn and moving words in the Brāhmaṇa and later works.¹

² Cf. Vedic Index of Names and Subjects, s.v.
³ The series runs as follows: —ṛcḥ, sāmāṇi, yajūṃṣi, brahman, iithāṃ Nath, purāṇam, gāthāḥ nārāsamsyaḥ.
⁴ Cf. Ṣat. Br., xi, 5, 6, 4-8=S.B.E., vol. xlv, pp. 96-98; Tat. Ṛt., iii, 10, ed. Ānandāśrama Sansk. Series, vol. 1, p. 144; Aṣv. Gr. S. iii. 3 S.B.E., vol. xxix, pp. 218-219. In these passages the various classes of texts are said to constitute as many forms of offerings to the gods, and their recitation is said to satiate not only the gods, but also the Fathers.
As forms of literary genre, though not as distinct branches of learning, the gāthās and nārāyaṇasūtras have their parallels at least in part, in some hymns and portions of hymns in the Rgveda and Atharva Veda Samhitās. We refer, in the first instance, to the so-called Dānastutis (“Praises of Gifts”), which form the concluding verses of a number of Rgvedic hymns. Of these hymns it has been said by a competent authority:—

“Some of them are songs of victory, in which the god Indra is praised, because he has helped some king to achieve a victory over his enemies. With the praise of the god is united the glorification of the victorious king. Finally, however, the singer praises his patron, who has presented him with oxen, horses and beautiful slaves out of the booty of war... Others are very long sacrificial songs, also mostly addressed to Indra, and they also are followed by verses in which the patron of the sacrifice is praised, because he gave the singer a liberal priestly fee.”

Another partial parallel is to be found in the so-called Kuntāpa hymns of the Atharva Veda6 of which we give below a specimen in Bloomfield’s translation7:—

“Listen ye to the high praise of the king who rules over all peoples the god who is above mortals, of Vaiśvānarā Parikṣit!

“Parikṣit has procured for us a secure dwelling, when he, the most excellent one, went to his seat.’ (Thus) the husband in Kuru-land, when he founds his household, converses with his wife.

“What may I bring to thee, curds, stirred drink, or liquor?” Thus the wife asks her husband in the kingdom of king Parikṣit.

“Like light the ripe barley runs over beyond the mouth (of the vessels). The people thrive merrily in the kingdom of king Parikṣit.”

The gāthās and nārāyaṇasūtras formed such a necessary accompaniment of Vedic sacrificial ceremonies that their recitation was incorporated in the rituals of some of the great sacrifices.

We may illustrate this in the first instance from the example of the Āsvamedha which the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiii. 2. 2. aptly calls 'the king of sacrifices,' and which could only be performed by a victorious king or by a paramount ruler. On a number of occasions during the course of the sacrifice provision is made for the recitation of gāthās by musicians in praise of the sacrificer. On the day of letting loose of the sacrificial horse the vināganagins (i.e., as explained by the commentator, the musicians who sang to the accompaniment of all sorts of lutes) are required to sing praises of the sacrificer along with those of just kings of ancient times. This was repeated daily during the whole year of the horse's wandering and was continued in the same way down to the day of the sacrificer's initiation (dikṣā). Afterwards the musicians have to sing daily, as before, praises of the sacrificer along with those of the gods. Towards the conclusion of the ceremony the musicians have to sing praises of the sacrificer along with those of Prajāpati. Still more pointed reference is made to the contents of the gāthās in connection with some other portions of the ceremonial. On the day of letting loose the horse, a Brāhmaṇa lute-player (vināgāthin) has to sing to the accompani-

8 For a detailed account of the sacrifice according to the texts of the White Yajurveda, namely Vājasaneyya Saṁhitā xxii ff. Sat. Br. xiii, 1-5, Kāty. Śr. S. xx, Āśval. Śr. S. x, 6-10, see now the excellent work of P.-E. Dumont, L'Āśvamedha, Paris-Louvain, 1927. The appendix to this contains trs. of the Black Yajurveda version as given in Āpast. Śr. S., xx, 1-23, Baudh. Śr. S., xv. 1. 30 and some fragments of the Śr. S. of Viḍhūla.

9 See Dumont, op. cit., pp. 40, 56, 68, giving full references.

ment of the uttara-mandrā (a kind of viṇā, according to the commentator) three stanzas composed by himself on such topics as 'he performed such and such sacrifice', 'he gave such and such gifts.' On the same day a Brāhmaṇa lute-player sings three gāthās similarly composed by himself and relating to the sacrifices and gifts of the sacrificer, while a Kṣatriya lute-player does the same on topics relating to the battles fought and the victories won by the sacrificer. This has to be repeated each day during the whole year.\textsuperscript{11}

In the above, it will be noticed, reference is made to gāthās celebrating generally the sacrificer’s praises along with those of ancient kings or of gods, as well as those specifically praising the king’s achievements as a sacrificer and conqueror. Concrete instances of these types are found in a series of more or less parallel texts of Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (xiii, 5. 4. 1 ff.), and Sāṅkhāyana Śrauta-sūtra (xvi, 9) listing the famous kings performing the Ashvamedha sacrifice and of Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (viii, 21-23) enumerating the kings who performed the ‘Great Consecration of Indra’.\textsuperscript{12} To take a few examples, the gāthā quoted about king Janamejaya Pāriksīta is as follows: \textsuperscript{12a}

\textsuperscript{11} Dumont, op. cit., pp. 32, 41-43, 304, 306.

\textsuperscript{12} A link between these two sets of lists is furnished by the fact that most of the kings performing the ‘Great Consecration’ are said in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa to have offered the horse sacrifice. Cf. the following:— “With this great anointing of Indra Tura Kāvaścyu anointed Jānamejaya Pāriksīta. Thereupon Jānamejaya Pāriksīta went round the earth, conquering on every side, and offered the horse in sacrifice.” Ait. Br., viii, 21, Keith’s tr.

"At Āsandivant, a horse grass-eating,  
Adorned with gold and yellow garland,  
Of dappled hue, was bound,  
By Janamejaya for the gods."

Of king Marutta Āvikṣita the following gāthā is quoted:  

"The Maruts as attendants  
Dwelt in the house of Marutta;  
Of Āvikṣita Kāmapri  
The All-gods were the assessors."

The gāthās of Kraivya, the Pañcāla king, are introduced to us in the following way:  

"At Parivakra, the Pañcāla overlord of the Krivis seized a horse meant for sacrifice, with offering gifts of a hundred thousand (head of cattle). A thousand myriads there were, and five-and-twenty hundredths, which the Brahmans of the Pañcālas from every quarter divided between them."

Lastly the gāthās about Bharata, son of Duḥṣanta, are as follows:

"Covered with golden trappings,  
Beasts black with white tusk,  
At Maṇḍara Bharata gave,  
A hundred and seven myriads.  
.................................  
The great deed of Bharata,  
Neither man before or after,  
As the sky a man with his hands,  
The five peoples have not attained."

The verses about Janamejaya, Kraivya and Bharata just quoted evidently belong to the class of gāthās in praise of kings' sacrifices and gifts to which reference is made in the account of

13 Sat. Br., xiii, 5, 4, 7-8 (Eggleston's tr.).  
the Āsvamedha sacrifice mentioned above. On the other hand, the verse relating to Marutta Āvīkṣita comes within the category of gāthās praising the kings along with the gods. Of another class of gāthās, those in honour of the gods, also referred to in the account of the Āsvamedha given above, it is unnecessary to speak in the present place. Concrete examples of this class are the Indragāthās ('songs in honour of Indra') to which reference is made in the Atharva Veda (xx, 128, 12-16) and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (vi, 32).

As in the case of the ritual of the Āsvamedha, the recitation of gāthās was made by some authorities part and parcel of the grhya sacrificial ritual. One of the important 'domestic' rites is the Simantonayana ('parting of the hair') which is performed on the expectant mother in the fourth, sixth, seventh or eighth month of pregnancy. Here the husband has to ask two lute-players (vīnā-gāthins) to sing about the king or anybody else who is still more valiant or about king Soma.16

Like the gāthās, the nārāsamsis are also found to be incorporated in some of the great sacrificial ceremonies. The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta-sūtra, in the course of its description of the Puruṣamedha sacrifice, mentions a series of ten nārāsamsis which are to be sung in regular cycles of ten day’s duration. Each of these is accompanied by a short statement of its subject-matter and a reference to the corresponding hymns of the

14 Ṣāṅkhāyana Grhyasūtra, 1, 22, 11-12 and Pāraskara Grhyasūtra, 1, 15, 7-8.
15 Āśvalāyana Grhyasūtra, 1, 14, 6-7.
Rg-Veda. We give below a summary of these nārāśanis according to the short description of the original text:—

1. How Śunahşępa, son of Ajigatta, was released from the sacrificial yoke,
2. How Kakśivant, descendant of Uṣij, gained the gift from his patron,
3. How Šyāvāśva gained gift from his patron,
4. How Bharadvāja gained gifts from his two patrons,
5. How Vasiṣṭha became the Purohita of Sudās,
6. How Āsaṅga Plāyogi, being a woman, became a man,
7. How Vatsa, descendant of Kāyva, obtained gift from his patron,
8. How Vaśa Aśvya gained gift from his patron,
9. How Praskanva obtained gift from his patron,

It will be observed that the list given above consists, with one exception, of praises for gifts received, or supplications to the deity for favours sought. The first and by far the more important class evidently falls into line with the dānastutis of the Rg-Veda already mentioned.

We may now consider the important and difficult question regarding the composition and authorship of the works under notice. In the account of the Āsvamedha given above, reference is made to vināganins (musicians) singing praises of the sacrificer as well as Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya vināgāthins (lute-players) composing and singing songs in honour of the sacrificer’s achievements. Evidently then there already existed at this early period a class of minstrels who not only preserved and handed down
but also composed songs in honour of human celebrities. This class, however, did not as yet form a closed caste or corporation, for individual Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya musicians could play the same rôle. Evidence is not lacking that a professional class of bards or minstrels had already emerged in the late Sāṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa times. In the list of symbolical victims at the Puruṣamedha occurring in the Vājasaneyā Sāṃhitā (xiii) and the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa (iii. 4) we find side by side the lute-player and the flute-player as well as the māgadha and the sūta so familiar in Epic and Puranic texts of later times. On the precise functions of the Vedic māgadha and sūta there is some difference of opinion,17 though their Epic and Puranic successors stand for royal eulogists or panegyrist and sometimes for genealogists.18

The gāthās and nārāśamsis occupy an important place in the development of Indian historical literature. Apart from the gāthās to the gods, they may be proved by references in the Vedic Sāṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas to relate to historical characters and incidents. Thus Janamejaya Pārikṣita of the Kuru line, Pārśu Aṭṭāra king of Kosala, Marutta Avikṣita king of the Pañcālas, and Bharata Dauḍāṇanti of the great Bharata tribe are all conspicuously mentioned in the late Sāṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa literature, and they no doubt belong to the same period. The references to Āsandīvant as capital of Janamejaya, and of Pari-vaktā as capital of Kraivya Pañcāla and to Nāḍāpīt as the birthplace of Bharata have every appearance of historical reality. To the human authorship of the gāthās, as distinguished from

17 See Vedic Index. s.v.
18 See Parpīter, The Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, pp. 16-18, which gives full references.
the supposed revealed character of the Vedic hymns, pointed testimony  is borne by a text of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa." Granting all these points the question still remains, 'What is the historical value of the gāthās and nārāsāṃsīs of Vedic literature? We have first to admit that these works no doubt because of their courtly exaggerations drew upon themselves the reproof of some of the Vedic schools. Thus the Kāṭhaka Sāṃhitā, the Maitrāyaṇī Sāṃhitā and the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, all belonging to the Black Yajur Veda, have a series of more or less parallel texts branding the gāthās and nārāsāṃsīs as lies and as the filth of Brahman (the Vedas) and placing acceptance of gifts from their reciters on the same moral level as that from a drunkard. These works, however, have been authoritatively recognised to be precursors of epic poetry. With at least equal justice we may claim that they were the forerunners of the Indian historical kāvyā, common to both being the fact that they eulogise the achievements of historical kings, naturally enough with some exaggeration.

Distinctly superior in importance to the gāthās and nārāsāṃsīs in the eyes of the Vedic Aryans, though not from the standpoint of Indian historiography, are the classes of compositions known to the Vedic Sāṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas under

19 "Om is the response to a ṛc; 'Be it so,' to a 'gāthā.' Om is divine, 'Be it so' human." Ibid., viii, 18, tr. A.B. Keith, Rgveda Brāhmaṇas, p. 309.

20 Cf. Kāṭhaka Sāṃhitā, xiv. 5: anṛtam bi gāthā=anṛtam nārāsāṃsī mattsya na pratigrhyam=anṛtam bi mattāḥ; Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, 1, 32. 6-7: Yad brahmanah śamalam=āsit sa gāthānārāsāṃsī=abbavat. yad=annasya sā sura tasmād=gāyātaśca mattsya ca na pratigrhyam. Cf. Maitrāyaṇī Sāṃhitā, 1, 11. 5.

the name of Itihäsa and Puräña. We may freely translate them as ‘legends of gods and heroes’ and ‘legends of origin’ respectively. In the passage of the late fifteenth book of the Atharvaveda quoted above, they are mentioned after the sacred Rk, Sāman, Yajus and Brahman, and before the gāthäs and nārāśamsīs, in a series of enumerated texts. The same order is preserved in the above-quoted texts from Satapatha Brähmana, (xi, 5), Taittirīya Aranyaka (ii, 10) and Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra (iii, 3), enjoining daily study of the Veda upon the householder. In a number of parallel passages in the Brhadaranyaka Upaniṣad virtually enumerating the known branches of learning at that time, Itihäsa and Puräña are similarly mentioned after Rg-Veda and Yajur-veda, Sāma-veda andAtharväṅgirasa, but before a number of subsidiary studies.\textsuperscript{22} In a similar series of parallel passages in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (vii, 1. 2; 2. 1; 7. 1), Itihäsa-Puräña is mentioned as the fifth after the Rg-veda, the Yajur-Veda, the Sāma-Veda and the Atharväna, but before a number of secondary branches of learning. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, (iii, 4. 1-4) not only is the same order preserved (Rk, Yajus, Sāman, Atharväṅgirasa, Itihäsa-Puräña), but a close connection is sought to be established between the last two.

The elaborate account of the Aśvamedha sacrifice in the Satapatha Brähmana and other works shows that not only were Itihäsa and Puräña dignified with the title of ‘Veda’, but that their recitation formed an important element of the complex sacrificial ritual. On the day of loosening of the sacrificial horse, the botṛ priest recites to the crowned king surrounded by his

\textsuperscript{22} See Brhadaranyaka Upaniṣad, ii, 4, 10; iv, 1. 2. iv, 5. ii=S.B.E.
vol. xv, pp. 111, 153, 184.
sons and ministers what are called the ‘revolving’ (or ‘recurring’) legends (pārīplava ākhyāna). These are so called because the priest recites on ten successive days as many different Vedas, and this goes on for a year in cycles of ten days each. In the order of the narration Itihāsa and Purāṇa are reserved for the eighth and ninth days, while Rk, Yajus, Atharvan, Āṅgirasa, sarpa-vidyā (‘the science of snakes’), devajana-vidyā (knowledge of divine beings), māyā (magic) are mentioned for the first seven days, and Sāman for the tenth.23

The recital of the pārīplava legends is evidently intended to show the models to whom the sacrificer is assimilated.24 Equally didactic is the use of Itihāsa and Purāṇa in certain domestic sacrifices described in the Grhyasūtras. According to Āśvalāyana Grhyasūtra25 when a misfortune like the death of a preceptor takes place, the members of the family should cast out the old domestic fire and kindle a new one. Keeping that fire burning, they sit till the silence of the night narrating the stories of famous men and discoursing on the auspicious Itihāsa-purāṇas. Again, according to Gobbila Grhyasūtra26 on the occasion of the ceremonies on the new- and full-moon days, the husband and the wife should spend the night so as to alternate their sleep with waking, entertaining themselves with Itihāsa or with other discourse.

23 See Sat. Br., xiii, 4. 3. 2 ff.; Āśval. Sr. S., x, 7, 1 ff.; Śāṅkh. Sr. S., xvi, 2. 1 ff. For the slight differences, see Sieg, Die Sagenstoffe des Rg-veda, p. 211.
24 Cf. Dumont, op. cit., p. 39, where the pārīplava ākhyānas are called “les anciens récits épiques, qui montrent les modèles du roi dans la légende, modèles auxquels on assimile le sacrificant.”
25 iv. 6. 6; cf. Pischel and Geldner, Vedische Studien, i. p. 290.
26 1, 6. 6.
While the ritual and didactic import of Itihāsa and Purāṇa in these ancient times is sufficiently demonstrated by the texts, the same cannot be said of their character as historical compositions. In the explanatory (artha-vāda) portions of the Brāhmaṇas as distinguished from those enjoining the precepts (vidhi), there have been preserved specimens of the old Itihāsa and Purāṇa.\(^{27}\) Here we have, as examples of Itihāsas, the legend of Purūravas and Urvaśī already known in the Rg-Veda, the legend of the Flood, the legend of Śunaḥśepa and so forth. As examples of Purāṇas, we have the legend of origin of the four castes out of the body of Prajāpati and the various creation-legends. A reference in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa\(^{28}\) shows that wars between gods and Asuras also formed the materials of the ancient Itihāsa. On the other hand, we have as yet no trace of genealogies of kings and dynasties with chronological references such as were to constitute an essential ingredient of the later Purāṇas according to the standard definition.

\(^{27}\) Cf. Sieg in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. vii, s.v. Itihāsa; Winternitz, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp. 208 ff.

\(^{28}\) xi, i. 6. 9.
3. VEDIC HISTORICAL TRADITIONS*

The Vedic lists of gotras and pravaras and the fragments of gāthās and nārāśamsis quoted in the Vedic Literature embody collectively a large mass of the oldest Indian historical tradition. But our account of the beginnings of Indian historiography will remain incomplete, if we are to ignore the residue of more or less authentic traditions preserved in the Vedic Samhitās, Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣads and other works. Of the numerous and undoubted defects characterising these oldest historical compositions of the Indians, we shall have occasion to speak presently. Nevertheless they are of considerable interest as

illustrating the extent to which the historical sense had dawned upon the Indians at the beginning of their history.

The Rgveda Sambitā

It is characteristic of the vagueness of religious conceptions of the Rgvedic seers that they refer to a number of mythical priests and heroes (like Atri, Atharvan, the Aṅgirasas, the Bhṛgus and Kutsa) as well as dasyus (like the demons Sūṣṇa and Śambara) alongside historical figures of these categories. In accordance with this attitude we find the Rṣi authors referring in a number of hymns to mythical alongside historical incidents inspired (as they piously believed) by the act of the deities. To take a few examples, in Ṛv. i. 63 which is a hymn addressed to Indra we read:

3  "Faithful thou, these thou deflect, Indra; thou art the Rbhus' Lord, heroic, victor.
   "Thou by his side, for young and glorious Kutsa with steed and car in battle slewest Sūṣṇa.

4  "That, as a friend, thou furtheredst, O Indra, when, Thunderer, strong in act, thou crushedst Vṛtra;
   "When Hero, thou great-souled with easy conquest didst rend the Dasyus in their distant dwelling.

7  "Warring for Purukutsa thou, O Indra, Thunder-armed; brakest down the seven castles;
   "Easily for Sudās, like grass didst rend them, and out of need, King, broughtest gain to Pūru."

In the above the fortunes of the mythical Rbhus, Kutsa, Sūṣṇa and Vṛtra are mentioned side by side with those of the historical Kings Purukutsa and Sudās.

1 See Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, s.v. Mythical priests and heroes, Demons and fiends; Keith, Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, pp. 223-228; 234-236.
Another Indra hymn (Rv. iv. 30) is as follows:

9 “Thou, Indra, Mighty one, didst crush Uṣas, though daughter of the sky,
   When lifting up herself in pride.
13 “Valiantly didst thou seize and take the store which Sūṣaṇa had amassed,
   When thou didst crush his fortresses.
14 “Thou, Indra, also smoteest down Kūlitrata’s son Sāmbara
   The Dāsa, from the lofty hill.
15 “Of Dāsa Varcin’s thou didst slay the hundred thousand and the five
   Crushed like the fellies of a car.
17 “So sapient Indra, Lord of Might, brought Turvaṣa and Yadu those
   Who feared the flood, in safety o’er.
18 “Arna and Citaratha, both Āryas, thou, Indra, swiftest swift,
   On younder side of Sarayu.
20 “For Divedāsa, him who brought oblations, Indra overthrew
   A hundred fortresses of stone.
21 “The thirty thousand Dāsas he with magic power and weapons sent
   To slumber, for Dabhiti’s sake.”

Here also the poet refers to the fortunes of the goddess Uṣas
and the demons Sūṣaṇa and Sāmbara along with those of the
historical Turvaṣa, Yadu, Divedāsa, Arna, Citaratha, Dabhiti
and Varcin.

Typical of the same blending of mythical and historical
characters as well as incidents is the reference in Rv. i. 53.

10 “Thou has protected Suśravas with succour, and Turvaṣa with
   thine aid, O Indra.
   Thou madest Kutsa, Atithigva, Āyu, subject unto this King, the
   young, the mighty.”

And in vi. 18 (also an Indra hymn):—

13 “This day the deed that thou hast done is famous, when thou, for
   him, with many thousand others,
   Laidest low Kutsa, Āyu, Atithigva, and boldly didst deliver
   Turvaṣa.”
Here again, it will be seen, Tūrvayāṇa who is elsewhere (Ṛv. x. 61. 1 ff.) said to be a prince of the Pakthas, is credited with victory over the mythical Kutsa and Āyu as well as the historical Atithigya otherwise called Divodāsa.²

In the above extracts the references to historical incidents, it will be observed, are always of an allusive character. The same feature characterises other historical references in the Rāgvedic hymns which are not so much mixed up with mythological matter. Take e.g. Ṛv. iv. 42 of which the concluding verses are as follows:

8 "Our fathers then were these, the seven Ṛṣis, what time the son of Durgaha was captive.
For her they gained by sacrifice Trasadasyu, a demi-god, like Indra, conquering foe-men.

9 "The spouse of Purukutṣa gave oblations to you, O Indra-Varuṇa, with homage.
Then unto her ye gave king Trasadasyu, the demi-god, the slayer of the foemen."

According to Śāyaṇa this means that Purukutṣa son of Durgaha being either captured or slain, his wife Purukutṣāṇi propitiated the seven Ṛṣis who obtained for her by favour of the gods Indra and Varuṇa a son Trasadasyu to restore the line.

Of the same nature is Ṛv. ix. 61 where we read:

1 "Flow onward, Indu, with this food for him who in thy wild delight Battered the nine-and-ninety down,

2 "Smote swiftly forts, and Śambara, then Yadu and that Turvaśa, For pious Divodāsa’s sake."

2 On the Řbhus, Kutsa, Śuṣṇa, Vṛtra, Purukutṣa, Sudās, etc. alluded to in the above extracts see V.I., s.v.
This is usually taken to refer to an attack by the Turvaśa and Yadu peoples on Divodāsa. ³

In the examples we have cited above, it will be observed that the Rṣi authors paid no attention to the topography of the incidents that they describe. Other passages, however, prove that they were not altogether wanting in the topographical sense. Thus in Ṛv. III. 23. 4 two Bharata chiefs are associated with the rivers Āpayā, Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī (all belonging to the region of the sacred Kurukṣetra of later literature). More distinct is the reference in Ṛv. VII. 96. 2 where the Pūrus are said to dwell on the two ‘grassy banks’ of the sacred Sarasvatī. Other texts pointing in the same direction are Ṛv. II. 41, VI. 61, VII. 95-96, containing apotheosis of the Sarasvatī ‘the mightiest and most divine of streams,’ ‘best mother, best of rivers, best of goddesses’, and above all Ṛv. X. 75 containing the famous ‘Hymn to the Rivers’ of which Max Müller (India, what can it teach us?, London, 1883, p. 168) justly says,

‘The poet takes in at one sweep three great armies of rivers—those flowing from the North-West into the Indus, those joining it from the North-East and in the distance the Ganges and the Jumna with their tributaries.’

This geographical sense of the Ṛgvedic seers manifests itself in a few descriptions of battle scenes. This is the case with Ṛv. III. 33 which tells us in the form of a dialogue between the Rṣi Viśvāmitra and ‘the pair of Mothers’, the Vipāś and the Sutudrī how the Bharatas, engaged in a raid, were able to cross the rivers in high flood, through the Rṣi’s prayers: ⁴—

³ For references in the above extracts see VI., s.v. Durgāka, Trasadasv Ṛurvaśa.

⁴ For this interpretation of the above text rejecting that of Sāyaṇa see VI., s.v. Viśvāmitra where full references are given.
"List quickly, Sisters, to the bard who cometh to you from far away with car and wagon.
Bow lowly down; be easy to be traversed: stay Rivers, with your floods below our axles.

"Yea, we will listen to thy words, O Singer. With wain and car from far away thou comest.
Low, like a nursing mother, will I bend me, and yield me as a maiden to her lover.

"Soon as the Bharatas have fared across thee, the warrior band, urged on and sped by Indra.
Then let your streams flow on in rapid motion. I crave your favour who deserve our worship."

"The warrior host, the Bharatas, fared over: the singer won the favour of the Rivers.
Swell with your billows, hasting, pouring riches.
Fill full your channels, and roll swiftly onward."

Of the same kind is RV. vi. 27. 5-7 where we read:

"In aid of Abhyāvartin Cāyamāna, Indra destroyed the seed of Varaśikha.
At Hariyūpiyā he smote the vanguard of the Vṛćivans and the rear fled frightened.
Three thousand, mailed, in quest of fame, together, on the Yavyāvati, O much-sought Indra,
Vṛćivan's sons, falling before the arrow, like bursting vessels went to their destruction.
He, whose two red steers, seeking goodly pasture, plying their tongues move on 'twixt earth and heaven,'
Gave Turvaśa to Sṛñjaya, and, to aid him, gave the Vṛćivans up to Daivavāta."

Here we see that the poet gives us the geographical situation—Hariyūpiyā and Yavyāvati (town or river?)—of the victory won over the Vṛćivans and Turvaśas by King Abhyāvartin Cāyamāna who is identified by some with the Sṛñjaya King Daivavāta mentioned in the same context. What is more,
the poet’s allusions to the numbers and equipment of the troops and their tactics indicate his interest in the art of warfare. 3

No battle is more famous in the Rgveda Samhitā than that of the ten kings allied against the Tṛṣṇu King Sudās who won a glorious victory on the banks of the Paruṣṭi river. The hymn (Rv. vii. 18) which was addressed by the Rṣi Vasiṣṭha, the purohitā of Sudās, to the god Indra, is quoted in extracts as follows:

5 "What though the floods spread widely, Indra made them shallow and easy for Sudās to traverse.
   He, worthy of our praises, caused the Simyu, foe of our hymn, to curse the rivers’ fury.

6 "Eager for spoil was Turvaśa Puruṣṭi, sain to win wealth, like fishes urged by hunger.
   The Bhṛgyus and the Druhyus quickly listened: friend rescued friend mid the two distant peoples.

7 "Together came the Pakthas, the Bhalānas, the Alinas, the Śivas, the Viśāṇins,
   Yet to the Tṛṣṇus came the Āryas’ comrade, through love of spoil and heroes’ war, to lead them.

8 "Fools, in their folly sain to waste her waters, they parted inexhaustible Paruṣṇī.
   Lord of the Earth, he with his might repressed them: still lay the herd and the affrighted herdsman.

9 "As to their goal they sped to their destruction: they sought Paruṣṇī; e’en the swift returned not.
   Indra abandoned to Sudās the manly, the swiftly flying foes, unmanly babblers.

11 "The King who scattered one-and-twenty people of both Vaikaiṇa tribes through lust of glory—
   As the skilled priest clips grass within the chamber, so hath the Hero Indra wrought their downfall,

5 See Vi., s.v. Abhyāvatīn Cāyāmaṇa, Hariyāpiya and Yavyāvatī for the references here given.
14 "The Anuvas and Druhyus, seeking booty, have slept, the sixty-hundred, yea, six thousand, And six-and-sixty heroes. For the pions were all these mighty exploits done by Indra.

15 "These Tr̥ṣus under Indra’s careful guidance came speeding like loosed waters rushing downward. The foemen, measuring exceeding closely, abandoned to Sudās all their provisions.

19 "Yamunā and the Tr̥ṣus aided Indra. There he stripped Bheda bare of all his treasures. The Ajas and the Sigrus and the Yakṣus brought in to him as tribute heads of horses."

The battle of the ten kings, no doubt because of its high reputation, is directly referred to under the technical designation (Dāsarājña) in two other Rgvedic hymns. In Rv. vii. 33 addressed by the same Rṣi Vasiṣṭha in praise of his own family, we read:

3 "So, verily, with these he crossed the river, in company with these he slaughtered Bheda. So in the sight with the Ten Kings, Vasiṣṭhas! did Indra help Sudās through your devotions.

5 "Like thirsty men they looked to heaven, in battle with the Ten kings, surrounded and imploring. Then Indra heard Vasiṣṭha as he praised him and gave the Tr̥ṣus ample room and freedom.

6 "Like sticks and staves wherewith they drive the cattle, stripped bare, the Bharatas were found defenceless; Vasiṣṭha, then became their chief and leader: then widely were the Tr̥ṣus’ clans extended."

Charged with more picturesque detail is the description in Rv. vii. 83 addressed by Vasiṣṭha to the gods Indra and Varuṇa:

1 "Looking to you and your alliance, O ye Men, armed with broad axes they went forward, fain for spoil. Ye smote and slew his Dīsa and his Aryan enemies, and helped Sudās with favour, Indra-Varuṇa."
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3 "The boundaries of earth were seen all dark with dust: O Indra-
Varuṇa, the shout went up to heaven.
The enmities of the people compassed me about. Ye heard my
calling and ye came to me with help.
8 "O Indra-Varuṇa, ye gave Sudās your aid when the Ten kings in
battle compassed him about,
There where the white-robed Tīrṣus with their braided hair, skilled
in song, worshipped you with homage and with hymn."

Many of the references in the above extracts (like the identi-
ity of the ten allied kings, the relation of the Tīrṣus to Sudās,
the identification of the Yamunā and the part played by the
Puruṣṇī in the fighting) have formed the subject of controversy
among scholars.6 Leaving these doubtful points out of account,
we can still observe how the poet gives us the geographical
situation of the most famous battle in Rgvedic times. What is
more, he vividly brings before our eyes, as no other Rgvedic seer
does, the successive stages of the battle—the exultant march
of the confederates, the resulting panic in Sudās's force, the
sudden turn of fortune and the final rout of the allies who
were either drowned in the river or forced to flee leaving their
camp to be plundered by the victors. With these passages, then
the realism of the Rgvedic seers in the description of historical
scenes reaches its culminating point.

The Atharvaveda Samhitā

The Atharvaveda is very sparing in its references to his-
torical traditions. Nevertheless we may distinguish several
types of such traditions in the same work. In Av. iv. 29.

6 See VI., s.v. Bheda, Bharata, Tīrṣu, Yamunā and specially Puruṣṇī
for full references. In Rgveda vii. 18-19 above quoted, Hopkins suggests the
reading Yadu in place of Yakṣa.
we have in the fashion of the Rv. passages above quoted a confused list of mythical and historical ṛṣis and heroes who are said to be favoured by the gods Mitra and Varuṇa:—


On the other hand Av. v. 19. 1. gives us what purports to be a historical example illustrating the dangers befalling the oppressors of Brahmanas:—

“They grew excessively; they did not quite (iva) touch up to the sky; having injured Bhīṣma, the Śrījayas, Vaitahavyas, perished.”

The Yajus Samhitās and the Brāhmaṇas

Passing to the Samhitās of the Yajur Veda and the Brāhmaṇas, we have to notice a number of distinct types of historical traditions, which shares in the exclusively liturgical character of the works concerned. The simplest and most numerous of these types consists of authoritative citations in support of specified branches of the sacrificial ritual. Frequently we are introduced to a series of authorities ending with the most important ones. We shall quote here only two out of numerous examples. Thus Sat. Br. i. i. 1. 7, discussing the question of the sacrificer’s taking the evening meal after performance of the Agnibhotra, says,
"On this point Āśādha Śāvayasa, on the one hand, was of opinion that the vow consisted in fasting........Yājñavalkya on the other hand said, If he does not eat, he thereby becomes a sacrificer to the manes and if he does it, he eats before the gods have eaten: let him therefore eat what, when eaten, counts as not eaten."

Of the same nature is *Kaus, Br.* xxvi. 3:

"Now Paṅgya used to say 'Superfluous would be a mantra repeated twice when not prescribed; therefore he should not proceed immediately.' So Paṅgya used to say. Now Kauśitaki used to say, 'These rites in which the number of mantras employed is limited have limited fruits. Those in which an unlimited number of mantras is employed have unlimited fruits.'"

Another type of traditional history that we come across in the later *Sāmbītās* and *Brāhmaṇas* consists of what may be called historical examples justifying the authoritative ritual. In some texts the examples are quoted to illustrate the dangers attending ritual errors. Thus in *Taitt, S.* vi. 6. 2 and *Kāth, S.* xii. 3 the Śrījayas are said to have been defeated because of a mistake committed in the ritual by their priest Devabhāga. By far the largest number of such examples is quoted to illustrate the advantages accruing to the sacrificer from the performance of specific rituals. How a king of an ancient line who had been exiled with his priest received back his kingdom inspite of the machinations of another king is told in *Sat, Br.* xii. 9. 3. 1 ff.:—

'Now Duṣṭarītu Paṃśiyana had been expelled from the kingdom which had come down to him through ten generations and the Śrījayas also expelled Revottaras Pāṭava Cākra Sthapati [The priest with the king's consent performed the Saurāmaṇi for the purpose of conferring upon him dominion over the Śrījayas, but Balhika Pratipīya, king of the Kurus, hearing of this report wished to prevent the performance of the sacrifice. After he had tried in vain to place the priest on the horns of a dilemma] he went home and said 'It is not so (as we had thought): that kingdom of the Śrījayas now belongs to Duṣṭarītu:—in such and such a manner has that Cākra Sthapati this day performed the sacrifice'.

A similar example is quoted in *Pañc. Br.* xxii. 12. 2-4:

“The Jāhūṣa and the Vṛćivats quarrelled for (the possession of) the kingdom. Viṣṇvimitra the king of the Jāhūṣa saw this rite (seill. the four-day rite of Viṣṇvimitra) and practised it. He got the kingdom, the others (Vṛćivats) were deprived of it.

More frequent than the above isolated examples are the lists of successful sacrificers that we find in the works under notice. Thus in connection with the ceremony of piling of the fire-altar we read in the *Taitt. S.* v. 6. 5 (similar lists are found in *Kāth. S.* xxii. 3; *Pañc. Br.* xxv. 16. 3; *J.U. Br.* ii. 6. 11):—

“This (fire) Para Āśāra, Kakśivant Auśij, Viṭhayya Črayasa, and Trasadayu Paurukutsyā piled, being desirous of offspring; then indeed did they win thousands each of children.”

Similarly *Sat. Br.* ii. 4. 2 ff. gives a list of kings and priests who performed the so-called Dākṣāyaṇa or Vasiṣṭha sacrifice (a modification of the full-moon sacrifice) with various resulting successes:

“Now he was indeed Dakṣa: and because he sacrificed in the beginning with this sacrifice it is called Dākṣāyaṇa sacrifice...........

“Now that same sacrifice was afterwards performed by Pratيدāra Śvaiknā; and he indeed was an authority to those who emulated him. An authority, therefore, he will become, whosoever, knowing this, performs that sacrifice: let him, therefore, perform that sacrifice........

“That same sacrifice was afterwards performed by Devabhāga Srautarśa. He was Purohita both to the Kuru and Śṛijayasa. Now a very high position (is held by him) who is the Purohita of one kingdom: how much higher, then, is the position (of one) who (is the Purohita) of two (kingdoms). A very high position accordingly he obtains, whosoever, knowing this, performs that sacrifice: let him, therefore, perform that sacrifice” and so on.

In a similar way *Ait. Br.* vii. 34, after describing the proper food of the king at the Rājasūya in lieu of Soma, says:
“This food Rāma Mārgaveya proclaimed to Viśvantara Sāuṣadmana; this also Tura Kāvaśeya proclaimed to Janamejaya Pārīkṣita; this Parvata and Nārada proclaimed to Somaka Sāhadevyo, to Sahadeva Sārījaya, Bahluru Daivāvīthṣa, Bhima of Vidarbha, Nagnajit of Gandhāra; this Agni proclaimed to Sanaṣṭūta Ariṇḍama and to Kṛatrīvīd Jānaki; this Vasiṣṭha proclaimed to Sudās Pajavana. All of them attained greatness, having partaken of this food. All of them were great Kings; like Āditya, established in prosperity, they gave heat, obtaining tribute from all the quarters.”

None of the examples of the class of compositions we are now considering is more famous than the more or less parallel lists of royal sacrificers, and their priests in the Ait. Br. the Sat. Br. and the Sāṅkh. Śr. Śū. In Ait. Br. (viii. 21-23) the list of kings consecrated to the Great Consecration of Indra and their ministering priests is given as follows:—

‘With this great anointing of Indra Tura Kāvaśeya anointed Janamejaya Pārīkṣita. Therefore Janamejaya Pārīkṣita went round the earth completely, conquering on every side, and offered the horse in sacrifice.....With this great anointing of Indra Cyavana Bhārgava anointed Čāryāta Mānava. Therefore Čāryāta Mānava went around the earth completely, conquering on every side, and offered the horse in sacrifice; at the sacrificial session of the gods he was the householder. With the great anointing of Indra Somacūṣman Vajrārantāyana anointed Čātiṅkā Sātrājīta. Therefore Čātiṅkā Sātrājīta went round the earth completely conquering on every side, and offered the horse in sacrifice. With the great anointing of Indra, Parvata and Nārada anointed Āṃbaṣṭhyā. Therefore Āṃbaṣṭhyā went round the earth completely, conquering on every side, and offered the horse in sacrifice,’ and so on.7

With the above we may compare Sat. Br. xiii. 5. 4. 1 ff. and Sāṅkh. Śr. S. xvi. 9 enumerating a group of royal performers of the Āsvamedha (or horse-sacrifice) along with their ministering priests.

7 In the above context the Ait. Br., quotes the story of Atyārīti Janaṁtapi and the priest Vasiṣṭha Sātyahavya as illustrating the danger of playing false with a Brahman.
The type of compositions just mentioned comprising historical examples of successful sacrificers, was intended no doubt to emphasise the efficacy of the rites concerned. The same motive resulted in the composition of another class of traditions in the form of historical introductions to expositions of the sacrificial ritual. Such expositions are, as a rule, expressed for greater dramatic effect in the form of an imaginary series of dialogues between different theologians. We may take J.U. Br. r. 59. 1-14 to illustrate the simplest examples of this kind:

"Now Brahmadatta Cālikitañeya went to the Kuru Abhipratārin Kākṣaseni. He (A.) offered him a honey-potion (madhyparka). Now his purohita Śunaka, stepping forth, sat down near by. He (B.) drank the honey-potion without addressing him (Ś.). He (Ś.) said to him (B.): ‘As knowing what, O Dālbhya, dost thou drink the honey-potion without addressing [me]?’ [Then follows a series of short questions on ritual put by Ś. and answered satisfactorily by B. At the end Ś. could only say], ‘Homage be to thee, reverend sir, with knowledge hast thou drunk the honey-potion.’ [Then follows another ritual question asked by A. and answered by B. When A. proposed to continue the talk, the other said], ‘Don’t! We have done thee this honour, do not ask us too much.’ [To this answer A. could only reply by expressing his disappointment]."

We have a similar example in J.U. Br. iv. 6-8 stating how Baka Dālbhya, the most learned Brāhmaṇa of the Kuru-Paṅcālas, answered a series of five questions put to him by king Bhagiratha of the Ikṣvāku family.

While in the above case the dialogues take the simple form of a catechism, they are given in other and more numerous instances in the historical setting of disputes between a number of theologians. This gives the opportunity for the priestly authors to introduce dramatic incidents and studies of individual character along with glimpses of contemporary manners.
In *Ait. Br.* ii. 19 we have an account (of which *Kauś. Br.* xii. 3 gives a shorter version), borrowed at least from life, of a dispute between a low-born priest and his fellows at a sacrifice.—

"The seers performed a sacrificial season on the Sarasvati, they drove away Kavaśa Ailūṣa from the Soma, 'The child of a slave woman, a cheat, no Brahman; how has he been consecrated in our midst.' They sent him out to the desert, (saying) 'There let thirst slay him; let him drink not the water of the Sarasvati.' [After he had gone to the wilderness, he saw the 'child of the waters' hymn']. The seers said, 'The gods know him; let us summon him.' 'Be it so' (they replied). They summoned him; having summoned him they performed this 'child of the waters' (hymn)."

Another illustration supported by a historical precedent, of a dispute between a king and a priestly family is told in *Ait. Br.* vii. 27:—

"Vićvantarā Sauṣadmanā, despising the Cyāparṇas, performed a sacrifice without the Cyāparṇas. Perceiving this the Cyāparṇas went to the sacrifice and sat down within the altar. Seeing them he said, 'There sit those doers of an evil deed, speakers of impure speech, the Cyāparṇas; remove them; let them not sit within my altar,' 'Be it so' they replied. They removed them. They being removed cried aloud, Heroes had the Kacypas among them in the Asitamgga who at the sacrifice from which Janamejaya Pārikaṣṭa excluded the Kaśyapas, won the Soma drinking from the Bhūta-vaivraś. What hero have we among us who will win this Soma drinking?' 'I am the hero for you,' said Rāma Mārgaveya. [After Rāma Mārgaveya had explained at great length the proper food for the King at the Rājaśīya, Vićvantarā Sauṣadmanā said], 'A thousand we grant to you, O Brahman; my sacrifice will be performed by the Cyāparṇas,'

In the above extracts the disputes between theologians turn on the general grounds of descent or conduct or even speech. Other disputes narrated in the *Brāhmaṇas* are concerned with specific questions of sacrificial ritual and are marked, as such, by greater contrasts of character and incidents. In *Sat. Br.* x. 3.4.
1 ff. we have the following characteristic story of a theological
disputation involving two figures well known to the Brāhmaṇas
and the older Upaniṣads viz., Śvetaketu Āruṇeya and his father
Uddālaka Āruṇi:

“Śvetaketu Āruṇeya once upon a time was about to offer sacrifice. [Being
asked by his father he said that Vaiśvāsavya was his hotṛ priest. When
the father asked the priest to answer a number of questions, the latter said
that he knew some of them, while as for the rest he could only say, 'Nay,
but thou wilt teach me, Sir.' The father then answered the questions
himself.”]

The pen-picture of Śvetaketu and Uddālaka in the above
extract—the former being described unlike the latter as a con-
ceited man of somewhat immature intellect—is in complete
accord with other references to these teachers in the Brāhmaṇas
and connected works. This of course, is an indirect evidence
of the historical reality of the characters concerned.4

We have another account of a theological dispute in which
Uddālaka Āruṇi figures as an ethical and at the same time
masterful and somewhat remorseless disputant in Sat. Br. xi.
5. 3. 1 ff.: —

“Śauceya Prācinayogya came to Uddālaka Āruṇi for a disputation on spiri-
tual matters. [After Uddālaka Āruṇi had answered a number of questions
which were already known to Śauceya Prācinayogya, the latter was compelled
to admit his ignorance about other questions. Śauceya, then, said] ‘Here are
logs for fuel: I will become thy pupil, reverend sir’ He replied, ‘If thou hadst
not spoken thus, thy head would have flown off; come, enter as my pupil.
‘So be it,’ he said. He then initiated him and taught him that pain-conquering
utterance, Truth.”

8 Cf. Sat. Br., xi. 4. 18 illustrating Śvetaketu’s boastful and self-assertive
c CHARACTER. Also cf. Cbb. Up., vi. 1 ff. giving a charming account of young
Śvetaketu returning from his teacher’s house ‘conceited, considering himself
well-read and stern’ and of Uddālaka’s disabusing him of his self-conceit.
The story of another contest in which Uddālaka Āruṇi figures as one of the disputants and which vividly illustrates contemporary manners is told in two versions in the Brāhmaṇas, Śat. Br. xi. 4. 1 ff. and Gopatha Br. i. 3. 6. The former version is as follows:—

"Now Uddālaka Āruṇi was driving about as a chosen (officiating-priest) amongst the people of the northern country. By him a gold coin was offered; for in the time of our forefathers a prize used to be offered by chosen (priests) when driving about for the sake of calling out the timid to a disputation. Fear then seized the Brahmans of the northern people. 'This fellow is a Kuru-Paṇcāla Brahman and son of a Brahman: Let us take care lest he should deprive us of our domain: come, let us challenge him to a disputation on spiritual matters. [After they had chosen Svaidāyana Śaunaka as their champion, he accosted Uddālaka and proved his knowledge of the Full and New Moon sacrifices.] Then he (Uddālaka) gave up to him the gold coin saying, 'Thou art learned, Svaidāyana' and he, having concealed it, went away. They asked him, 'How did that son of a Gautama behave?' He said, 'Even as a Brahman and the son of a Brahman: the head would fly off of whosoever should (dare to) challenge him to a disputation. They then went away in all directions. [Then Uddālaka came back to Svaidāyana as a pupil. But the other said, 'I will tell thee even without thy becoming my pupil.']"

We have in this extract in the familiar figure of Uddālaka Āruṇi the picture of a typical wandering disputant of Ancient India. In the description of the stakes offered and risked we have an emphatic illustration of the keenness with which such disputes were fought in ancient times. We have, finally, a remarkable series of individualistic representations of character. In Uddālaka Āruṇi we find a redoubtable disputant confident of success and inspiring terror in the hearts of his adversaries. This is explained by reference to a few biographical notices, viz., the teacher's belonging to the sacred Kuru-Paṇcāla country and his occupying the office of a chosen priest. But this proud
disputant has no hesitation in humbling himself before his victorious foe for acquiring the superior knowledge. On the other hand the Brāhmaṇas from ‘the northern country’ are pictured as a selfish and faint-hearted stock, caring not for the pride but only for their possessions threatened by their formidable antagonist. As a foil to this unworthy group we have the attractive figure of Svaidāyana, so unlike other teachers of his class, who spares his beaten foe the humiliation of defeat and magnanimously instructs him in his own superior knowledge.

We turn now to the last class of theological disputations in which kings as well as Brahmanas take part and which in the form of intellectual tournaments naturally provide opportunities for displaying marked contrasts in character. Take, e.g., the dialogue between king Aśvapati Kaikeya (otherwise unknown to history) and a number of Brahmanas, of which we have two different versions in Sat. Br. x. 6. r ff. and Chbh. Up. v. 11. The former version with which we are here concerned runs as follows:—

"Now at the house of Aruṇa Aupavesi these came once together. [Here follow the names of several Brahmanas]. They took counsel together regarding (Agni) Vaiśvānara, but did not agree as to Vaiśvānara. [They went to Aśvapati Kaikeya who knew Vaiśvānara thoroughly. After the King had honoured them with gifts, they came to him with fuel in their hands, saying], 'We want to become thy pupils.' He said, 'How is this, venerable sirs, when ye are learned and sons of men learned in the scriptures?' They replied, 'Venerable sir, thou knowest Vaiśvānara thoroughly; teach us him.' He said, 'I do indeed know Vaiśvānara thoroughly; put your fuel on (the fire), you are become my pupils.' [He then instructed them in the usual form of questions and answers].

Here, it will be observed, the Brahmanas, although they are reputed to have hereditary knowledge of the scriptures,
humble themselves before Āsvapati for acquiring the superior knowledge. On the other hand the king, who may be regarded as a type of the enlightened prince of those days, while imparting the instruction, insists upon the respect due to him as a teacher. 9

No dialogues in the Brāhmaṇas, as later on in the Upaniṣads, are more famous than those of which Janaka king of Videha and Yājñavalkya are the central figures. In Sat. Br. xi. 3. 1. 2 ff. we have a dialogue between the great king and the famous Brahman, in which the latter correctly answers the questions about the Agnihotra put to him by the former. On the other hand Sat. Br. xi. 6. 2. 1. ff. tells us how a number of Brahmans including even Yājñavalkya failed fully to satisfy the king with their answers:—

"Now Janaka of Videha once met some Brahmans who were travelling about. [Here follow the names]. He said to each of them, 'How do ye each of you perform the Agnihotra? [After they had successively answered the King's questions, he told Yājñavalkya], 'Thou, O Yājñavalkya, hast enquired most closely into the nature of the Agnihotra.........But not even thou knowest either the uprising or the progress or the support or the contentment or the return or the reascent world of these two (libations of the Agnihotra).

9 The longer version of the Cbhb. Up., above-mentioned is notable for a fuller characterisation of the individuals concerned. Here the Brahmans at first approach the ubiquitous Uddālaka Aruṇī who however, with the remarkable shrewdness of his nature, referred them to Āsvapati Kaikeya. For he reflected, 'Those great householders and great theologians will examine me and I shall not be able to tell them all.' The Brahmans, according to the same version, when approaching Āsvapati repelled all his offers of hospitality, and coldly replied that their object was to acquire knowledge of Vaiśvānara from the King. Āsvapati respected their dignity so far that he imparted his knowledge without exacting the initiatory rites due to him as a teacher.
VEDIC HISTORICAL TRADITIONS

[After the King had left] they said, 'Surely this fellow of a Rājanya has out-talked us. Come, let us challenge him to a theological disputation.' Yājñāvalkya said, 'We are Brahmans and he is a Rājanya: if we were to vanquish him, whom should we say we have vanquished? But if he were to vanquish us, people would say of us that a Rājanya had vanquished Brahmans: do not think of this! They approved of his words. [Yājñāvalkya overtook the King and learnt from him the secret of the Agni Hotra. In return Yājñāvalkya granted the King the boon of asking questions when he pleased.] 'Thenceforth Janaka was a Brahman.'"

The above story evidently shows Yājñāvalkya to have been as superior to his fellows in learning, as in practical wisdom. Though defeated, he yet succeeds in maintaining the prestige of his class and while learning the secret from the king, he is yet able to confer upon him a favour.

The same combination of superior learning and worldly wisdom characterises Yājñāvalkya in the story of the tournament held by Janaka at his court. The story (Sat. Br. xi. 6. 3. 1 ff.) is as follows:—

"Janaka of Videha performed a sacrifice accompanied with numerous gifts to the priests. Setting apart a thousand cows, he said, 'He who is the most learned in sacred writ amongst you, O Brahmans, shall drive away these (cows). Yājñāvalkya then said, 'This way (drive) them.' They said, 'Art thou really the most learned in sacred writ amongst us, Yājñāvalkya?' He replied, 'Reverence be to him who is most learned in sacred writ! We are but hankering after cows'. [After 'the shrewd Sākalya' had volunteered to question Yājñāvalkya, the latter asked], 'Have the Brahmans made of thee a thing for quenching the fire-brand, Sākalya?' [After Yājñāvalkya had answered all his questions, he said], 'Thou hast gone on questioning me beyond the deity, beyond which there must be no questioning: Thou shalt die ere such and such a day, and not even thy bones shall reach thy home!' [And so it came to pass].

In the above extract we have a typical illustration of an enlightened court of those days, lavish in its patronage of Brahmanical learning and ritual. Coming to individual charac-
ters, we find Yajnavalkya with his usual shrewdness parrying a direct answer to the question about his claim to superior learning. When, however, Sakalya dared to challenge him, Yajnavalkya betrayed his haughty temper by trying to silence him with a threat. When this last failed in its end, he ended by cursing his adversary, as the author tells us, with fatal results.

The next type of traditional history to be found in the Brähmanas deals with the supposed historical origin of existing institutions. In accordance with the prevailing atmosphere of these works even such beginnings are connected with performance of the sacrificial ritual. Thus in Sat. Br. ii. 4. 4 we are told in connection with the Dākṣāyaṇa sacrifice that it was performed by Dakṣa Pārvatī whence 'even to this day these (descendants of his) the Dākṣāyaṇas are possessed of the royal dignity.' Similarly Sat. Br. xiii. 5. 4. 19 says,

"Sātānīka Sātrājīta performed the Govinata (form of Āśvamedha), after taking away the horse of the Kāśya (King); and since that time the Kāsīs do not keep up the (sacrificial) fires, saying, 'The soma drink has been taken from us.'"

We have to mention, in the last place, a unique historical tradition preserved in the Sat. Br. i. 4. 1. 14 ff. relating to the migration of a band of Vedic Aryans from the Sarasvati’s banks to the eastern lands of Kosala and Videha:—

'Māthava, the Videga, was at that time on the (river) Sarasvati. Agni thence went burning along this earth towards the east; Gotama Rāhuṇa and the Videga Māthava followed after him as he was burning along. He burnt (over) all these rivers. Now that (river) which is called Sadānīrā flows from the northern (Himalaya) mountains; that one he did not burn over. That one the Brahmins did not cross in former times thinking, 'it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara'. Now-a-days, however, there are many
Brahmans to the east of it. At that time (the land east of the Sadānirā) was very uncultivated, very marshy, because it had not been tasted by Agni Vaiśvānara. Now-a-days however, it is very cultivated for the Brahmans had caused (Agni) to taste it through sacrifices. Māthava the Videgha then said to Agni, 'Where am I to abide?' 'To the east of this (river) be thy abode', said he.

In this famous and oft-quoted extract the priestly author has handed down a concrete instance of the greatest historical event of the Brāhmaṇa period viz., the expansion of Vedic civilization from its central seat in Kurukṣetra to the lands of the East and the South. The author’s appreciation of chronology, again, is displayed in his reference to the three successive stages of the advance marked by the original settlement on the Sarasvati, the reclamation and colonization of the land to the west of the Sadānirā (the later Kosala) and those of the land to the east of the Sadānirā (the later Videha). The progress of the settlers, characteristically enough, is traced to the burning down of the regions concerned by the God of Fire in aid of the colonizing king and priest.

The older Upaniṣads

When we pass from the Brāhmaṇa to the older Upaniṣads, we find that the types of traditional history preserved in the later works are, so far as they go, a continuation of those of the earlier. Of the simplest type, that of authoritative citations in support of doctrine, we have an example in Taitt. Up. 1. 9:

'Satyavacas Rādhitara thinks that the true only is necessary. Taponitya Paurasiṣṭi thinks that penance only is necessary. Nāka Maudgalya thinks that learning and practising the Veda only are necessary.'
As in the case of the Brāhmaṇas, there is no reason to doubt that the authorities cited in the Upaniṣads are anything but historical personages.

The next type of traditional history, that of religious disputations in the form of dialogues, is, as Oldenberg has already shown, more fully developed in the older Upaniṣads than in the Brāhmaṇas. For not only do they occur oftener, but they also attain greater volume and importance. The reason for this development has very properly been found by the same scholar in the contrast between the sacrificial lore of the Brāhmaṇas and the higher knowledge of the Upaniṣads: the former was on the whole shared equally by a band of experts, while the latter was more or less an individual possession of the elect to be imparted also to favoured individuals. From the standpoint of modern historical criticism the defects of the Upaniṣad dialogues are sufficiently obvious. In them we find an unmistakable element of mythology and folklore, as e.g. in Chh. Up. iv. 5 ff. where the bull of a herd, the fire, a flamingo, and a Madgu bird are successively mentioned as teaching Satyakāma Jābāla and in Ibid. viii. 7 ff. where the god Prajāpati is stated as instructing Indra and the asura Virocana. The frequent references to the splitting of heads of defeated disputants may also contain, as Oldenberg thinks, an element of magic. Nevertheless the dialogues of the Upaniṣads, even more than their prototypes in the Brāhmaṇas, may be rightly affirmed to mark a distinct advance in Indian historiography. In the fami-

liar form of dialogues between prince and learned Brahman, father and son, husband and wife, they frequently offer, as we shall see presently, charming pictures of contemporary life at the royal court and in Brahman settlements. In them, again we find faithfully reflected, as shown below, the lights and shades of the various types of character—types which, if not always true to fact, are uniformly drawn from life.  

Let us illustrate the above with a number of examples. A dialogue illustrating the mutual relations of a Brahman teacher and a Kṣatriya prince is narrated in the Chh. Up., iv. 1:—

"There lived once upon a time Jānaśruti Paurāṇya, who was a pious giver, bestowing much wealth upon the people and always keeping open house. He built places of refuge everywhere, wishing that people should everywhere eat of his food. [Overhearing a report from a pair of flamingoes about the superiority of a certain Raikva, the King sent a messenger to search for him. The teacher was found in the forest lying beneath a bullock-team and scratching his sores. When the King offered him cows and ornaments and a carriage, the teacher repulsed him with scorn. It was only when the King offered him his own daughter in marriage along with the above presents that Raikva said], 'You have brought these (cows and other presents), O Śūdra, but only by that month (scull. of the girl) did you make me speak?' [He then instructed the prince in his superior knowledge]."

Leaving aside the element of folklore, the above description brings before us two life-like characters of a type not yet extinct.

11 On the defects of the Upaniṣad dialogue, from the standpoint of literary form and technique, see specially Oldenberg, op. cit., pp. 168-72. As Oldenberg notes, the spirit underlying these dialogues is illustrated by Jaim. Up. Br., iii. 8. 2 where we are told that 'whenever one formerly engaged in a theological disputatation, they used to wait on him as on one dead.' The following description of the historical value of the dialogues may be taken to complete the picture given by the German scholar.
in this country. The high-minded prince, so generous towards his peoples, is not conceited enough to withhold any price for acquiring superior knowledge. By his side stands the proud Brahman revelling in his repulsive eccentricities and contemptuous of earthly greatness, but yet vain enough to covet the hand of a princess.

In other and by far the larger number of examples the above rôles are reversed, the Brahman being said to be worsted in debate by his Kṣatriya antagonist who ends by forcing him to become his own disciple. In this type of which we have already observed some specimens in the Brāhmaṇas we seem to anticipate some of the famous dialogues of the Buddhist canon wherein the Buddha is made to confound proud Brahmins with his own superior dialectical skill. We may begin our illustration of this class with, Chbh. Up. 1. 8 telling the story of a prince who with sly humour reminiscent of the Buddha in the Pāli canonical texts, accords the honour of precedence in debate to two Brahman disputants only to silence them with his superior knowledge. The story is as follows:—

'There were once three men well-versed in Udgītha, Śilaka Śālavatya, Caikitaṇyana Dālbhya and Pravāhaṇa Jaivali.' [After they had agreed to have a discussion on the Udgītha] Pravāhaṇa Jaivali said, 'Sirs, do you both speak first, for I wish to hear what two Brahmins have to say.' [After Śilaka Śālavatya had silenced Caikitaṇyana Dālbhya only to be silenced in his turn by Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, the latter said], 'Your Śāman (the earth), O Śālavatya, has an end. And if any one were to say, Your head shall fall off (if you be wrong), surely your head will now fall.' [The other could only ask humbly to be taught by the king].

Another dialogue showing how the same prince Pravāhaṇa Jaivali prevailed over Svetaketu Āruṇeya and his father—two famous names already known to us from the dialogues in the
Brāhmaṇas—is narrated in two versions, Chbh. Up. v. 3. 1 ff. and Br. Up. vi. 2. 1 ff. In the former version the story is as follows:

"Śvetaketu Ārīṇeya went to an assembly of the Pañcālas. Pravāhaṇa Jaivali said to him: 'Boy, has your father instructed you?' 'Yes Sir,' he replied. [After he had failed to answer a series of five questions, the Prince said], 'Then why did you say (you had been) instructed? How could anybody who did not know these things say that he had been instructed? Then the boy went back sorrowful to the place of his father and said, 'Though you had not instructed me, Sir, you said you had instructed me. That fellow of a Rājanya asked me five questions and I could not answer one of them.' [When the father went to the king's place, the latter said], 'Sir, Gautama, ask a boon of such things as men possess.' He replied, 'Such things as men possess may remain with you. Tell me the speech which you addressed to the boy.' [The king, after assuring him that this knowledge did not go to any Brāhmaṇa before and was confined to the Kṣatriyas alone, proceeded to instruct him duly].

This extract introduces us to an important institution of the Upaniṣad period, viz. the assembly (samiti or pariṣad) of the people. Further, we have here a series of vividly drawn characters evidently reproduced from life. The Prince is merciless in exposing the ignorance of the conceited youth, but is liberal in communicating the exclusive knowledge of his class to the father as soon as he is convinced of the latter's earnestness. On the other hand, the young Śvetaketu is so full of self-conceit that he cannot bear the humiliation of being defeated by 'that fellow of a Rājanya,' and upbraids his father for failing to instruct him. In sharp contrast with his character is that of his father who has no hesitation in seeking instruction from the Prince and successfully convinces him of his own earnest thirst for knowledge.
Still another dialogue in which the above pair, Śvetaketu and his father, are described as being confounded by a Prince is told in Kauś. Up. i. 1ff.:—

“Citra Gāṅgāyāni, forsooth, wishing to perform a sacrifice, chose Āruṇi (Uddālaka, to be his chief priest). But Āruṇi sent his son Śvetaketu and said, ‘Perform this sacrifice for him.’ [Śvetaketu, being asked a question by the king, could only reply], ‘I do not know this. But let me ask the master.’ [His father, however, on being asked the same question, said, ‘I also do not know this and he proceeded for instruction to the king’s place. Taking fuel in his hands as the mark of a disciple Āruṇi said to the king], ‘May I come near to you?’ He replied, ‘You are worthy of Brahman,’ O Gautama, because you were not led away by pride. Come hither, I shall make you know clearly.’”

In the above Śvetaketu and Uddālaka bear their usual characteristics. The former is of immature learning, but too proud to accept instruction from a Kṣatriya, while the latter thinks it no humiliation to acquire the Kṣatriya’s superior knowledge. Again, the king, like Pravāhaṇa Jaivali in the passages cited immediately above, is unrelenting towards the conceited Śvetaketu, but magnanimous in his relations with the modest Uddālaka.

In the dialogue between Ajātaśatru king of Kāśi and Gārgya Bālāki, of which we have two versions (Kauś. Up. iv. 1 ff. and Br. Up. ii. 1 ff.) we have another instance of a Prince silencing a proud Brahman with his superior knowledge.

“Bālāki, we are told, was a man of great reading. Volunteering to tell the king the nature of Brahman, he learnt to his mortification that the qualities attributed by him to Brahman were already known to Ajātaśatru. After Bālāki had been reduced to silence; came the king’s crushing retort: ‘Thus far only (do you know), O Bālāki,’ to which the latter could only signify his humble assent. In the Kauś. Up., version the king completes his triumph by saying ‘Vainly did you challenge me’, saying, ‘Shall I tell you Brahman?’ When however Bālāki actually came forward as a pupil, the
magnanimous king cried out: 'I deem it improper that a king should initiate a Brahman. Come, I shall make you know clearly.' And so he proceeded to instruct the Brahman."

We have to mention, in the last place, a few dialogues of which Janaka king of Videha and Yājñavalkya, already known to us from the dialogues of the Brāhmaṇas, are the leading figures. In two instances (Br. Up. iv. 1 ff. and Ibid. 3 ff.) Yājñavalkya so well instructs Janaka in philosophical truths that the gratified king finally offers himself and his people as slaves to the teacher. In the next example (Br. Up. iii. 1)—which is an amplification of Sat. Br. xi. 6. 3. 1 ff.—we are told how Janaka arranged a kind of intellectual tournament in which Yājñavalkya carried off the prize of victory. The story runs as follows: —

"Janaka Vaideha sacrificed with a sacrifice at which many presents were offered to the priests (of the Aśvamedha). Brahmans of the Kurus and the Pańcālas had come thither and Janaka Vaidheha wished to know which of those Brahmans was the best read. [He offered a prize of one thousand cows to the wisest among them. When Yājñavalkya asked his pupil to drive away the cows], the Brahmans became angry and said, 'How could he call himself the wisest among us?'. [One of them, Aśvala, who was the hṛṣṭ priest of Janaka, pointedly asked], 'Are you indeed the wisest among us O Yājñavalkya?'. He replied, 'I bow before the wisest, but I wish indeed to have these cows,' [After this Yājñavalkya was questioned at great length by successive persons all of whom he reduced to silence. To the lady Gārgi Vācaknāvi who plied him with questions about Brahman, Yājñavalkya at length cried out], 'O Gārgi, do not ask too much, lest thy head should fall off.' After that Gārgi held her peace. [But after a time she again challenged Yājñavalkya to a fresh discussion with a remarkable simile illustrating the assimilation of these intellectual combats with military contests]. 'O Yājñavalkya,' she said, 'as the son of a warrior from the Kāśis or Videhas might string his loosened bow, take two pointed foe-piercing arrows in his hand and rise to do battle, I have risen to fight thee with two questions. [When she was again silenced by her superior opponent, she declared], 'Venerable
Brahmans, you may consider it a great thing, if you get off by bowing before him. No one, I believe, will defeat him in any argument concerning Brahman.' [When in spite of this warning, Vidagdha Sākalya challenged Yājñavalkya with a series of questions, the latter ended by questioning him about the Self, saying], 'If thou shalt not explain him to me, thy head will fall.' Sākalya did not know him and his head fell, nay, thieves took away his bones, mistaking them for something else.'

As in the parallel passage of the Sat. Br. above quoted, we have here a typical picture of an enlightened royal court of those days. The character of Yājñavalkya, again, as in the preceding example is marked by a distinctive individuality. While cleverly parrying a direct answer to the question about his claim to superior learning, he has no difficulty in crushing his opponents with his deeper knowledge of the Self. But he betrays the implacable side of his nature by warning the lady Gārgī and by cursing the unfortunate Sākalya, as we are told, with fatal effect.

**General remarks**

The historical traditions preserved in the Vedic Samhitās and other works that we have considered so far are almost completely lacking in chronological references. In the Brāhmanas, indeed, a chronological approach is presented by such types of traditions above-mentioned as those relating to the origin of existing institutions and the gradual advance of Vedic civilisation from its stronghold in the sacred Kurukṣetra country. The penetrating and thorough analysis of the relevant data has also enabled Oldenberg to trace two important landmarks in Rgvedic chronology, viz. those represented by the series of kings Sudās-Purukutsa-Trasadasyu and those by the series Parikṣit-
Janamejaya.\textsuperscript{12} An incipient sense of a chronological starting-point, again, is presented by \textit{Chh. Up.} i. 10 giving the picturesque story of the teacher Uśasti Cākrāyaṇa who lived with his wife as a beggar after the Kuru country had been devastated by locusts or hailstones (\textit{matacī} in the original). Of a real chronological era, however, starting from a definite historical event there is as yet no trace.

Summing up our estimate of the oldest surviving fragments of Indian traditional history as above described, we may state that with all their admitted defects—the mixture of mythology and folklore in their composition, their implicit acceptance of supernatural forces as the dominant factors ruling human affairs, their indifference to chronology, their slight attention to topography, they occupy an important place in the evolution of Indian historiography. The imperious urge of the Rgvedic seers to celebrate the achievements of their royal patrons along with their own together with the evident anxiety of the authors of the later works to find support for their doctrinal or ritual points in past antecedents, led them to create several distinct types of traditional history. As yet these examples did not approach the character of a system. But beyond doubt they collectively embodied a mass of genuine tradition which was afterwards utilised by the authors of the systematic genealogical lists of royal dynasties and priestly families in the Epics and the Purāṇas.\textsuperscript{13} Above all we have in the various classes of

\textsuperscript{12} See H. Oldenberg's paper \textit{Über die Liedverfasser des Rgveda Nebst Bemerkungen über die vedische Chronologie und über Geschichte des Rituals. ZDMG. viii, 199-247.}

\textsuperscript{13} The view of F. E. Pargiter (\textit{Ancient Indian Historical Tradition}, pp. 59ff.) rejecting the Vedic (the so-called Brahman) tradition in favour of
compositions above-mentioned, contained in solution, as it were, most of the types of historical workmanship found in later times, specially those of sacred biography and church-history along with systematic royal and dynastic Chronicles.

the Purāṇa (the so-called Kṣatriya) tradition has rightly not found acceptance among scholars. For some notable attempts to reconstruct the dynastic history of the Vedic period by co-ordinating the Epic and Puranic material with the Vedic, see S. N. Pradhan, The Chronology of Ancient India, and Hemachandra Raychaudhuri, Political History of Ancient India, Pt. 1. chs. 2-3.
"Lāja-vacaniṣka Mahāmātrās."

In his work Aśoka (p. 52) Professor Radhakumud Mookerjee writes:

"The Jauagāḍa text of the Kaliṅga Rock Edict II mentions a class of Mahāmātrās who are described as Lāja-vacaniṣkas, i.e., those who were entitled to receive the king's message directly, and not through the royal Viceroys. Thus these Mahāmātrās might be regarded as Provincial Governors, as they are given independent charge of their province."

It is impossible to support this view. The passage in the Jauagāḍa text to which Professor Mookerjee refers is as follows:—

_Devānāṃpiye hevaṃ [ā]ha Samāpāyaṃ mahamatā l[ā]-javacaniṣka] vataviyā._

This is translated by Professor Mookerjee (_ibid._, p. 126) as follows:—

"His sacred Majesty thus says: At Samāpā the High Officers entitled to receive the king's messages are to be addressed as follows."

Evidently Professor Mookerjee understands Lājavacaniṣka in the above to be a technical title. But phrases like madvacānena (or madvacanad) vaktaivyah are a well-known idiom in the Sanskrit and Sanskritic languages, meaning that a certain person should be addressed according to the words of the speaker. In the text of Aśoka's inscription quoted above, the

---

1 The above follows the transcript in Hultzsch, _Corpus Inscr. Ind._, Vol. i, p. 116. For _lāja⁵_ Senart and Bühler read _lājë⁵_, a reading which is adopted by D. R. Bhandarkar and S. Majumdar Sastri, _The Inscriptions of Aśoka_, p. 88.

2 Among numerous instances of this kind may be mentioned _ueyatām_
phrase mahamattā lajvacanikā vataviyā evidently stands for devānampiyasā vacanena mahāmattā vataviyā of the parallel Dhauli version (Separate RE. i and ii). This last has been taken by all translators including Professor Mookerjee\(^3\) to mean that the mahāmatras concerned should be addressed by the command of the king. There is thus no justification for conjuring up a class of 'lajvacanika mahāmatras' from the text of Aśoka's inscription above mentioned.

II

Rājūkas

The Rājūkas (with the variant forms rajuka, lajuka, lajūka) are mentioned as a class of officials in Aśoka's RE. iii and PE. iv. The precise nature of their office has remained undetermined up to the present time. But recently some theories have been advanced on this point. According to Professor Mookerjee (Aśoka, pp. 53, 56) the Rājūkas were "the ordinary Provincial Governors" differing apparently in this respect from the "Lajvacanika Mahāmatras", above mentioned. His arguments (op. cit., p. 133n.) may be thus summarized:

(i) "Rājāke or raju (Manshera) (sic), is probably connected with the word Rāja which in Pāli might mean even a mahāmatta, mabhāmātra and 'all those who have power of life and death' (Childers'). In the Mahāvamsa there is even the term Rājāko for a king."

asmad-vacanād-vṛṣṭalāh' 'ucyatām asmad-vacanāt viśvāvasu-prabhṛtayāh trayo bhṛtārāh,' 'ucyatām mad-vacanāt Kālapīyako Daṇḍapāsṇikāscā in Mudrārākṣasa, Act i; 'mad-vacanāc-ca saṃghasya pādābbivandananm kṛtvā vaktavyaṁ,' Divyāvadāna, p. 431.

3 Aśoka, p. 120. Other instances of the use of the same idiom in Aśoka's inscriptions are: The Queen's Edict: Devānampiyashā vacanenu savasta mahamattā vataviyā; Brahmagiri Rock Edict: (i)uvanmāṇgirite ayaputas mahāmātāya cha vacan(e)na I(st)asi mahāmattā ārogiyam vataviyā. (So also in Siddāpur Edict).
(2) PE. iv declares the Rājūkas to be in charge of 'many hundred thousands of people' and to be invested with certain powers of the sovereign.

These arguments do not seem to carry much conviction. As to (1) even a cursory examination of the transcript and estampage of RE. iii (Mansehra version) shows that the [ra]jm occurring therein is not a complete word, but has its final letter dropped out. Evidently it stands for the complete word rājuko of the Shahbazgathi version whose grammar and language are identical with the Mansehra recension. The form rājuko is doubtless a variant of rājūka in the Gīrnar version, of which the nominative singular form would be rājūke. Thus there is no ground for holding that rājūka and raju are two alternative designations of the same office. In so far as the word rājūka is concerned, its etymological connection with rājan is extremely problematic. In Sanskrit rājaka may indeed be derived from rājan in the sense of 'a little king' or 'a petty prince' in accordance with Pāṇini, v, 3. 85. The word-form rājakō which occurs in the Mahāvaṃsa in the sense of king, as mentioned by Professor Mookerjee, shows that the Pāli grammarians in this respect followed the rule of Sanskrit grammar. But no grammatical rule exists either in Sanskrit or in Pāli for deriving rājūka from rājan. Even if we could prove with Prof. Mookerjee a connexion between rājan and rājūka, it would not carry us very far in our appreciation of the importance of the latter office. For rājan in Pāli has a very wide connotation:

"It is primarily an appellative (or title) of a khattiya, and often the two are used promiscuously. Besides it has a far wider sphere of meaning than we convey by any translation like 'king' or even 'sovereign' or 'prince.' We find it used as a designation of 'king' in the sense of an elected or successory
(crowned) monarch, but also in the meaning of a distinguished nobleman or a local chieftain, or a prince with various attributes characterizing his position according to his special functions.""}

The widely extended and indefinite connotation of the term rājan in Pāli is well known to Professor Mookerjee, but he apparently does not realize how this disproves his own case.

As to (2), the passages in PE. iv to which Professor Mookerjee refers and which will be quoted and commented on in the sequel, undoubtedly show that the Rājūkas held authority over hundreds of thousands of people, and were granted wide powers of jurisdiction by the Emperor. But these passages, while showing that the Rājūkas were judicial officers of high standing, are not sufficiently definite to warrant their identification with provincial governors. Professor Mookerjee is, aware of the difficulty in the way of acceptance of his interpretation, for he admits⁵ that the Yutas, the Rājūkas and the Prādesikas in RE, 111 may have been mentioned in an ascending order, in which case the Prādesikas, of course, would have a higher status than the Rājūkas.

A very different explanation of the term Rājūkas was proposed by the late Dr. K. P. Jayaswal who took it to mean 'Imperial High Ministers', and in fact 'a committee of the Parisat' vested with full executive authority. We propose to consider his arguments⁶ seriatim.

"The Prādesikas correspond to the Mahāmātras at Ujjain, Taxila, etc. In other words, they were the 'Provincials' or the Provincial Ministers. If the Prādesikas were the Provincial Ministers, the Rājūkas who are more important

4 PTS. Dict. s. v. rāja.
than, and who are contrasted with, the *Prādeśikas* must be the Ministers at
the seat of the Central Government."

It may be conceded that the derivation of *prādeśika* from
*pradeśa* is quite natural, and has the support of many inter-
preters of Asoka's inscriptions. But the authorities, while
agreeing in the main on this point, have differed in their inter-
pretation of the term. For, while Dr. F. W. Thomas derives
*prādeśika* from *pradeśa* in the sense of 'report,' Kern held it to
mean, 'a provincial governor.'\(^8\) Even if we were to understand
*pradeśa* as a territorial term, there is nothing to indicate the
extent of its jurisdiction in the Maurya times. The passage in
Childers' Pāli Dictionary to which Dr. Jayaswal refers in this
connexion and which occurs in the *Vinaya Piṭaka* (Vol. III,
p. 47) is as follows:—

Rājāno nāma paṭhavyā rājā padesarājā maṇḍalikā antara-
bbhogikā akkhadassā mahāmatā ye vā pana chejjabhejjam
anusāsanti ete rājāno nāma.

Here the context shows that *padesa* stands for a kingdom
of medium extent, and cannot mean 'the largest administrative
area in a kingdom.'\(^9\) Even if we were to take *prādeśika* in the
sense of 'Provincial Ministers,' there is no evidence to show that
the *rājūkas* were 'more important' in comparison with them.
On the contrary we have to remember the possibility (to which
a reference has been made above) of the terms *yutas, rājūkas,*

---

7 Cf. Kern (*JRAS.*, 1880, p. 393); F. W. Thomas (*JRAS.*, 1915, p. 112, 
correcting his earlier identification with *pradestṛ*, *JRAS.*, 1914, pp. 385-6),
Hultsch, *Corpus*, p. 5, n. 3.

8 See the references quoted in the preceding foot-note.

9 In the *Visuddhimagga* (PTS. ed. p. 301) *padesarājā* is similarly used
in the sense of a sub-king.
and prādesikas being mentioned in RE. iii in an ascending order of importance.

"The people (Jana) and subjects (Prajā) (who were lacs and lacs) were in the charge of Rājūka; as a child is in that of a nurse—with full control. The People and Prajā denote that the whole of the people were under their rule .........Their 'going out of office' every five years also suggests that they were of the class of High Ministers."

The first part of this statement is based on a passage in PE. iv which runs as follows:—

Lajūkā me babūsu pānasatasabasesu janasi āyatā

of which the natural meaning is that many hundreds of thousands of people (and not 'the people who were lacs and lacs') were subject to the jurisdiction of the rājūkas. When Dr. Jayaswal reads into the simple references in the inscription above-mentioned to Jana and Prajā the meaning of the whole people, he is surely stretching the sense to a degree unwarranted by the text. The second part of Dr. Jayaswal’s statement refers to the following passage in RE. iii (Girnar version):—

Sarvata vijite mama yutā ca rājūke ca prādesike ca paṃcasu paṃcasu vāsesu anusamy[ā]na[mn]iyātu.

Here the words sarvata vijite mama seem to suggest that the officers concerned were spread throughout the empire rather than that they were concentrated at the head-quarters. The conclusive evidence in favour of the view that the Rājūkas were at least in part local officers is furnished by their juxtaposition with Yutas and Prādesikas, for no one contends that the latter were officers of the Central Government. With reference to the interpretation put upon anusamyāna by Dr. Jayaswal ('going out of office') it rests upon the authority of a passage in the late
which merely relates to the desirability of transferring officers. On the other hand the renderings of Bühler (‘tour for official inspection’), Bhandarkar (‘circuit’), and Hultzsch (‘complete tour’) are supported by the weight of authorities in the early Brahmanical and Buddhist literature. The verbal form of *anusamyāna* occurring in a Pāli passage in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* (Vol. i, pp. 59-60) signifies going out on tour into the interior of the districts for various specified purposes. Thus the argument for raising the Rājūkas to the class of ‘High Ministers’ based upon their supposed going out of office every five years falls altogether to the ground.

“The technical meaning of *daṇḍa*, government, is known from the study of Hindu Politics. *Daṇḍa* and *abhībāra* will thus mean government and military operations, Peace and War. The Rājūkas were given complete independence in matters of Government and Military undertakings—both in matters of Peace and War, home government and foreign relations. Such powers can only be held and exercised by the Imperial High Ministers.”

In the above the reference is to the following passage in PE iv:—

*tesam ye abhibāle vā daṃde vā atapatiye me kāṭe*

which has been taken by other scholars to mean that rewards and punishments (or otherwise, judicial, investigation and punishment) have been left by the king to the jurisdiction of the Rājūkas. It is difficult to follow Dr. Jayaswal when he claims for *daṇḍa* in the foregoing passage the ‘technical mean-

---

10 IBORS., 1908, pp. 36-40.
ing" of government. In the works on 'Hindu Politics' to which he refers daṇḍa has the meaning of fine, punishment, army etc. Daṇḍa is used in the sense of army in contrast with other items such as kośa (treasury) and janapada or rāṣṭra (the territory) in the famous category of seven limbs of sovereignty. In the well-known verse of Manu vii. 65 daṇḍa in the sense of army is distinguished from kośa and rāṣṭra as well as from sandhi and vīgraha (peace and war). With regard to the term abhibāla, it is true that Sanskrit abhibāra has the sense of 'attack' or 'assault', while Pāli abhibarati similarly has the alternative sense of 'censure', 'revile' or 'abuse', but abhibāla in Pāli has the meaning of 'offering' or 'gift' which admirably fits in with the sense of daṇḍa as punishment in the passage abhibāle ca daṇḍe ca. It thus follows that the Rājūkas were certainly high judicial officers, but there is nothing to indicate that they were the Imperial High Ministers. The connection of the Rājūkas with the judicial administration is also indicated by a subsequent passage in PE iv:

Ichitaviye hi esā kimti viyohālasamatā ca siya dam- 
dasamatā ca.

"Scholars have taken rājūka as a derivation of rājū, rope. But Rājū is a known Pāli form in the sense of 'ruler' 'king'. The citizens of the republican Licchavi State are called rājūs, and seven kings who attacked Benares are called rājans and rājās. The Rājūkas of Aśoka thus were 'the rulers' or

15 Cf. svāmy-amātya-janapada-durga-kośa-daṇḍa-mitra etc. of Artha- 
śāstra, viii. i.

16 Amātya daṇḍa āyatto daṇḍe vaiṇayikī kriyā | utpatam kośarāṣṭre ca 
dūte sandhiviparyayam||

17 For references see Apte's Sanskrit-English Dict. and PTS. Dict., s.v.

18 See PTS. Dict., s.v.
Rulers-Ministers, the committee of the Patissi vested with real executive powers over the whole Empire."

The whole of the above is based upon a mis-statement of facts. Rājū in Pāli is not an independent noun-stem, but is one of the modified forms which the word rājan assumes in the plural case-endings. Thus we have from the noun-stem rājan the following forms:

Instrumental plural ... rājūbi, rājūbhī, (with variant forms)

Dative ," ... rājūnam (as above)

Ablative ," ... rājūbi, rājūbhi (as above)

Genitive ," ... rājūnam (as above)

The passages to which Dr. Jayaswal refers in this connection are as follows:

Jāt., vol. i, p. 179:—Rājā tām pakkosāpetvā, ‘sakkhisasi tāta sattahi rājūbi yuddham kātun’ti āba. ‘Deva............. sakala—Jambudipe rājūbi saddhim yujjhitum sakkhisāmīt;’

Ibid., p. 504:—Tattha nicca kālam rajjam kāretvā vasantānām yeva rājūnam sattasabassāni sattasatāni satta ca rājano honti.’

In the above it will be noticed that rājūbi is used in the instrumental plural, while rājūnam is in the genitive plural, both being doubtless derived from the root-word rājan. There is thus no room for the supposition that either the king or the citizens referred to in the above passages bore the title of rājū.

The truth is that the connection which Bühler suggested long ago between the Aṣokan Rājūka and the Rajjuka of the Kurudhamma Jātaka is based upon sound philological principles. On this point we cannot do better than refer to the high autho-

rity of Professor Suniti Kumar Chatterjee whose note on the Orthography of the early Brāhmi Inscriptions is reproduced at the end of this article. Once the identity of Rājūka and Rajjuka is established, we can trace the course of development of this office in the following way. In the period of small States preceding the unification of Northern India into a single Empire, the Rajjuka was the title of a petty land-surveyor entrusted with the task of measuring the fields for Government revenue. As the Jātaka story shows and as is indeed indicated by the full form of the title Rajjagābaka amacca ("the rope-holding officer"), he used in person to measure the fields by means of a rope (rajju) tied to a stick which he pitched in the ground. With the rise of the Magadhan Empire and the consequent expansion of the administrative machinery, the rajjuka was evidently entrusted with a wide jurisdiction, and was given high judicial functions probably in addition to his older duties as revenue or settlement officer.

III

Rāstrīya Pusyyagupta—Yavanarāja Tuṣāspha.

In the Junāgadh Rock inscription of Rudradāman in connection with the description of restoration of the famous Sudarsana lake occur the following words:

20 Cf. the present writer's work Hindu Revenue System, p. 54.
20a Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, Aśoka, 2nd ed., p. 302, quotes Dr. Jayaswal's Interpretation of rājūka and its criticism by the present writer only to definitely reject the former explanation. His own view (ibid., p. 64) is that rājūkas were heads of districts as distinguished from prādēśikas who were heads of divisions or provinces.
.......(s) y = artbe Mauryasya rājñah Candrag (u)p(ta)s-(ya)
(r)āṣṭriyena (V)aiśyena Pusyaguptena kāritam Aśokasya Maurya-
ysya te yavanarājena Tuṣāsphena = ādhiṣṭhāya pranāḥbhīr = āla
(m)krta(m). The above was translated by Kielhorn' as
follows 22: —

"............for the sake of .............ordered to be made by the Vaiśya
Pusyagupta, the provincial governor of the Maurya king Candragupta;
adorned with conduits for Aśoka the Maurya by the Yavana king Tuṣāspa while
governing."

The translation of Kielhorn has been generally adopted
and even improved by later scholars who have sought to throw
further light upon the nature of the Maurya provincial admin-
istration. Thus Professor Beni Prasad 23 writes as follows: —

"The later Junāgadhi inscription of Rudradāman records that Surāṣṭra or
Kaṭhīāvāḍ was governed by the Vaiśya Pusyagupta in Candragupta’s time
and by the Yavana Tushāspa (sic) under Aśoka. The former Governor is
designated Rāṣṭriya, while the latter is called Adhiṣṭhāya (sic)."

According to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar 24 the Girnar inscrip-
tion of Rudradāman shows that "the province of Surāṣṭra or
Kaṭhīāvāḍ was governed by Vaiśya Pusyagupta in Candra-
gupta’s time and by the Yavana king Tuṣāspa (sic) when Aśoka
was king": thus it furnishes an instance of the second type of
provincial governors ‘who were not related to the king’s family’,
unlike ‘the Kumāra Viceroylalties.’ 25 In the opinion of
Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri 26 the reference to the Yavanarāja in

22 Ibid., p. 46.
23 The State in Ancient India, p. 189.
25 On these two types see Bhandarkar, op. cit., p. 52.
26 Political History of Ancient India, 2nd ed., 1927, pp. 180-81; repeated
pp. 236-37.
the Girnar inscription shows that probably 'he was appointed *mukhya* of the Surāṣṭra *samgha* by Aśoka,' while the use of the term Rāṣṭriya meaning probably 'a sort of Imperial High Commissioner' makes it appear that 'the position of Puṣya-gupta in Surāṣṭra was like that of Lord Cromer in Egypt.'

In considering the correctness of the above views we have first to mention that Kielhorn's rendering of the verb *adhisṭhāya* as 'administering' or 'governing' and of *rāṣṭriya* in the sense of 'Governor' is based upon the connotation of the term *adhisṭhāna* and *svadhisṭhāta* applied in the same inscription to Suviśākha who was entrusted by Rudradāman with the government of the Ānartta and Surāṣṭra country.\(^{27}\) We, however, think that *adhisṭhāya* here may just as well refer to the superintendence of construction of the works concerned. The use of the verb *adhisṭhā* in the sense of 'to direct, to preside over, superintend,' is known to Sanskrit literature.\(^{28}\) In this connection it may be pointed out that Professor Prasad's interpretation of *adhisṭhāya* as an official title is a deplorable blunder due to the oversight of the commonest rule relating to the construction of verbal forms with the termination *lyap* or *yap*. Reverting to Kielhorn's interpretation of the Girnar inscription, we have to mention that there is nothing in it to indicate whether Surāṣṭra or any larger or smaller jurisdiction was entrusted to the charge of Puṣya-gupta and Tuṣāspha. It may indeed be asserted that neither the etymological sense of *rāṣṭriya* nor its parallel forms found elsewhere justify us in holding that he was an officer of the rank of Provincial Governor. The term *rāṣṭriya* is known to Pāṇini who has a special *sūtra* (iv, 2, 93) for its formation.

\(^{27}\) *Ep. Ind.*, viii, p. 461.
\(^{28}\) See Apte's, Sans.-Eng. Dict. s.v.
but in his time it was evidently understood in a very wide sense so as to apply even to one who was born in a kingdom. 29 In the Arthaśāstra we have the terms rāṣṭrapāla and rāṣṭramukhya which probably correspond to the rāṣṭriya of the inscription. These officers are distinguished in a number of passages 30 from the antapāla and the puramukhya. From such references it is clear that the title was meant to indicate an officer in charge of the districts in the interior of the country as distinguished from towns as well as districts on the frontier. 31 If a high status be claimed for the rāṣṭrapāla on the ground that he is included in the same grade as the kumāra, the same status should be accorded to the antapāla belonging to the identical grade. But neither the antapāla of the Arthaśāstra nor the anta-mahāmātra of Aśoka’s inscription who is his equivalent has the rank of a Provincial Governor. It may also be added that rāṣṭhika in Pāli which probably corresponds to rāṣṭriya signifies an official of the kingdom. 32 In these circumstances it is a plausible conclusion that the rāṣṭriya Puṣyagupta and the Yavanarāja Tuṣāspha after his time held charge of small jurisdictions falling within the limits of the neighbouring Viceroyalty at Ujjayinī. 33

29 Very indefinite also is the Vedic rāṣṭriya (or rāṣṭriya) which occurs, for instance, in Maitr. Saṃj. 11. 12, 111 3. 7; Kāśi. Saṃ. xiii. 10.
31 Cf. the passage quoted above from Arthaśāstra, V. 1.
32 See PTS. Dict., s.v.
33 Mr. C. D. Chatterjee in his learned and elaborate paper (A historical character in the reign of Aśoka-Maurya, D. R. Bhandarkar Volume, Calcutta,
As to the argument that the title of rājā borne by Tuṣāṣpha 'probably indicates that he enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy,' Dr. Raychaudhuri himself disposes of it by pointing to the analogy of Rājā Mansingh's appointment as Subadar of Bengal under Akbar. Indeed almost his whole case for the alleged exceptional position held by Puṣyagupta and Tuṣāṣpha rests upon the authority of a passage in the Arthaśāstra referring to the Kāmboja, the Surāstra, the Kṣatriya (?) and other corporations (samghas). But can the reference in the Arthaśāstra be safely taken, apart from any corroborative evidence, to reflect the conditions of the Maurya period?

1940, pp. 330 ff) deals with Prince Piṅgala of Surāstra mentioned in the Petavattthu and its commentary the Paramatthadipani as a feudatory of the Maurya emperors Bindusāra and Aśoka. He thinks (op. cit., pp. 337-38) that Piṅgala was 'a vassal chief' whose 'relation to the Crown was not possible direct but through the governor of Surāstra or the viceroy of the western division of the Maurya empire, whose headquarters was at Ujjaini.' Piṅgala therefore, according to this scholar was very likely a local chief subject to an imperial governor or viceroy. As for the term rāṣṭriya, the same author admits (p. 337, n. 4) that it is not known in the sense of ruler of a small territory or a province, while Pāli riṭṭiṇa (Skt. rāṣṭrika) means a hereditary chief; his equivalents in the Aśokan inscriptions namely, riṭṭiṇa, latṭiṇa and riṣṭika, signify probably a class of noblemen or landlords belonging to the western provinces. Sanskrit rāṣṭriya, therefore, and its Pāli or Prakrit equivalents bear in no instance the sense of a provincial governor. In the same context the author above-mentioned thinks that Puṣyagupta, although styled a rāṣṭriya, was a rāṣṭrika in the sense of exercising the supreme authority in a sovereign state within the imperial territorial limits. It is difficult to understand how an officer who was admittedly a representative of the paramount power could exercise supreme authority in a sovereign state. In fact the author proceeds immediately to equate Piṅgala's office with that of rāṣṭrapāla of Kauṭiyā's Arthaśāstra and pradeśika of Aśoka's inscriptions.

34 xi, 1:—Kāmboja-surāstra-kṣatriya-krenyādayo varteśastropajvinah.

35 In the same context the Arthaśāstra mentions the Licchivikas, the
reference simply mean that the Surāśṭras with other named and unnamed sanghas lived by agriculture, trade as well as the profession of arms (vērtāśastropaśvinah), or in other words that they were merely a fighting and industrial corporation? Neither RE. v nor RE. xiii (with its fuller list), while mentioning the names of various autonomous tribes included within the limits of the Maurya Empire, makes the slightest reference to the Surāśṭras. Incidentally, it may be remarked that the sanghas in the Arthasastra, as Dr. R. C. Majumdar has shown, had not one but several mukhyas at their head.

Vṛjikas, the Mallakas, the Madrakas, the Kukuras, the Kuras and, the Pāñcālas as examples of rājāsvadopaśvin sanghas. These however, are not mentioned by Dr. Raychaudhuri in his description of Maurya Government (op. cit., pp. 226 ff.).

36 In Political History, 4th ed., p. 237 n3 Prof. Raychaudhuri brings forward an additional argument viz. the above-mentioned reference in the Petauvatthu commentary to a king Piṅgala of Surāśṭra. But the tradition is as much silent as the Arthasastra itself about the existence of Surāśṭra as a political unit, or as Prof. Raychaudhuri would prefer to call it, an autonomous vassal state. Prof. Raychaudhuri duly notes (op. cit., p. 237, n. 4) the correspondence above referred to between Rāṣṭriya and the Rāṣṭrapāla of Arthasastra as well as Raṭṭhika of Pāli literature. But he has not considered the objections urged above on the score of inconclusive character of the evidence.

37 Corporate Life, 2nd ed., p. 104.

38 It is interesting to observe that Dr. Raychaudhuri in the 4th edition of his Political History (p. 237) concedes the above point, for he takes Tuṣāspa to have been one of the mukhyas or chiefs of the Surāśṭra Sangha appointed by Aśoka. In the same context he for the first time considers Surāśṭra to have been alternatively an autonomous vassal state or a confederation of autonomous vassal states.
IV

The significance of PE. IV

In *Hindu Polity* Dr. K. P. Jayaswal claims to have discovered on the basis of "the combined evidence of Aśoka’s inscription and the *Divyāvadāna*" a concrete instance of the high constitutional position of the council of ministers in Ancient India. His view of the matter may best be described in his own words which are reproduced below.

"We have the recorded instance of the pious despotism developed by Aśoka and what was the result? Was the Ministry overthrown and [were] the constitutional laws set at naught? Or was the despot deprived, if not of his throne, of his sovereignty?"

In other words, we are asked to believe that Aśoka sought to make himself a despot whereupon the Ministers in defence of the "constitutional laws" of the country combined to deprive him of his sovereignty.

The inscription of Aśoka which is sought to support Dr. Jayaswal’s contention is PE. iv. Dr. Jayaswal who regards it as "one of the most important documents of the constitutional history of Hindu India", draws from it the conclusion that the rājūkas acting on behalf of "the Jānapada Body" and with its support "deprived the Emperor of India of his aśvāryya or sovereign authority". Before we proceed to consider the arguments in favour of this proposition we may make a few general observations. Such a strong "adverse statement against interest" as that involved in Dr. Jayaswal’s interpretation wherein the Emperor is made to proclaim the abject surrender

1 Part II, p. 143 ff.
of his authority would require the strongest corroborative evidence to be worthy of credence, more especially when we remember that the inscription in question is distributed in no less than six recensions embracing all the home provinces of the Empire. But apart from Dr. Jayaswal’s interpretation of PE. iv and the late Buddhist religious tradition to which we shall presently refer, there is no independent testimony in support of Dr. Jayaswal’s statement. On the other hand, the evidence of the contemporary inscriptions makes it clear that down at least to the 26th year of his consecration when PE. iv was written, Aśoka’s sovereign authority remained unimpaired. We thus find in other inscriptions written or engraved in the same year that Aśoka claims his officials to be conforming to his precepts (PE. i), that he is attending to the welfare not only of his relatives but also of all classes (PE. vi) and, most important of all, that he has ordered (ānapātā) the rājukas to preach the Dharma (PE. vii).

Let us now turn to the interpretation of PE. iv on which primarily rests the admissibility of Dr. Jayaswal’s contention. The crucial passage is the following:

\[ \text{Lajukā pi laghami paṭicalitave maṃ pulisāni pi me chaṃdāmnāni paṭicalisānti.}\]

In the above Dr. Jayaswal takes ‘laghanti’ (evidently a mistake for laghami in the original) to be equivalent to the Sanskrit laṅghanti, and he translates the whole passage as follows:

\[ \quad \text{—} \]

\[ ^2 \text{The transcript of the Delhi-Sivalik version in Bhandarkar and Sāstri has paṭicalitave, which is evidently a slip for paṭicalitavē in the original.} \]
"And the Rājūkas disregard my proclamations, while my own subordinate officers will promulgate my opinion and orders".

This is an admittedly obscure passage which cannot yet be said to have been properly explained. We may first mention the authoritative versions that are already in the field. Bühler who took laghamti to be equivalent to Skt. raṅghamte³ ('they hasten i.e. are eager') translated the whole passage as follows⁴: —

'But the lajkas are eager to serve me. My (other) servants also, who know my will, will serve (me)'.

Senart, who corrected laghamti into caghamti of the following passage and took paticalati to stand for Sans. paricarati, gave the following translation⁵: —

"Les rājūkas s'appliquent à m'obéir; eux aussi les parusas obéiront à mes volontés et à mes ordres".

Lüders connected laghamti with Skt. arbanti, 'they must' and held pulisāni to be the accusative plural of pulisa. His translation is as follows⁶: —

"Auch die Lājjukas müssen mir gehorchen und auch den Beamten die meinen willen kennen, werden sie gehorchen,"

which is paraphrased by Hultsch⁷: —

'The Lajūkas also must obey me. They will also obey the agents who know (my) wishes.'

More recently Professor S. K. Chatterji has proposed⁸ to connect the root lagh with NIA rah to remain, and derive it

---

3 Not raṅghamte, as alleged by Bhandarkar (Āsoka, p. 311, n. 4).
5 Les Inscriptions du Piyadasi, ii, p. 42.
6 SKPAW., 1913, p. 993.
7 Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Revised edition, p. 124.
from a hypothetical Indo-European root régh-o, rgb-ë. He gives the following translation:—

"The Lajükas also remain (are staying) to serve (to obey) me and they will also serve (obey) the officials who know my will."

Dr. Jayaswal evidently takes paṭicalitave, to be equivalent to Skt. praticalitum, ‘to go against’, and gives on this assumption a free translation of the above passage. This only adds one more to the list of hypothetical interpretations of the passage concerned. We, however, fail to understand why Dr. Jayaswal in the very next sentence translates paṭicalisamti as ‘will promulgate’, evidently making it stand for Skt. paricālayisyanti. Nor does he show any reason for rejecting Professor Lüders’ construction of pulisāni as a plural accusative. Indeed if Dr. Jayaswal were consistent, he would have construed the whole passage in some such way as the following:—

"The Rājükas, too, proceed to disregard me, and they will disregard those officers of mine, who know my wishes."

In any case, Dr. Jayaswal’s interpretation, as it stands, is purely hypothetical and no certain conclusion can be based upon it.

The passage immediately following the one we have discussed above is usually read as follows:—

‘te pi ca kāni viyovadisamti yena mam lajukā caghānti ālādhayitave’.

Dr. Jayaswal proposes to correct yena mama lajukā in the above into ye na mam lajukam which he alleges to be the reading of the Mathiah recension of PE. iv. Accordingly he translates this passage as follows⁹:—

⁹ Hindu Polity, Part ii, p. 145.
“And they [Rājūkas] will advise the Provinces which wish to serve the Rājūkas, not me.”

In connection with this passage we may observe that te is held by other authorities to stand for the purusas of the preceding passage, while ca kāni are read as two independent words, and caghāmti is taken in the sense of Skt. ಶಕ्ष्यान्ति. As Dr. Jayaswal gives no reason for differing from these interpretations, it is difficult to agree with his conclusions. Let us confine ourselves to the reading of the text in question. The above passage is completely preserved in three recensions, namely, Delhi-Topra, Radhiah and Mathiah, while it is imperfectly preserved in two other versions, namely, the Delhi-Meerut and the Rampurwa, and is altogether absent in the Allahabad version. Dr. Jayaswal apparently does not dispute the accepted reading yena mam lajūkā in the first two versions. Why, then, should the supposed reading of the single Mathiah version have the preference over that of the two other versions combined? How, again, to account for the sudden change from lajūkā in the plural into lajūkam in the singular? And going to the root of the matter, let us ask whether the reading on the Mathiah pillar is what is stated by Dr. Jayaswal. The answer is furnished by the mechanical copy of the transcript in Hultsch’s Corpus.

Another passage which ought to be mentioned in this connection occurs later on in the inscription and reads as follows:—

\[ \text{Avu (var. āvā) ite pi ca me āvuti.} \]

10 Cf. Hultsch, op. cit., p. 124, n. 9 and 10.
In the above āvuti has been held to be equivalent to Skt. āyukti (‘order’) by Senart whose view has been accepted by later scholars. As to āva ite, Senart translates it as ‘from this day’ (Skt. yāvad itah), while Bühler explained it to mean ‘even so far’. Dr. Jayaswal equates āva ite with Skt. āva rte for which he finds a parallel in the Vājasaneyī Samhitā. He also compares āvuti with Skt. āvṛtti which he claims on the authority of ‘Monier William’s’ (sic) Dict. s.v. ā-vṛ to bear the sense of ‘prayer’. His translation of the above passage accordingly is as follows: ‘And though fallen from position, my prayer is that’, on which he comments thus: ‘It is significant that the king now ‘prays’, and does not ‘command’ as in other documents’.

In discussing this point we have first to observe that the reading āva ite occurs in two versions of PE. iv. (Delhi-Topra and Allahabad), while in three other versions (Radhiah, Mathiah and Rampurwa) it has the form āvā ite. Dr. Jayaswal’s suggested equivalence of āva ite with Vedic āva rte which in itself is extremely problematic, fails entirely to account for the word-form āvā ite. On the other hand, Bühler’s rendering, which exactly fits in with the form āvā ite, is supported by Hultsch on the authority of āvā-gamu [k]e of the Dhauli and Jaugada Separate Rock Edict i. We may also compare the words āva saṃvātakapā in RE. iv and v. In view of these difficulties it seems impossible to support Dr. Jayaswal’s rendering of āva ite.

10 For references see Hultsch, op. cit., p. 125, n. 1 and 2.
11 The transcript of the Rampurwa version in Bhandarkar and Śāstrī (op. cit., p. 70) under these words is a blank. This is evidently a slip.
given above. Turning to the word āvuti we find on a reference to the latest (1899) edition of Monier-Williams’ *Dict.* (s.v. ā-vṛ) that its meanings are given in one place as ‘to choose, desire, prefer’, ‘to fulfil’, ‘to grant (a wish)’, while elsewhere it is taken to mean ‘to cover, hide, conceal’, ‘to surround, enclose’ etc. The first group of meanings is found mostly in the Vedic literature, and the second group in the classical literature. It is therefore incomprehensible how Monier-Williams’ authority can be quoted for the explanation of āvuti as ‘prayer’. On the other hand, Senart’s rendering of the word is supported by the fact that āvutike of the Dhauli Separate Edict II corresponds to āyutike of the Jagada Separate Edict II.¹³

Finally, we may mention a few general considerations which tend to cast some doubt upon the correctness of Dr. Jayaswal’s interpretation of PE. iv. Throughout the inscription the tone is that of one administering affairs on his own authority, not that of a person who has been forced to bow to the authority of others. Let us notice the significant expression kāte (Skt. kṛtaḥ) (instead of kāritaḥ) used no less than three times with reference to the vesting of authority in the Rājūkas. In the second place the author of the inscription is throughout anxious to declare the object of his administrative measure, namely, to secure the earthly and spiritual well-being of his subjects, and he closes with an important modification of the current rule relating to criminal trials, namely the grant of a respite of three days. Would not a sovereign who has been deprived of his authority by his ministers draw ridicule and contempt upon

himself by issuing appeals in public to those who had superseded him? As for Dr. Jayaswal’s explanation of *janapada* as a Corporate Body, it has been disposed of by Dr. Narendra Nath Law\(^{13a}\) whose arguments have not yet been seriously challenged. Lastly, we may mention that if the Rājukas, as appears probable from our preceding discussion, were provincial officers, their supersession of the king would be altogether out of the question. The only Body which could properly deprive the king of his authority would be the Council of Ministers or the *Parisaṭat*.

V

*The authenticity of the Buddhist traditions of* Aśoka’s *loss of sovereignty*

In support of his contention that Aśoka was deprived of his sovereignty by his ministers, Dr. Jayaswal in addition to the alleged testimony of PE iv, brings forward the evidence of a story in the *Divyāvadāna*.\(^{14}\) There we are told how the heir-apparent Sāṃpadi, at the instance of the ministers prevented the Emperor from making further gifts from the Treasury to the monks, and how Aśoka’s allowance was cut down till at last he received only half an āmalaka which he sent as his last offering to the Saṃgha.

The story in the *Divyāvadāna* forms the last of a cycle of four legends in this work (Nos. xxvi-xxix) dealing with Aśoka’s reign, and bearing the titles of *Pāṃśupradāna*, *Kunāla*, *Vitaśoka*, and *Aśoka*. These stories at first belonged to an

\(^{13a}\) Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. ii, pp. 385-407, 638-650.

\(^{14}\) Ed. E. B. Cowell and R. A. Neil, pp. 429-34.
independent work which was completely incorporated in the *Divyāvadāna* 15. The *Aśokāvadāna*, as this work is called, exists also in two Chinese versions, one of which, called the *A-yu wang tchouan*, was prepared by the Parthian Fa K’in about 300 A.D., and the other called *A-yu wang king* was written by the monk Saṃghabhara (?) of Fou-nan in 512 A.C. Considerable fragments of the *Aśokāvadāna* again occur in Chap. xxv of the Chinese version of the *Samyukta Āgama* which was prepared between 435 and 468 A.D. Three stories of the Aśokan cycle (including that of the Emperor’s gift of half an āmalaka with which we are here concerned) are found in the collection of stories which has been called *Śūrālāṃkāra* and attributed to the famous Āsvaghoṣa. The two Chinese versions of the *Aśokāvadāna* and the stories in the Chinese version of the *Śūrālāṃkāra* have been made accessible to us in the French translations of Jean Przyluski and Edouard Huber respectively. 16

A comparison of the parallel versions of the story of the gift of half āmalaka shows a common agreement on the point that Aśoka was deprived of his sovereign authority because of his extravagant donations to the Buddhist monks. This is shown in all the versions by the king’s emphatic repudiation of

---


the ministers’ courtly statement that he was still the sovereign.\textsuperscript{17}

The same note is struck in all the versions of the story in the message which Aśoka sends to the ministry along with his gift of half an āmalaka and the comment which the head of the ministry makes on receiving the same.\textsuperscript{18}

Admitting the unanimity of our authorities on the point just mentioned, we have now to ask whether we are justified in treating their account as a historical fact. There seems to be no ground for assigning a high antiquity to the Buddhist story. “The Gāthā quoted by the Divyāvadāna,” says Dr. Jayaswal,\textsuperscript{19} “is more ancient than the compilation of the Divyāvadāna and the former could not have been composed many centuries after the event.” This argument is not convincing, as the Divyāvadāna, according to competent authorities,\textsuperscript{20} is not later in date than the second century A.D., and the result of this late date is

\textsuperscript{17} See Divy. p. 431:—atha rājāsokah sāsrudurdinanaayanaavadano mātyān uvaça dākṣīṇyād suṣṭam hi kim kathayathā bhrastādhirājya uyaṃ śeṣam tvāmalakārīdhamityaivasitam yatra prabhutum mama, B.E.F.E.O., iv, p. 723:—“Alors le roi prononça ces stances:—‘Vous dites que j’exerce la royauté, et que mes ordres sont exécutés. C’est pour me flatter que vous parlez ainsi. Ce que vous dites n’est que mensonge. Mon autorité est mort, je ne dispose plus de rien’”; Przyluski, op. cit., p. 298:—“Le roi dit, ‘Vous êtes dans l’erreur quand vous dites que je suis le maître. Je ne suis pas le maître.’” Cf. new Tokyo ed. of the Tripiṭaka, ii, Saṃyukta Agama, ch. 25, p. 180b:—“You all are telling a lie to please me that I am the established king. But I have nothing which I can call mine own”.

\textsuperscript{18} We refrain from quoting further references as they may be easily verified. We may note especially the significant expressions used of Aśoka in the Divy. story, (pp. 431-2), bhrastādhirājya, bhrastāsthiyatana and bhrādhikāra.

\textsuperscript{19} Hindu Polity, Part ii, p. 121.

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Winternitz, Geschichte der Indische Litteratur, ii, 222-3.
not likely to be much affected by the supposed relative priority of the Gāthā. A more weighty argument is that the story of Aśoka’s gift of the half āmalaka occurs in the Sūtrālāṃkāra attributed to Aśvaghoṣa which helps to push back its date probably to the first century A.D. The relative antiquity of the story is also suggested by the fact that it is incorporated in the Chinese version of the Saṃyukta Āgama and is thus made to form part of the Canon. But even if the date could be pushed back with certainty to the first century of the Christian era, there would still be a gap of three centuries from Aśoka’s time. Dr. Jayaswal’s arguments from internal evidence in favour of the authenticity of the Buddhist story are equally unconvincing. “The monks,” he says, “were to gain nothing by an invention of such a story which (sic) threw discredit on a great personage of their religious history.” A careful study of the story in its parallel versions, however, makes it quite clear that every detail of it, so far from throwing discredit upon the Emperor, is quite consistent with his position as a shining light of the faith, while serving to vindicate its cardinal principles. Indeed, if the Buddhist monks were to think of demonstrating doctrines like the evanescence of earthly greatness, the paramountcy of fate and so forth by the example of “a great personage of their religious history,” they could not have done better than invent the story of the great Emperor, “the elephant among the Mauryas,” who, when reduced by adverse circumstances from the position of ‘Lord of Jambudvīpa’ to that of ‘the Lord of half an āmalaka’, found solace in the words of the Master and gave

his last possession to the order. Witness for example the passionate words which break forth alike in Asoka’s own pathetic lament and the grave comments of his associates. But then, it is urged by Dr. Jayaswal, the monks “would not have invented a story which would have been a bad precedent in case other monarchs wanting (sic) to imitate the munificence of the Maurya Emperor.” In the form in which the story has come down to us in its complete versions there is no room for the monks’ apprehension of the consequences contemplated by Dr. Jayaswal, for we are told, immediately after the account of

22 Cf. Samyuktā Āgama, (p. 180):—“Oh, the wealth is to be greatly hated and abandoned. Besides let us remember the gāthā that Buddha has pronounced: Everything flourishing has its decline from which arises a gulf!” Cf. B.E.F.E.O., iv, (p. 723):—“...La puissance est quelque chose de misérable. O combien ‘eile est à mépriser!.....Vraies et non pas vaines sont les paroles du Sublime......” Przyluski, op. cit., p. 298:—“Oh! les richesses sont profondément méprisables...Les paroles du Buddha sont véridiques. Dans ses paroles, il n’est rien qui ne soit exact. Il a dit que tous ceux qui s’aiment ont la douleur de se séparer.........”; Divy., p. 431:—“......aśvavṛyam ṅbig anāryam uddhatanadātoya prāvasopamam martiṣyendrasya mamāpi yat pratibhayam dārādram abhyāgatam athavā ko Bhagavato vākyam anyathā karisyati sampattayo bi sarvā vipatīnīdhana iti pratijñātam.”

23 In B.E.F.E.O., iv, p. 725, the messenger who takes Asoka’s gift to the monks says of the Emperor:—“......Śes bons karmāṇs sont épuesés; brusquement sa chète est survenue. Trompé par ses karmāṇs, il est sombré, il a perdu sa majesté, tel le soleil qui s’approche du couchant.” In Przyluski, op. cit., (p. 209) the Sthavira of the monastery on receiving the gift thus addressed the monks: “Il convient, à cause de cela, de ressentir pour la transmigration un dégoût et une aversion profonds. Les richesses et les plaisirs s’évanouissent rapidement. La puissance et la souveraineté sont bientôt perdues.” In the Divy., p. 433, the Samghasthavira says: “bhedatā bhavantah ākṣyam idāniṁ samvegam utpādayitr̥m kutāh evam by uktaṁ Bhagavatā parāvipattih samvejanīyam sthānam iti.”

24 Hindu Polity, loc. cit.
the king’s gift of his half āmalaka, that he gave away before his death his whole kingdom to the Saṃgha by a sealed deed of gift, and that the ministers so far respected the Emperor’s act that they redeemed it from the monks by paying four kotis of gold.\^\smallskip 25\ From the point of view of the Buddhist monks, then, there could be no better precedent for later “monarchs wanting to imitate the munificence of the great Emperor.”

Even if we were to admit that the Buddhist story embodied a genuine historical tradition, it is difficult to follow Dr. Jayaswal when he acclaims it as ‘the great constitutional datum on the reign of Aśoka’.\^\smallskip 26 The parallel versions, in the first place, do not agree as to the authority that deprived Aśoka of his sovereignty. In the Sūtrālamkāra story,\^\smallskip 27 we are told that when the Emperor urged his ministers to procure fresh treasures which he could bestow upon the monks, they refused to give him the same. According to the A-yu wang ēbouan,\^\smallskip 28 the heir-apparent Sampadi agreeing with the ministers deprived the king of all that belonged to him. In the Divyāvadāna story\^\smallskip 29 Sam-

26 Hindu Polity, Part II, p. 121.
27 B.E.F.E.O., iv, p. 723:—“Il exigea de ses ministres de lui procurer encore d’autres trésors mais ses ministres ne voulaient plus lui en donner.”
28 Przyluski op. cit., p. 298:—“Là-dessus Eulmo-ti [Sampadi], d’accord avec les ministres, profita de la maladie du roi pour lui retirer tout ce qui lui appartenait.” Cf. Sāmyukta Āgama:—“At this the prince (San-po-ti) promptly ordered that no treasure should go out for the use of the great king (=Mahārāja).”
29 P. 430:—tasmīṃ ca samaye Kukūlasya Sampadi nāma putro yuvānārājye pravṛttate tasyāmātyair abhibhitam. Kumāra Aśoko rājaś saulpakālāvasthāyi idam ca dravaṃ karukṣṭārāmam preṣyate kośebalinaśca rājano, niṣvar-tayitavyaḥ yāvat kumārena bhāṇḍāgārikaḥ pratisidhīdhaḥ.
padi acting in accordance with the advice of his ministers forbade the treasurer to send Aśoka’s gift to the monastery. When Dr. Jayaswal makes out\(^{29a}\) “Chancellor Rādhagupta”, whom he thinks\(^{29b}\) with true historical insight to be ‘probably a descendant of Viśnugupta’ (Kauṭilya), to refuse further gifts to the Buddhist Samgha on the orders of Aśoka, he overlooks the fact that Rādhagupta’s name is not mentioned in any version among the ministers responsible for the revolution, while the A-yu wang tchouan expressly states that he advised the gift of the whole four koṭis to the monks, but the bad ministers advised the heir-apparent otherwise. Dr. Jayaswal is not quite correct in saying\(^{30}\) that the Buddhist monks do not call the ministers sinful for their act. The version of the A-yu wang tchouan explicitly states that it was the bad ministers of perverse views (“de mauvais ministres aux vues perverses”) that advised the heir-apparent. Indeed it is clear both from the accounts of A-yu wang tchouan and the Divyāvadāna that the monks regarded the action of the heir-apparent and ministers as an act of usurpation. For we read in the former work,\(^{31}\) ‘Aujourd’hui il est gouverné par la foule de ses sujets,” while the Divyāvadāna says, *Bṛṣṭyaḥ sa bhūmipatir adya bṛādbikāraḥ.* If any doubt were left on this point, we would refer to the description (which is common to all versions) of the circumstances under which Aśoka was deprived of his sovereignty. The Emperor, we are told, had fallen ill and grieved that the balance of 4 koṭis out of his contemplated gift of one thousand koṭis to the

\(^{29a}\) Hindu Polity, Part II, p. 120. \(^{29b}\) Ibid., p. 146n. 
\(^{30}\) Ibid., p. 146. \(^{31}\) Przybiski, op. cit., p. 299. \(^{32}\) P. 432.
Saṅgha was yet unpaid. When he proceeded to send the gifts to the Kukkuṭārāma monastery, the ministers told the heir-apparent that Aśoka had not long to live and was dissipating the treasure, and that since the strength of kings lay in the treasury, this ought to be prevented. It was thus not in vindication of "the constitutional law" of the country but in the interests of the prospective successor to the throne that the ministers advised, if the Buddhist tradition is to be believed, the withdrawal of sovereign authority from the great Maurya.

[A Note on the Orthography of the Early Brāhmī Inscriptions in the matter of Indication of the Double Consonants]

By Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterji

T. W. Rhys Davids already noted in his *Buddhist India* (pp. 180-1) that in the early orthography of the inscriptions what was actually a double consonant in pronunciation was written by a single consonant: s ḳ y n̄o, according to him, may have been either Sākiyānā or Sākkiyānā.

The early Brāhmī orthography was not a rigorous but only a haphazard one. The device of putting one consonant on the top of another to indicate a group may be said to be just coming in vogue, for we find a great deal of hesitancy and obvi-

33 Cf. Przyluski, *op. cit.,* pp. 296-7: "Puis le roi Aśoka tomba malade et, sachant qu'il allait mourir, il pleura et fut affligé.....Alors le roi donna de l'or de l'argent et des objets précieux au monastère de Kukkuṭārāma...De mauvais ministres aux vues perverses dirent au prince héritier: 'Le roi Aśoka approche du terme de sa vie; il dissipe ses trésors et, donnant tout, il est sur le point de se ruiner. Vous serez roi; or les trésors et les objets précieux constituent les ressources d'un roi; il faut maintenant empêcher qu'ils ne soient complètement dissipés.' *Divy.,* pp. 429-30 has practically the same account. Even in the version of the *Sūtraṇākāra* (BEFEO., iv, p. 723) the occasion of the Emperor's being deprived of his authority is said to be that he fell seriously ill.
ous mistake in the proper writing of some of these groups (e.g., vv for vy in katavyo for kuttavvyo as in Girnar). Even though groups of dissimilar consonants would be attempted to be indicated (e.g., tp, vy, ml, pr, sl, as in Girnar), the same consonant doubled was never expressed in the orthography as such: there are no cases of kk, yy, pp, tt, etc.

A double consonant is really a long consonant. To indicate this long consonant, the early Indian scribes who used the Brāhmī alphabet either (i) wrote a single consonant, leaving it to the reader’s acquaintance with the language to enable him to pronounce it doubly (or long) in the right place (we may compare with it the use of short vowels for long ones in the Kharoṣṭhī script); or (ii) in some rare cases, it seems they transferred the length-mark to the preceding vowel, i.e. made the preceding vowel long when the consonant immediately after that vowel was pronounced long (or double). Thus, *vṛṣa* > *vṛṣa* would be written (i) either as *vāṣa*, (ii) or as *vāṣa*; *cikitsā* > *cikicchā* as (i) *cikīchā* (ii) or as *cikīchā*. The lengthening of the vowel as an orthographical device in this connexion is rather uncommon, and is found mainly at Girnar; *rāhā* = *rāhhā*, *rāno* = *rāhnō* (cf. in a local i.e. Gujarati Kṣatrapa coin the transcription in Greek characters as *pañno* = *pānnio* = *pāhno*), *vāsa* = *vāsaa*, *yāta* = *yāttā* (< *yātra*), *sūpāthāya* = *sūpāthāya* (< *sāpārthāya*), etc.

The subsequent history of Indo-Aryan, as in the Prākṛts and the Modern Vernaculars, amply demonstrates that in the 3rd century B.C. and later, the double (or long) consonant pronunciation was the one actually current, and at this early period the modern or vernacular habit of dropping one member of a double consonant group with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel could not have been established. Thus, Old Indo-Aryan *bḥaka* > Middle Indo-Aryan *bẖaṭṭa* > New Indo-Aryan *bẖaṭa*; Old Indo-Aryan, an̄ya* > Middle Indo-Aryan *āṇṇa*, *āṇṇa* > New Indo-Aryan *āṇa*; *kṝya* > *kṝjja* > *kṝjja* etc. The *bẖaṭa*, *āṇa* and *kṝjja* stage, as apparently suggested by the inscripitional orthographies (rare enough as they are) *vāsα* and *rāno* (for *vāsaa* and *rāhnō*), could not possibly have characterised
early Middle Indo-Aryan of the 3rd century B.C. The long -ās- and āṅ- can only be taken as an orthographic device for -ass- and -aṅṅ-. As regards the word rājāka-rājuka-lājuka, the spellings with ā- (rājuka, lājuka) show that we do not have the Skt. word rājan here. The word in the vernacular was evidently pronounced as rājāka or lājāka (<rājju+ ka or rajju+ uka); and rājju- could evidently be written either as rāju- or as rāju, as we have seen above; and lāju-, of course, is the graphic device for lājju-, which was the Eastern form of the word.
SLAVERY IN ANCIENT INDIA—A STUDY IN INDIA’S SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY

Megasthenes, writing his account of India towards the beginning of the third century B.C., remarked that the Indians did not use aliens as slaves, much less a countryman of their own.¹ Whether this memorable pronouncement was the result, as has been held, of the Greek’s experience of the unusual mildness of the system in vogue among the Indians,² or else of the same idealizing tendency that runs through Tacitus’s

*ABBREVIATIONS:

CHI. = The Cambridge History of India, Vol. i, Ancient India. Edited by E. J. Rapson, Cambridge, 1922.


Kane, H.D. = P. V. Kane, History of Dharmasāstra, Vol. ii, Pt. i, Poona, 1941

Kane, K.S.S. = P. V. Kane, Kātyāyanasmythārodhāra or Kātyāyanasmythi on Vyavahāra (Law and Procedure). Text (reconstructed), Translation, Notes and Introduction, Bombay, 1933

Nārada. = The references in Roman numerals are to the sections on judicial procedure (Vyavahārapadam) and those in Arabic numerals are to the verses in Julius Jolly’s edition, Calcutta, 1885

Rangaswami, A.K. = K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, Additional Verses of Kātyāyana on Vyavahāra in A Volume of Studies in Indology presented to Prof. P. V. Kane, Poona, 1941

¹ MacCulloch, Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian, p. 71.

Germania, it is difficult to decide. Nevertheless, it is but a truism to say that the whole history of India in early times reveals the existence of slavery as a recognised institution. In the Rgveda, the word dása or dasyu is used to mean the unconquered aborigines as well as the subdued slave,—a proof, no doubt, of the frequency with which individuals of the former class could be and were changed into the second. To judge from historical analogies, capture in war must have been at this period one of the chief sources of slavery. But that an Aryan freeman could also be reduced to slavery for debt seems to follow from a passage in the famous dicing hymn in which the parents and brothers of a gamester are made to say, "We know him not, take him away bound." Of the kinds of work allotted to the slave and of his status in general, we have as yet no information, though the slaves are mentioned sometimes among the objects of priestly gift (daksinā). In this age of general simplicity the slave presumably was regarded as a member of the master's household, and in any case he must have held a minor place in the public economy in comparison with the free labourer. The following period, that of the later Samhitās and the Brāhmaṇas, undoubtedly introduced more complex social conditions, of which the outworn symptoms

4 Rv. x. 34. 4.
5 Cf. Rv. viii. 19. 36. For similar references to gifts of slaves in later Vedic literature see Kane, H.D., Ch. v, Slavery, pp. 180-2.
6 Cf. A. B. Keith (in CHI, p. 101): "The Rgveda unquestionably presents us with a society which is not dependent on [slave] labour, and in which the ordinary tasks of life are carried out by the freemen of the tribe."
were the emergence of a developed city-life, the improvement of agriculture, and above all the multiplication and specialisation of industries.\(^7\) Nevertheless, though we have references as in the story of Kavaşā Ailūsa\(^8\) to the degraded condition of the slaves, there does not appear to have occurred at this epoch any striking change in the character or extent of this institution.\(^9\) Indeed Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra strikes a note of remarkable humanism when it says\(^9a\) that one may stint himself, his wife or son as to food, but not a dāsa who does his menial work.

It is in the following period that we are first introduced, in connection with the remarkably vivid and objective pictures of social life in the Pāli canon and specially in the Jātakas, amid what seems the old economic environment,\(^10\) to a somewhat full


\(^8\) Ait. Br., ii, 19, Kaun. Br., xii, 1, 3 where the scer Kavaṣā Ailūsa as a supposed dāśīputra is held to be unfit for participation in the Soma sacrifice.

\(^9\) Prof. Keith conjectures (op. cit., p. 128) that during the above period, "For the peasant working on his own fields was being substituted the landowner cultivating his estate by means of slaves, or the merchant carrying on his trade by the same instrumentality." But the evidence for such a supposed transformation is of the slenderest kind, and all that we know of subsequent times belies the possibility of its happening. Even of such a comparatively late period as that of the early Buddhist literature, we are told by a competent authority (Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, p. 55):—"We hear nothing of such later developments of slavery as rendered the Greek mines, the Roman lai.-fundi, the plantations of Christian slave-owners, scenes of misery and oppression."

\(^9a\) ii, 4. 9. 11:—Kāmamāṁmānaṁ bhūryāṁ putram voparundbyānma tveva dāśakarmakaram.

\(^10\) Cf. Mrs. Rhys Davids (in CHI., p. 198):—"The rural economy of India at the coming of Buddhism was based chiefly on a system of village communities. The Jātaka bears very clear testimony to this. There is no
knowledge of Indian slavery. According to a passage in the Suttavibhāṅga section of the Vinaya Piṭaka\textsuperscript{11} slaves are of three classes, \textit{viz.}, those born in the master’s house, those acquired by purchase and those captured in war. Again, a Gāthā\textsuperscript{12} occurring as well in a Jātaka story as in a passage of the Niddesa mentions four kinds of slaves, \textit{viz.}, those who are slaves from their mothers, those who are bought for money, those who are slaves of their own free will, and those who are driven to slavery by fear. An alternative list combining both these groups was remembered in the Buddhist tradition as late as the fifth century A.D.\textsuperscript{13} The Jātakas contain concrete illustrations of most of these classes\textsuperscript{14} besides mentioning instances of persons reduced such clear testimony in it to isolated large estates or to great feudatories or to absolute lords of the soil holding such estates.”

\textsuperscript{11} P. T. S. ed., Vol. IV, p. 224: dāso nāma antojāto dhanakkito karamarūṇito.

\textsuperscript{12} Amāyādāsāpi bhavantu b’ekte,
 dharaṇena kītāpi bhavanti dāsā,
 sayam pi b’ekte upayanti dāsā,
 bhayaṁ paṇumāpi bhavanti dāsā.
Quoted in Vidhuraṇaṇḍita Jātaka (Fausböll’s ed., Vol. VI, p. 285), and Niddesa, t. ii.

\textsuperscript{13} See, e.g. the passage in Buddhaghosa’s Sumanāgalavilāsini (P. T. S. edition, Part I, p. 168); dāso ti antojāto-dhanakkita-karamarūṇita-sānam dāsabyam upagatānam aññatāro.

\textsuperscript{14} Reference to a slave born in the master’s house occurs in the Kaṭābaka Jāt. (Vol. I, pp. 451 ff.); to the purchase of slaves in the Sattabhasta Jātaka (Vol. III, p. 343); to the capture and enslavement of persons by frontier robbers in the Cullanārada Jātaka (Vol. IV, p. 220); to voluntary enslavement through fear in the Khaṇḍābāla Jātaka (Vol. VI, p. 138) where Prince Candakumāra, speaking as the mouthpiece of the intended victims if his father’s sacrifice, begs for life even at the cost of being reduced to a slave’s status. In the Mahāsurasoma Jātaka (Vol. V, p. 497), King Brahmadatta decides to intercede for the captive kings, thinking that otherwise the man-eater
to slavery by way of judicial punishment. An interesting sidelight is thrown upon the economic conditions of the time by a casual observation made in one of the above passages to the effect that 700 kārṣāpanas were held to be sufficient for purchasing a male or a female slave. From various other passages the slave appears to have been usually employed in performing the ordinary household duties. But there is a remarkable instance—remarkable in view of the degraded (porisādo) Sutasoma would settle them in the forest as his slaves or else take them to the frontier and sell them. References to prisoners of war being reduced to slavery are found in Mahānārāmadasakapajātaka, (Jāt. vi, p. 220). A historical instance of this kind is furnished by Asoka’s Rock Edict xiii mentioning as an ordinary incident of warfare the wholesale enslavement of the conquered inhabitants of Kaliṅga.

15 In the Kulāvaka Jātaka (Vol. i, p. 200) we are told how a wicked village superintendent (gāmabhōjakas) was condemned by the king to be the slave of the villagers. In the Mahāmārama Jātaka (Vol. vi, p. 389) the king at the intercession of the wise man Mahosadha spares the lives of the four guilty ministers and condemns them to be his slaves. On the other hand a passage in the Vessantara Jātaka (Vol. vi, p. 521), which has been taken (Mrs. Rhys Davids, in CHI., p. 205, and n6) to refer to slavery incurred for debt, simply describes in our view the giving away of a daughter in marriage for failure to return money kept in deposit.

16 See Jāt. Vol. iii, p. 343. On the other hand slaves apparently of the cheapest sort could be purchased for 100 pieces (kārṣāpanas?); hence the frequent use of such expression as ‘meek as a roo-piece slave-girl’. (Cf. Durājūna Jātaka, Vol. i, p. 209).

17 Kārṣāpanas, as is well-known, were of three varieties, gold, silver and copper (cf. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, Ancient Indian Numismatics, Ch. n). There can be little doubt that in the above passage silver kārṣāpanas are meant, for a gold or a copper coin of the same designation would be too high or too low a price to pay for a slave.


19 See the Kaṭābaka Jātaka cited above.
occupation assigned to the slave subsequently in the Brahmanical Smṛtis,—of a born slave acting as the private secretary of his master. The treatment of the slave, in other respects, seems to have depended upon the temperament or even the varying mood of his owner. We find, e.g. in the instance just cited, "the slave, petted, permitted to learn writing and handicrafts besides his ordinary duties as valet and footman, saying to himself that at the slightest fault he might get beaten, imprisoned, branded and fed on a slave’s fare." This seems to suggest, as has been held, that the slave as yet had no legal protection against his master. Indeed a Jātaka text actually refers to the master’s absolute right over his slave. The evil custom of keeping slaves in fetters does not appear to have been altogether unknown. Runaway slaves, again, it would seem, were forcibly taken back by their owners. On the other hand there are few instances in the Buddhist literature of this period of

20 Mrs Rhys Davids, in CHI., p. 205.
22 The passage, which is quoted by Ratilal Mehta, Pre-Buddhist India, p. 210, occurs in Vidyuraparṇījātaka Jāt. vi, p. 300 and is as follows: ayito hi dāssasā janīda issaro.
23 In the passage from the Khaṇḍāhāla Jātaka already quoted, the prince offers along with the other victims to serve bound in fetters if he is saved from death.
24 See the Vinaya Piṭaka, P. T. S. ed., Vol. i, p. 76. Reference to the general depression of a slave’s condition occurs in a passage of the Sāmaṇṇaphala Sutta (Dīgha Nikāya, P. T. S. ed., Vol. i, p. 72) which pointedly describes the joy of a slave “not his own master, subject to another, unable to go whither he would,” after he had been “emancipated from that slavery, become his own master, not subject to others, a freeman, free to go whither he would.”
actual maltreatment on the part of the masters. The slave could secure manumission by the master’s favour or even by purchase.

Such seems to have been the state of slavery in the period which we are now treating. To realise the influence of Buddhism upon this institution, it is well to remember that according to the tradition Buddha, while deprecating in his own person the acceptance of slaves, so far respected the master’s right of ownership that he forbade admission to the Samgha to the unmanumitted slave. Nevertheless, we have at least two recorded instances of liberation, by a distinguished disciple of the Master, of his slaves who rose thereafter to the rank of saints in the Buddhist Church. A more

25 Mrs. Rhys Davids (in CIII., p. 205) mentions two instances of beating of female slaves (Majj. N., 1. 125, Jāt., Vol. I, pp. 402 ff.). A more striking example occurs in a passage of the Puggala Paññatti (P. T. S. ed., p. 56), which mentions slaves carrying out the king’s orders, “impelled by whip, impelled by fear, weeping with tears upon their faces.” The pathetic story of the children of King Vessantara being ill-treated by their cruel master the Brahman Jājakava, is meant so obviously for the purpose of moral edification as to lose much of its value as a contemporary picture of social life.

26 See, e.g., the passage in the Sona-Nanda Jātaka (Vol. V, p. 313) where a pious family is described as retiring to the Himalayas after liberating their slaves (dāsajanan bhujissam katvā). Also compare the Vessantara Jātaka (Vol. VI, p. 577) where the king at the time of giving away his children in slavery, fixes their ransom which it afterwards paid by their grandfather.

27 Cf. the passage in the Dīgha Nikāya (1. 1, 10) where non-acceptance of a male or a female slave is mentioned among the Buddha’s notable characteristics.

28 See e.g., the Vinaya Pitakam, loc. cit.:-na dāso pabbājetabbo.

29 The references are to the male slave Dāsaka and the female slave Puṇṇa or Puṇṇikā mentioned as the authors of Gathas in the Theragāthā P. T. S. ed. p. 4) and Therigāthā (P. T. S. ed. p. 123). Both are mentioned
important fruit of Buddha’s teaching in this direction is revealed in Asoka’s edicts\textsuperscript{30} including the kind treatment of slaves as well as servants.\textsuperscript{31}

The Arthaśāstra and the Dharmaśāstras which introduce us to the epoch of known codes of law, naturally deal with the institution of slavery at great length, though we have no reasons to believe from the available evidence that there was any change in the fundamental economic conditions of the country. Both these sets of authorities, to begin with, distinguish between the slaves and other workers. Kauṭilya, e.g., in his two chapters\textsuperscript{31a} bearing the title dāsakarmacakālpa separately treats the rules relating to the slaves (dāsas) and various grades of workers, e.g., agricultural labourers, herdsmen, merchants, artizans, physicians, hired servants, and even priests officiating at the sacrifices. In a similar manner Nārada,\textsuperscript{32} whose treatment of the subject is the most complete, distinguishes the slaves from the workers (karmakaras) of four specified grades, while including both under the common designation of persons bound to obedience (śūrūsakas). This distinction turns principally upon the difference of employment, impure work\textsuperscript{33} being reserved for the slaves and work of a pure

in the Paramatthadipani (P. T. S. edition pp. 73, 200) as having been liberated by their master Anāthapiṇḍika.

\textsuperscript{30} See, e.g., the Rock Edict No. xi, and the Pillar Edict No. vii.

\textsuperscript{31} May we in view of the above facts compare the influence of Buddhism upon slavery with that of Christianity in the early centuries of its existence?

\textsuperscript{31a} iii, 13 & 14.  \textsuperscript{32} v, 2-3.

\textsuperscript{33} Such as sweeping the doorways, the place for depositing filth, and the rubbish-heap; gathering and removing the leavings of food, ordure and urine and rubbing the master’s limbs at his wish. Cf. Nārada, v, 6-7.
character being entrusted to the rest. Among the slaves themselves different grades and classes are distinguished in the Arthashastra and Smritis, these being subject to separate causes and provisions of the law. In Kauṭilya’s list, e.g., the following may be clearly distinguished: (a) slaves acquired by purchase in various ways, e.g., of minors from the hands of kinsmen and strangers, (b) persons given as pledge (āhitaka) whether by themselves or by others, (c) born slaves (udaradāsa) and persons born of female slaves in the master’s household (grbejata), (d) slaves by way of punishment (daṇḍapranita), (e) slaves obtained by inheritance (dāyagata), (f) slaves received by gift (labdha). According to Manu slaves are of seven kinds, (a) one taken captive ‘under a standard,’ i.e., in warfare (dvajābytā), (b) one who serves for maintenance (bhaktadāsa), (c) one born of a female slave in the master’s house (grbaja), (d) one purchased (krita), (e) one acquired by gift (datrima), (f) one acquired by inheritance from ancestors (paitrka), (g) one enslaved by way of punishment (daṇḍadāsa). Narada mentions no less than fifteen kinds of slaves, viz., (a) one born of a female slave in the master’s house, (b) one acquired by purchase, (c) one received through gift (d) one acquired by inheritance, (e) one maintained during famine (f) one given as pledge (g) one released from a heavy debt (b) one taken captive in war, (i) one won in a stake, (j) one offering himself for a slave, (k) one serving for a specified term, (l) one who serves for maintenance, (m) one who accepts slavery out of desire for a female slave, (n) one self-sold, (o) one fallen from the monastic life.

34 [il. 13. 35 [viii, 415. 36 [v, 26-28.
In connection with the sources of slavery mentioned above, a few points may be noted in the present place. Regarding the class of purchased slaves it may be observed that elsewhere Nārada, while describing the different kinds of wives, mentions a class of wanton women (svairini) who are acquired by purchase (dhanakritā), and he goes on to state that the issue of a woman who is purchased for a price (śulka) belongs to the begetter. Mention may be made here of the rule of Kātyāyana, Ke. KSS., vv. 693-94 allowing the benefit of half a month in case of sale of a male slave and twice as much in case of sale of a female slave to the purchaser in case the purchase was made without examination. We may further observe in this connection that the evil practice of fathers selling their children into slavery, though condemned in general terms by Manu, Yājñavalkya and Viśnu as well as in a Mahābhārata text was actually resorted to in times of distress in the early centuries of the Christian era. Reference to the class of inherited slaves is found in a rule of Kātyāyana KSS., vv. 882-83, including slaves in the class of property that should be enjoyed by co-sharers in common at the proper time. A vivid illustration of another class of slaves is furnished by a passage in the second Act of the Mṛcchakaṭīka drama where the gambler Saṃvāhaka offers his own person for sale in the

37 xii, 51; 54. 39 iii, 236. 38 xi, 61. 
40 xxxvii, 6. 40a xiii, 45, 23.

41 See e.g., the text of the Milinda-paṇha (vv. 8. 7) where Nāgaseṇa discoursing on the dilemma of King Vessantara’s “mighty giving” of his children unto slavery mentions as an acknowledged custom, the act of pledging or selling the son on the part of a father, falling into debt or losing his livelihood.
open street for the sum of ten suvarṇas which he owes to the gambling-master Māthura.

Comparing the Arthaśāstra and the Dharmaśāstra rules on the subject of slavery, we are first struck with the radical attitude of Kauṭilya which is based on his conception of the rights of the Aryan freeman, not to say those of the individual man. Kauṭilya, e.g., imposes42 penalties increasing, it is true, in degree with the social status of the party injured, for the sale and mortgage of a minor Śūdra, Vaiśya, Kṣatriya and Brāhmaṇa, the only exception being made in the case of the born slave. In the same context he prescribes half the above scale of penalties for the offence of ‘depriving of his Aryan character’ even a slave guilty of stealing wealth. In this connection he lays down the memorable maxim43 that while the sale and mortgage of children are permissible among barbarians, no Aryan should be reduced to slavery. On the other hand, the general tendency of the Smṛtikāras is to emphasize the rights of the twice-born classes and specially of the Brāhmaṇas to the exclusion of those of the Śūdras. To borrow a modern expression, while the Arthaśāstra insists, in the main, upon the principle of nationality, the Dharmaśāstra lays stress upon the principle of birth and social status. Manu,44 e.g., while imposing a heavy fine upon a Brāhmaṇa for forcibly reducing an initiated person of the higher classes to servile work, expressly

42 III, 13. Kauṭilya however, permits the mortgage of an Aryan as a temporary and an emergency measure.

43 The text is as follows:—mlecchānāmadoṣah praśam vikretumādbhūtam vā na tuevāryasya dāsabhāvah.

44 VIII, 412-413.
allows him this right with respect to the Śūdras, and he repeats in this connection the favourite Brāhmaṇical doctrine of the Śūdra’s divinely ordained duty of service. A slight tincture of humanity is found in a text of Jaimini’s Mimāmsāsūtras to the effect that a man making a gift of everything in the Viśva-jit sacrifice cannot give away the Śūdra who waits upon him out of duty. Yājñavalkya, Nārada¹⁷ and Kātyāyanas lay down in the same spirit the maxim that slavery should be in the anuloma and not in the pratiloma order. Nārada making a significant exception in the case of one who has renounced the duties of his order. Viṣṇu⁴⁹ imposes the penalty of the highest amercement upon a person who employs an individual of high caste in servile work. Kātyāyana⁵⁰ goes so far as to declare categorically that slavery pertains to the three lower classes but not to the Brāhmaṇas, and he further declares, if Caṇḍeśvara’s reading of the text⁵¹ be accepted as correct, that a Brāhmaṇa should not be enslaved even by an individual of his own caste. When a Brāhmaṇa is enslaved, Kātyāyana continues, the king’s lustre is destroyed, and he

---

₄⁵ Śūdraśca dharmaśāstratvāt, Mimāmsāsūtras, vi. 7. 6.
₄₆ 11. 183.
₄₈ Quoted in Parāśaramādhava, Bib. Ind. ed., p. 341. [=Kane, KSS., v. 716].
₄₉ Quoted, ibid., p. 154.
₅₀ Quoted in Vivādaratnakara, p. 152. [=Kane, KSS.; v. 715].
₅₁ Caṇḍeśvara reads: samavarnepi viprantu dāsatvam naiva kārayet. On the other hand Mādhava’s reading of this passage (Par., p. 342) is ‘asavarnena iti viprasya dāsatvam naiva kārayet,’ which he takes to imply that a Brāhmaṇa could be the slave of a person of his own class. Kane, KSS., v. 717 also gives the reading samavarnopviprantu on the authority of Aparārka etc. as well as that of samavarnepi according to Devanābhaṭṭa’s Smṛti-Candrikā.
quotes Bṛhaspati to the effect that while the rule of the Kṣatriya, the Vaiśya and the Śūdra permits their enslavement by persons of their own order, a Brāhmaṇa should not be employed on servile work. In the same spirit Kātyāyana declares the sale or purchase of a Brāhmaṇa woman into slavery to be invalid and the seller or buyer thereof to be punishable.

It would seem to follow from the above that the general tendency of the Dharmaśastras was to eliminate, or at least restrict, the class of high-born slaves. It was apparently for this reason that the condition of the slave in the Smṛti literature shows, on the whole, as compared with the Arthaśāstra, a change for the worse. Kauṭilya, e.g., mentions the act of causing the removal of dead bodies or ordure or urine or the leavings of food by a pledged person to involve forfeiture of the deposit. On the other hand Nārada tacitly sanctions this treatment by including the pledged person in his list of slaves for whom work of an impure character such as that mentioned above is expressly reserved. More explicit is the testimony of Kātyāyana who reserves work of the above kind for the issue of female slaves. Again Kauṭilya, in the context in which the above passage occurs, mentions various penalties for maltreat-

52 Kane, KSS., v, 718. Kātyāyana indeed declares that when a Brāhmaṇa performs servile work out of his own free will, it must not be of an impure character. See the text quoted in Par., p. 342 and Vivāda., p. 152, together with the commentary of Madhava.

53 ādadyād-brāhmaṇāṁ yastu vikriṇīta tathāiva ca|
    rājīṁ tadakṛtam kāryam daṇḍyāh synh sarva eva te|| Kane, KSS.,
    v, 726.

54 ut, 13.

55 v, 6; 26.

56 Kane KSS., v, 720.
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ment of different kinds of slaves. For keeping in a state of nudity or tormenting or punishing a pledged person, *e.g.*, the deposit-money is to be forfeited. For improper conduct (*atikramaṇa*) towards women of this class the same penalty is ordained, and if these belong to various specified classes of nurses and attendants, they are decreed to be liberated. For violating a pledged female nurse without her consent, the punishment should be the first or the middle amercement, according as the woman is under the offender’s own control or not. For corrupting a pledged girl of this class the deposit-money should be forfeited, and the marriage portion (*śukla*) should be paid along with double the amount as fine. For selling or pledging a pregnant female slave without providing for her maintenance (*dāsim vā sagarbhāmapratiṣṭhitabharmanyām*), the offender along with the purchaser and the person contracting should be punished with the first amercement. The same punishment should be inflicted for selling or pledging by force in a foreign land and on mean work a person less than eight years of age belonging to certain specified classes of slaves. For again selling or mortgaging a male or female slave after having once redeemed such a person, a fine of twelve *paṇas* should be levied unless the slave gives his consent thereto. In the body of the Brāhmaṇical Smṛtis such wise and humane rules are in general completely absent. Yājñavalkya indeed imposes a fine upon a man violating a female

57 In another place 11, 12 Kauṭilya decrees similar penalties for defiling the free daughter of a male or of a female slave as well as a female suitable for ransom.

58 11, 290.
slave. With this may be compared a provision of Kāṭyāyana\textsuperscript{59} inflicting a fine upon a person who, though well off, sells a female slave faithful to her master and unwilling to part from him. Manu\textsuperscript{60} on the other hand, sanctions the right of chastisement with respect to an offending wife, son, uterine brother, pupil and slave, while making the important reservation that the infliction of chastisement on a “noble part” of the body is punishable as theft.

As with the personal rights of the slave, so with his rights of property. Kauṭilya\textsuperscript{61} allows the self-sold slave along with the born slave and the person pledged, to retain what he earns without prejudice to his master’s work and even inherit from his ancestors. In the same context he permits the slave acquired by purchase to transmit his property to his kinsmen in whose default alone it should vest in the master. On the other hand Manu\textsuperscript{62} lays down the remarkable dictum repeated later on by Nārada,\textsuperscript{63} Devala and Kāṭyāyana,\textsuperscript{64} to the effect that the wife, the son and the slave have no property of their own and whatever they earn belongs to their owner. Exceptions to this general rule, however, are made by the writers abovementioned.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[59] Kane, KSS., v, 729:—
\begin{verbatim}
vikroṣaṃānāṃ yo bhaktāṃ dāśīṃ vikṛtumnicchati
anāpadiśtaḥ saktah sanprāṇuyād-duśatam damanś|
\end{verbatim}
\item[60] vii. 299-300.
\item[61] iii. 13.
\item[62] vii. 416: bhāryā putraśca dāśīca traya evādhanaḥ smṛtāḥ|
yatte samādhibaccabhiḥ yasta te tasya taddhanam|
\item[63] v, 41.
\item[64] Quoted in Vivāda, p. 150. [=Kane, KSS., v. 724 which is as follows:—
\begin{verbatim}
dāsaṣya tu dhanam yasyāśvānī tasya prabhuh smṛteḥ|
prakāṣaṃ vikrayādyaita na svāmī dhanamarbati||
\end{verbatim}
\end{footnotes}
expressly in the case of the wife and the son and by implication in the case of the slave. Manu and Yājñavalkya, indeed, expressly permit a Sudra father to give at his discretion a share of the inheritance to his son by a female slave. Yājñavalkya adds that in such a case when the father dies, the slave’s son should have a half share if there are legitimate sons, and a full share if there are no such sons and no daughter’s sons. In the passage above quoted, Kātyāyana excepts from the general rule relating to the slave’s disability of ownership property acquired by means of ‘open sale’.

Turning to the rules of emancipation, we find the same difference in the spirit of the Arthasastra and the Dharmaśāstra. Kauṭilya permits the self-sold slave together with the born slave and the person pledged to purchase their freedom, provision being made in the case of the former that the ransom should correspond to the price paid (prakṣeṇapāṇurūpasāṣayā niskrayah). For neglecting to liberate the slave on payment of a corresponding ransom, and for detaining a slave without reason, Kauṭilya prescribes a small fine. In the same context he declares that the person enslaved by way of punishment (daṇḍapraṇīta) should receive his freedom by performing work and the free-

65 See e.g., Manu, ix, 194, 206; Yāj., ii, 114, 118-119.
66 ix, 179.
67 ii, 133.
68 ii, 134.
69 Kane, KSS., v, 724.—Prakāṣam vikrayādyattu na svāmi dhana-marbatu. Kane, KSS., p. 267n thinks that the reading prasādavikrayāt in place of prakāṣam vikrayāt in Vācaspatimiśra’s Vaiśṇavacintāmani gives the better sense. The whole passage would then mean ‘what the slave gets through the favour of his master and the price he got by selling himself do not belong to the master.’
70 iii, 13.
man taken captive in war (aryaprāṇo dbuajāytyah) by means of work or else of half its money equivalent. In fact Kauṭilya's only bar against redemption seems to embrace the cases of a person self-pledged becoming an outcast once, a person pledged by others becoming so twice, and these persons trying to escape to a foreign kingdom once (sakrātmādhātā niṣpatitāḥ sidet dviranyenābitakah sakṛdubbaḥ paravisyābbimukhau).

On the other hand, Nārada makes it impossible except in the cases to be noted presently, for his first four classes of slaves to win freedom otherwise than by the favour of their masters. With respect to the pledged person, Nārada's rule is practically the same, for he declares that such an individual can be released when his master redeems him and becomes equal to a slave when he is allowed to be taken in lieu of payment of debt. In the same connection Nārada ordains, in direct contravention of the rule of Kauṭilya above quoted, that a person voluntarily selling himself into slavery is incapable of release from servitude. It must be mentioned in explanation of this attitude that both Manu and Yājñavalkya rank the selling of one's own self among the upapātakas. The Smṛtikāras, moreover, introduce characteristically enough a new ground of disability by making the apostate from asceticism (pravrajyāvasita) the king's slave and for ever incapable of release. While Kauṭilya decrees a

71 v, 29. 72 v, 32. 73 v, 37. 74 XI, 59. 75 III, 340. 76 Cf. Yāj., ii, 183; Nār., v, 35. Cf. Kane, KSS., v, 731:—

pravrajyāvasito daso moktavyasa na kenaśca |
anākālabhyta dasyāmnucyata goyugam dadaśa |
Rangaswami, A.K. v, 90:—

pravrajyāvasito yatra punardarān samābarat |

nāsau svāmi bhaavotttatra daso byeṣa vigārtayat||. 77 Loc. cit.
female slave bearing a child to her master to be forthwith released along with her offspring, the Smṛtis with the single exception of Kātyāyana⁷⁸ make no such provision. Manu⁷⁹ on the other hand states in one place that a free woman by marrying a male slave is herself reduced to servitude. In fact the only important concession made in the Dharmaśāstras in favour of the slaves seems to be that one reduced to slavery by force or sold into slavery by robbers together with a slave rescuing his master’s life from grave peril, is decreed forthwith to be liberated from servitude.⁸⁰ Nārada,⁸¹ indeed, states that in the last-mentioned case the slave should take a son’s share of his master’s wealth. For the rest the methods of emancipation in the Dharmaśāstras are practically the same as those of the Arthaśāstra, allowing of course for the merely tacit recognition of the slave’s right ownership in the former instance. One who becomes a slave for maintenance (bhaktadāsa), according to Yājñavalkya⁸² and Nārada,⁸³ is released by giving up his subsistence,—Yājñavalkya adds, also by giving a ransom. One who has been maintained during famine, Nārada goes on,⁸⁴ is released by giving a pair of cows, one who has been enslaved for debt by repaying the sum with interest, one enslaved for a stipulated period by the expiry of his term, one who has voluntarily offer-

⁷⁸ svadāsīṃ yastu samgacchētpravātā ca bhavettatabh|
           avekṣya bijam kāryā syānma dāsi sānvayā tu sā|| Kane, KSS., v. 723.
⁷⁹ Quoted in Vīvāda, p. 150: dāsenodāḥ svaddāsi yā sāpi dāśtvamāṇyuṣīyāt
           yasmādhhūtaḥ prabhuiśrayaḥ svāmyadhīnaḥ prabhuryataḥ.
⁸⁰ Cf. Yāj., ii, 182; Nār., v, 30, 38.
⁸¹ v, 30.  ⁸² ii, 182.  ⁸³ v, 36.
⁸⁴ v, 31-36. [Kātyāyana, Kane, KSS., v. 731 repeats Nārada’s rule relating to emancipation of persons maintained during famine].
ed himself together with a person taken captive in war and one won in a stake by giving a substitute of equal capacity for work; one who has accepted slavery for the sake of a female slave is released by giving her up.

A word may be added here regarding the status of the emancipated slave. In an oft-quoted passage\textsuperscript{85} Manu says that a Śūdra, though emancipated by his master, is not released from servitude, a doctrine which he bases upon his dictum of the Śūdra’s inherent nature. Nārada,\textsuperscript{86} however, appears to state that when a slave is emancipated, his food may be eaten, his presents may be accepted, and he may be respected by worthy persons.

\textsuperscript{85} viii, 414: \textit{na svāminā nisṛto'pi Śūdro dāśyādvimucyate| nisargajam bi tat tasya kāstasmāt tadopābati.}

\textsuperscript{86} Quoted in Parāśaramādhava, p. 347.
SOME CURRENT VIEWS OF THE ORIGIN AND
NATURE OF HINDU KINGSHIP CONSIDERED

I

In his work entitled *Hindu Polity*, Dr. K. P. Jayaswal treats *inter alia* the speculations of the ancient Indian thinkers relating to the origin of kingship, or more generally, of the State. His views on this important subject, needless to say, deserve the most careful consideration of every student of Indian antiquities, and it is this task which we propose to take up here.

Let us begin by analysing the principal points of his thesis:

I The "Vedic theory" implied that kingship had its origin in war, or to state more correctly, in election under the stress of war. This "suggests that the institution of kingship was borrowed [by the Aryans] from the Dravidians."  

II The "Arājaka democrats" who propounded a "theory of extreme individualism" held that the State was founded on the basis of Social Contract.  

III The "political writers" (otherwise called the "scientists") laid down a "contractual theory of the origin of monarchy" which was a monarchist adaptation of the "republican theory of contract."  

IV The theory of the *Manusambhitā* which was the "nearest Hindu approach to the divine theory of kingship" had "no direct support in earlier literature." It was started to "support an abnormal state of affairs opposed to law and tradi-

tion, viz., political rule by Brahmin” (sic), and was “never approved or adopted by a single subsequent law-book.”

V From the above it follows that the Hindu king was held to be “a servant of the State” or “virtually a constitutional slave” and that his office was taken to be “a trust.”

I As regards the Vedic theory of the origin of kingship the text quoted by Dr. Jayaswal is not the only evidence bearing on this point. Assuming, as Dr. Jayaswal does, that the divine sovereignty of Indra can rightly be taken to be a reflex of the human sovereignty of the earthly king, we have to mention in this connexion at least one other Vedic ākhyāyika which leads to a quite different conclusion. The whole passage may be quoted in full. “Prajāpatirindramasrajatā-nuñavaram devānām, tam prābīṇot/ para bi/, eteṣām devānām adhipatiredbiti/ tam deva abruvan/, kastuamasi/ vayam vai tvacch-reyāmsah/ sma iti mā deva avocanniti/, atha vā idam tarbi prajāpatata barā āsit/ yadasminnāditye/, tadenamabravit/ etanme prayaccha/ atbāhametesām devānām-adhipatirbbaivyāmīti/, ko’ham syāmityabravit/, etat praddayeti/, etat syā ityabravit/ yadetat braviṣṭi/, ko na vai nāma prajāpatih/ ya evam veda/, vidurenām nāmnā/, tadasmai rukmaṃ kṛtva prayamunācitt/ tato vā indro devānāmadhipatirbravat/.” It is evident that what we have here is not a theory of election, but of creation of kingship by the will of the Supreme Deity. Let us quote another text, almost certainly taken from a Brāhmaṇa, which expresses in the

6 Ait. Br., i, 14.
clearest terms the divine creation of the human King. It is cited from an unknown āmnāya by Viśvarūpa, the author of the earliest extant commentary on the Yājñavalkya Smṛti. The text in part is as follows:—

Sabha vā idam-abhavat, devās-ca manuṣyās-ca, te yado-pakārair-na sekur-manuşyān-ātmikartum atha devās-tirobha-bhūvah, tān Prajāpati-abraviit-kaḥ prajāḥ pālayita bhūvi sarve 'antarbitāḥ sthaḥ asaṁrakṣyamānāḥ prajā adbharmārditās tyakṣyaṁcitāḥ pradānām-upajīvanam-asākham-iti' te devāḥ Prajāpatim abrivaḥ 'puruṣamārtim rājaṇām karavāma Somād rūpaṁ-ādāy-Adityāt tejo vikramam-atha Indrād Viṣṇo-vijāyaṁ Vaiṣravaṇaṁ tyāgaṁ Yamāt samyamanamiti.' (The gods and men failed to bring the people under their control through benevolence. Then the gods disappeared. When Prajāpati enquired as to who should protect the peoples, the gods replied that they would create a king in the form of a man by taking different qualities from the different deities). As regards the further observation of Dr. Jayaswal that Ait. Br., i, 14 suggests the institution of kingship to have been borrowed by the Indo-Aryans from the Dravidians, it must, we are afraid, be treated as too original to deserve any serious notice. For its acceptance involves a number of unproved assumptions. These are:—

1 that in pre-Aryan times the Dravidians had kings,

2 that the aborigines with whom the Aryans came in contact belonged ethnically to the Dravidian stock,

3 that the Aryans with their known aversion towards the aborigines did not hesitate to borrow one of their most important institutions from them.

Nor, again, does the evidence of historical analogy support Dr. Jayaswal’s theory. In the parallel case of the Anglo-Saxon invaders of Britain, it was not by borrowing from the conquered people but through the necessities of the situation which called for a common and permanent leader in war, that the institution of kingship, as is generally held, came into general use.

II No. 2 is a brilliant example of the author’s ingenuity in discovering the hidden meaning of familiar facts. Before the publication of the *Hindu Polity*, ‘arājaka’ was held in all quarters to have only one meaning relating to ‘kinglessness’ or ‘anarchy’. But Dr. Jayaswal with characteristic boldness gives it an original significance in the sense of a ‘non-ruler State’ and accords it a place in his list of Hindu ‘technical constitutions.’ By it he means an idealistic constitution in which law instead of an individual was taken to be the ruler and which was based on “mutual agreement or social contract between the citizens.”

Now what are the grounds on which this novel interpretation of a very familiar term is sought to be based? “The technical Arājaka,” we are told, “does not mean anarchy” as this is indicated by “a special term mātsyanyāya.” But that Arājaka was a technical term and not, as is ordinarily held, a popular expression for anarchy, is precisely the point requiring to be proved. The sole evidence on which Dr. Jayaswal relies is the well-known and oft-quoted text of the Jaina Ayārānga Sutta (11, 3. 1. 10) forbidding monks and nuns to pass through certain countries which are specified as follows:—

8 *Hindu Polity*, part 1, p. 97 n.
arāyāṇi vā gaṇarāyāṇi vā juvarāyāṇi vā dorajjāṇi vā
verajjāṇi vā viruddbarajjāṇi vā.

Here there is nothing to justify Dr. Jayaswal’s assumption of reference to a non-ruler or Law-State and consequently his interpretation of arājaka must be dismissed as not proven.¹⁰

Having thus invoked an imaginary ‘Arājaka constitution’ “based on the rule of law,” Dr. Jayaswal must needs father on its exponents an equally imaginary theory of the basis of the State. The texts quoted by Dr. Jayaswal¹⁰ in support of his view occur in the course of the two well-known stories of the origin of monarchy in the Śāntiparvan (chs. LIX and LXVII). Now admitting that the Śāntiparvan in its existing form has incorporated a mass of earlier materials, one may be permitted to doubt very much whether a portion of the text torn from its context and not described (as the ancient narratives are) in the form of itihāsam purātanam, can safely be attributed to a class of authors (‘Arājaka democrats’) whose existence is unknown to history.

III The theories of the origin of kingship in the Artha-
sāstra, the Manusambhitā, and the Mahābhārata, which Dr. Jayaswal ascribes to the ‘political writers’ (or the ‘scientists’) are undoubtedly very remarkable of their kind. But to characterize them as examples of the contractual origin of kingship is to

¹⁰ We may quote here the version of H. Jacobi who translates (SBE., Vol. xxii, p. 138) the whole passage as follows:—‘A monk or a nun on the pilgrimage whose road (lies through) a country where there is no king or many kings or an unanointed king or two governments or no government or a weak government, should if there be some other place for walking about or friendly districts, not choose the former road for their voyage.’

give an altogether one-sided, and therefore imperfect, view of their true nature. For, first, let it be noted that the person with whom the 'contract' is supposed to be made is not an ordinary mortal but is a superhuman being,—Manu Vaivasvata, progenitor of the present race of living beings,\textsuperscript{10b} Manu the father of the human race,\textsuperscript{11} or else Praðhu who traced his descent from Virajas, the mind-begotten son of Brahmā.\textsuperscript{12} In the first instance, again, the theory of election is supplemented by that of quasi-sanctity of the king, from which follows the doctrine of sinfulness of slighting royalty.\textsuperscript{13} In the last two cases we are told in graphic language how it was by the direct act of the supreme god, Brahmā or Viṣṇu, moved thereto by the acute distress of the people, that a ruler was set over them.\textsuperscript{14} How very remote this is from the idea of 'contractual origin of kingship!' And going back for a moment to the three accounts above mentioned, we are tempted to ask how very one-sided after all is the element of contract that actually enters into their composition. In the Arthaśāstra the contract is implied and not expressed, and its result is stated to be that the king is spiritually responsible for his misgovernment, while he is entitled to his usual one-sixth share even from hermits dwelling in the forest. It follows that the subjects have no explicit authority to bring the king to account

\begin{footnotes}
\item[10b] Arthaśāstra, 1, 13.
\item[11] Sāñtiparvan, Ch. LXVII.
\item[12] Ibid., Ch. LIX.
\item[13] Arthaśāstra, 1, 13: \textit{Indrayamashānametadrāyaragah pratyakṣahapradhānāsādāh/tānāvamanyamanam daivo'pi daṇḍah śṛṇitu/ tasmādṛṣṭāno nāvamantavyāḥ/}
\item[14] Cf. Sānti, LIX, 87 ff.; Ibid., LXVII, 20 ff.
\end{footnotes}
for his misdeeds and inflict upon him temporal penalties, but he must needs be made subject to spiritual sanctions. Similarly in ch. LXVII of the Sāntiparvan the people are said to have entered into an agreement with Manu, the king-designate, but the agreement which was meant to overcome Manu’s reluctance to rule only stipulated for the subjects’ payment of the royal dues and their granting the king immunity from their own sins.\(^{15}\) In ch. LIX, it is true, Pṛthu, the first ‘king’ (rājan) is said after his miraculous birth to have complied with a long list of promises ending in the famous pratiṣṭēna (‘coronation-oath’).\(^{16}\) But Dr. Jayaswal, while quoting the context in which this important statement occurs in full, fails to reproduce the whole story and thus helps to present a distorted version of its true constitutional significance. For, in the lines following those describing Pṛthu’s consecration, Bhṛṣma is made to explain, obviously in reply to the latter part of Yudhiṣṭhira’s query (‘why does one man rule over the many who are his equals in all respects’?), that the Lord Viṣṇu entered the person of the king, whence kings are reverenced by the people as gods. Why should the people submit to one man, the royal sage goes on, except for his divine quality? A god is born on earth as king after his stock of spiritual merit is exhausted, and is endowed with Viṣṇu’s divine majesty. As he is established by the gods, no one transcends him and every person submits to his authority.\(^{17}\) It will be seen from the above that the idea of the coronatio-oath is here swamped, if not superseded, by that of

\(^{15}\) loc. cit., 22, 29.


\(^{17}\) Sānti., LIX, 128, 131, 134-35.
the king’s divine nature which is explicitly declared to be the basis of his rule over his subjects.

IV The well-known account of the origin of kingship in the *Māṇavadharmaśāstra* undoubtedly carries the king’s authority to a high pitch. But is it correct to state that it had “no direct support in the earlier literature”? The divine creation of the human king is already foreshadowed in the story of the creation of Indra’s sovereignty by Prajāpati in the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* that we have cited above. Furthermore, the description of the coronation ritual in the *Brāhmaṇas* would itself without “twisting” “support” the theory of the king’s divine nature. In the accounts of the great ceremonies of royal consecration in the *Brāhmaṇas*, we are again and again told how the *yajamāna* is raised by the sacred act of the ritual to the status of the gods. The following passages that are relevant to this case may be mentioned in this connexion. The *Sat. Br.*, explaining one of the rites of the *Vājapeya*, says (v. 2, 2, 14-15): 

\[ \text{tad-Brhaspater-evainam-etasāyujyāṁ salokatāṁ gamayati/ devebhyo nivedayatyām mahāvīryo yo' bhyāse-} \]

\[ \text{cītyayām yuṣmākaiko' bhūt-tam gopāyateti.} \]

In another place (v. 2, 1, 11) it states: 

\[ \text{prajāpateḥ praśaḥ abhūmeti prajāpaterbyeṣa praśaḥ bhavati yo vājapeyena yajate.} \]

In connexion with the *Rājasūya*, we have the following: *Sat. Br.*, v. 4, 3, 4: \[ \text{eṣā Indro bhavati yacca kṣatriyo yadu ca yaj-} \]

18 “He thus makes him attain to the fellowship of Brhaspati and to co-existence in the world.....Him thus indicated, he thereby indicates to the gods: ‘Of mighty powers is he who has been consecrated: he has become one of yours; protect him!’ thus he thereby says” (*SBE.*, Vol. xli, p. 41).

19 He who offers the *Vājapeya* indeed becomes Prajāpati’s child” (*SBE.*, Vol. xli, p. 32).
mānāh.20 On the Asvamedha, Sat. Br., xiii, 4. 4. 3 says: tad yādenam devaiḥ sāmāyantī devaivevainam tataslokaṁ kurvanti,21 Taitt. Br., iii, 9. 20. 2: aśvenāiva medhyena prajāpateḥ sānyujyam salokatāmāpnoti/ etāsāmeva devatānām sānyujyam sārṣṭitām samānaloκatām āpnoti yo’śvamedbhena yajate. This doctrine of divine sanctity of the Kṣatriya yajamāna or the king is held in one important Brāhmaṇa passage to be the basis of his rule over his subjects. We refer to Sat. Br., v. 1. 5. 14 where it is said that with reference to a Rājasūya rite making the sacrificer shoot to a certain distance with an arrow, ‘tad yad rājanyah pravidhyati eṣa vai prajāpateḥ prayaksatamāṃ yad rājanyastasma’d-ekah san-bahūnāmiṣte.22

Not merely in its antecedents but also in its later history is the Mānava account of the origin of kingship related to other canonical works. It would indeed be exceedingly strange if one of the most characteristic doctrines of the Manusamhitā were “not” to be “approved or adopted by a single subsequent law-book.” For was it not a smṛti writer who declared: vedārthopaniḥbaddhavatvāḥ prādhānyāṃ hi manoh smṛtam/, manvarthaviparitātāḥ yā smṛṭih sā vināśyati.23 Nor does the reason

20 “He is Indra for a two-fold reason, namely, because he is a Kṣatriya and because he is a sacrificer” (SBE, Vol. xli, pp. 98-99).
21 “The reason why they thus sing of him along with the gods is that they thereby make him share the same world with the gods” (SBE., Vol. xliv, p. 372).
22 “And as to why a Rājanya shoots, he, the Rājanya, is most manifestly of Prajāpati (the lord of creatures); hence, while being one, he rules over many” (SBE., Vol. xli, p. 25).
23 Bṛhaspati quoted by Kullūka in his commentary on Manusmrīti, i, 1: For this verse see also Bṛhaspatismṛti reconstructed by K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, GOS., Vol. lxxv, Baroda 1941, p. 233, v. 13 where it is found
advanced by Dr. Jayaswal for the alleged unique character of Manu's theory commend itself to our approval. For assuming that the Mānavadharmaśāstra was written to support the rule of the Brāhmaṇa Puṣyamitra, was not "political rule by a Brāhmaṇa" sanctioned by the Smṛtis as an āpeddharma? Reverting to the point which immediately concerns us, what is the evidence tending to show that Manu's theory "failed miserably"? Dr. Jayaswal claims the authority of constitutional writers to the effect that the Mānav doctrine was transformed into a "divine theory of the servitude of the king to the subject." But the only "writer" who holds this view is the author of the Śukranītī, and his famous doctrine (1. 188) is not even once mentioned or alluded to by Dr. Jayaswal either in the present context or in the two chapters to which reference is made in the footnote. On the other hand theories of kingship resembling that of Manu are found in many of the later "law-books" and Purānas. We have room for a few examples. Nārada:—raṣṭaṁbhairādiśatuvādhibhitānugrabadarśanāt/, yadeva kurute rājā tatpramāṇamiti sthitiḥ/; nirbalo'pi yathā striṇām pūjya eva patiḥ sadā/ praśānāṁ vigno' pycvam pūjya eva praśāpatiḥ/; paśca rūpāṇi rājāno dhārayantyamitaujasaḥ/

with a few verbal changes. Equally significant is the preceding verse (v. 12) of the Bhāspatīṁśti just mentioned. It is as follows: 'tāvacchāśāṇi sabbante tarkavyākaraṇāṇi ca/ dharmārthabhamokṣopadeśā manuvāyamana-

dṛṣyate/' (The sciences, dialectics and grammar flourish as long as Manu the teacher of Virtue, Wealth and Salvation is not perceived).

24 Cf. Manu, x, 81; Yāj., iii, 3, 5 etc. Medhātithi commenting on the former verse says: yadāśya sarīrakṣaṁbahanitakarmāvasād bhavanti...tadā kaśtriyaavas grāmanagarākṣadinā śastrābhārayena sati sambhave sarvādhī-
pattyaṇa jīvet.

24a Jolly's ed., sec. xvii, vv. 22, 26, 52b, 54-5.
agnermdrasya somasya yamasya dhanadasya ca//; śuciscaivā-
sucih samyak-kathāṁ rāja na daivatam//; loke'sminmaṅgalān-
āśān brahmāṇa gaurbhaṭāṇaḥ/, hiranyam sarpir-aśitya āpo
rāja tathāṭaṁ//, etāṁ satatam paśyennamasyedarcahyā svamyam/
pradaksinām ca kurvita yathāśāyaḥ pravardhate//
Bṛhatparāśara24b: ājñā nrpāṇām paramāṁ bi tejo yastāṁ na
manyeta sa śastravadyah śrūyaścaka kuryācaka vadeccaa bhubhr-
tadeva kāryaṁ bhūvi sarvalokaṁ//, durbhāratañvāṁśusamāna-
dipti-brūyaṁnanusyaḥ paraśaṁ nrpaśyaṁ yastasya tejo'pya-
vamanayāṁnaḥ sadyaṁ sa pañcaivamupaiti pāpāt//.

V To argue in the face of the above that in the Hindu
theory the king was "a servant of the State" and his office was
"a trust" is to admit the validity of one set of facts to the exclu-
sion of another set of at least equal indisputability. How strong
a spell the sentiment of divine sanctity of the king cast upon the
Hindu mind may best be gauged from its survival down to
modern times. In a famous Bengal Vaśīţava work of the early
seventeenth century A.C., a Hindu officer of the Moslem court
is represented quite naturally as addressing his master, an
unconsecrated foreigner, as a part of Viṣṇu.25 And is it not a
matter of common knowledge that to the present day the Raja
of Puri is popularly known as Calanti Viṣṇu (a moving Viṣṇu)?

* * * * *

24b Quoted in Viramitrodaya, Rājanīṭaprabāśa, Benares ed., p. 23.
25 See the Caitanyacaritāṁtyam of Kṛṣṇadīsa Kavirāja, Madhyalițā, ch. 1.
The passage referred to occurs in the course of the address of the Dabir Khas
to Alauddin Hussain Shah, and runs as follows:—tumi narādhipa bha Viṣṇu
aṁka sama. (You are a king, equal to a part of Viṣṇu).
Having considered Dr. K. P. Jayaswal’s views about Ancient Indian Kingship, we shall briefly notice his analysis of Hindu Imperial Systems. In his work *Hindu Polity* he distinguishes three main types of empire to have existed in Ancient India—*Adhipatya*, *Sāvabhauma*, and *Sāmrājya*—which he interprets respectively as ‘Suzerainty’ (or ‘Over-protection’), ‘pan-country Sovereignty’ (or ‘One-king empire’) and ‘Federal Imperialism’. These interpretations are sought to be based partly on the etymology of the terms in question and partly on the evidence of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* and are sought to be justified by means of recorded instances in history and legend.

Now the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, in course of its exposition of ‘the Great Consecration ceremony’ (*Mabhābhiṣeka*) of the king of gods, and its copy, ‘the Great Consecration’ of the king of men, mentions a ‘stock list’ of the various positions which fall to the lot of one consecrated under this ceremony. This comprises, besides a long list of descriptive epithets, the terms *Sāmrājya*, *Bhaujya*, *Svārājya*, *Vairājya*, *Rājya*, *Pāraneṣṭhyā*, *Māhrājya*, *Adhipatya*, *Svāvasya*, and *Ātiṣṭha*. These terms, it may be added, are associated in the same context with the peoples of different quarters or regions. Thus we have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sāmrājya</td>
<td>The Eastern peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhaujya</td>
<td>The Satvants in the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svārājya</td>
<td>The Southern and Western peoples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 Part ii, pp. 195 ff.
27 viii, 12-19.
28 *Ait. Br.*, viii, 14. (relating to the *Mabhābhiṣeka* of Indra). In the corresponding passage (*ibid.*, viii, 19) relating to the *Mabhābhiṣeka* of kings, the same arrangement is maintained except that Māhrājya—and the following terms are connected with the middle region.
The Uttarakurus and Uttaramadras beyond the Himālayas.

The Kuru-Paṅcālas with the Vasas and Uśinaras in the middle,

while Paramēṣṭhya, Māhrājya, Adhipatya, Svāvāsya and Ātīṣṭha are connected more fancifully with the upward quarter. It is evident that the terms just mentioned have to be understood more or less as technical designations. All the other expressions used in the above context should preferably be taken to be descriptive of royal (or imperial) authority. Such is the case with the term Sārvabhauma in the passage referred to by Dr. Jayaswal, which may be quoted here in Keith’s translation 29:

"If he who knows thus should desire of a Kṣatriya, ‘May he win all victories, find all the worlds, attain the superiority, pre-eminence and supremacy over all kings, and over-lordship, paramount rule, self-rule, sovereignty, supreme authority, kingship, great kingship and suzerainty; may he be all encompassing, possessed of all the earth (Sārvabhaumah), possessed of all life, from the one end upto the further side of the earth bounded by the ocean, sole ruler’, etc.

29 Rigveda Brāhmaṇas, pp. 331-32. In the original the text (viii. 15) is as follows:—Sa ya icched evamvīt kṣatriyamāyaṁ sarvā jūṭa-jayetayaṁ sarvalokān-vindetayaṁ sarvesaṁ rājānaṁ śraīṣṭhyam-ātiṣṭhān paramatām gaccheta sāmrājyaṁ bhaujyaṁ svārājyaṁ vairājyaṁ pārameṣṭhyaṁ rājyaṁ māhrājyaṁ-adhipatyaṁ-ayaṁ samantaparyāyī syāt-sārvabhaumah sārvāyaṁ āṅtād-āparārdhāṁ-prthivyai samudrāparyāntayā ekarādhiti...sa ya icched-evamvīt-kṣatriyāhām sarvā jūṭa-jayetāh-ābāṁ sarvalokān vindeyam-ābāṁ sarvesaṁ rājānaṁ śraīṣṭhyam-ātiṣṭhām paramatām gaccheyam sāmrājyaṁ bhaujyaṁ svārājyaṁ vairājyaṁ pārameṣṭhyaṁ rājyaṁ māhrājyaṁ-adhipatyaṁ-ābāṁ samantaparyāyī syāṁ sārvabhaumah sārvāyaṁ āṅtād-āparārdhāṁ prthivyai samudrāparyāntayā ekarādhiti.
"If a Kṣatriya who knows thus desire, 'May I win all victories, find all worlds, attain the superiority, pre-eminence and supremacy over all kings and over-lordship, paramount rule, self-rule, sovereignty, supreme authority, kingship, great kingship and suzerainty, may I be all encompassing, possessed of all the earth (Sārvabhauma), possessed of all life, from the one end upto the further side of the earth bounded by the ocean sole ruler', etc.

'Sārvabhauma', then, in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa implies not so much a specific kind of empire, as a rather vague description of imperial authority. Dr. Jayaswal, indeed, finds in the above-quoted text of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa an explanation of this term. He writes\(^\text{30}\):—"The wish to be a Sārvabhauma is expressed to become (sic) (the sole) monarch of the land up to its (natural) frontiers, up to the sea, over all human beings."\(^\text{31}\) But it may be asked whether the phrase 'sārvāyuṣa āntād-āparārdhāt prthiyayai samudraparyantāyā ekarāt' following immediately after Sārvabhauma should not rather be regarded as forming along with the latter a part of the vague description of royal and imperial authority.

In connexion with the present subject Dr. Jayaswal\(^\text{32}\) throws out the suggestion that the ideal of Sārvabhauma "probably arose in Magadha whence the field for conquest lay open up to the Bay of Bengal; its non-Aryan population, unlike the Aryan janas or nations of the Doab, was no moral barrier to the Hindu imperialist." But all the traditions of empire in the East attach themselves, as Dr. Jayaswal's own citations\(^\text{33}\) from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and from the story of Jarāsandha in the Mahābhārata show, to the conception of sāmrājiya, not that of sārvabhauma. Dr. Jayaswal observes in the same context that the Sārva-


\(^{31}\) The reference is to the Ait. Br., text cited above, viii, 15.


bhauma system was extended "even to the Aryan India (sic) by the kings of Magadha, which (sic) shocked the principle of jana-rājya." But the Purānic evidence on which Dr. Jayaswal relies shows that the "Hindu historians" were "shocked" not at the establishment of 'ekarājya' and 'ekacchatra' by Mahāpadma, but because he belonged to the despised Śūdra caste and exterminated the Kṣatriyas. We quote below the passage in full.\textsuperscript{31} In truth, the application of the 'one-king idea of Empire' 'to Aryan India' could not have been a great innovation in the time of Mahāpadma. Already had Kosala shown the way by its annexation of the 'Aryan' kingdom of Kāśi. As Dr. Jayaswal himself observes in another context,\textsuperscript{32} "Competition [for Sārvabhauma] follows between the three [viz., Kosala, Avanti, and Magadha], and Magadha finally wins under Nandavardhana."

Let us next turn to the term ādhipatyā. Dr. Jayaswal explains it\textsuperscript{36} as "an overlordship embracing protected states" and more fully, as "an imperial system in which suzerainty or 'over-protection' (ādhipatyā) on (sic) states outside its frontier was

\textsuperscript{34} Pargiter, Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 25:—


exercised by the dominant state.” This explanation is based on the argument that the phrase ‘āyam samantaparyāyī syāt’ occurring in the above-quoted text of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (viii. 15) immediately after ‘ādhipatyam’ is synonymous with the latter. Without denying the technical character of the term in question in the Brāhmaṇa period, for which indeed there is independent evidence,37 we think that here again the succeeding phrase in the Ait. Br. text is a part of the general description of royal and imperial authority.

The last point that remains to be considered is the significance of the term ‘Sāmrājya.’ Here there can be no doubt that some kind of Empire or at least over-lordship is meant.38 Dr. Jayaswal, however, translates39 the term “in modern phraseology” into “a Federal Imperial system.” This is one of those instances of bold and reckless identifications of Ancient Indian with European political institutions which abound in the Hindu Polity. For, to confine ourselves to the present example, what does a Federal State, Imperial or Republican, imply? It involves two sets of administrations, the Federal and the State, the former being charged with direction of external relations and internal affairs of common interest, the latter with the management of local affairs of state. The late German Empire,

37 Cf. Taitt. Br., ii. 2. 2. to applying to Indra the epithet of adhipati of the Gods.

38 Cf. e.g. the well-known passage of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiv. 1.


3. 12. declaring the samrāṭ to be superior to the ‘rājāni’. The technical significance of samrāṭ is as old as the Rgveda (cf. Ibid., iii, 55. 7 applied to the Sun; viii, 19. 32 applied to Agni. Also cf. Sāmrājya used of Varuṇa in i.

25. 19). Atharvaṭeda xvii. 1. 22 applies the epithet samrāṭ to Indra.
which in our time has been the only example of a Federal Empire, thus possessed a Federal Executive and Legislature (consisting of the Emperor with his ministers and the two Houses of the Bundesrath and Reichstag respectively), besides the State Executive and Legislatures. Now, can the possession of the above features be predicated of any single Empire in Ancient, or, for the matter of that, Mediaeval or Modern India? Dr. Jayaswal defines ‘Sāmrājya’ in the above context as ‘a collection of States under one acknowledged super-state’ and he immediately proceeds to identify the same with a ‘Federal Imperial System’ or ‘Federal Imperialism.’ But in such a case the true equivalent of Sāmrājya would be ‘paramount sovereignty.’ Dr. Jayaswal sees in the federal character of the Sāmrājya its difference from the sārvabhauma (‘one-king’) system. But as his interpretations of both the terms have been shown to be open to serious doubt, the basis of the comparison falls to the ground.  

Besides characterising the Sāmrājya as Federal Imperialism, Dr. Jayaswal has tried to discover the original character of this institution. Relying on the story of king Jarāsandha of Magadha in the Mahābhārata, he says that Jarāsandha is there described as ‘President or Samrāt of the Federal organisation, and Śiśūpāla, the Cedi king, as the “common generalissimo.” “In this detail”, he continues, “we detect an inter-

40 A description of different grades of rulers including the Samrāt and the Sārvabhauma actually occurs in the late mediaeval work, the Śukranitiśāra (i. 183-187). There the difference is made to depend entirely upon the extent of the ruler’s powers as shown by the amount of tribute raised from the subjects.

41 II. 19.
State basis of originally free nature." Now the meaning of the 
Mabābhārata account will best appear from the passage,43 
wherein Kṛṣṇa recounts to Yudhiṣṭhira the story of Jarāsandha's 
mighty deeds. The plain meaning of this passage is that Jarā-
sandha, after overcoming the prosperity of the royal houses 
referred to in the preceding lines (viz. the Ikṣväkuśa, Ailas and 
Bhojaś), was consecrated by them and that he placed himself 
at the top of all kings after attacking them. King Śīṣupāla took 
refuge with him and became his general. It may be mentioned 
in this connexion that the term saṃśraya used in the present 
passage with reference to Śīṣupāla and other kings is a well-
known variety of the six forms of policy, and is recommended 
by the Arthaśāstra and Niti authors in the case of weak kings.44 
Moreover, the notable phrase applied above to Śīṣupāla45 has its 
exact counterpart in Kāmandaka's admonition46 to a saṃśrita 
king. It thus appears that what amounts merely to acceptance 
of protection from a powerful king is magnified by Dr. Jayaswal 
into the election of President of a Federal organisation, and, 
what is more, the appointment of a subordinate prince as com-
mmander-in-chief, as e.g. of Rāja Man Singh by Akbar in

43 u. 14. 7 ff.:—Idānim eva vai rājaḥ Jarāsandho mahipatiḥ/ abbhibhuya śriyaṁ tesāṁ kulānām abhiṣecatayā/ sthito mūrdhni narendrāṅgām-ojasākramya sarvāśaḥ// so'vanim madhyamām bhuktvā mitho bhedam-amanvata/ 
prabhur yas-in paro rāja yasmīn-ekavāse jagat// sa sāmṛttyaṁ mahārājī prāpto bhavati yogataḥ// tapo sa rāja Jarāsandhaṁ saṃśritiya kila sarvāśaḥ/ rājjan-senāpati-jātāṁ Śīṣupālaḥ pratapavān/ tam-evā ca mahārāja śīṣyatam samuṣṭhitāḥ//. [Then follows a list of kings who took refuge (saṃśrita) 
with Jarāsandha, or were devoted (bhakta) to him].

45—śīṣyatam samuṣṭhitāḥ.
46 xvi. 29:—uṣītayat tatra kālam gamayitvā gurau ievā.
Mughal India, is transformed into the election of a generalissimo of the Federation.

But it is said\(^47\) that the Mahābhārata actually contains an instance of “free election of an Emperor by a collection of kings and his consecration to that position.” This is the statement that Sāntanu was consecrated king of kings by other kings.\(^48\)

We are tempted to ask whether the mere fact of joining in the Abhīṣeka amounts to participation in the act of election. In the Rāmāyaṇa it is said of Rāma’s consecration after his return to Ayodhyā at the end his term of exile that the Rtvikṣa, the Brāhmaṇas, the women, the ministers, the citizens and the merchants together consecrated him.\(^49\) Are we to understand from this that all these classes, the women not excepted, met together in an Assembly (or, shall we say, Diet or Parliament) for the free election of Rāma? Again, Brahmmapurāṇam, giving the rules for consecration of the king, mentions that Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, the chief Śudras, women devoted to their husbands and having sons, should join in the ceremony.\(^50\) Similarly the Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇam, gives the direction that the leading Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śudras, and the chiefs of mixed castes should join in consecrating the king.\(^51\)

48 Bombay ed. 1, 100. 7=B.O.R.I., critical ed. 1. 94. 6:—Tam mābipā mahāpālam rājarājye bhyāṣecayān.
49 vi. 130. 62:—rātṛghbhr-brāhmaṇaḥ pāvaṁ kanyābhīr-mantrikhibhi tadbhi/ pauras-cāvābhīyaṣṭīc-ṣte samprahṛṣṭāh sanigamaṁ//.
50 Nṛpatas-tvabhīṣekatyav daivajñayacaucau-naraṁ/ brāhmaṇaṁ kṣatriyar-vaiśyaṁ śudramukhyaṁ-tatthava ca/ pātriṣvabhrīḥ naṁrīṣīḥ ca putravrata//. Quoted in Mitra Miśra’s Vīramitrodhyā, Rājendrakāśa, p. 45.
51 tatu brāhmaṇaṁkhyā-ś ca kṣatriyā-ś ca viśas-tadbhi/ śudhāś-cāvarta-nukhyā-ś ca nānātirtha-samudbhavaṁ// etc. Quoted Mitra Miśra op. cit., p. 53.
Are these general directions to be taken as a charter of popular suffrage for the election of kings?

II

In his work Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories, Dr. Narayan Chandra Bandyopadhyaya indicates his view of the origin of Vedic kingship in the following words (Op. cit., Pt. i, pp. 83-87):

"We have in the early Vedic literature two streams of tradition relating to the origin of Monarchy i.e. those relating to Manu and to Prithu Vainya". "Apart from these there are other traditions in the Vedic literature, especially in the Brāhmaṇas, which tell us something as to the origin of Monarchy...... These speculations point to the recognition of the earliest king as the greatest benefactor or his evolution from the successful military chieftain........'War begat the King, has been the conclusion of eminent authorities on Teutonic or Anglo-Saxon (sic) history, and what was true in the West was not altogether negligible in the case of the Indian Aryans'.

Now it is quite true that Manu is mentioned in the Vedic Samhitās and the Brāhmaṇas as the father of the human race and as a culture-hero who taught mankind sacrificial and other duties. Similarly Prithu (otherwise called Prthiś or Prthi) is regarded in these works as a rṣi and as the inventor of agriculture.1 But none of the Vedic texts, unlike the Epic, refers to Manu or Prithu as the first king, although some passages of the Yajus Samhitās and the Brāhmaṇas, describe him as "the first consecrated of men", in other words as the first properly constituted king. It is therefore difficult to find in the Vedic texts "recognition of the earliest king as the greatest benefactor". As regards the king's "evolution from the successful

1 For references see Vedic Index, s.v.
2 Kāṭhaka Saṃ., xxxvii. 4; Taitt. Br., 1. 7. 4; Śat. Br., v. 3. 5. 4.
military chieftain", *Ait. Br.* i. 14 undoubtedly mentions the *Devas* to have elected Soma (not Indra, as writes Dr. Bandypadhyaya) as their king for successful fight against the *Asuras*. But other traditions in the *Brāhmaṇas* point to the belief in the evolution of the divine kingship from the possession of general superiority or even of a particular ritual by the deity concerned. Take e.g. *Ait. Br.*, viii. 12 where we are told, "The gods with Prajāpati said, 'He is of the gods the mightiest, the most powerful, the strongest, the most real and the best to accomplish; let us anoint him.' 'Be it so', they replied. Thus they did anoint Indra". Again *Pañc. Br.*, (xv. 3. 30) tells us how the gods at first did not yield sovereignty (rājya) to Varuṇa, but when Varuṇa uttered a particular chant, they yielded it to him. As for the Anglo-Saxon analogy which is quoted already by the authors of the *Vedic Index* (s.v. rājan), it is enough to state that recent research has definitely proved that kingship existed at least among the Angles long before their migration into Britain. 3

As regards the evolution of Vedic kingship Dr. Bandypadhyaya gives an elaborate account which we reproduce below, as far as possible, in his own words:

"The pre-eminence of the ruling clan and the vested rights of princes claiming descent from the same ancestor stood in the way of establishment of autocracy [of the early Vedic king]. The people, again, were a powerful and dominant factor standing in the way of an irresponsible exercise of authority" (*Op. cit.*, Pt. i. p. 86).

"Owing to the influence of sacerdotalism the regal office was gradually coming to be associated with more and more important functions.....The priests were not only harping on the parallelism between the duties of the king and of the *Devas*, but some of them were going so far as to regard the

king as the master of the universe and a part-taker of the tributes to the universal rulers”. In the Rgveda and still more the Atharva Veda coronation hymns we have “germs which developed into the conception of the universal and indivisible sovereign authority” as well as “the germs which gradually developed into the ideas regarding the divine nature of royalty”......

“For their success the kings gradually came to depend on ritual and magic...... All these point to the gradual decay of popular control of the administrative machinery”. “Nevertheless, the king never became irresponsible to the people, nor accountable to God only, as in Europe”. (Op. cit., Pt. i. pp. 96 ff.).

“We find in the later Sambhâtas and the Brâhmaṇas clear evidence of a new phase of political evolution”. “Religion and ritualism (sic) over-shadowed everything ... The king as the Upholder of order was regarded as the counter-part of the Gods...The king’s authority no longer depended on the people, but it was made to depend on the sanction of the high universal rulers whom he represented”. “Monarchy came to be established on a firm footing and the king came to enjoy a constitutional position, by virtue of well-defined functions and duties formally vested in him rather than subsisting on the mere personal relation between him and his subjects”. Other causes tending to strengthen the royal authority were that “an aristocracy of blood and service grew up and supported the king’s interest” and that “the king’s position was strengthened by the alliance with the priestly bodies”. “Through the agency of ritual the favour of the Gods was assured to the king and as such an amount of sanctity attached to his duties and functions. In lieu of this divine aid, the king was compelled to acknowledge subservience to the ministers of religion”. “Monarchy came to be glorified. As such, not only did the king protect life and property, but performed (sic) sacrifices to win divine favour for his people...Furthermore the king came to be regarded as the protector of Dharma and the Brâhmaṇas”. Nevertheless, “the tendency to irresponsibility was fully checked first, by the priests who exercised great influence”, and secondly, by the popular bodies who (sic) always asserted their rights carefully safeguarded in the coronation ritual in which the priest exacted the oath”. “The king thus became a constitutional monarch only exercising authority limited by the law”. (Op. cit., Pt. i. pp. 125 ff.).

Let us consider these points seriatim:—

In the early Vedic period according to all evidences the king stood in danger of his rival kinsmen. What high
position was enjoyed by Princes is illustrated by RV. x-40. 3 comparing Rājaputraś with the divine Aśvins. But none of the AV. texts quoted by Dr. Bandyopadhyaya is enough to prove "the vested rights" of Princes in restraint of the king’s arbitrary exercise of his power. AV. i. 9. 3 conveying the poet’s prayer to set the king in supremacy over his kinsmen (sajāta) has been taken by Zimmer,4 probably rightly, to illustrate his third type of Vedic polity, which for want of a better name we may call ‘dynastic government’. Of the other texts quoted by the author, AV. i. 29-30 referring to the constant enmity of brothers or outsiders and ibid., III. 4 mentioning kinsmen meeting the king, are too vague for his purpose. As regards AV. III. 5. 6-7, the author finds in it mention of “prominent people who participated in the nomination of the king-elect to the people”. But apart from the contradiction involved in nomination by the selected few and election by the people, the above verses can be rightly interpreted only to mean that certain specified officers and groups of persons were most closely associated with the king’s administration, so much so as to deserve in some cases the title of ‘king-makers.’ Further evidence of this close association is found in the fact that some of them participated, as is mentioned in the Yajus Sambitās and the Brāhmaṇas, in the ceremony of Offerings to the Jewel-bearers (Ratnabhavimśi) at the Rājasuyā and that of guarding the sacrificial horse at the Aṣvamedha. To argue in the face of this vague evidence that “the kinsmen of the king together with a number of other important personages had formed a body of men, who selected the ruling prince and

4 Altindisches Leben, p. 176.
probably guided his conduct,” is to stretch the meaning to a degree unwarranted by the texts. The author’s statements in this connection that “the Grāmaṇi represented public opinion, the Sūta represented the army” are altogether gratuitous assumptions. As for the Grāmaṇi it is wholly uncertain whether he was a nominee of the King or an elected officer. Again, the rendering of the Sūta as ‘charioteer’ has been proved to be untenable, as this has been found to be the sense of another office known from AV. times, viz. that of the saṃgrahītṛ. As regards the alleged control of the King by the people, the author quotes RV. x. 124. 8 giving the simile of “subjects choosing a King” and AV. iii. 4 “in which the tribesmen are said to select the King.” Now these and other texts have been quoted and discussed by a number of scholars to whom unfortunately no reference is made by the author. It appears that while Zimmer, followed by Bloomfield, took the above passages to refer to the King’s election by the clan or canton, Geldner explained them to mean mere acceptance by the subjects. 5 The question therefore must be regarded as still open. Coming to other texts, RV. x. 173 (= AV. vi. 87-88) quoted by the author is quite inconclusive; the author himself translates the relevant passage as ‘May the people all like (welcome) you.’ So also neither AV. vii. 94 (praying to Indra to make the viśas ‘like-minded, wholly ours’), nor AV. vi. 73. 1 & 3 (enjoining the subjects to be like-minded and loyal to the King), suffices to

5 For references see Zimmer, op. cit., pp. 162-5; Bloomfield, SBE; xlIII. 336; Geldner, Vedische Studien, 11, 303. For a fuller discussion of this point, see the next essay.
prove that the people "asserted themselves whenever the King was in the wrong."

While the texts quoted by the author are thus proved to be too indefinite or inconclusive to support the case for popular control, other passages in the RV. not noticed by him point to the high significance of the King’s office even at such an early period. That the Rgvedic King enjoyed from the first a position of the highest dignity and supreme authority is proved not only by the frequent application of the epithet rājan to the great gods Mitra, Varuṇa, Indra, Agni etc., but also by the similar use of similes relating to kingship. The brilliant picture of Varuṇa wearing a golden mantle and clad in new robes, sitting surrounded by his spies (RV. i. 25. 10 ff.), must have been drawn from life, as was pointed out long ago by Zimmer. The RV. even in its older parts is familiar with technical terms indicative of the King’s dominion or authority or both. Such are kṣatra, rāṣṭra and rājya. It is a significant index of their connotation that these terms are applied freely in the Rgvedic texts to the authority of the gods. The essence of the King’s authority, viz. the subjection of the people to his will, is clearly suggested by such passages as RV. iv. 42. 1-2. There the god Varuṇa, after declaring that the lordship (rāṣṭra) belongs to him, twice proclaims that the gods obey his will (kṛatu). Again in the references to the King as balīhṛt (“taker of tribute”) and to his officers called grāmaṇī and senānī,

6 For a further discussion of this point with references, see the writer’s forthcoming work, Hindu Public Life from the earliest times to the accession of the Maurya Dynasty.
8 See Vedic Index, s.v. for references.
which go back to RV. times, we have clear traces of the primitive royal administration. A careful consideration of the above facts would seem to cast grave doubts on the author’s characterisation of the early Vedic period as conforming to “the simple political ideal of the King elected by the people and governing according to their wishes.” It is significant to note that the author himself sums up his view of the early Vedic Kingship by saying, “We have in the Vedic King the sole repository of the executive power, while the Sabha was the advisory body. . . . Last of all, there was the Samiti which regularly met to express the popular approval of acts either mooted to it for acceptance or to join in state ceremonies.”

The RV. and AV. coronation hymns quoted by the author undoubtedly reflect a somewhat advanced conception of the King’s authority. But these texts do not prove that “the royal office was gradually coming to be associated with more and more important functions.” We have evidence of such increase of the King’s functions only in the subsequent period. As regards “the parallelism between the duties of the King and of the Devas,” or more correctly, the transference of divine epithets and attributes to the earthly King, this applies hardly, if at all, to the RV. and AV. periods. Almost all such known instances belong to the period of the Yajus Samhitās and the Brahmaṇas.”

9 Cf. Sat. Br., v. 4. 3. 12 extending to the earthly king the epithet dhṛtavrata (‘upholder of the sacred law’) frequently applied in the RV. to Mitra and Varuṇa and less often to Indra, Agni and Savitar. Also compare Ait. Br., vii, 13 applying to the consecrated king the epithet dharmasya gopā (‘protector of the law’) which is a transference of the title dharmāṇam adhyakṣaḥ given to Indra in RV., viii, 43. 24, the title dharmakṛt (‘he who
Coming to another point, AV. iv. 22. 7 mentioning the newly consecrated King as having Indra as his companion (Indra-
sakhā) certainly hints at the King’s divine or semi-divine posi-
tion. Among other references not noticed by the author, we
may mention AV. xx. 127. 1 ff. where Parikṣit, one of the
renowned Kings of this time, is described as “exceeding mortals
as a god.” Nevertheless, we think that the germs of the theory of
the King’s divinity do not belong to the late RV. or AV. period,
but may be traced to the early RV. times. As was pointed out
by the present writer elsewhere, 10 RV. iv. 42. 8-9 describing
King Trasadasyu as a ‘demi-god’ (ardha-deva) already hints at
the divine or semi-divine character of Kingship. Turning to
the next point, we may notice that while certain charms and
prayers of the AV. doubtless indicate the dependence of King-
ship upon ritual and magic, they do not by themselves prove
“the gradual decay of popular control of the administrative
machinery,” of which the author has not given a single proof.
As regards the comparison drawn by the author between Vedic
and Mediaeval European Kingship, it is no doubt true, as was
proved by the present writer, 11 that two of the component ele-
ments of the Western theory of Divine Right (viz. that ‘Kings
are accountable to God alone’ and that ‘non-resistance and
passive obedience are enjoined by God’) are practically un-
known to the Hindu thinkers. But this does not justify the
rash generalisation involving confusion between theory and

keeps the law’) applied to Indra in AV., xx. 62. 6 and that of daśrma-dhri
(law-observer) applied to certain Gods in AV., i. 25. 1.
10 Hindu Political Theories, 2nd ed., p. 20.
practice, viz. that in India ‘‘the King never became irresponsible to the people, nor accountable to God only, as in Europe.’’

We may pause here to consider the author’s criticism (op. cit., Pt. 1. pp. 99-100 n.) of the present writer’s interpretation of the \textit{RV.} text relating to King Trasadasyu cited above. Alleging that the writer has applied the first six verses of \textit{RV.} iv. 42 to Trasadasyu, the author observes that they ‘‘ought to be taken as dedicated to King Varuṇa himself rather than to the composer Trasadasyu.’’ Proceeding in the same strain, he says that assuming the first six verses to be correctly attributed to the king, ‘‘Trasadasyu nowhere speaks of his eminence as having been due to his being a King. The truth is that this King came to be regarded as a mythical personage—a demi-god owing his birth to the favour of Indra and Varuṇa.’’ On the above grounds the author bases his charge that the writer has ‘‘tried to prove that in the eyes of Indians, the royal office was a divine institution.’’ Now, in the first place, the above reference was given by the writer in the context of his analysis of \textit{RV.} theories of Kingship. There was in this case not the remotest suggestion of its applying to any other period of Indian history or phase of Hindu thought. The reference, again, was taken to ‘‘hint broadly at the divine or semi-divine position of the King.’’ It is therefore amazing to find the writer being charged with trying to prove that the royal office was a divine institution in the eyes of the Indians. In the next place, there is not the slightest basis for the author’s allegation that the writer has misapplied the first six verses (which, by the way, are given in the form of self-praise of the two gods Indra and Varuṇa, and not as ‘‘dedication to Varuṇa’’) to King
Trasadsasyu. The writer's quotations were actually taken, as was shown clearly in his footnote, from verses 8 and 9 which, as Geldner in his German translation of the RV. (Part i) observes, were added by the poet after the first six verses to illustrate the service rendered by the two Gods in favour of the Pūru people. We find it difficult to understand how the author could mistake this reference in view of the fact that he quotes verse 9 in the same context to support his criticism. The author, moreover, has not taken any notice of the writer's argument based on the Rgvedic conception of gods 'as beings of superhuman excellence.' We are, again, unable to follow the author's description of Trasadsasyu as a mythical personage in view of the fact that not only is his ancestry as well as descent well-known to the Rgvedic poet, but that he was remembered in the later Brāhmaṇa texts along with other historical Kings among the famous sacrificers of ancient times.

Let us now come to the period of the Yajus Sambhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. Without denying the extensive development of the sacrificial ritual in these works, it is possible to exaggerate, as the author has done, the cleavage between the Early and Late Vedic periods. A fair proportion of the Rgvedic Sambitā including the whole of Book ix consists, as is well known, of sacrificial songs used for definite ritual purposes. The great sacrifices of the Rājasūya, Vājapeya and Asvamedha may be

12 Cf. op. cit., p. 428 n where after analysing the first seven verses, Geldner observes:—"Daran reiht der Dichter ein weiteres gemeinsames Venedienst beider Götter um das Pūruvolk. Sie haben der Gemahlin des Königs Purukutsa den Trasadsasyu als Sohn geschenkt zum Dank für das Rossopef, das diese ihnen dargebracht hatte (8-9)."

13 For references see Vedic Index, s.v.
traced back by direct references to the AV. and in some cases to RV. times. In the second place, the divinity of the King, such as it is, is held in the Yajus Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa texts to follow mostly from his participation in the great public sacrifices, viz. the Vaijapeya, the Aśvamedha and the Rājasūya. Very exceptional are such texts as Sat. Br., v. 1. 5. 14 deriving the King’s authority as such from his being “a visible form of Prajāpati” and Ibid., v. 4. 3. 4 etc. declaring in connection with the Rājasūya that “the sacrificer is Indra for a two-fold reason, because he is a Kṣatriya and because he is a sacrificer.” As for “the aristocracy of blood and service” growing up around the King, it does not appear to be a product of the late Vedic period. We can trace it, such as it is, to the ibbas and upāstis (or stis) of the RV. and AV. texts. What little foundation is there for the view that these and other causes established monarchy “on a firm footing” is proved not only by the indirect evidence of the Yajus Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas regarding rites for restoring expelled Kings,14 but also by direct admissions in the Brāhmaṇas.15 Lastly, with reference to the author’s contention that the King in the late Vedic period “became a constitutional monarch only exercising authority limited by the law,” we have to remember that the comprehensive scheme of the dharma (duties) of varṇas and āśramas as well as of the individual King, can be traced only from the time of the aphoristic Smṛtis. Of the Brāhmaṇa period nothing is more characteris-

14 Cf. Taitt. Saṃ., ii. 3. 1; Ait. Br., viii. 10; Pañc. Br., xviii. 5. 5-6, etc.
15 Cf. Kauś. Br., xvi. 4 which gives in the usual form of dogmatic exposition of the ritual the author’s answer to the question: Why are the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas unstable, the Viś stable?
tic than the absence of fixed ideas regarding the King’s status in relation to his subjects. Thus while many passages of the 
Yajus Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas inculcate the principle of the Brāhmaṇa’s superiority to the Kṣatriya, there are other texts which assert the equivalence of these powers and a few which even assert the superiority of the Kṣatriya over the Brāhmaṇa.  
What little warrant exists for the supposition of the fixed legal or customary status of the King at this period is proved by the significant reference in the Yajus Samhitā texts, to rites by which the priest can manipulate the sacrifice so as to destroy or weaken the Kṣatra by the Viś and vice versa. Even if it were true that the King’s functions and duties were ‘well-defined’ at this period, this would not by itself suffice to make him occupy “a constitutional position” or transform him into “a constitutional monarch only exercising authority limited by the law.” For it is only a gratuitous assumption to predicate of this period that “the priests exercised great influence” or that “the popular bodies” “always asserted their rights carefully safeguarded in the coronation-ritual.” In truth the Yajus Samhitā and Brāhmaṇa texts, like those of the RV. and AV., present a striking contrast between the high pretensions of the priestly order and their actual claims which refer almost exclusively to

16 For the Brāhmaṇas’ superiority over the Kṣatriyas, cf. Taitt. Saṃ., ii. 6. 2; Ait. Br., viii. 1; Sat. Br., iv. 1. 4. 1 ff. For their equivalence, cf. Taitt. Saṃ., v. i. 10. 2; Ait. Br., vii. 22. For the superiority of Kṣatriya over Brāhmaṇas, cf. Sat. Br., i. 3. 2; ibid., v. 4. 2. 7. For a fuller account, see the writer’s work Hindu Public Life from the earliest times to the accession of the Maurya Dynasty.

17 Cf. Maitr. Saṃ., iii. 3. 10; Ibid. iv. 6. 8. Kāth. Saṃ., xxi. 10, etc.
private, and not public, rights. As regards the alleged influence of ‘the popular bodies,’ it is disproved by what the author himself calls “the decay of popular domination” as “easily proved by the absence of the mention of the Samitis or the Samgrāmas” in the Brāhmaṇas. Indeed the author elsewhere expresses the opinion so adverse to his view just cited, that “the King’s authority no longer depended upon the people, but was made to depend on the sanction of the high universal rulers whom he represented.” We would, finally, quote the famous and oft-quoted passage (vii. 29) from the Ait. Br. explaining the status of the other castes (at least in certain quarters) from the Kṣatriya’s standpoint. From this it would appear that while the Śūdra occupied more or less the position of a hereditary serf without rights of person and property, the Vaiśya bore the burden of taxation and had little or no personal rights and even the Brāhmaṇa could be removed from his holding.

III

In his recently published work Chandragupta Maurya and His Times Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji describes the position

18 Cf. Sat. Br., ii. 2. 6, which, after referring to two classes of Gods viz. the Gods proper and human Gods (Brāhmaṇas), draws the corollary that gifts should be given to the Brāhmaṇas. For a fuller account with further references, see the author’s work Hindu Public Life, etc.

19 In the above-quoted text of the Ait. Br., the Brāhmaṇa is declared to be ‘an acceptor of gifts, a drinker of Soma, a seeker of livelihood, one to be moved at will’ (ādāyi, āpāyi, āusāyi, yatbākāmaprayāpyah), the Vaiśya is said to be ‘tributary to another, to be eaten by another, to be oppressed at will’ (anyasya baliṣṭe anyasyādyo yatbākāmapayeḥ) and the Śūdra is said to be the servant of another, to be removed at will, to be slain at will (anyasya presyatā kāmotṣṭe poyo yatbākāmapadvayāḥ).
of the King in the Ancient Indian polity in the context of the Maurya Empire as follows:—

"Ancient India was built upon the basis of decentralisation on principle ......... It believed in the self-government of the group, in the extension of self-government from the sovereign at the top through all grades and strata of society down to the lowest classes in the villages. Every village was self-governing. There were also unions of villages as self-governing federations. Ancient India was thus built up as a vast rural democracy," (Op. cit., p. 77).

"Hindu thought counts Dharma as the true Sovereign of the State, as the Rule of Law. The King is the executive called the Dānda to uphold and enforce the decrees of Dharma as the spiritual sovereign." ....... (Op. cit., p. 79).

"In this way democracy descends to the villages and the lowest strata of the social structure and operated as the most potent agency of uplifting the masses. Thus ancient Hindu monarchy was a limited monarchy under the very constitution of the State......... The Maurya empire had to fit itself into this traditional frame-work of administration." (Op. cit., p 84).

Let us consider this string of somewhat hasty generalisations in the proper order.

We may point out at the outset that the evidence of administrative decentralisation is almost wholly lacking for the whole of the Vedic period. It is true that as far back as Rgvedic times we have reference to an officer called grāmaṇi (usually translated as ‘leader of the village’), who appears from various incidental references and especially from the part assigned to him in the Yajus Saṁhitā and Brāhmaṇa texts at the Rājasūya to have been a personage of considerable importance. But of self-governing villages or unions of villages or other autonomous social and local groups we have as yet hardly any trace.¹ In the

¹ Characteristic of the obscurity of our data for Vedic times is the fact that it is quite uncertain whether the grāmaṇi was an elected representative of the villagers or was the King’s nominee. Another village officer called grāmyavādin (translated as ‘village judge’) who is mentioned in the Yajus
immediately following period we have a number of scattered notices in the Jātakas as well as the Smṛti, Arthaśāstra and other texts collectively testifying to the exercise of executive and judicial powers at least from time to time by village bodies. The fact, however, remains that the largest and most authentic stock of concrete illustrations of self-governing villages and unions of villages belongs to South India from the eighth and early ninth centuries A.D. down to the time of the Imperial Colas. For the remaining and by far the longer periods of Ancient Indian History our records are almost completely silent about the working of village institutions. It would of course be unwise to derive any positive conclusion from this silence of our authorities. We may, however, point out that such glimpses of rural life as we get from classical Sanskrit literature do not in general suggest a vigorous system of rural self-government. In

Sāṃhitā texts is only a name, though his sabhā (Court) is referred to in one passage. For references see Vedic Index. s.v. grāmani and grāmyavādin.

2 On the above see especially R. C. Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, Ch. 11; Ratilal N. Mehta, Pre-Buddhistic India, pp. 175-78; K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, The Colas, Vol. ii, Pt. 1 Ch. xviii

3 Hopkins doubtless goes too far when in the face of almost complete absence of data from the Great Epic he writes (The Social and Military Position of the Ruling Caste in Ancient India, J.A.O.S., Vol. xii, pp. 17-18):—

"As to the constitutional powers of the villages, we have no reason to believe that they had any political rights beside the liberty given to them by the Royal overseer."

4 Take e.g. the wonderfully life-like picture drawn by Bāṇa's master-hand, of the incidents of Harṣa's march from his capital against the King of Gauḍa (Harṣa-carita, Cowell and Thomas’s tr. pp. 206-9). Among the crowd attracted from the country-side by curiosity to see the King are mentioned rogues who complained of imaginary wrongs of former governors (bhogapati) and the good acts of past officials (ayuktakaśi), as well as others who were con-
so far as the various social and territorial groups—families, castes and districts, guilds, heretics and corporations etc.—are concerned, we have undoubtedly a number of Sūrī texts enjoining upon the King observance of their Dharmas (usually translated as 'laws') and maintenance of their samaya or saṃvīt ('agreement'). It does not, however, follow that thereby "these several groups were empowered to legislate for themselves." To prove this point, we may refer, firstly, to the difficulty of implicitly accepting with the author the Sūrti rules as part of the organic law of every Indian State. In the second place, the Sūrti rules above-quoted would seem for the most part to credit the groups simply with the authority to declare their own customs, to frame mutual agreements and so forth. Indicative also of the limited authority of the groups is the fact that according to Gautama (xi, 20) the observance of their Dharma by the King is contingent on its being in accordance with the sacred law. In the case of the Saṃvīt, Bṛhaspati (viii.

tent with their appointed overseers (paripāla-puraṇa). Is not this description typical of an official-ridden village administration?

5 For references, see Radha Kumud Mookerji, Local-Government in Ancient India, Chs. iv-vi.

6 It is worth recording that the concrete instances of the exercise of administrative and other powers by the guilds etc. are even fewer than those in the case of village assemblies.

7 Thus as examples of laws of districts mentioned by Manu, viii. 41, Medhatithi refers to the dharmas of Kuśa, Kāśi, and Kāśmīra countries, Govindaśāja, Kullāka and Rāghavānanda allude to those of certain districts, Sarvajña-Nārāyana refers to those of the inhabitants of one and the same village and Nandana mentions the southern (Dākṣinātya) custom of marrying the daughter of the maternal uncle.
9) explicitly states that it must not be opposed to the interests of the King and must be in accordance with the sacred law.

On a general review of the above facts it seems difficult to follow Dr. Mookerji in postulating for Ancient India "an extension of self-government from the sovereign at the top through all grades and strata of society down to the lowest classes in the villages." In particular, it is difficult to agree with his contention that "Ancient India was built up as a vast rural democracy." In so far as the village group is concerned, it is probable enough that the system of rural self-government evidenced for Northern India by the Ātaka stories as well as the Smṛti and other texts and for South India in the time of the Imperial Colas and their immediate predecessors by the more direct testimony of the inscriptions, had in each case a long, but forgotten, history behind it, while it left an unrecorded legacy for succeeding times. We may well believe more generally that the rural self-governing institutions, although systematically ignored by our other authorities, were so firmly rooted in the soil as to survive long periods of misrule and neglect. Making due allowance for all these considerations, we are unable to agree with Dr. Mookerjee about a fundamental law or custom of the constitution fixing the autonomous status of "every village and all "unions of villages" throughout Ancient Indian History. From this standpoint it seems to be opposed to every canon of historical criticism to trace back, as Dr. Mookerji does, the village republics praised by Sir Charles Metcalfe in the early days of British rule through a gap of more than two thousand years to the Maurya and still earlier times. What seems most probable is that while the village
bodies were invested by custom and tradition with substantial rights of self-government, the actual exercise of these powers varied considerably according to the conditions of time and place.

A careful consideration of the foregoing arguments will perhaps suffice to show how insufficient are Dr. Mookerji’s grounds, drawn from the working of village and other groups, for the view that “Ancient Hindu monarchy was a limited monarchy under the very constitution of the State.” We may next consider Dr. Mookerji’s arguments based upon his view of the relation of the King to Dharma. The conception of the king’s upholding the Dharma can be traced back to two texts of the Ait. Br. (viii. 12 & 17, not viii. 26 as stated by Dr. Mookerji) applying to the divine King Indra and his earthly counterpart the epithet of dharmasya goptā (protector of dharma). But there is no hint as yet of the sovereignty of Dharma to which perhaps the earliest reference occurs in a famous passage of the Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad. 7a. By the time of the Epics and metrical smṛtis the conception of dharma as a complex mass of individual and social duties tracing their origin to the Sacred Law and Tradition and upheld by the King, had taken definite and complete shape. To admit all this, however, is not to conclude with Dr. Mookerji that the King was merely charged with upholding and enforcing the decrees of Dharma. For in the first place, we have a number of important Arthaśāstra and Smṛti texts completely ignored by the author, which at least agree in including rājasāsana (the King’s edict), along

7a See ibid., iv. 4. 14 stating that dharma is the kṣatra of the kṣatra, and that there is nothing higher than dharma.
with dharma (smṛti law), vyavahāra (secular law), and caritra (custom), among the sources of law administered in the courts.⁸ Among other objections that may be urged against Dr. Mookerji’s thesis is that besides the above-mentioned difficulty of taking the smṛti rules as part of the organic law of every Indian State, we have no evidence of a permanently constituted human authority capable of calling the King to account for violation of the dharma. Dr. Mookerji, indeed, refers to the Pariṣad said to consist of legal experts, which according to the smṛti texts was entrusted with the decision of doubtful points of Dharma. But between the Pariṣad as contemplated in these texts and a council for controlling the King, there is all the difference between a fortuitous gathering with no fixed constitution or powers of initiative and with little sanction and a permanent as well as regularly constituted body with well-defined powers of action.⁹ If, indeed, we are to judge by the

⁸ The important text occurring in Arthasastra (viii. 1) is as follows:—

Dharmasca vyavahārascacaritram rājaśasanam
Vivādārthas-catuṣpādō pācimah pūruvaūdhakah

Nārada (i. 10) has in place of the last quarter (pāda) uttarah pūruvaūdhakah which apparently is in flat contradiction with the above. For a definition of rājaśasanam, see Kātyāyana Smṛti, verse 38. For a discussion of these texts; see K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, Rājadharma, pp. 132-34.

⁹ Dr. Mookerji’s description op. cit., p. 79 of the Pariṣad as consisting of “a body of legal experts called śrētas” hardly does justice to the varied qualifications of the members as enjoined by the smṛtis. Cf. Manu, xii. 111 (S.B.E., Vol. xxv. p. 510:)—“Three persons who each know one of the three principal Vedas, a logician, a mīmāṁsāka, one who knows the Nirukta, one who recites (the Institutes of) the Sacred Law, and three men belonging to the first three orders, shall constitute a (legal) assembly, consisting of at least ten members.” We may take this opportunity to point out a few slips in Dr. Mookerji’s quotation and translation of the relevant texts. He quotes (p. 79) Manu as
example of a seventeenth century Hindu State, the learned assemblies of the Brähmaṇas in ancient times did not function as a constitutional check on the King's authority.  

declaring the sources of law to be (1) Veda or Śruti, (2) Smṛti or Dharmaśāstra, (3) Śīla or code of conduct enjoined by the śāstras and (4) Ācāra or the manners and customs of holy men. Now in the two passages (Manu ii. 6 & 12) to which Dr. Mookerji undoubtedly refers, the sources are stated to be (1) Veda (2) Smṛti (or else Smṛti and Śīla of those versed in the Veda) (3) good custom (ācāra) and (4) self-satisfaction. On p. 82 Dr. Mookerji quotes Sātapaṭha Brähmaṇa (xiv. 4. 2. 23) as stating that “the Daṇḍa or the King is necessary to maintain Dharma or those 'principles of justice by which the strong are prevented from eating up the weak' (abhīyān baltīyamsam-āśamaḍte dhar- mena yathā)”. Now the extract referred to occurs in the context of the famous story in the Bhīḍāvanyaka Upaniṣad i. 4. 11-14 of the creation of the Brähmaṇa, the Kṣatriya, the Vaiśya, the Śūdra and Dharma successively by Prajā-pātri. No reference is found in it to the Daṇḍa or the King maintaining Dharma. Again, the passage quoted by Dr. Mookerji in the original, which ends in yathā, unfortunately leaves the sense incomplete without the addition of the next word rajñāvam. In this complete form the passage means that even a weak man desires to overcome a strong one with the aid of Dharma, just as a man in ordinary life desires to do with the help of a King. It is difficult to understand how this passage could be construed to refer to those “principles of justice by which the strong are prevented from eating up the weak.” Again, Dr. Mookerji quotes (p. 83) a passage from Arthaśāstra, viii. 1 purporting to mean that “subject to Dharma or the Law and Constitution of the realm, the sovereign had the supreme power in the State as its Head. (Kṛṣṭabhiṣāyī hi svāmit).” But the first part of this statement is altogether wanting in the text which simply means that the King is the head of the seven prakṛtis (or elements of sovereignty). In Dr. Mookerji’s quotation the tat referring to the prakṛtis and occurring at the beginning of the sentence is left out, while the word ēs it added at the end is a superfluity.

10 See Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol. ii Pt. i s.v Pariṣad, for examples of decisions by learned Brähmaṇas in the Maṭhā State under Sivaji and his son. For restrictions on the authority of Brähmaṇical as well as other caste pariṣads, see K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, op. cit., p. 100 giving full references.
ON THE NATURE AND FUNCTIONS OF VEDIC ASSEMBLIES.

I

Describing the composition and functions of the Vedic Assemblies, Dr. K. P. Jayaswal in his *Hindu Polity* writes as follows:—

"The Samiti was the national assembly of the whole people or Viśāh."

"The Samiti was a produce of the developed, not early, Vedic age."

"It seems that the village formed the basis of the constitution of the Samiti."

"Probably [the Sabhā] was the standing and stationary body of selected men working under the authority of the Samiti."

"One function of the Sabhā is definitely clear. The Sabhā acted as the national judicature."

"The rise of the Sabhā is to be dated, like that of the Samiti, in the latest period of the Rgveda."

"[The Vidāba] seems to have been the parent folk-assembly from which the Sabhā, Samiti and Senvā differentiated." *Op. cit.*, Part I, pp. 11-20.

Let us consider these points seriatim:

In his *Altindisches Leben* Zimmer pointed out long ago that the Samiti was the assembly of the Folk in which the King took part.¹ In inferring from one of the texts quoted by Zimmer (*RV*. ix. 92. 6) that it was the King’s duty to attend the Samiti, Dr. Jayaswal has added a fresh argument in support of the above thesis. Another text (*RV*. x. 97. 6) quoted by Dr. Jayaswal, however, which uses the simile of Kings in a Samiti was interpreted by Zimmer (probably with better reason)

to refer to a type of constitution similar to what prevailed in Ancient Germany as described by Tacitus. In this constitution there was no single head in times of peace, the members of the ruling house exercising power equally. Dr. Jayaswal breaks new ground by suggesting for the Samiti a representative character. But though he could claim for his theory the analogy of the Anglo-Saxon Folk-moot, his arguments do not appear to be very convincing. Referring to the Chh. Up. story of Svetaketu’s going to the Samiti of the Pañcalas (which, by the way, belongs to a very late Vedic stratum), he considers it “hardly probable that the whole nation without any principle of representation would be actually present” “where philosophers and statesmen were sitting.” But was not the Athenian Ecclesia, which in its days of glory was attended by Themistocles and Pericles, an assembly of the whole people? Is there, again, any reason to suspect that the Rgvedic states were larger in size than the Athenian State in Pericles’s time? Dr. Jayaswal finds a concrete instance of Vedic application of the principle of representation in the position of the Grāmaṇi who was “a representative persona in the coronation ceremony.” The reference here is of course to the inclusion of the Grāmaṇi in the list of recipients of the ratnabaviṣ (offering to the “Jewel holders”) at the Rājasūya. But although the allusion to the Grāmaṇi (in the singular) at the above ceremony is as yet an unsolved problem, Dr. Jayaswal has failed to quote any evidence for the representative character of this personage in the same

2 For discussion of this point with full references, see the writer’s paper “Some types of constitutions in the Vedic Sambitās and Brāhmaṇas,” Prācyavāṇi, Calcutta, Vol. I, no. 1.
connection. In particular, he has not considered the suggestion that this officer was probably the Grāmāṇi of the village or city where the royal residence was situated. Dr. Jayaswal quotes AV. xii. 1. 56 and Tait. Saṃ. ii. 1. 8. 4 as referring to village meetings. Even if these interpretations were correct, it would not by itself support the theory that “the village formed the basis of the constitution of the Saṃiti.” But do the above texts bear out Dr. Jayaswal’s interpretation? The AV. passage, which is taken from a long hymn in honour of the goddess Pṛthivī (Earth deified), is as follows:—

\begin{align*}
\text{Ye grāmā yad-aranyam yāh sabbhā adhi bhūmyām}\ |
\text{Ye samgrāmāḥ samitayasteṣu cāru vaddena te}||
\end{align*}

In the above Jayaswal takes samgrāmāḥ and samitayah to be in apposition to each other and he translates ye samgrāmāḥ samitayah as “the assembled Saṃitis.” From this he infers that “those who (sic) were assembled together were the villages together.” Now another AV. passage (xv. 9. 2-3) which Jayaswal quotes in part in another context (p. 20) runs as follows:—

tam sabbhāscōsamitiścō senā ca surā cânuvyacalan/ (‘Him followed the Sabhā, the Saṃiti, the Senā and the Surā’). This passage proves conclusively that the Sabhā, the Saṃiti, the Senā (evidently the equivalent of Samgrāma in the former text) and surā (probably referring to dinking-parties such as were known as āpāṇaka in the time of Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra) were distinct, though closely associated, bodies.\footnote{3}{Eggeling, SBE., Vol. xli, p. 60; V.I., s.v. grāma.} \footnote{4}{Cf. Whitney and Lanman’s tr.:—‘What villages, what forest, what}
Putting the two texts together, it is natural to infer that the Sabbath, the Samiti, the Sena—Samgraha between themselves exhausted, according to the poet, the principal gatherings of the Folk, just as the villages and the forest comprised between them the whole tract of country. As regards the Taitt. text which occurs in a long series of Kamyestis, the relevant portion is the following:—

samgraha samyatte samayakamah.

Jayaswal takes it to mean 'the village-together meeting desirous of agreement.' But this explanation is evidently a forced one and is unsupported either by the authority of ancient commentators or of modern interpreters who agree in taking samgraha in the sense of battle.6

As regards the antiquity of the Samiti, Jayaswal's view seems to be self-contradictory. 'The Samiti,' he says in one place, 'was a product of the developed, not early, Vedic age,' while elsewhere he thinks that it must have been an ancient institution 'even in the Vedic Age.' If, as is generally held, the Samiti was the Popular Assembly of the Vedic people, it must have come down, to judge by Greek, Roman and Teutonic analogies, from almost immemorial times.6 By the time that assemblies (are) upon the earth, what hosts, gatherings—in them may we speak what is pleasant to thee.'

5 Cf. Sāyana on the above:—parakṣya-ṣenāyāṃśa法治va śūratamam bāṃṣyāṃmī svāmimgre yaḥ pratijām kārtumicchati tasya pašum vidhatte/ yadvā sandhikāminab pašum udbhate]. Also cf. Keith's tr., HOS., Vol. 18, p. 142:—"He who when a combat is joined desires an agreement" etc.

6 Indeed it has been held that the folk-assembly goes back to the Indo-European times. Cf. Otto Schrader, Reallexikon der Indo-Germanischen Altertumskunde, s.v. Volksversammlung.
the Samiti emerges into history in the latest parts of the RV. and in the AV., it had acquired the important right of debate unknown even to its Teutonic counterpart. But that the Samiti had a president (Pati or Iśāna), as Jayaswal thinks, hardly follows from the text of the Pāraskara Gṛhyasūtra quoted by him. In truth Pāraskara refers to the Iśāna of the Parsat which apparently he takes to be equivalent to Sabbā.7 We are tempted to identify this lord of the Parsat with the Sabbāpatti mentioned in the Śatarudriya text of the Yajus Sambhitās.8

We now come to Jayaswal's statement that "the Samiti was a sovereign body from the constitutional point of view." We have an instance of a Sovereign Popular Assembly in the Ancient German constitution described by Tacitus. Describing this constitution, Stubbs says,9

The central power was wielded by the national assemblies. These were held at fixed times;...Of matters of deliberation the more important were transacted in the full assembly at which all freemen were entitled to be present;....Of the greater questions were those of war and peace.......The magistrates for the administration of justice in the pagi and vici were elected in the general council. It also acted, in its sovereign capacity, as a high court of justice, heard complaints and issued capital sentences."

Now we have no data of a similar kind for the Vedic Samiti. Jayaswal indeed finds in RV. x. 191. 3 and AV. vi 64 evidence that matters of state were discussed in the Samiti. But this is based upon his translation of mantra in the fore-

7 See Pāraskara Gṛhyasūtra, III, 13. 1:—atbhānāḥ sabbā-praveśanam| sabbām-abhyeyate......aha pratviṣati......paṛṣadāmetya japed......asyāḥ| paṛṣada Iśānāḥ sabarsa sudusṭaro jana iti. In the above Jayarāma explains paṛṣadām as sabbām.

8 Vāj. Saū. xvi. 24; Taitt. Saū. iv. 5. 3. 2; Kāt-Saū. xvii. 13.

going passages as ‘policy of state’ or ‘matters of state,’ which is evidently a forced one and for which no authority is given. Jayaswal’s view that ‘the most important business of the Samiti’ was ‘electing the Rājan’ and that ‘it could also re-elect a King,’ was advocated long ago by Zimmer. But the most important texts quoted by the last-named scholar were interpreted by Geldner in a different sense so as to apply to the acceptance of the King by his subjects and not to his election by the clan or canton. On the other hand there are other Vedic texts not noticed by Jayaswal, which indirectly testify to the high constitutional status of the Samiti. Take e.g. AV. viii. 10. 5-6 which pointedly illustrates the deliberative function of the Samiti as well as the Sabbā. That the Samiti, evidently as the Popular Assembly par excellence, was a most important asset to the King is suggested by two AV. passages. Again, amid the uncertainties of the texts there is a remarkable

10 Op. cit., p. 175:—“In Wahlmonarchien fand Zweifelsohne durch die vereinigten Viś in der Samiti die Eikirung des Herrschers statt.”

11 See Geldner, V edische Studien, II, 303. In RV. x. 124. 8 (Viso na rājanam uṇāṇaḥ) and AV. iii. 4. 2 (tvām viso uṇāṇaṁ rājan ayaḥ) he explains the root vr to mean vāṇeh (to desire), and viso to mean subjects, not clan or canton.

12 In this passage we are told how the mystical abstraction Viśāj successively ascended and descended in the sabbā, the samiti and the āmantraṇa (tr. as ‘consultation personified’ by Griffith; Whitney and Lanman, AV. tr., p. 512, doubtfully translate it as ‘address’).

13 See AV. v. 19. 15 which mentions at the end of a long list of imprecations against the Ksatariya injuring or robbing a Brāhmaṇa, the terse statement that the samiti does not suit him (nāmai samitiḥ kalpaṭe). On the other hand AV. vi, 88. 3 conveying a prayer for a newly consecrated King states at the end of a list of blessings that the Samiti may suit him (dhruvāya te samitiḥ kalpaṭāmibha).
NATURE AND FUNCTIONS OF VEDIC ASSEMBLIES

reference in the Sat. Br. (vii. i. i. 4) clearly pointing to the right of control possessed by the Popular Assembly\[sup]13a\] over the distribution of public lands. On the whole, it seems desirable, in the complete absence of any data comparable to the Anglo-Saxon charters, laws and references to historical works, to suspend our judgment regarding the sovereign character of the Vedic Samiti. In the parallel example of the Anglo-Saxon National Council, intensive research has proved recently what little foundation exists for the older view of its being a sovereign body.\[sup]14\]

Turning to the parallel institution of the Sabha, we find Jayaswal holding that it was "the standing and stationary body of selected men working under the authority of the Samiti." As he himself admits, this is a mere hypothesis not deducible from the available data. It is, however, difficult to reconcile this

\[sup]13a\] The passage may be quoted in Eggeling's translation as follows:—

"To whomsoever the Kshatriya with the approval of the vis grants a settlement, that is properly given." As was observed by the present writer in another connection (Agrarian System in Ancient India, p. 83), "This passage evidently refers to the public land of the Folk or the State, and it seems to mean that while the King's gift of such land with the consent of the people was in accordance with the tribal or customary law, it was sometimes arbitrarily disposed of by the sole authority of the ruler."

\[sup]14\] See e.g. R. Munro Chadwick, Studies in Anglo-Saxon Institutions, Excursus iv. There we are told that the functions of the Anglo-Saxon Council, notwithstanding instances of dependence of individual Kings on popular support, were essentially of a deliberative character. As regards the Council's alleged right of electing and deposing the King, the royal succession, after the tenth century according to the same authority followed in the overwhelming majority of known instances the ordinary system of primogeniture, while in Bede's time the succession was not left to the Council but was settled beforehand by the sovereign.
hypothesis with Jayaswal's statement made elsewhere 14a that like the Samiti the Sabha "also was a popular body." Jayaswal finds in AV. vii. 12. 2 reference to the fact that "free discussion was held in the Sabha and a resolution of the Sabha was considered binding on all and inviolable." Now the relevant portion of the text just quoted is in the Saunaka recension as follows:

Vidma te sabhe nama nariṣṭā nama va asi. This is translated by Bloomfield15 as

"We know thy name O assembly, Mirth verily is thy name,"
while Whitney and Lanman16 translate it as follows:—

"We know thy name O assembly, verily sport by name art thou."

In place of the above interpretation of Nariṣṭā as 'mirth' or 'sport,' Jayaswal quotes the authority of Śāyaṇa who takes it in the sense of 'not injured' and justifies his meaning by referring to the inviolability of the resolution of the Sabha.17 Now it appears from the context that the second verse just quoted is meant especially to apply to the Sabha unlike the first which refers both to the Sabha and the Samiti. If, as Jayaswal thinks, the Samiti was the sovereign body in the State, it is inconceivable that the binding and inviolable character of its resolutions should be held to be the exclusive attribute of the Sabha. Again, in the list of symbolical victims at the Puruṣamedhā18 we find Bhima (explained by the commentator as bhayaṅkara i.e. 'the terrible') dedicated to Nariṣṭa. More-

17 See Śāyaṇa on above:—nariṣṭā abhiṣṣitā parairanabhībhāvyā ... anuttaraṁyavākhyataṁ nariṣṭeṣṭiṁnāṁ.
18 Vāj. Sam., xxx, 6; Taitt. Br., iii. 4. 2. 1.
over in the Vedic mantra quoted in Pāraskara Gṛhyasūtra, which seems to be a reminiscence of the AV. verses above cited, Sabbā is significantly called nāḍīḥ and tvuṣīḥ\textsuperscript{19} explained by the commentator Jayarāma as nadanaśīlā (‘sounding’) and dipī (‘shining’) respectively. Finally, in the Paippalāda recension of the AV. the text above quoted occurs in the variant form:—

Veda vai sabbe te nāma subhadraśi sarasvatī,

which seems to suggest for Sabbā a connotation similar to ‘mirth’ or ‘sport’ stated above. These facts would seem to cast grave doubts upon Sāyaṇa’s interpretation of nariṣṭā which is accepted implicitly by Jayaswal.\textsuperscript{19a}

Dr. Jayaswal’s contention that ‘the Sabbā acted as a national judicature’ is essentially a reflection of the much older

\textsuperscript{19} The mantras are as follows:—sabbaṅgaṁśi nādirnāṁśi tvuṣīrṇāṁśi lasyaṁśe nāma and sabba ca ma samitiś-cobhe praṣaṇaptadhibitaraṇa saacetanau etc. with which we may compare AV. Yutm. 12. 1-2:—sabba ca ma samitiś-cāvatām praṣaṇaptadhibitaraṇa saṃvidāne and vidma te sabbe nāma nariṣṭā nāma va asi.

\textsuperscript{19a} In further support of the above arguments I append below a note on the term nariṣṭā kindly contributed by my learned friend Pandit Kṣitirṣa Chandra Chattopadhyaya, M.A., of the Calcutta University. “Nariṣṭā is a peculiar word found in the AV. That its etymology was early forgotten is clear from the fact that it occurs as nariṣṭō in the Vāj. Saṃ. The accent in the second syllable would seem to preclude the taddhita suffix īṣṭaṇ, as also the idea of nam-tatpuruṣa. The only way, therefore, open to us is to regard it as a bhūbrihi of na and riṣṭa. It is not analysed in the Pāda text of either school, though the Prātiṣeṣṭaṇya of each school notes this. Western scholars generally connect the word with Skt. narma and German Narr. and hold it to mean ‘merriement’, ‘sport’—a sense supported by the context in which it is found. Sāyaṇa’s explanation of the word in the AV. is doubtful, as both the accent and the feminine form appear to be irregular in the case of a tatpuruṣa compound with nam.”
views of Ludwig and Zimmer. To the passages quoted by these scholars, Jayaswal has added the text of Pāraskara Gṛhya-
sūtra just cited. Adopting Oldenberg’s translation of nādiḥ and tuśiḥ in this passage as ‘trouble’ and ‘vehemence,’ he writes, ‘As trouble and vehemence were in store there for the culprit, the Sābba seems to have acquired those names.’ Some of the other texts quoted by Jayaswal after Ludwig and Zimmer, however, were interpreted differently by other scholars—a fact which has unfortunately been ignored by Jayaswal. Take, e.g., Vāj. Saṃ., xx. 17 (repeated with slight variations in Taıt. Saṃ., i. 8. 3, i, Kaṭh. Saṃ., ix. 4, Maıtr. Saṃ., i. 10. 2) containing a prayer by a royal sacrificer and his wife for expiation of wrong done in village or forest or Sābba. On the authority of Mahādhara’s commentary on Vājasaneeya Saṃhitā, Ludwig and Zimmer took the reference to Sābba to relate to ‘attacks on the great’ or to ‘partiality in deciding disputes.’ Eggeling, however, who is supported by the authors of the Vedic Index has suggested that the above may refer to gambling and other non-political activities of the Sābba. To us it seems that the solemnity and comprehensiveness of the penitential formula in the Yajus texts above cited best accords with the political activities of the royal pair in the Sābba.

22 See Eggeling SBE., Vol. xi., p. 398; Vedic Index, s.v.
23 The passage is quoted below in Keith’s tr., op. cit., p. 115:—
   “The wrong we have done in village or wild,
      In the assembly, in our members,
   The wrong to Śūdra or Aryan
   The wrong contrary to the law of either,
      Of that thou art the expiation, hail.”
Jayaswal’s statement that the *Sabba* like the *Samiti* dated from the latest Rgvedic period is based on the argument that *RV*, x. 71. 10 gives the only reference to *Sabba* in the constitutional sense. This view ignores the fact that Ludwig e.g. took a number a passages of the early Rgvedic period²⁴ to support his view that the *Sabba* was the exclusive assembly of the Brähmanas and Maghavans (‘rich patrons’).

Turning now to the Vidatha we find Jayaswal regarding it as “the parent folk-assembly” on the authority of Roth who associated it with civil, military and religious functions. In the St. Peters burg Dictionary, however, the meaning of *Vidatha* is given primarily as ‘order’, secondly as ‘the concrete body giving orders’ and finally, as the assembly for secular or religious purposes or for war.’ Jayaswal, again, is completely silent about other interpretations of the term which are contrary to the sense of ‘assembly.’ Thus while Ludwig and Zimmer agree with Roth in taking *Vidatha* at least in the derivative sense of ‘assembly,’ Oldenburg, Geldner and Bloomfield interpret it as ‘sacrifice’ at least in a derivative sense.²⁵ Even within the first group of scholars there is room for considerable difference of opinion. For unlike Roth Ludwig held it to mean primarily the assembly of Maghavans and Brähmanas, while Zimmer took it to be a smaller assembly than the *Samiti*. In view of these differences it seems impossible to predicate any certain attribute of the Vedic *Vidatha*.

²⁴ Cf. *sabhayo vipraḥ* (*RV*. ii. 24. 13) and *rāyih sabbavān* (*RV*. iv. 2. 5) quoted by Ludwig, loc. cit.

Dr. Narayan Chandra Bandyopadhyaya's views on the nature of the Vedic assemblies may be quoted in his own words as follows:—

"Probably early Sabbath were of the type [of associations of the kin], but later on the Sabbath became not only an association of kinsfolk, but of men bound together either by ties of blood or of local contiguity."

"That Sabbath which held the conspicuous place in the political institutions of the community, "which we may designate as the Political Council,? "was a central aristocratic gathering associated with the King."

"The Sabbath was the advisory body to the King ... It acted as a Judicial Assembly."

"The Samiti was also known by other names i.e. Samghati or Samgrama."

"[We] come to the following conclusions as regards the character of the Samiti:—(1) That it was a gathering of the whole folk of the community, (2) It was the assembly of the rāstra, (3) That it had a close connection with the Royal person and met on all important occasions like royal coronation, in times of war or national calamity (sic). Probably, this Samiti was convened to elect and accept the King or to approve of his acts." Op. cit., pp. 110-18.

We shall consider these points in the proper order:

Beginning with the original character of the Sabbath, it is probable enough that it was at first an association of kinsmen.26 But the author's comparison of Sabbath with "I.E. Sebh-ā" and with the cognate forms "O.E. Sibh., Ger. Sippe., Goth. Sibja" should be corrected as follows: — "Cf. *I.E. S(u)e-bbo and the related forms O.E. Sib(b), O.H.G. Sipp(e)a, Goth. Sibja, and Mod. German Sippe." The author may be right in his supposition that the Sabbath subsequently "came to mean any kind of gathering, for religious purposes, for sport or for discussion of local interest (sic)." As for his view that the Sabbath par excellence was 'the Political Council' with an aristocratic constitu-

tion, it follows more or less the same arguments and repeats the same conclusion as those of Ludwig. The author, however, has failed to consider the later criticisms of Ludwig's interpretations of the most relevant texts. Assuming that the Sabha was 'the political council,' the author's comparison of its evolution with that of "the Council of Chiefs among the Teutons, the Senate among the Romans and the Witanagemot (sic), among the Anglo-Saxons" is singularly unfortunate. For it is a well-known fact that while the Witenagemot was an offshoot of the Folkmoot, neither the Teutonic Council of Principes described by Tacitus nor the Roman Senate had a popular origin. While on his subject the author quotes Chbh. Up., v. 3. 6. ibid., viii. 14. 1 and "Sat. Br., ii. 5. 14" (a slip for iii. 4. 14) to prove, in opposition to Zimmer, the intimate connection of the Sabha with the King. This view can claim the support of the authors of the Vedic Index, who also quote two of the texts just cited. We may, however, observe that the Chhāndogya passages belong to the late Vedic period when the Sabha had apparently become restricted to the narrow sense of 'the Council' or 'the Court.' As for the Sat. Br., text, the author's comment that "Soma is here spoken of as an Emperor or Overlord holding a durbar or court to which under-Kings are flocking together" practically reproduces the words of Eggeling in the


28 Thus Bloomfield J.A.O.S., Vol. 19, pp. 13, 18, while agreeing that the sabbhā generally means a public assembly, finds for it in a few RV. and AV. passages simply the sense of 'house' or 'parlour'—a sense already attributed in the St. Petersburg Dictionary to the sabbhā in a number of Vedic texts. Bloomfield explains (loc. cit.) rayih sabbhāvān as 'wealth consisting of houses' and vidastyah sabbeyah (RV. 1. 91. 20) as 'genteel, of good house.'
footnote to his translation. The author, however, completely overlooks the different version of the Kāṇva recension quoted by Eggeling in the same context. If, indeed, we are to judge from the epithet Sabhāpati occurring in the Yajus texts above cited, the connection of the Sabhā with the King must have become indirect at a relatively early period. The author’s view based upon the authority of AV. vii. 12, namely that the Sabhā was the advisory body to the King, is plausible enough. Again, his opinion that the Sabhā acted as the judicial assembly is practically identical with the view of Dr. Jayaswal which we have fully considered above. The author, however, it must be mentioned, has failed to explain how a body, which in one aspect was a ‘political council’ with an aristocratic constitution or “the advisory council of the selected few”, could in another aspect be regarded as a “judicial assembly.” As regards the Samiti, the author’s identification of this assembly with the Samgati of RV. x. 141. 4 was anticipated long ago by Ludwig whose view was accepted by the authors of the Vedic Index. But the author’s further identification of Samiti with Samgrāma, though supported by quotations from Yāska and Śāyaṇa, is contradicted by the AV. text mentioned above. distinguishing Sabhā, Samiti and Samgrāma as separate, though evidently associated, bodies. Coming to another point, the

29 The passage is thus translated by Eggeling, S.B.E., Vol. 26, pp. 79-80. “Even his (Soma’s) own Kings come (to him) to attend the Sabhā and he is the first to salute the Kings, for he is gracious.” On the other hand the Kāṇva text, according to the same scholar, is as follows: — “For he is his gracious lord, therefore he heeds not even a King and yet (?) he is the first to salute the Kings; thus he is indeed gracious to them.”

30 Ludwig, op. cit., p. 253; VI. s.v.
author's views regarding the composition and functions of the Samiti repeat for the most part those of Dr. Jayaswal which we have discussed above, although he does not go to the length of calling it the sovereign body in the State. We need here only observe that there seems to be no warrant for the author's statement that the Samiti met on all important occasions like those of the royal coronation, war or other national calamity.
ON SOME TEXTS RELATING TO THE OWNERSHIP OF THE SOIL

In *Hindu Polity*¹ Dr. K. P. Jayaswal has presented us with an elaborate discussion relating to the question of ownership of the land in Ancient India. In the course of this discussion he examines a number of important passages from the literature of *Mimāṃsā*, *Smṛti* and *Arthaśāstra*, and he concludes that there is no evidence for ascribing to the king the right of property in the soil. In the present paper we propose to consider three of these passages to show how far Dr. Jayaswal has succeeded in proving his case.

I.

We shall first take the passage² wherein the *Manu-smṛti* gives the rule of law relating to the king's share in ancient treasure as well as metals hidden underground. It runs as follows:—

\[ \text{nibhinān-tu purāṇānām dhātūnām-eva ca kṣitau/} \\
\text{arddhabbāg-rakṣanādārāja bhūmer-adhipati-bih sah}! \]

Bühler in his English translation of the *Manusāṃhitā*³ took the last *pāda* to mean "(and) because he is lord of the soil," and pointedly drew attention to this "distinct recognition of the principle that the ownership of all land is vested in the king." He claimed to find support for his interpretation in the concluding portion of Medhātithi’s commentary on the above which he translated in the following way:

1  Part ii, pp. 173-88.
3  1a viii, 39.
“[The king] is lord of the soil (bhūmi); it is just that a share should be given to him of that which is found in the soil belonging to him.”

This explanation is altogether rejected by Dr. Jayaswal who substitutes for it a highly original interpretation of his own. He first renders the phrase “bhūmer-adhipatir-hi sah” as “the king is the protector of both the upper and the sub-soil (sic.).” Then he proceeds to quote and interpret in his own way what he thinks to be the “real portion” of Medhātithi’s commentary:

“atra hetu rakṣanād-iti yadyapi ksitaḥ nibitasya kenaścid-
ajnānān-na rājakṣayaraksopayujyate tathāpi tasya balavatāpabārah
sambhāvyate ato’sty—eva rakṣāya arthavattvam etadarthab-
mevāba bhūmeradhipatir hi sah.’

“Medhātithi...says that although no one knows what is there in the land and the government has to do very little guarding there, yet as there is a likelihood of the whole land being taken away by a strong enemy, the king is entitled to his ‘share’ for this constructive protection.”

This statement is open to objection on more than one ground. For, in the first place, even if we follow Dr. Jayaswal, in taking the phrase ‘bhūmeradhipatibh, as consisting of three distinct words ‘bhūmeḥ’ ‘adhi’ and ‘pati’ and understand the last term to mean ‘protector,’” how is it possible to render the whole, as Dr. Jayaswal does, in the sense of ‘protector of both the upper and the sub-soil’? The natural meaning of adhipati would seem to be adhikeḥ pati, ‘superior protector’ or ‘lord.’ And does Medhātithi, after all, support the theory of the king’s protectorship, as distinguished from the ownership, of the

soil? In the extract quoted above from his commentary, the point that is sought to be explained is evidently the use of the word 'rakṣanāt' with reference to what is hidden underground. Dr. Jayaswal understands Medhātithi to assert the king's protectorship of the whole land. But he overlooks the fact that the word 'tasya' in the extract 'tasya balavatā' etc. is in the masculine gender and cannot therefore possibly stand for the preceding 'ksita' which is feminine. Medhātithi, indeed, does not leave us in doubt as to his meaning. For in the lines immediately following those quoted by Dr. Jayaswal, we read prabhur-asau bhūmes-tadiyāyāśca bhuvo yallabdham tatra yuktam tasya bhāgadānam.

Here the mention of 'prabhu,' lord or sovereign as a synonym for 'adhipati' is decisive as to the meaning of the latter term. If the above arguments are accepted as correct, it will follow that Jayaswal’s charge⁴ against Bühlcr relating to the quotation of a mutilated text of Medhātithi and the consequent misinterpretation of his meaning has recoiled on his own head.

II.

The second passage would seem to involve a still more decisive answer to the question of ownership of the soil than the passage first quoted, for it apparently contrasts the rights of the king with those of his subjects. Here, however, Dr. Jayaswal has criticised the reading of the text as given

⁴ Cf. his translation:—“As there is likelihood of the whole land being taken away by a strong enemy, the king is entitled to his 'share' for this constructive protection.”
⁴⁴ Op. cit., p. 174 n
by another scholar and has advanced a correspondingly different interpretation. The passage is a verse quoted by Bhaṭṭa-
vāmin in the course of his commentary on Kauṭilya’s *Artha-
sāstra* (ii. 24). In Dr. R. Shamasastry’s edition it was quoted as follows:—

rāja bhūmeḥ patir-dṛṣṭah śāstrasajñairudakasya ca/
tābhyām-anyatā tu yad-dravyam tatra svāmyam kuṭumbinām///

It was translated by Dr. Shamasastry\(^5\) as follows:—

“Those who are well versed in the śāstras admit that the king is the owner of both land and water, and that the people can exercise their right of ownership over all other things excepting these two.”

This explanation was accepted with avidity by the late Dr. Vincent Smith\(^6\) in justification of his thesis that

“The native law of India has always recognised agricultural land as being crown property.”

Against this view Dr. Jayaswal has poured forth the vials of his patriotic indignation.\(^6\) He begins by giving a new reading of the text which he claims to be based upon a copy of the original manuscript now deposited in the Madras Government Oriental Research Library:—

rāja bhūmeḥ patir-dṛṣṭah śāstrasajñairudakasya ca/
tābhyām-anyatā tu yad-dravyam tatra svāmyam kuṭumbinām///

Then he proceeds to translate it in the following way:—

“The king is the protector (*pati*), according to the opinion of the learned in the śāstras, of the *bhūmi* (land) and water. Excepting these two whatever property there may be, his family members have sameness of right therein.”

---

4b *Arthaśāstra* tr., p. 144.
5 *Early History of India*, 3rd ed. p. 131 n; *Oxford History of India*, p. 90.
This, according to Dr. Jayaswal, is “in effect the theory of Mimāṃsā and the law and constitution” “retold in connection with the rights of the family of a ruler.” It involves, in other words, the doctrine that the king is only a protector (and not owner) and hence there is no co-parcenary of his family members therein. Now it is not a little significant that another scholar who has had the advantage of drawing upon the original manuscript has furnished a reading which fully agrees with that of Shamasastri given above. We refer to Mm. Ganapati Sastri who reads6 the second caraṇa as

‘tābbhyām anyatra yad dravyāṁ tatra svāmyāṁ kutumbināṁ.’

In view of the long and brilliant record of the last-named scholar as an editor of Sanskrit texts, the question of the king’s ownership of the soil may be considered, in so far as the present passage is concerned, to be definitely set at rest. But let us admit for a moment the correctness of Dr. Jayaswal’s reading ‘sāmyam’ instead of ‘svāmyam.’ Would the above passage still bear the sense attributed to it by Dr. Jayaswal? Our answer would depend upon the meaning of the terms ‘pati’ and ‘kutumbināṁ.’ We shall best discover this by considering the evidence of parallel passages, if any, and of the context. In the case of ‘pati,’ we have already seen how Medhātithi renders ‘adhipati’ in the verse of Manusambhitā (viii 39) as ‘prabhuḥ,’ ‘lord’ or ‘master.’ Another corroborative testimony is found in the Mānasollāsa attributed to King Someśvara (iii) of the (Western) Cālukya dynasty, which has the following verses at the end of its chapter on ‘nidbi’ (treasure trove):

Here, it will be observed, the king is declared to be the lord (īśvara) of all wealth, especially of that which is stored inside the earth. No ingenuity can twist this explicit testimony into a plea for the king’s being merely the protector. As for the term ‘kutumbin,’ it may be taken to mean a family member as Dr. Jayaswal has done, or else the head of a family. But the context in which the present passage is quoted by Bhāṭṭa-
svāmin, namely the payment of irrigation dues by the subjects, would suggest the use of kutumbinām in the latter sense. If the above arguments were to be accepted as correct, the sense of the whole passage even with the reading (sāmyam) would be as follows:

“The king is described by those who are learned in the Śāstras as the lord of the soil and water: the house-holders have the same (right of property) in all things other than these two.”

Thus even assuming the correctness of Dr. Jayaswal’s reading we have here an unequivocal declaration of the king’s right of property in the soil.

III.

The third and the last passage which we propose to consider in the present place is a quotation from the Rājanītiprakāsa of Mitramiśra.7 Let us quote the original extract:

6a Ibid., Vol. 1, 2, 360-361, G.O.S., xxviii.

7 Benares ed., p. 271.
"Kātyāyanah:—

bhūśvāmi tu smṛto rājā nānyadrayasya sarvadā/
tatphalasya hi śadbhāgaṃ prāpnuyān-nānyathaiva tu//
bhūtānāṃ tannivāsītvāt svāmitvaṃ tona kīrtitam/
tatkriyābaliśadbhāganī śubhāśubhanimittajam' iti//

Asyārtbaḥ/raja bhuvah svāmi smṛteḥ/anyadravyasya bhū-

misambaddhadravyasya na svāmi/anyathā bhūmisvāmyābhāve/

bhūtānāṃ prānināṃ/tannivāsītvāt bhūnivāsītvāt/svāmitvaṃ

rājña iti śesah/ityahāt tatkriyābaliśadbhāganī prāpnuyāt'.

The plain meaning of the above passage is not far to seek.
It contains a categorical affirmation of the doctrine of the king’s
ownership (svāmitvaṃ) of the land (which it explains and justi-
fies by his levy of 1/6th share of the produce thereof), and it
proceeds to derive therefrom what may be called a theory of
the king’s constructive lordship over his subjects whence again
arises the king’s right of collecting the usual sixth. But let
us see how Dr. Jayaswal understands this passage. His trans-
lation of it, which betrays his usefulness ingenuity is as follows⁸:—

“When the king is called the svāmin (master) of the land and in no case
of any other wealth, he only becomes entitled to receive the one-sixth share
of the produce from it, not [that he is master] in any other way. The
mastership which is connected with him is due to the habitation thereof by
living beings and is the one-sixth share arising from their acts whether good
or bad.

“Its meaning is [this]: king is called the svāmin of land, not of other
wealth connected with land. ‘Not in any other way’ is [laid down] as there

⁸ The above corresponds to verses 16-17 of P. V. Kane’s reconstructed
Kātyāyana text, Kātyāyanasmṛtpūrṇa, Bombay, 1933. These verses like-
wise occur in Lakṣṇāmadhāra’s Kṛtyakalpataru quoted in the Kṛpāntipradēṣa of
Mitramīśa, Chowkhamba Skt. Series, p. 271.
is want of mastership in land. 'Living beings' are those having life; 'habitation thereof' is habitation of the land; 'mastership,' that is, mastership of the king. Hence he can only receive one-sixth from their acts.'

Now the above translation is open to the following objections:

1. The word 'only' has nothing corresponding to it in the original text of Kātyāyana.

2. In Kātyāyana's verse above-quoted 'smṛtaḥ' is evidently taken by Dr. Jayaswal to be in the subjunctive and 'prāpnuyāt' in the present tense. This involves an unnecessary forcing of the sense.

3. Dr. Jayaswal evidently understands 'nānyathā' in Kātyāyana to stand for something like 'nānyathā svāmi smṛtaḥ.' But the natural connection of 'anyathā' is with 'prāpnuyāt.' Besides how can 'svāmi be detached from the compound 'bhūsvāmi?'

4. If the words 'anyathā bhūsvāmyābhāvē' in the commentary were meant to be understood in Dr. Jayaswal's sense, Mitramiśra would have added a corresponding verb like 'smṛtaḥ' to explain his meaning (cf. his explanation of the phrase 'tatkriyā°' in the same extract as 'tatkriyābhālisadbbāgam prāpnuyāt') and 'bhūmisvāmya°' would have had the fifth and not the seventh case-ending (vibhakti). As it stands, it can only be taken to signify the commentator's sense that 'anyathā' means 'if the king were not the owner of the land.'

10 We may quote here the high authority of P. V. Kane who translates (Kātyāyanā-smṛtiśāroddhāra, p. 121) the two verses of Kātyāyana quoted above as follows:

'The king is declared to be the lord of land, but never of other
The result of the foregoing discussion would seem to show that three out of the texts quoted by Dr. Jayaswal to disprove the king's ownership of the land do not support his case, but prove just the contrary.\textsuperscript{11} On the other hand the evidence of the Mīmāṃsā text (vi. 7. 3) which Dr. Jayaswal in the same context quotes\textsuperscript{12} along with the commentaries thereon is no less decisive as to the denial of the king's proprietary right. There is nothing surprising in this contradiction. We have here evidently to deal with two distinct schools of logists, one advocating the king's right of ownership and the other based on the authoritative Mīmāṃsā as emphatically denying the same. The seeker of truth need not indulge in the hasty generalisation, doubtless prompted by political prejudices, that agricultural land in India has always belonged to the Crown, nor should he consider it a 'sacrilege' to be told that the theory of the king's ownership of the land was not altogether unknown to some schools of Hindu legal opinion.

\textsuperscript{11} The significance of these texts has been thoroughly discussed by the present writer in his work \textit{The Agrarian System in Ancient India}. Calcutta, 1930, pp. 96 ff.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Op. cit.}, Part II, p. 175 n.
ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SOME ADMINISTRATIVE TERMS AND TITLES

Bali

This is the oldest Indo-Aryan term for the king's revenue. In the Rgveda it is the exclusive designation of the Indo-Aryan king's receipts from his subjects as well as from conquered kings.1 Zimmer, affirmed² that bali in the former sense was originally a voluntary offering on the part of the subjects, and that only in later times it assumed the character of compulsory payment or a tax. This explanation seems to have received some support from later German interpreters of the Rgveda. Grassmann,³ has for bali the equivalents 'Geschenke' (present), 'Spende' (gift), as well as 'Abgabe' (tax or tribute), while he explains *balibret* as 'abgabeleistende' (tax-paying) and 'steuerpflichtig' (liable to taxation). Even Geldner⁴ gives for bali the equivalent 'Spende' (gift) along with 'Tribut', 'Zoll' (toll) and 'Huldigung' (homage). On the other hand the authors of the Vedic Index hold⁵ that there is no evidence in the Rgveda to support Zimmer's view. It is possible that bali was from the first of the nature of a customary contribution payable by the subjects, and not depending solely upon their free choice. In the Brāhmaṇa period bali had certainly assumed the character

---

1 For references, see U. N. Ghoshal, Hindu Revenue System, pp. 4-5.
2 Altindisches Leben, 166.
3 Wörterbuch zum Rgveda, s.v. bali.
4 Der Rgveda in Answahl, Erster Teil.
5 s.v. bali.
of a tax, as is shown, e.g., by the well-known passage of the Ait. Br., describing the Vaisya as 'tributary to another, to be eaten by another, to be oppressed at will'. In later times when other items of taxation appear along with bali, the latter term seems to have been used in a wider as well as in a more restricted sense. As an example of the former kind may be mentioned that the standard lexicons\(^7\) frequently identify the terms bali, bhāga (-dheya) and kara, as common designations of the tax on land. In its more restricted sense which is found specially in the Arthaśāstra, bali is clearly distinguished from these cognate terms. Thus Arthaśāstra\(^8\) while enumerating the sevenfold 'body of income', mentions bali, bhāga and kara as distinct items included under the heading of rāṣṭra ('country-part'). Again, while describing the functions of the superintendent of agricultural store-house, the Arthaśāstra\(^9\) distinguishes bali, sadbhāga and kara with other items as component parts of rāṣṭra. Even the Manusāṁhitā\(^10\) distinguishes between bali and kara.

About the meaning of the term bali in this narrower sense there is some difference of opinion. By the commentators of the Manusāṁhitā, bali is explained in the passage just quoted as (the king's) sixth share of the produce and the like.\(^11\) In other words bali is identified with bhāga. On the other hand the Arthaśāstra which, as we have seen, further distin-

---

6 VII. 29:—anyasya balikṛt anyasyādyo yathākāmaśye yo.

7 Cf. Amara, ii. 8. 28; iii. 3. 165; Ibid., 156; Sāvatā, 36c, 626; Vaija-yanti, i. 345.

8 II. 6.

9 II. 15.

10 VIII. 307:—yatīrakṣan balmadatte karām śulkaṁ ca pārthivah\| 

pratibhāgaṁca daṇḍaṁ ca sadyo narakāṁ uṣaṁ tō||

11 dhānyādeḥ sadbhāgaḥ etc.
guishes bali from bhāga, has to discover for it an independent meaning. Thus Bhaṭṭasvāmin, commenting on one of the Arthasastra passages (ii. 15), above referred to, explains bali as 'the tenth or the twentieth part as current in different tracts and in excess of the sixth share'.

Similarly, Kṣirasvāmin in his commentary on Amara, ii. 8, 28. quotes an Arthasastra text to the effect that bali as distinguished from bhāga and kara is the means of subsistence of the king's officials. Bali, then, as used in the Arthasastra, is essentially of the nature of a petty cess over and above the king's normal share of the produce. In his commentary on the last-named passage from Kauṭilya (ii. 15), Gaṇapati Sāstri further identifies it with the so-called begging receipts of the king. Commenting on the other passage of Kauṭilya (ii. 6), Gaṇapati Sāstri more explicitly defines bali as a present or a begging receipt. The same meaning is adopted by J. J. Meyer, the German translator of the Arthasastra, who renders bali in both the above passages as 'Spende' (gift), while he explains it to be a so-called voluntary gift or contribution to the royal or state treasury ('eine sogenhante freiwillige Gabe oder Beisteuer an den Königlichen oder Staat-schatz'). It is supported by the authority of Hemacandra who in his Anekārthasamgraha gives for bali the equivalents a present and the demon called by that name. It may also

12 saṭbbāgādanyo yathādekaprasiddho daśavimśatibandhlādikah.
13 rājagābyah saṭbbāgādirbhāgaḥ pratyekam śhūvarajāngamādi deyāḥ karah niyōjoṣāyō yo balīh.
14 balīḥ saṭbbāgathikāḥ yathādekaprasiddho daśavimśatibandhlādikah yaṃ bbikṣābbhaktam vadanti.
be connected with the original signification of the term in the 
Rgveda.\textsuperscript{18}

If the above remarks be borne in mind, they may help us to fix with more precision than hitherto attained the meaning of at least one famous historical inscription containing these terms. Asoka’s Rummindei Inscription, as is well-known, closes with the words "bida Bhagavam jāteti Luminīgāme ubalikekatē atha-bhāgiyeca. Dr. F. W. Thomas,\textsuperscript{19} who first conclusively proved the term ubalikekatē in this extract to mean ‘free from bali’, added that the latter term properly meant a religious cess. His explanation has generally been accepted by scholars, although it is noticeable that Hultzsch\textsuperscript{20} translates it more freely as ‘free of taxes.’ Now applying the signification of bali as just mentioned (which we are justified in doing in view of the fact that the inscription like the Arthaśāstra distinguishes between bali and bhāga), we should translate ubalikekatē as ‘free from the additional cess.’ The pur-
port of the whole passage, then, would be that the village, in consideration of its being the birth-place of Buddha, had its rate

\textsuperscript{18} In connection with the two passages quoted above from Kautilya Shamasasty translates (Arthaśāstra tr., pp. 66, 112) bali as ‘religious taxes’ and as taxes that are levied for ‘religious purposes.’ This explanation is evidently based on the alternative meaning of the term as ‘religious offering.’ In two passages of the Aṅguttara Nikāya (II. 68 and III. 45) Rājabali actually figures in a list of five balis which is the Buddhist equivalent of the Brahmanical five daily sacrifices. Nevertheless there is nothing in the Arthaśāstra or its authoritative commentary, as Shamasasty himself recognises, to justify the above interpretation.

\textsuperscript{19} J.R.A.S., 1909, p. 467.

of land-revenue reduced by the Emperor to 1/8th, while the additional cess was abolished altogether.

**Bhāga**

The term, bhāgadūgha as applied to one of the king’s ratnins (‘Jewel-bearers’) occurs a number of times in the Yajus Samhitās and the Brāhmaṇas.\(^{21}\) If Śāyaṇa’s explanation of this term in connection with some of these passages\(^{22}\) is to be believed, bhāga as the technical designation of a specific tax was already known at this period. But elsewhere\(^{23}\) Śāyaṇa explains the same term in the sense of ‘carver,’ which shows the absence of a continuous traditional interpretation up to his own time. This, of course, has the result of leaving the meaning of the term in question an unsolved problem. In its technical sense as the designation of a specific tax on land (as distinguished from the more general sense in which, as we have seen above, it is identified with bali and kara), it occurs in the two Arthaśāstra passages to which we have referred above. *Arthaśāstra*, ii. 6, mentions bhāga with bali, kara, etc., under the heading of rāṣṭra, while in ii. 15, it includes ‘one-sixth’ (śaṭbhāga) with bali, kara, etc., under the same general heading. In this case bhāga undoubtedly means the king’s customary share of the produce normally, though not universally, amounting to 1/6th. Bhāṭṭaśvāmin, e.g., commenting on the latter passage explains śaṭbhāga in the general sense of ‘king’s share’ (rājabhāga) and adds

\(^{21}\) Cf. Taitt. Saṃ., i. 8. 9. 2; Taitt. Br., i. 7. 3. 5; 11. 4. 8. 1; Sat. Br., i. 1. 2. 17; V. 3. 1. 9, etc.

\(^{22}\) Cf. Śāyaṇa on *Taitt. Saṃ.* and *Taitt. Br.*, loc. cit.—yo rājāḥ prāpyam śaṭtham bhāgam prajābayo gṛhitvā rājāne dogdhi prayacchati sa bhāgadūghah.

\(^{23}\) Cf. Śāyaṇa on *Sat Br.*, v. 3. 1. 9.
that the term ‘one-sixth’ includes by implication other rates such as one-third and one-fourth prevailing in different tracts.\textsuperscript{21} In addition to the above, bhāga seems to have been applied in the Arthasastra by a natural extension of meaning to other taxes of a similar nature.\textsuperscript{25} Thus we have in Arthasastra, II. 24, the term udakabhāga meaning the water-tax paid by the cultivators of yet lands at varying rates. The use of the term bhāga in this connection has perhaps to be understood in the light of the well-known theory of the king’s ownership of land and water that is expressed in a couplet quoted in Bhāṭṭa-
svāmin’s commentary on the above.\textsuperscript{26} Another example of the technical use of bhāga occurs in Arthasastra, II. 12, where we have the term lavanaḥbhāga meaning the king’s share of the salt which is levied from manufacturers apparently under a system of State licenses. Mention is made in the same connec-
tion of the king’s levy of one-sixth of imported salt and pro-
vision is made for the sale of the king’s share.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{24} Śadgrahaṇam prāyikatuvaṇḍayaṇemapi yathādeśaprasiddhānām triya-
caturthādabhbhāgānāṃ sampalakṣaṇam

\textsuperscript{25} Rājaṛṣyaḥ sadbhāgādib.

\textsuperscript{26} rāja bhūmeśa patīrdeṣuḥ sāstrajñairudakasya ca/
tabhyām anyatu yaddrayaṃ tatra svāmyaṃ kṣaṇaṃ kim/ 

\textsuperscript{27} Another sense in which bhāga seems to have been used in the Arthasastra is the portion of merchandise paid by merchants to the king. In II 16 describing the duties of the Superintendent of merchandise with reference to the sale of merchandise in foreign lands, Kauṭilya says:—paravayya tu panyapatipanyayorardhamāḥ ścāgamāya śulka varanyātiva-
bikagulmataradeyabhaktabhāgavyaiśuddhamudāyaṃ pāṣaye//. Here the read-
ing bhāga is adopted both by Shamasastry and Jolly while Gaṇapati reads bhāṭaka instead. In another place, II 35, we are told regarding the duties of merchant spies in respect of the sale of merchandise:—śulka varanyātiva bhikag-
gulmataradeyabhāgabhaktapurasyagāraṣapramāṇāṃ vidyaḥ. From the close simi-
Kara

As the designation of a fiscal term kara appears to have been unknown to the early Vedic literature. In the Dharmaśātras it is already a familiar term, while it is of frequent occurrence in the Epics, the Smṛtis and the Purāṇas and the literature of Drama and Kāvya. In its general sense of a tax it is, as we have seen above, identified with bali and bhāga in the lexicons. The Jaina canonical literature similarly knows its use as the general designation of the tax on land as well as on movables. The narrower application of the term kara as the designation of a specific tax occurs in the Arthaśāstra (11. 6, 11. 15 and the Manusambaṭṭa (viii. 307) passages we have quoted above. The significance of kara in the last-named text is differently interpreted by different commentators, as is shown by the following examples:—dṛavyādānam (Medhaṭithi), bhūmi-niyamatam doyaṁ bhiranyam (Sarvajñanārayaṇa), gułmadāyādikam (Rāmacandra), grāmapuravāsibhyah pratimāsam vā bhādrapauṣa-niṣṭamena grāḥyam (Kullūka), grāmaṇvāsibhyah pratimāsikam (Rāghavānanda). The last two interpretations are very much in

larity of this passage with the one quoted immediately above, it seems clear that the word bhāga should be read in the former case as well. Now bhāga in the above passages is understood by Shamasasty (Arthaśāstra tr. pp. 120, 180) to mean ‘the portion of merchandise payable to the foreign king’ and ‘one-sixth portion paid or payable by merchants,’ while Meyer (op. cit.) renders it as ‘Königsanteil’ (king’s share).

28 The Abhidhānārāṇyendra, e.g., quotes a text mentioning no less than 16 kinds of karas of which dṛavyakara has eighteen specified sources (including gokara mahāśakara uṣṭakara chañalikara ṭṛṇakara patrāpakara kāṭṭbakara), while it also mentions kṣetракara in the sense of the different taxes of the nature of ūlkaka and so forth that are levied upon fields (yo yasmin kṣetre ūlkādirūpo viṣṭro karaḥ sa kṣetre kṣetraviṣṭayah karaḥ).
accordance with Bhaṭṭasvāmin’s explanation\textsuperscript{29} of the term in his commentary on Kauṭilya, ii. 15. With it may be connected the definition of \textit{kara},\textsuperscript{30} in Kṣirasvāmin’s quotation of the Arthaśāstra text above cited. \textit{Kara} thus appears to be of the nature of a periodical tax levied more or less universally on villagers. It is apparently this vague and unsatisfactory definition that has led modern interpreters of the Arthaśāstra to attempt a more precise analysis of its meaning. Thus in connexion with the two Arthaśāstra passages above-mentioned, Shamasasstry translates it in one place as ‘taxes paid in money’ and elsewhere as ‘taxes or subsidies that are paid by vassal kings and others.’\textsuperscript{31} In his German translation of the Arthaśāstra\textsuperscript{32} Meyer, while rendering it on the authority of Bhaṭṭasvāmin as ‘Jahressteuer’ (annual tax), thinks Shamasasstry’s first explanation to be possibly correct, while he also suggests for it the equivalent ‘Bodensteuer’ (ground-tax). Gaṇapati Śāstṛ, on the other hand, in his Arthaśāstra commentary explains \textit{kara} in the above passages as a tax levied in respect of fruit trees.\textsuperscript{33} Of all these explanations it may be said that they are not authenticated by independent evidence.

The Girnar Rock Inscription of the Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman dated c. 152 A.C. shows \textit{kara} in use as a distinct source of revenue at this period and throws some light upon its nature. There it is said of the Great Satrap that he met the expenses of construction of the dam of the Sudaśana lake out of his own

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{karaḥ prativarṣadeyaḥ Bhādrapadikavāsansāntikādyāpadānām.}
\textsuperscript{30} \textit{pratyekāṃ sāvitarajāgamādideyaḥ karaḥ.}
\textsuperscript{31} Arthaśāstra, tr., pp. 66 and 112.
\textsuperscript{32} ii. 81 and n.
\textsuperscript{33} \textit{phalavyāśādī-sambadalhāṃ rājadeyaḥ.}
purse and without oppressing his subjects by means of kara, viṣṭi, and praṇaya.\textsuperscript{34} From this it would seem that kara was held like viṣṭi and praṇaya to be an oppressive tax.

**Śulka**

Perhaps the earliest mention of śulka as a tax occurs in the *Atharvaveda* where we have in one place\textsuperscript{35} the verse:

\begin{quote}
yo dadāti śtipādāmahī lokena sammiti
sa nākamabhyārobuti yatra śulko na kriyate abalena baliyase
\end{quote}

In the above reading śulka adopted by the editor Mr. S. P. Pandit\textsuperscript{36} is based upon the evidence of all the manuscripts and oral reciters of the Veda that were available to him. It has been followed by Whitney and Lanman in their translation of the *A.V.*\textsuperscript{37} In the *Dharmasūtras* śulka is a familiar fiscal term.\textsuperscript{38} Pāṇini\textsuperscript{39} provides for the formation of words from śulka, and the term occurs in the *gaṇa ardhracādī*.\textsuperscript{40} Like bali and bhāga, śulka has a non-technical as well as a narrower technical sense. As an instance of the former kind may be mentioned the definition in the *Kāśikā* on the above sūtra of Pāṇini viz. rakṣānirveśo rājabhāgaḥ śulkāḥ, which the Bālamanaṅramā further explains as rakṣā tadārthā nirveśo bhṛtiḥ rakṣānirveśaḥ and the Padamaṅjarī explains similarly as nirveśo bhṛtiḥ rakṣānimmittakā nirveśo rakṣādinirveśaḥ. According to this
interpretation šulka is a general designation for tax. The narrower technical sense of šulka is illustrated in the standard lexicons\textsuperscript{41} which uniformly render šulka as ‘what is payable at the ferries’ etc., ghaṭṭādideya. What other items are included in the expression etc. (ādi) will best appear from Kṣīravāmin’s commentary on the above-mentioned passage of Amara:—ghaṭṭo naditarastbhānamādisabdāt guḻmapratyādau prāveśyanaīskramyadravyebhyo rājagrāḥyaḥ bhāgah śulkaḥ. Šulka, then, comprises the ferry-duities, the tolls paid at the military or police stations and the transit duties that were paid by merchants. The corresponding Pali term suṅka occurs in the same general sense of tolls, duties and customs.\textsuperscript{42} The commentators of the Manusambhūta on the passage above cited\textsuperscript{13} likewise explain śulka in the general sense of duties paid by merchants. This is shown by the following examples:—

šulkaṁ vanikprāpyabhāgaṁ (Medhātithi); śulkaṁ sthalajalapathadīnā vāniṣṭhākaparibhyo niyatastbhānesu dravyānusāre grābyāṁ dānaṁiti prasiddhāṁ śulkaṁ tarādideyam (Sarvajñānāśīla); śulkaṁ vanigāderbhatṭhādīnajñatastbhānesu dravyānusāren āyat grābyāṁ (Rāghavānanda); śulkaṁ pathikairvāṇigādibibirdīye
dām (Nandana). A somewhat more restricted application of the term šulka occurs in the Arthaśāstra. In one place\textsuperscript{44} šulka heads the list of items constituting the “dūrga” (the fortified town), while vanik, nadipāla, tara, vartani and other items are included under the heading of rāstra (the country-part). In the two Arthaśāstra passages\textsuperscript{45} that we have referred to above

\textsuperscript{41} Cf. Amara ii. 8. 27; Anekārthasamgraha, ii. 19 etc.
\textsuperscript{42} For references, see P. T. S. Dictionary, s.v. suṅka.
\textsuperscript{43} viii. 307. 44 ii. 6. 45 ii. 16; ii. 35.
śulka is distinguished from gulmadeya and taradeya as well as vartani. Śulka, then, is specifically the tax levied on merchants inside the fortified town and is distinct from the ferry-duties, etc., that are levied in the country-part. It is in strict conformity with this view that Kauṭilya elsewhere lays down rules for the collection of śulka by the superintendent of tolls at the toll-house situated near the main gate of the town. But śulka could also be collected at the ports, for in another chapter dealing with the duties of the superintendent of ships (navačjhaka) we are told that merchants should pay their share of the toll in accordance with the usage of the ports. In the same chapter Kauṭilya says that at frontier-stations ferrymen should collect tolls, charges for carriage and road-cess. This shows that śulka could be levied at the frontier-stations as well.

* * * * * * *

Mahādanāṇāyaka

Among the official titles first brought into vogue in the early centuries of the Christian era is the term mahādanāṇāyaka. This title was well-known to the Mathurā region in the reigns of the Kushan Kings in the second and third centuries of the Christian era. A similar title, viz. mahāsenapati, was known to Western India about the same time under the rule of the Sātavahana Kings. The title mahādanāṇāyaka was

46 II. 21.
47 II. 28: pataṃśuṃvatam śulkaśyaṃvanijo dadāyuh.
48 pratyaṃcara tarā śulkaśyaṃvanijo vartaniṃca gyānīyuh


2 For Mahāsenapati see Nasik Cave Inscr. of Vaśishhiputra Pulumāyi;
known to the Telugu country during the rule of the Ikṣvāku Kings about the third century A.D. In the Gupta period mahādaṇḍanāyaaka was a familiar title in the Eastern, Southern as well as Northern provinces of the Empire. Another official title, namely mahābalādbikṣata, was also in vogue in the same regions in Gupta times.


5 For this title cf. Kāramāṇḍā (Fyzabad district) Inscr. of the reign of Kumāragupta I dated GE. 117; Majhgawan (Central India) plates of Mahārāja Hastin dated GE. 191, Sohaval plates of Mahārāja Sarvanātha dated K.E. 191 and Nālandā plate of Samudragupta.

In considering these different interpretations we may begin by observing that daṇḍa may etymologically refer both to a military and a judicial office, for it means 'the army' as also 'the rod of punishment'. In conformity with this double derivation is the two-fold meaning of daṇḍanāyaka in the St. Petersburg Lexicon s.v., viz. (1) 'Richter' (2) 'Anführer einer Heeressäule, einer Kolonne'. On the other hand, it may be pointed out that apart from the great Jaina lexicon which understands the term in an impersonal sense, nearly all other lexicons take daṇḍanāyaka in the technical sense of senānī ('commander'). The title daṇḍamukhya which is no doubt a synonym for daṇḍanāyaka is taken in Kāmbadaka's Nītisāra (xviii. 49), a work usually ascribed to the Gupta period, in the sense of 'a general'. The Brhatsambhātā, which belongs to the late Gupta period, brackets (71. 4) senāpati and daṇḍanāyaka together. This suggests that both refer to the military command. We shall, therefore, not be far wrong if we conclude that mahādaṇḍanāyaka of the Kushan, Andhra, Ikṣvāku and Gupta inscriptions means 'commander-in-chief'. In what relation this officer stood to the mahābalādhikṛta and mahāsenāpati mentioned side by side in a few records of the same period, it is unfortunately not possible in the present state of our knowledge to explain.

* * * * * * * * *

6 The text is:—tantrapālaka rāṣṭrarākṣake bhūpale svarāṣṭracintākārtari.
7 Cf. Abhidhānacintāmani, ii. 9; Kalpadrūkṣa, i. 6; v. 17.
Kumārāmātya

Of the administrative terms met with for the first time in the records of the Gupta Emperors, that of Kumārāmātya is one of the most important. It has been usually interpreted to mean 'minister of the Crown-Prince,' 1 although there has been forthcoming 2 another explanation of it as 'one who has been in the service of the king from the time when he was a boy.' Both these explanations are etymologically correct, the former evidently taking the term to be a tat-purusa compound, while the latter is supported by the parallel form kumārādhyāpaka meaning 'a teacher while still a youth.' 2a The former explanation, however, is not only more natural, but is historically the only correct one, as the title rāyāmāca (Skt. rājāmātya) is found already in the records of the Sātavāhana period in Western India. 3 But whatever the etymological or historical origin of the term might have been, its true import in the Gupta administrative system can only be understood in the light of the context in which it occurs in the documents of this period. In the Allahabad pillar inscription of

---

1 Cf. Fleet, CII., iii, p. 16 n. (‘Councillor of the Crown-Prince’); Bloch, ASR, 1903-4, p. 103, (‘Prince’s Minister’); Marshall, ASR, 1911-12, p. 52, (‘Councillor of the heir-apparent’); Beni Prasad, The State in Ancient India, p. 296, (‘minister of the Prince-viceroy’); Hirananda Sastri, Nālandā and its epigraphic material, Memoirs of the Archeological Survey of India, No. 66, p. 35 (‘the prince’s or heir-apparent’s minister’). Altogether improbable is Dr. Bhandarkar’s tr. (El., xi, p. 176 n) as ‘the princes, the noble lords.’

2 Bloch in El., x, p. 50.

2a See Monier-Williams’ Dict. s.v.

3 Cf. the Nasik Cave inscription (El., viii, 8, No. 19) recording a donation by the daughter of a rāyāmāca.
Samudragupta the praśasti is said to have been composed by Harišena, the sāndhiivigrbha, kumārāmātya and mabādanāṇāyaka, who was a servant of the Emperor and whose intellect had been awakened by constant attendance on His Majesty. Another inscription records a gift by a mantri-kumārāmātya, who afterwards became also a mahābalādhikṛta and who was the son of a mantri-kumārāmātya of Candragupta II. In these cases evidently the kumārāmātya was an officer of the Crown (not 'a Councillor of the Crown-Prince'), and the examples show how he could rise to the high offices of Foreign minister, Commander-in-Chief and State Councillor. We might suppose that like the amātya of the Arthaśāstra and the 'caste of councillors and assessors' described by Megasthenes, though not to the same extent, the kumārāmātya of the Gupta period was the title of a generic class of officials, out of whom were selected the high officials of State.  

Another aspect of the kumārāmātya's functions is shown by the evidence of the copperplate inscriptions of the Gupta Emperors in North Bengal and the clay-seals of the same period that have been discovered on the site of ancient Vaiśāli in North Bihar. The Dāmodarpur plates Nos. 1 and 11 belonging to the reign of Kumāragupta I, and bearing dates corresponding to 443-444 and 449-50 A.D. refer themselves to a time when the uparika Mahārāja Jayadatta was governing the province

4 Fleet, CII., iii, No. 1. The words in the original are etac-ca kāvyam rasmevva bhāṭārakapāddanāṃ dāsasya sāmipa-parisarppan-anusṛgab-omnimitamalae-sāndhiivigrbha-kumārāmātya-mabādanāṇāyaka-Harišenaśya.

5 El., x, 15.

6 This explanation has been tacitly accepted in the History of Bengal, Vol. 1. recently published by the University of Dacca, p. 284.
(bhukti) of Puṇḍravardhana and the kumāramātya Vetiavarman appointed by him was administering the office of the District headquarters in the Koṭīvara District (viṣaya). Two other records of the same group, Nos. iv and v, belonging to the reigns of Budhagupta and Bhānu(?)gupta show that in their time, while the Puṇḍravardhana province was governed by an uparika mahārāja, the administration of the Koṭīvara district was carried on by a viṣayapati and an āyuktaka respectively. It thus appears that in the province of North Bengal the kumāramātya was carrying on those functions which were afterwards entrusted to the viṣayapati and should indeed have been normally reserved for the latter, namely that of administering the district in subordination to the provincial governor.

The evidence of the Basārh seals belonging to the same period shows that in the neighbouring province of Tirabhukti, the kumāramātya was likewise entrusted with the district administration in subordination to the provincial governor called uparika. Thus in Bloch's descriptive list of these seals, No. 20 (represented by two specimens) reads:—

'Tirabhukty-uparik-ādhikaraṇasya' while No. 22 (of which there are six specimens) reads:—

'Tira-kumāramāty-ādhikaraṇa'.

On the analogy of the Dāmodarpur plates Nos. i and ii above-mentioned, we may take them to refer respectively to the uparika in charge of the Tirabhukti province and the kumāramātya stationed at the district headquarters called Tira. Of a

7 See EI., xv, No. 7 for reference.
8 ASR., 1903-4, p. 109.
somewhat peculiar character is the seal No. 200 in Spooner’s descriptive list of clay seals discovered by him subsequently at Basarh. On it are written in characters of the 4th or 5th century A.D. the words:

\[ \text{Vaisali-nama kunche kumaramyadbikaranasya.} \]

This may be translated as ‘of the office of the kumaramy at the Kunça called Vaisali’, but of the place indicated by the phrase Vaisalinama-kunda we cannot form any idea.\(^9\)

We may now proceed to consider the significance of the legends on certain other seals found by Bloch in the course of excavations at Basarh. In Bloch’s classified list to which reference has been made above, Nos. 4, 5 and probably 9 bear the legend:

\[ \text{‘Yuvaraja-padiya-kumaramyadbikaranava’.} \]

and Nos. 6 and 7 have—

\[ \text{‘Sri-yuvaraja-bhattarakapadiya-kumaramyadbikaranasya’} \]

while No. 8 reads—

\[ \text{‘Sri-parambhattarakapadiya-kumaramyadbikaranava.’} \]

These legends were translated by Bloch respectively as follows:

9 \textit{ASR.}, 1913-14, p. 134

9a Among the clay seals discovered at Nalanda which belong to a somewhat later period, there are a few with the legends \textit{Magadhabbuktan kumaramyadbikaranasya} and \textit{Nagara-bbukta kumaramyadbikaranasya} (Hirananda Sastri, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 51-3). In the light of the Basarh seal legends just mentioned, it seems natural to refer the above to the office of the district headquarters of the provinces concerned, the office of the provincial governor being left out. Hirananda Sastri’s tr. of \textit{adbikaranava} as ‘court’ \textit{(op. cit., p. 35)} is too narrow.

‘His Highness, the Yuvarāja, the Chief of Princes’ Ministers,’ ‘(Seal) of His Highness, the illustrious Yuvarāja and Bhaṭṭāraka, the Chief of Princes’ Ministers’ and ‘His Highness, the illustrious Paramabhaṭṭāraka, the Chief of Princes’ Ministers.’ These versions are contrary to the rules of grammatical construction and the accepted meanings of the terms in question. Adbhikaraṇa is a well-known term meaning a court of justice or an office and is not synonymous with adhikṛta, Yuvarāja and bhaṭṭāraka are not two independent words, but evidently refer to one and the same personage. Yuvarāja-pādiya and paramabhaṭṭāraka pādiya are not nouns in the nominative case, but adjectival formations. Another explanation of the three legends above-mentioned has been presented by the late Mr. R. D. Banerji in his work, The Age of the Imperial Guptas. He takes ‘pāda’ (in the singular) to mean ‘equal to’ and Yuvarāja-bhaṭṭāraka to signify ‘the real heir-apparent’ as distinguished from the Yuvarājas who were ‘the younger princes of the royal family.’ From this he concludes that ‘some of the kumārāmātyas were held to be equal in rank to the princes of the blood-royal’ and others were held to be ‘equal to the heir of the Emperor,’ while others again were ‘equal in rank to His Majesty the Emperor.’ This explanation is open to the following objections:—

1. The termination pādāḥ (in the plural) is a well-known honorific designation added to the names or titles of persons. No authority has been cited to illustrate the use of pāda (in the singular) in the sense

10a R. D. Banerji, op. cit., pp. 73-4.
of ‘kalpa’ which by the way means ‘a little less than’ and not ‘equal to,’ as understood by Mr. Banerji.

(2) Even if we could understand the termination pāda in Mr. Banerji’s sense, the compound Yuvarāja-pādiya-kumārāmāty-ādhikaraṇa cannot mean ‘Of the office of the kumārāmātya equal in rank to the Yuvarāja,’ for the allīx citta (ıyā) has always a possessive sense.

(3) The distinction drawn between Yuvarāja and Yuvarāja-bhāṭṭāraṇa has not the slightest evidence in its favour. Yuvarāja by itself, always means the ‘Crown-Prince.’ It is natural to take Yuvarāja-bhāṭṭāraṇa, ‘the lord, the Crown-Prince’, as an expanded form of the simple term Yuvarāja.

(4) The conclusion to which Mr. Banerji’s arguments lead him, namely that certain Kumārāmātyas were equal in rank even to the Emperor—a fact which he himself admits to be unparalleled in the history of ancient or modern times—is enough to prove the untenableness of his interpretation.

What then, is the meaning of the three seal-legends that we are now considering? Probably the clue is furnished by the inscription on one of the seals discovered by Sir John Marshall at Bhīta in 1911-12,11 which reads:—

Mabāsvapati-mabudāṇḍanāyaka-Viṣṇurakṣita-pādānudbyāta-kumārāmāty-ādhikaraṇasya.

11 ASR., 1911-12, p. 52.
The term *pādānudhyāta* is regularly used in the Ancient Indian inscriptions to indicate the relation of a feudatory or an official to his suzerain, or that of a son or younger brother to his superior. As in this case the first sense is out of the question and the second is improbable, we have to apply the last meaning. Thus the whole inscription would probably mean that the *kumārāmātya* in question was the son of Viṣṇurakṣita, the Chief Cavalry Officer and Commander-in-chief. Evidently the *kumārāmātya* thought his office to be so unimportant that he preferred to be known even in his official capacity by his relationship to his father who held a distinguished position. If this argument has any weight, it follows that the legends *Yuvārāja-pādiya-kumārāmātya-ādhikaraṇa* and the like on the Basarh seals refer similarly to the *kumārāmātyas* who were related probably as sons to the Crown-Prince and the Emperor.

A few references in the inscriptions of the sixth and seventh centuries enable us to trace the application of the term *kumārāmātya* in the period of decline and fall of the Gupta Empire. The Aumauna plate of the Mahārāja Nandana of 232 G.E. (551-2 A.D.) introduces us to a prince who styles himself *deva-guru-pādānudhyāta-kumārāmātya*. The omission of all references to the name of the paramount sovereign shows that in the find-spot of the inscription (comprised within the modern Gaya district) he reigned practically as an independent sovereign, while his use of the well-known official designation of the Gupta period probably shows that like the Nawab Viziers of Oudh during the decline of the Mughal Empire, he retained

---

12 Cf. Fleet, *II*, iii, p. 17 *n*².  
13 *EI*, x, 12.
the official title which had belonged to his ancestors under the Gupta Emperors. More significant, still, is the evidence of the record of Lokanātha, who reigned in East Bengal in the latter half of the seventh century A.D. probably as a feudatory of the later Guptas. In this case the seal attached to the copper-plate bears in characters of the Gupta period the legend—

kumārāṃty-ādhikaraṇasya

while alongside is written in characters of the seventh century—

Lokanāthasya.

Probably the explanation is to be found in the fact that the ancestors of Lokanātha had served as Kumārāṃtyas under the Gupta Emperors and that long afterwards when their descendants assumed practical independence they continued to use not only the title, but even the identical seals of the earlier period.

* * * * * * *

☞ Khola, Mahākaṭuka, Khaṇḍapāla-Khaṇḍarakṣa

Among the titles of administrative officers occurring in the land grants of the Pāla kings and their eastern contemporaries, we find three very rare terms, Khaṇḍapāla (and its equivalent Khaṇḍarakṣa), Khola and Mahākaṭuka. They are found conjoined only in one inscription, namely the Rāmgānj plate of the Mahāmāṇḍalika Iśvarāghoṣa. The term Khaṇḍarakṣa occurs by itself in three Eastern inscriptions of this period, namely, Nālandā grant of Devapāla, Monghyr grant of Devapāla and

14 El., xv, 19.
1 Inscriptions of Bengal, iii, ed. N. G. Majumdar, pp. 149 ff.
SIGNIFICANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TERMS & TITLES

Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla, ⁴ while Khandaṇapāla occurs similarly in the Panchobh grant of Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Paramesvara Mahāmāṇḍalika Saṅgrāmagupta.⁵ Of the two other titles Khola occurs alone in the Khālimpur grant of Dharmapāla⁶ and Mahākaṭuka in the Panchobh grant above-mentioned. Evidently because of the extreme obscurity of these terms, their meaning has been left unexplained by the editors of the above grants. No more success has attended the efforts of some recent scholars who have undertaken a systematic survey of Pāla and Sena administration,⁷ for they have either left the terms without any explanation or else offered suggestions which lack any confirmation.

The clue to the proper identification of these terms has to be sought, as in many other instances of the same kind, in the Jaina canonical and post-canonical literature. To begin with Khola, it is included in a list of Desī words in Hemacandra’s

⁴ Ed. E. Hultsch, IA., xv
⁵ Ed. J. N. Sidder and Amareswar Thakur, IBORS., v, pp. 582 ff
⁶ The Antirigam Plate of Jayabhaṇḍadeva (El., xix, pp. 41 ff) has in the concluding phrase of its list of administrative officers Khandaṇapāla-Puraṇijaya-sarab on which Dr. Hirananda Sastri (Ibid., p. 44 n) writes, "Read 8urān, the adjective kirttān being in the plural; the mention of only two heroes Khandaṇapāla and Puraṇijaya must be taken to include other heroes." But apart from the grammatical difficulty hinted at by Dr. Sastri, the form of the immediately preceding phrase Virbhaṇḍadeva-ab-akṣapata-vajradatta-sandhibivragri-punnāga-pratibhāra-bhojapāla-raṇaka etc. would seem to require a reading like khandaṇapāla-puraṇijaya-puraṇijaya-sarab in place of khandaṇapāla-puraṇijaya-sarab. If so, we have here a fourth instance of the title khandaṇapāla in an Eastern grant.
⁷ Cf. Dr. R. G. Basak, in the Bengali Pravāṣi, Āśvin, 1343 and Mr. Promode Lal Paul in Dacca University Studies, Vol. ii, No. 1.
⁸ No. 2, 80.
Deśināmamālā. But none of his synonyms Laghubhagadabha and Vastraikadeśa suits our present context. On the other hand, a welcome light is offered by the Jaina lexicons. The great Jaina lexicon Abhidbāna-Rājendra gives among the synonyms of Kholā “Rājapurūṣa”, while the handy Ardha-Maghadi Dictionary of Muni Sri Ratnacandraji more specially mentions the sense of guptacara or spy. Either of these senses would admirably suit our present requirement, for in the list of officers in the two inscriptions concerned Kholā is immediately preceded and followed by a number of minor administrative titles: —

*dūta-kholā-gamāgamika-abhitvaramāṇa (Khālimpur grant)*

*kholā-dūta-gamāgamika-lekhaka-dūtapraśānika (Rāmgaṇj grant)*

The term Kaṭuka is derived from Sanskrit Kaṭu under the rule svartbe-kan. But this etymology does not help to throw light upon its technical significance. It occurs twice in Bāṇa’s Harṣacarita, meaning according to the commentator Śaṅkara, Hastipakayoktrā (“elephant-rider”) in one case, and in the other in the double sense of Tikṣṇa and Pratibhā. Leaving aside the first two senses which are quite inapplicable in the case of our inscriptions, it may be doubted whether the technical administrative significance of the term has been correctly found by the commentator. The second passage from the Harṣacarita reads: *kapavikāraṇa iva dīrṇa dīrne kaukairudvejyamānasya* which Cowell and Thomas following the commentator translate as ‘like a phlegmatic patient he is daily worried by acrid

---

9 Bombay edition, 1892, pp. 228 and 250.
10 Cf. F. W. Thomas, ‘Two lists of words from Bāṇa’s Harṣacarita,’ *IRAS.*, 1899, p. 510.
11 Harṣacarita, tr. p. 221.
doorkeepers." From all that we know of the chamberlain's duties it is extremely doubtful whether he may be taken as the type of a vexatious official, such as was evidently the author's intention. Here again the clue is found in the valuable Jaina literature. The Abhidhāna-Rājendra, quoting from the Cūrṇi of Nīśitbāṣṭra, gives for Kaṭūga (evidently the Prakrit form of Sanskrit Kaṭuka) a synonym Daṇḍaparicchedakārī which may be translated as 'one who measures (proportionately deals out?) punishment.' This may mean an officer entrusted with the administration of criminal justice, or more probably one charged with punishment of criminals. It is evident that an officer of this type has so many opportunities for misuse of his powers as to make his name a by-word for oppression in the olden times. This has apparently been done by Bāna in the passage above mentioned. With this explanation in mind we may offer a plausible interpretation of the term Mahākaṭuka of the land-grants. The Rāmgaṇj inscription has been assigned on palaeographical grounds to the eleventh century,\(^{12}\) and the Panchobh Grant to the latter part of the 12th century.\(^{13}\) It may be suggested that in Eastern India by the 11th and 12th centuries the order of Kaṭukas had been organised with a chief at its head, or more probably the Kaṭuka himself had been raised with a higher designation to the status of other first class officers. It is at any rate significant that both in the Rāmgaṇj and the Panchobh grants Mahākaṭuka occurs in juxtaposition with a number of more or

---

12 N. G. Majumdar, op. cit., p. 149.
less well-known high dignitaries with the same prefix added to their names:—

mahāsandhīvigrāhika, mahāpratibāra, mahākaraṇādhyakaṣa, mahāmudrādhibikṣa, mahākṣapatalika, mahāsangvedhikṣa, mahāsenāpati, mahāpādamulika, mahābhogaṇapati, mahātanaḍālubikṣa, mahāvīṣubapati, mahādānḍanāyaka, mahākāyastha, mahābalaṅkoṣṭhika, mahābalāḍhicarāṇika, mahāsāmanta, mahākāṭuka (Rāmgaṇī grant).

mahāsādhanika, mahākṣapatalika, mahāpratibāra, mahādvīndhaṃḍhikaraṇika, mahābalaṅḍhyakṣa, mahākāṭuka, mahāutthānaṇika, mahādānḍanāyaka, mahādānḍika (Panchobh grant).

We now turn to the term Khaṇḍāpāla and its equivalent Khaṇḍarakaṣa. This term has been tentatively translated as 'Superintendent of repairs' and as 'Superintendent of municipal wards.' These explanations evidently rest upon the supposed etymological significance of the base -khaṇḍa, for which however we are furnished with no independent authority. Here again the valuable Jaina literary evidence comes to our rescue. The Ardhā-Magadhī Dictionary has under the caption khaṇḍarakkaḥ the Hindi synonyms dāṇi ('Customs-Inspector') and Kotvāl ('Head of Police'). With this is identical the explanation in the great Jaina lexicon which gives for the same term the synonyms dāṇḍapāśika and śulpāla. The latter explanation is also given by Leumann in his edition of the Aṇṇapāṭikasūtra. Though these authoritative explanations may be

14 N. G. Majumdar, op. cit., App. x, p. 184; to the same effect R. G. Basak, loc. cit., who compares his functions with those of a P. W. D. engineer.
15 J. N. Sīkdar and Amāreswar Thakur, op. cit., 593.
16 Das Aṇṇapāṭikasūtra, erstes upānga der Jaina, I Teil, glossar.
accepted as correct, it is difficult to understand their connection with the root-word *khaṇḍa*, for which the *Deśināmamāla* (ii, 78) gives the synonyms *muṇḍa* and *madyabhāṇḍa*, none of which is applicable here. What is still more to the point, a different sense is required for *khaṇḍapāla-khaṇḍarakṣa* in the inscriptions under notice, for there we have *dāṇḍika, dāṇḍapāsika* and *śaulkika* mentioned alongside *khaṇḍarakṣa* and *khaṇḍapāla*. 17 Let us try to find out whether any clue is afforded by the juxtaposition of the title in the inscriptions concerned. 18 This is as follows:—


In the above, the titles evidently have been arranged in a number of closely-related groups. *Cauraddharānīka*, dāṇḍika and dāṇḍapāsika belong to the class of police officers, śaulkika and gaulmika to that of customs officers, prāṇtapāla and koṭṭapāla along with hastyaśvaṭṭānavaḥbalavāyāprtaka to the group of military officers, kisoravaclawagomabisājivikādhyakṣa to the class of officers in charge of State herds. What then is the significance of *khaṇḍarakṣa*? We suggest that it should be taken to belong to the group prāṇtapāla ("Warden of the Marches") and koṭṭapāla ("Officer in charge of the fortress or fortified city"). This is supported by the context of the term *khaṇḍapāla* in the

17 Cl. also Chamba Inscriptions No. 15 and 26 in Vogel, *Antiquities of the Chamba State*, pp. 166 and 199.
18 Monghyr, Bhagalpur, and Nālandā Grants.
SIGNIFICANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TERMS & TITLES

Rāmgaṅj grant: —ant thiśasanika-antah-pratihāradanḍapāla-khanḍapāla-duḥśādhyasādhanika etc.

Here the immediately preceding term danḍapāla evidently stands for danḍanāyaka, which according to the standard lexicons,\textsuperscript{19} means senāni or commander. We may mention in this connection the significant fact that in the other land-grants of the Pālas,\textsuperscript{20} the term aṅgarakṣa (evidently a military title) occurs in place of khaṇḍarakṣa of the Monghyr, Bhagalpur and Nālandā grants: —prāntapāla-kotṭapāla-aṅgarakṣa-tadāyuktaka-viniyuktaka etc. It follows from the above that khaṇḍarakṣa-khanḍapāla is a military office of nearly the same status as prāntapāla and kotṭapāla.

\textsuperscript{19} Abbidhānamacintāmaṇī, II, 9; Kalpadrukoṣa, 16, 17.
\textsuperscript{20} Bāngarh grant of Mahipāla I and Manahali grant of Madanapāla.
THE MINERAL WEALTH OF ANCIENT BENGAL

The tract of country now known as Bengal was famous even in ancient times as a well-watered land rich in fruits and crops. In the second quarter of the seventh century A.D., when the celebrated Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang visited India, he was charmed with the wealth of crops, fruits and flowers in the three provinces of Puṣṭavardhana, Tāmralipti and Karṇa-suvarṇa. Evidence however is not lacking to prove that Ancient Bengal was not without its store of precious minerals.

Diamonds

In the domain of Sanskrit literature there exists a class of works called Ratnaśāstra or Ratnaparīkṣā where we find mention of sources of different kinds of precious minerals in early times. In 1896 the French scholar Louis Finot published his work Les Lapidaires Indiens containing the text with annotated translation of eight different Ratnaśāstra works belonging to the eighth and later centuries of the Christian era. The eight works are Ratnaparīkṣā of Buddhahatta, Bṛhatasāṃhitā (chs. 80-83) of Varāhamihira, Agastimata, Navaratnaparīkṣā, Ratnaparīkṣā of Agasti, Ratnasamgraha, Laghuratnaparīkṣā and Maṇimāhā-

1 See Watters, On Yuan Chwang’s Travels in India, Vol. ii, p. 184:—
"The country [of Pun-na-fa-tan-na i.e. Puṣṭavardhana] had a flourishing population. Tanks, hospices and flower-groves alternated here and there, the crops were abundant"; Ibid., p. 190:—"The land [of Tan-mo-lih-ti=Tāmralipti] was low and moist, farming was good and flowers abounded"; Ibid., p. 191:—
"The land of [Kie (Ka)-lo-na-su-la-na or Karṇa-suvarṇa] was low and moist, farming operations were regular, flowers and fruits were abundant".
M. Finot gives the sources of diamond after these works in tabular form as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratnaparikṣa of Buddhabhaṭṭa</th>
<th>Suṣṭra</th>
<th>Himalaya</th>
<th>Māraṅga</th>
<th>Paṇḍra</th>
<th>Kalāṅga</th>
<th>Kośala</th>
<th>Vaiyāyana</th>
<th>Sūpāra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bṛhatśamhitā</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Venuṭaṭa</td>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agastimata</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Vaiṅga</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Venuṭu</td>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navaratnaparikṣa</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Māraṅga</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Vaiṅgara</td>
<td>Sopāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratnaparikṣa of Agastī</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Magadhā</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Arāha</td>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratnasamgraha</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Māraṅga</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Arāha</td>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above it follows that that Vaiṅga and Magadhā occur in place of Māraṅga in two works. How far this reference is reliable in the absence of other corroborative evidence, it is difficult to say. On the other hand it will be seen that all the six works include Paṇḍra in the list of sources of diamond. What is more, two of them distinguish the diamond of Paṇḍra from those of other lands as regards colour. From these quotations it appears that the Paṇḍra land (roughly corresponding to North Bengal) had acquired repute as a source of diamonds.

---

2 Finot, op. cit., Introduction, p. xxv.  
3 “śyāmaṃ paṇḍrabhaṇaṃ māraṅgāviṣaṇe nātyantapūaprabhaṃ sūpāraṃ sitasārdvameghasadṛśaṃ raktaṇca saurāṣṭrajam ātāmṛaṃ himaśailaṇaṃ īśāṃ bhamā vaiyāyaṭṭottabhaṃ tathā kaśiṃgāṃ kanakāvabhāṣācarīraṃ safraṣaṃ kauśalaṃ||” (Buddhabhaṭṭa’s Ratnaparikṣa 1. 19 cited in Finot, op. cit., p. 7. “Venuṭaṭe viśuddhaṃ śrīrākṣaṃupamopamaṇaṃ kauśalakaṇaṃ saurāṣṭrajam ātāmṛaṃ kṛṣṇaṃ sairāpṛakaṇaṃ vajraṃ īśāṭāmāṃ bimavai ṭataṃgajam vallapuṣpasamākṣaṃ āpitam ca kalinga śyāman paṇḍraṃ sam- bbūtaṃ” (Bṛhatśamhitā, l.xxx. 6-7, quoted in Finot, op. cit., p. 60).
even before the sixth century A.D., the date of Varāhamihira’s Byḥatsambhiṭā.

Let us now try to find out approximately at what period diamonds were found in ancient Bengal. The Agastimata says,

'Diamonds were produced in Kośala and Kaliṅga in the Kṛta age, in Vaṅga and Himālaya in the Tretā age, in Paunḍra and Saurāṣṭra in the Dwāpara age, in Surpāra and Veṇu in the Kali age.'

Similarly the Navaratnaparikṣā observes,

'Diamond was derived from Kaliṅga and Kośala in the Kṛta age, from the Himālaya and Mātaṅga in the Tretā age, from Paunḍra and Saurāṣṭra in the Dwāpara age and from Vairāgara and Sopāra in the Kali age.'

The last two verses are quoted almost verbatim in the Mānosollāsa, an encyclopaedic work compiled by King Someśvara Bhūlokamalla of the Cālukya dynasty in 131 Śaka (i.e. 1209 A.D.). From the above facts it would appear that North Bengal, according to the above-named authors of the Ratnasāstras, produced diamond after its sources had been exhausted in the regions of Oude, the Eastern sea-board and the Himalayas and before the opening up of the mines of the Sopara region on the west coast.

4 kṛte kośalakaliṅgau tretāyāṁ vaṅgahemajau
   dvāpare paunḍrasaurāṣṭrau kalau sūrpaṇavenujau||

5 kṛtyuge kaliṅgeṣu koṣale vaajasambhavah
   himālaye mātaṅgādrau tretāyāṁ kulīsambhavah
   paunḍrake ca surāṣṭre ca dvāpare parasantatiḥ
   vairāgare ca sopāre kalau bhrasambhavah||
   Navaratnaparikṣā, 37-8, quoted in Finot, op. cit., p. 148.

6 See ibid., Vol. 1, p. 65, Gaekwad’s Oriental Series [where we have kṛtyuge in place of kṛtyuge and yā ca santati in place of parasantati of the Navaratnaparikṣā verses above cited].
We have another evidence tending to the same conclusion. In the chapter called Kośaprāveśya of Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra mention is made of the arrangements for testing the precious minerals and the like deposited in the King’s treasury by the royal treasurer. We are here introduced to a description of five varieties of precious articles, namely jewels, pearls, beryls, diamonds and corals. That this chapter is based upon the materials of an old ratnaśāstra treatise, there can be no doubt. The sources of diamond are indicated here as follows:—

“Sabhārāstraṇam madhyamarāstraṇam kastirāstraṇam (v.r. kaśmaraṇastraṇam) śrīkaṭanakaṇaṁ maṇimantaṇam indravāna-kaṇca vajram.”

These regions are not easy to identify at present, although we may follow the commentator Bhaṭṭasvāmin in identifying Madhyamarāṣṭra with Kośala and Indravāna with Avanti. The omission of Bengal or any part of it from the list is very significant. Equally eloquent is the silence of The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea written by an unknown Greek mariner in the latter half of the first century A.C. This work gives us a description seriatim of the ports and trading centres from the Red Sea coast in the West to those of the Bay of Bengal in the East. It is worth noticing that the Periplus refers to the export of diamond from the Malabar coast, but not from the coast of Bengal. We may therefore surmise that the output of diamonds in North Bengal should be dated some time after the first century A.D. By the time of the Agastimata and the Navaratnaparikṣā, which should probably be dated after the
Bṛhatasamhitā (fifth century A.D.), the supply from North Bengal had become a matter of the past.

Pearls

From very early times Ceylon was famous for its production of pearls. We have however some scanty evidence to the effect that ancient Bengal also was a source of pearls. We give below in tabular form the places of origin of pearls as mentioned in the old ratnasāstras and works based upon them:—

Ārthasastra—Tāmraparṇi pāṇḍyakavāṭaka pāśikya kulā cūrṇi mahendra kardamā śravasi hṛada Himālaya.


Agastimata—Śīhala Āravaṇi Pārasīka Barbara. (Cited as above, p. 95).

Nūvaratnaparikṣā—Śīhala Āravaṇa Pārasīka Barbara. (Cited as above, p. 153).

It will be noticed that only one of the above works, viz. the Ratnaparikṣā, refers to the Pundra country. This solitary proof, needless to say, is not conclusive. We have however another evidence of a stronger character. The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, while describing the east coast of India, writes, 8

"There is a river near it called the Ganges and it rises and falls in the same way as the Nile. On its bank is a market-town which has the same name as the river Ganges. Through this place are brought malabathrum and Gangetic spikenard and pearls."

This mention of Gangetic pearls is supported by a reference in the Mahābhārata belonging approximately to the first two centuries A.D. The Sabhāparvan in course of its description of

8 Ibid., p. 47. (Annotated tr. by Wilfrid H. Schoff).
the eastern conquests of Bhima, mentions only the Kings living on the sea-coast as presenting pearls to the conqueror.  

**Gold**

The *Periplus*, in the course of its description of the river and town of Ganges above-mentioned, observes,

"It is said that there are gold mines near these places, and there is a gold coin which is called Calis."

We may infer from the above extract that the author, whose knowledge of the Eastern sea-board was doubtless very slight, was not very sure about his statement. We may surmise however, if there is any basis of truth in the report of the *Periplus*, that the gold mines in question were situated in the modern Chotanagpur or Tipperah belt. 

---

9 The passage (11. 30) runs as follows:—

```
sa sarvān mlecchanapatin sāgarānvāvāsinaḥ|
karamābhārayāmāsa ratnāni vidvāhani ca||
candanāgusvāṣṭrāṇi maṇimaukikakambalam|
kañcanaṁ māītabāvāya vidrmaṇca mahābhānam||
```  

10 In chapter III of the *History of Bengal*, Vol. I, p. 45 published by the Dacca University, Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri compares the above-mentioned statement in the *Periplus* with the reference to 'the gold district' (*Swarna-vūhi*) in a Faridpur grant, as also the place-name 'gold village' (*Swarnagrāma*) so well-known as the capital of Eastern Bengal in Early Muslim times. From the vagueness of these references, however, and their complete lack of corroborative evidence as also from the impossibility of locating gold mines in an alluvial area, we are tempted to ask whether the titles after all are not purely metaphorical.
THE OLDEST REPRESENTATION OF THE SĀKṬA CULT IN BENGAL ART

In his recently published work called *Excavations at Paharpur, Bengal*, Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, while describing the terra-cottas of the main shrine, writes as follows:

"Another plaque shows a man seated on a cushion, holding the top-knot of his head with the left hand and a sword in the right across his own neck as if in the act of striking. This may possibly refer to the life of Buddha himself when he cut off his long hair with his sword just before he turned a recluse.

In the absence of further references, it is not possible to trace this remarkable sculpture which is not illustrated in the volume under notice. Its significance, however, can be understood from the clear description given above.

Representations of the Buddha's cutting off his hair, preparatory to his renunciation, are by no means unknown to the Eastern school of sculpture to which category the series of terra-cottas at Paharpur belongs at least in part. This scene, for example, is represented in two stelae hailing from a village in Jessore and from an unknown site in Behar, which have been described and reproduced by the late Mr. R. D. Banerji. But neither in these nor any other known specimens the Buddha is figured as holding his sword "across his own neck as if in the act of striking."

2 *Eastern Indian School of Mediaeval Sculpture*, pp. 56, 57, and Pls xix, b, and c.
The clue to the correct interpretation of the Paharpur plaque is to be found in a series of four Pallava and Early Cola sculptures which were first identified by Dr. J. Ph. Vogel in a paper published in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*. In these sculptures which are found in the Draupadi rātha and the Varāha Cave at Mamallapuram, the Lower Cave at Trichinopoly and the temple at Puḷḷaṁaṅgai (10 miles to the south of Tanjore), we have the identical motif of a pair of male figures kneeling by the side of a four-armed goddess who can be easily identified as Durgā or Mahiṣāmardini. Dr. Vogel, after a minute examination of the sculptures in question, concludes that in each of the above examples the person kneeling to the proper right of the goddess is shown in the act of offering his own head to the deity.

The description of the kneeling figures by Dr. Vogel in the above examples tallies in all essentials with that of the seated figure of the Paharpur terra-cotta, to which Mr. Dikshit refers. In the two clear specimens, those from Trichinopoly and Puḷḷaṁaṅgai, the personage seizes the tuft of his hair by the left hand while applying the sword held in his right hand to his neck. The difference *viz.*., the absence of the goddess and the seated posture, is probably due to the fact that the Paharpur plaque was held to be not a cult-object, but a decorative design.

3 *The Head-offering to the Goddess in Pallava Sculpture,* BSOS., vi, pp. 539-543, with four plates.

4 For the illustrations of the two specimens see Dr. Vogel’s article cited above. A very similar motif (without the goddess) occurs in an old South Indian sculpture preserved in the Madras Government Museum. It is described
A terracotta panel now deposited in the Mathura Museum enables us to trace the extension of this striking motif further afield in the region of the Upper Ganges valley as far back as the Gupta period. It “shows a bearded monk with emaciated ribs detaching his own head with a sword which has half entered his throat.” In this specimen the monk is shown as kneeling with the right hand grasping the sword and the left holding the tuft of hair exactly as in the South Indian examples quoted above. As Mr. Agrawala kindly informs me, the terra-cotta was discovered from the bed of the Jumna at Muttra in 1938. Mr. Agrawala assigns it on grounds of style to the Gupta period.

The offering of his own head by the devotee is not unknown to our ancient religious literature. An early instance is found in the Rāmāyaṇa (Uttarakāṇḍa chaps. ix-x) in connection with the story of Rāvaṇa’s austerities for matching the greatness of his half-brother Vaiśravana (Kubera). How Rāvaṇa propitiated Lord Brahmā is told in the following lines:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{daśavarṣasasvabṛṇi nirāhāro daśānanah} \\
\text{pūrṇe varṣasahasre tu śiraścāgnau jahāva saḥ} \\
\text{evam varṣasahasṛṇi nava tasyāticakramuh} \| \\
\text{śirāṃsi nava cāpyasya praviṣṭāni hutāsanām} \|
\end{align*}
\]

as “showing a man holding his head by its hair with his left hand while he severs it from his body by means of a sword in his right” (F. H. Gravely, C. Sivaramamurti and other curators, Guide to the Archaeological Galleries, Madras Government Museum, Madras 1939).

5 V. S. Agrawala, Handbook of Archaeology, Muttra, 1939, p. 51, and figure 39.
atha varṣasahāsre tu daśame daśanam śirah
cohettukāme dasagrīve prāptastatra pitāmabh

The above instance is only an isolated one. It is quite otherwise with the literature of the Śāktas, where we find repeated sanctions for ritual-offering of his own blood by the devotee in honour of the goddess. In the Devī-māhātmya section of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, we are told how the king Suratha and the Vaiśya Samādhi, after hearing the story of the Devi’s māhātmya, propitiated the image of the deity by various offerings and ended by making her an offering soaked with blood from their own bodies. The Devī being propitiated appeared before them and granted them their desires:

tau tasmin puline devyāḥ kṛtvā mūrtim mabimayim
arhaṇām cakratustasyāḥ puṣpadūpāgniṭtarṇānāḥ
nirābārau yatābārau tanmanaskeu samābītau
dadatustau baliṇcaiva nījagātāṛapūkṣitam
evam samārādhaṭṭhaṃ bhirvarṣairyaṭṭhamanoh
parituṣṭa jagaddhātri prayakṣaṃ prāba caṇḍikā
devyuvāca
yat prārthyate tvayā bhūpa tvaya ca kulanandana
mattastat prāpyatam sarvam parituṣṭa dadāmi tat
tahān

The Kālikā Purāṇa has the following verses in praise of practice of blood-offering from his own body by the devotee:

śārdūlasca naraścāvā svagātra-rudhiran maṁ tatbāh
caṇḍikābhairavādānām balayah parikṣītāh

... ... ... ...

6 Rāmāyana, Uttara-kāṇḍa, Ch. x, 10-12.
7 Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, xxiii, 7-11.
8 Kālikā Purāṇa, lxvii, 5 and 12.
śimbasya śarabhasyātha svagātrasya ca śonitaiḥ/
devi triptimāvāpnoti sabasarīm pārivatsarān

With these may be quoted the verses from the same work sanctioning the offering of flesh by the devotee:

yah svabhīdayasañjātamāmsanī māsāpramāṇataḥ/
tilamudga-pramāṇādvā devyai dadyāttu bhaktitah/
śanmāsābhyantarē tasmāt kāmamīśtamāvāpnyāt

... ... ... ... ...
yenātmamāmsām satyena dadāmīsvāri bhūtaye/
nirvānāṃ tena satyena debi ham ham namo namaḥ/
ityanena tu mantreṇa svamāmsaṃ vitaraṇbuddhah

The Tantra-sāra, perhaps the most popular Tāntric nibandiḥ work in Bengal, actually quotes rules relating to the offering of one’s own blood before the goddess and the blessings supposed to follow from this act:

svagātrarudhiradāne tu

... ... ... ... ... ... ...

kaṇṭhādho nābbitaścorddhvaṃ bṛddhāgasya yatastataḥ/
pāśivayoścāpi rudhiram durgāyai vinivedayet

phalantu kumāritantre

svagātrarudhirām dattvā natvā rājaṭvamāpnyāt

yah svabhīdayasañjātam māmsam māṣa-pramāṇataḥ/
tilamudga-pramāṇam vā dadyādbhaktiyuto narāḥ/
śanmāsābhyantarē tasya kāmamīśtamāvāpnyāt

In the late Tāntric nibandiḥ work from Bengal, called Prāṇatoṣaṇī written (as we learn from the preamble) by Rāma-

9 lxvii, 172 and 184-185.
10 Tantra-sāra. pp. 933-34. Bangabāvi ed., Calcutta 1334 B.S.
toṇa Vidyālāmākāra in 1743 Śaka (1821 A.D.), we have a quotation from the Matsya-sūkta of Mahātantra. Here we have a comparative list of the merits of different kinds of blood-offerings before the Devī including that of his own blood by the devotee.\(^\text{11}\) It is a matter of common knowledge that the rule of offering blood nearest the heart before the goddess is very much observed by pious Hindu ladies of Bengal down to our own times.

The offering of one’s own blood before the goddess was not approved as a general rule by all the authorities of the Śākta cult. The Kālikā Purāṇa forbids a Brāhmaṇa to offer his own blood as well as that of some creatures in the passage mentioned below:

\[
\text{siṁham vyāghram naraṇcāpi svagātrarudhiramṛtathā na dadyāt brāhmaṇo madyām mahādevyai kudācana/}
\]

\[
\text{... ... ... ... ... }
\]

\[
\text{svagātrarudhiram dadyāccātmavadyamavāpnyāt}\(^\text{12}\)/
\]

To the same effect runs a text quoted in the Tantra-sāra:—

\[
\text{madyām dattvā mahādevyai brāhmaṇo narakam vrajet svagātrarudhiram dattvā ātmabatvāmavāpnyāt}\(^\text{13}\)/
\]

Lastly, the Haratattva-didibiti,\(^\text{13a}\) while quoting similar inhibitory texts from the Gāyatritantra, reproduces and explains away a text of the Yoginītantra expressly enjoining a Brāhmaṇa to offer his own blood to the Devī:—

\[
\text{yattu evam vipro devatāyai svagātrarudhiram dadediti}
\]

---

12 Kālikā Purāṇa, lxvii. 50 and 52.
13 Tantra-sāra, p. 934.
yogīnītantrasaṣṭhapāṭhāvacanāṁ tatādhyādhibikāriparam. pūruvavacane svagātārudhīradānasya madyatulyanindāsravanāt.

It is interesting to observe that the conflict of authorities is reflected in the literature of folk-lore which as might be expected contains a number of references to such a peculiar rite as the head-offering ceremony. In Somadeva’s Kathā-sarit-sāgara (11th century) we have in two slightly different versions (LIII, 86-193 and LXXV, 5-120) the story of the Brāhmaṇa Vīravara who to save his royal master from his impending doom actually or nearly cut off his own head as an offering to the goddess Cāṇḍikā, when the deity struck by this extraordinary act of devotion granted all his desires. In the other versions of the Vētalā-paṇcaviṃśati, such as those of Śivadāsa, Kṣemendra (in the Bṛhatkathāmaṇjari), and Jambhaladatta, Vīravara is more properly described as a rājaputra and kṣatriya. The Hitopadeśa (III, 8), which also gives the story of Vīravara similarly characterises the same as a rājaputra.

Apart from these references, we have mention of head-offering before the goddess as a familiar motif in some other well-known tales of Sanskrit literature. Somadeva’s Kathā-sarit-sāgara (LXX, 4-51), Kṣemendra’s Bṛhatkathāmaṇjari (IX. 405-415) as well as Śivadāsa’s version of the Vētalā-paṇcaviṃśati contains the story of the washerman Dhavala and his brother-in-law (or friend) who cut off their own heads for presentation to the goddess Gaurī in a fit of excessive devotion. When the grief-striken wife of Dhavala prepared to follow suit, the goddess

restored the dead persons to life. The same story is told in Jambhaladatta’s version of the Vētāla-paṇcaviṃśati with this difference that Dhavala there figures as a prince and is said to have won his bride by similarly offering to cut off his own head so as to propitiate the goddess. Above all, the Dvātrimśat-puttalikā has a number of stories of King Vikramaśitya, the paragon of royalty, who performs the same extraordinary act of sacrifice. In most of these stories (Nos. ii, vii, viii, xxviii) the king interceding in favour of some suffering mortal prepares to strike at his own neck with his sword and thus successfully propitiates the goddess Ambikā or Bhuvanesvarī or an un-named deity said to be fond of human flesh. Only in one story (xxvii) the act of devotion is performed before a Bhairava or attendant of Śiva.

The classical Tamil literature also refers to this dread rite which was known as talai-bali. Thus in the Silappadikāram translated by Mr. V. R. Ramacandra Diksitar (Oxford University Press 1939), we are told of warriors who “cut off their dark-haired heads containing such fierce red eyes as seemed to burn those upon whom they looked and willingly offered them upon the sacrificial altar (of the guardian deity) with the prayer that the conquering king might be ever victorious.”

The popularity of the head-offering motif is shown by the fact that it finds mention not only in ancient Sanskrit and Tamil, but also in modern vernacular literature of folk tales.

15 Ibid., pp. 61-63, and notes.
17 Ibid., p. 113, and the author’s note, p. 113, n.
We have thus the pathetic story of Hamir the valiant Cauhan chieftain of Ranthambhhor who had the audacity to defy the mighty Alauddin Khilji, Sultan of Delhi and at last ended his life by cutting off his own head as an offering to the God Rudra. This story is told in four Hindi poems of the first half of the nineteenth century and is illustrated by at least three series of paintings of Kangra school belonging to that period.

It thus appears that the religious rite of head-offering had an extensive vogue in Indian art and literature going back at least to Gupta times. Its motives are various, involving persuasion of the deity by the devotee for conferring material favours upon himself or upon others. It is most often associated with the Saktta cult, though some examples of its connection with the cult of Siva and other deities also occur. Examples of devotees cutting their necks in the famous centre of Saktta cult in Bengal, the temple of Kali at Kallighat, occurred as late as 1855. The religious literature of the Sakttas though it does not directly sanction this rite at least encourages the same by recognising offering of one’s own blood to the goddess as an act of merit. From this point of view our present plaque possesses a unique historical significance. If our argument is accepted as correct, the Paharpur plaque would be the oldest known representation of the Saktta cult in Bengal. Of its date we can speak only in very general


19 See the article in the Bengali monthly magazine, Bhāratīvyara, Sṛavaṇa 1347 B.S. quoting two letters dated 17.6.1854 and 21.1.1855, deposited in the Imperial Records Office, Delhi.

19a No reference is unfortunately made to this paper or even to its
terms. It has been shown in recent times\textsuperscript{20} that the Paharpur sculptures belong to three distinct chronological groups of which the first and second may be assigned to the Gupta tradition of Eastern India in the 7th century and the third to the indigenous tradition in the century following. The Paharpur terracotta, to which category our present specimen belongs, may be assigned to this later chronological stratum.

\textsuperscript{20} S. K. Sarasvati, \textit{Early Sculpture of Bengal in Jl.}, Vol. xxx, pp. 40-41. For the controversy about the date of the Paharpur sculptures see Ch. xiv. 'Sculpture' by Dr. Nihar-Ranjan Ray (p. 525 n.) in the \textit{History of Bengal}, Vol. i. published by the Dacca University. It may be added that according to this last-named author the majority of the terracotta are contemporaneous with the history of the monument and should therefore be dated not later than the last half of the eighth century A.D.
AN EPISODE IN THE HISTORY OF ANCIENT BENGAL—THE OCCUPATION OF VARENDRI (NORTH BENGAL) BY DIVYA AND HIS LINE

Introductory

Among the most interesting episodes of the Ancient History of Bengal may be mentioned the short-lived occupation, in the last quarter of the eleventh century, of Varendri, the ancestral seat of the Pāla kings, by a line of chiefs belonging to the humble Kaivarta ('fishermen') caste. The founder of this line was Divya (otherwise called Dibboka or Diboka) originally an officer of the Pāla kings, who was succeeded in turn by his brother Rudoka and his nephew Bhima. It is an index of the newly awakened interest in our country's past that a group of public-spirited citizens forming a society for the commemoration of Divya ('Divya-Smṛti-Samiti') have been till lately holding annual celebrations in honour of the long-departed chieftain. To the same active interest it is owing that an extraordinarily keen controversy has been started in our times over the life and character of the Kaivarta leader. In view of the great importance of the subject it is proposed to consider it as fully as the existing materials will allow.

The sources of Divya's history

The materials for reconstructing the lost history of Divya are remarkably scanty. Leaving aside popular tales, the evidence in favour of his historical existence was confined even so
late as thirty years ago to the references in two or three copper-plate inscriptions.\(^1\) The fortune discovery of a manuscript of the *Rāmacarita* ('the chronicle of king Rāmapāla') by the late Mm. Haraprasad Sastri in 1897 and its publication under the auspices of the [Royal] Asiatic Society of Bengal by the same scholar in 1910, have made it possible for the first time to unlock, if to a slight extent, the secret of Divya's career. The author of this precious work, Sandhyākara Nandin, composed it in the reign of Madanapāla, the youngest son of Rāmapāla, who ascended the throne after the death of his elder brother Kumārapāla and his nephew Gopāla III. The father of Sandhyākara Nandin, Prajāpati Nandin, as the author tells us at the conclusion of his work, occupied the office of 'Minister of Peace and War' (*Sāndhyāgrahika*) under the Pāla kings. The author, therefore, had ample opportunities for acquainting himself at first hand with the course of contemporary events. The *Rāmacarita* must accordingly be acknowledged to be a work of high authority for the reign of Rāmapāla and the years immediately preceding and following the same. Nevertheless, the history of Divya is still plunged in darkness and, it is feared, will remain so for a long time to come.

The materials for Divya's biography, to begin with, are altogether one-sided in character. Accordingly we are not surprised to find Sandhyākara comparing Divya's occupation of Varendrī with the abduction of Sītā by the demon King Rāvana. A similar instance of one-sided

\(^1\) See Belava Grant of Bhojavarmān and Manhāli Grant of Madanapāla, referred to below.
judgment is found in the seventeenth century history of England, where Oliver Cromwell the chief actor in the drama of the Great Rebellion was stigmatised by historians of the Stuart party as a hypocrite and a reprobate. We may surmise that if any chronicler of Divya’s party had wielded the pen, he would not have shrunk from painting Divya and Bhima as the saviours of Varendri from Mahipāla II’s yoke, in the guise of lord Kṛṣṇa emancipating the people from the tyranny of King Kāṃsa. In the interest of historical truth, therefore, we should beware of accepting at its face value any statement of the Pāla court poet, which is derogatory to Divya and his family. On the other hand we may safely accept as a historical fact any admission derogatory to the Pāla Kings or favourable to their enemies.

Another obstacle standing in the way of recovery of the complete history of Divya and his family is the scantiness of authentic data so far discovered about them. The Rāmacarita, as is well-known, belongs not to the literature of history, but to that of artificial poetry (kāvya). The literary mode of composing history in the kāvya fashion, which was foreshadowed by the Hatigumpha Inscription of Khāravela, the Nāsil prāsasti of Gautamiputra Sātakarni, the Ginnar Rock Inscription of Rudrādāman and some other famous rock inscriptions of the first two centuries before and after Christ, was afterwards adopted in the Harṣacarita and other works. The defects of a historical work proceeding from the pen of a poet using the intricacies of the kāvya style are sufficiently obvious. In a work of this character it is idle to expect regard for such cardinal canons of historical composition as definiteness of topography and chronology, con-
nected narrative of events and analysis of the principal characters. The Rāmacarita is no exception to this general rule. It is, beyond doubt, almost completely free from that undue preponderance of the descriptive element as compared with the narrative, which disfigures, for instance, the Gaudavaho of Vākpatitāja and the Kumārapālacarita of Hemacandra. Not without reason does the poet claim for his work that it is filled with the interest resulting from the events described. 3 Nevertheless it must be admitted that the historical value of this work has been greatly impaired for another reason. The Rāmacarita is throughout written in double entendre, its verses from first to last applying in one sense to Rāmacandra, the hero of the Rāmayana, and in another to Rāmapāla the Pāla King. As the poet proudly observes, his work recording the noble achievements of Rāma the lord of the Raghus and Rāmapāla King of Gauḍa is the Rāmayana of the Kali Age and he himself is the Vālmiki of the same Age. 3 In performing this difficult feat, the poet has, it is true, preserved the order of events in the Rāmāyaṇa story. But this has been neglected in places in the history of the Pāla Kings. What is most regrettable is that the facts recorded by him, while sufficiently clear in the case of Rāmāyaṇa story, are so obscure with regard to contemporary events that a commentary, which is unfortunately incomplete, is our only guide for comprehending their true import. The

2 The reference is to v. 6 of the Appendix called Kavipraśasti where the author applies the epithet ghaṭanāparisphutarasa to his work.
3 See v. 11 of the Kavipraśasti which runs as follows:—
auḍāṇam raghupariṇaḥgaudādhiparāmadavevyoreṣaḥ
kaliyugārāmāyaṇamibha kavirapi kalikālavālmikih//
published work again is based upon one single faulty manuscript. The Varendra Research Society has therefore earned the gratitude of the scholarly world by sponsoring the publication (with an accompanying English translation) of an improved edition of the Rāmacarita.¹

Divya's early life.

In the commentary to Rāmacarita 1. 12 it is said of Rāmapāla that he 'rescued the earth which had been submerged beneath the weight of the Kaivarta King.' The commentary to another verse (1. 29) states that Rāmapāla destroyed the ease of the Kaivarta King.² These two statements of the commentator are our only authority (which indeed there is no proper reason to disbelieve) for determining the caste of Divya and his family. A direct proof of Divya's official rank is furnished by another verse (1. 38) of the Rāmacarita which, as explained by the commentator,³ suggests that he held high military or political office under the Pāla Kings. The term bhṛtya applied here to Divya would evidently be inappropriate if he had been a feudatory chief. That Divya was a military officer is suggested by a reference in a contemporary inscription. In the Belāva copper-plate inscription of Prince Bhojavarman it is said, in

⁴ The reference is to be the new edition of the Rāmacaritam by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Dr. R. G. Basak and Pandit Nani Gopal Banerjee (Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, 1939).
⁵ The relevant passages are: kenah ka[h]kusita inah kaiwarāntapah tasmin nimagnāya and sa Rāmapāla...dvātāḥ śatroḥ kaiwarātasya nrpsya svāsthyam...nirāsthat.
⁶ mãṃsabhūja laksmya aṁś̄aṁ bhuṅjānena bhṛtyenoccairdaśakena naccairmabāṁ daśā avastāḥ yasya atyechritenotyartabāḥ.
the course of eulogy of his grandfather Jatavarman that the latter surpassed the strength of Divya’s arms. From the fact that Jatavarman was a contemporary of Mahipala II’s father King Vighrhapala III, it has been concluded that Divya attained fame as a general of the last-mentioned King and that this renown was eclipsed by Jatavarman. It is difficult to judge how far this view is correct. It is not improbable that Divya got his chance of winning his reputation after Mahipala’s death and that Jatavarman was alive even then.

**Character of Mahipala II.**

The greatest achievement of Divya’s life was his occupation of Varendri. Let us first analyse the character of the ill-starred Pala King who was thus deprived of his ancestral possession. In a group of eight connected verses (kulaka) the Rama-carita tells us how in one sense Sitā, the daughter of Janaka, was abducted by Rāvana and how in another sense the ancestral dominion of the Pala Kings was acquired by Divya. Taking the first of these verses, we find that it means with regard to Rāmapāla that this Prince suffered great mental anguish when his father died and his brother who was intent on impolitic measures (anitikārambha) ascended the throne. About the significance of this term anitikārambha, there is a great deal of controversy. According to some scholars who take it in its usual sense supported also by the commentary, it means that

7 The reference is to the phrase [nindan divyabhujāriyam in verse 8 of the Belava Grant, Ep. Ind., xii; or Insers. of Bengal, vol. iii (no. 3) by N. G. Majumdar.](8 1. 31:—prathamāṃparāte pītārī mahipāle bhrātārī kṣamābhārām/bibhratyanīkā[rmambha]rate rāmbhākārītāṃ dadhāt//)
Mahipala was addicted to impolitic acts. In support of this view is quoted another verse which means in substance that 'the night of the world' fell upon mankind because of the evil acts of Ramapala's impolitic elder brother and was dispelled by the first-named Prince through his majesty. Of similar import is another verse according to which, if we are to accept the commentator's explanation, the King (bhūmibhṛta) Mahipala was capable of performing wonderful tricks and was hard like a pavement of stone. In another verse of the connected group (kula) above-mentioned, Mahipala is described as 'bhūta-nayātrānayukta' which is taken by the commentator to mean that the King was engaged in non-observance of truth and policy.

According to the above view, then, Mahipala was addicted to impolicy, he was an adept in trickery, he was hard like a stone pavement, he was ever-engaged in non-observance of truth and policy. Completely different from the above is the opinion of another group of scholars. This is based primarily upon the commentator's explanation of the word antikārambhārate referred to above. Mahipala, according to this explanation, disregarded the advice of his minister who was skilled in 'the six-fold measure' of foreign policy; his troops were greatly

9 I. 22:—lokāntara-pranāyino durnayādbhājo 'graṇamano vyasanāt/ patītāṁdha-kāravatyānubbhāvādudabhi gotami tena/

10 I. 32:—rāme tu citrakūṭaṁ vikātopalapataalakṣitimaśakatōram/ bhūmibhṛtamāpatisē tapasvini mabāṣaye 'sabane/

The commentary explains it in Rāmapala's sense as follows:—
'citrakūṭaṁ abhidvatamāyam śilākuṭimāvat karkaṁ bhūbhr- 
tam mahipālaṁ tapasvīn anukampāhata堪venāpanne'.

11 I. 36.

12 bhūtaṁ sātyaṁ nayo nītāṁ tayoraraksane yuktaḥ prasaktāḥ.
alarmed at the onslaught of the assembled ‘four-fold force’ of the feudatories, some abandoned their arms, some had their bound-up hair dishevelled and others began to run away, while those who remained on the battlefield suffered heavy loss of their own accord. Nevertheless Mahipāla, without caring to acquire sufficient strength, embarked on the furious struggle with the forces of his feudatories and was submerged in the fight. In the opinion of the second group of scholars this was the only impolitic act of Mahipāla. They also hold that the word ‘impolitic’ (durnayabhāk) applied to Mahipāla in a verse above quoted\[13\] refers merely to the King’s short-sightedness regarding military affairs, while the adjectives citrakūtam and vikaṭopalapātalakūṭtimakathoram of another verse\[14\] are applied to bhūmibhṛta not with reference to Mahipāla, but in the sense of an underground prison. Finally, these authors adopt what they think to be the true reading tayorarakṣane (in place of tayarurakṣāne) in the commentary to the verse 1. 36 quoted above. Thus they explain the term bhūtanayāṭrāṇayukta of 1. 36 to mean that Mahipāla was engaged in the observance of truth and policy. From the above arguments it follows that Mahipāla’s impolitic act consisted solely in the fact that in disregard of the advice of his wise minister he confronted the formidable forces of his feudatories with his few dispirited troops; he was otherwise constantly engaged in the observance of truth and policy.\[15\]

\[13\] I. 22.
\[14\] I. 32 quoted above.
\[15\] According to Dr. R. C. Majumdar (Chap. vi. The Pālas, p. 150) in History of Bengal, vol. i, Dacca, 1943. Sandhyākara Nandi as a partizan of
Our view of the character of Divya depends upon the right answer to the two opposite views just mentioned. If Mahipāla was in reality impolitic, tricky and addicted to the violation of truth and policy, the person who delivered Varendri from his yoke must, beyond doubt be regarded as a public benefactor. Were we, on the other hand, to accept the view that Mahipāla, usually inclined to follow the paths of truth and policy, deviated from this course only by engaging in an unequal fight, the conduct of Divya would not be adjudged as deserving of much praise. In support of the second view it may be argued that the commentator explains vyasanāt in 1.22 as yuddhavyasanāt. There can be no doubt, then, that Mahipāla’s excessive proneness to fight was the chief cause of his ruin. We can safely affirm that it was this mentality that led him against the advice of his wise minister to engage in an unequal fight with the huge forces of the chiefs. Does it therefore, follow that this second view is the right one? If that were so, how should we account for the opprobrious term -rate in the phrase anitikārmbharate applied to Mahipāla in 1.31 above quoted? What, again, is the justification for the unusual explanation of bhūmibhṛta as underground prison in 1.32 quoted above. If the authors of Rāmapāla ‘cannot be regarded as an unprejudiced and impartial critic of either Mahipāla or the Kaivarta chiefs who were the enemies of Rāmapāla’. In the same context, however, Dr. Majumdar quotes the epithet rājaspravara translated by him as ‘a good and great king’ which the poet applied (t. 29) to Mahipāla. Elsewhere (op. cit., p. 154) he refers to Sandhyākara Nandi’s ‘every flattering description of the personal virtues of Bhīma and the riches and strength of his kingdom’. Do not these facts prove that Sandhyākara Nandi, in spite of his acknowledged bias in Rāmapāla’s favour, was incapable of suppressing the good points in the characters of the king’s adversaries?
the second school are right in holding that we are not in a position to go beyond the commentary, why should a different canon of interpretation be adopted in the case of the last-named verse? As regards the phrase *tayorarakṣane* (which we take to be the correct reading) in the commentary on 1 36 above quoted, we admit that Mm. H. P. Sastri in his edition of the *Rāmācarīta* has emended it into *tayoraksane*. But we cannot consider this point as he has given no reasons for the change.¹⁶ We have further, to observe that the commentator, while explaining *bhūtanayātrānayuktah* in the verse last mentioned, gives *prasakta* ('addicted') as the synonym of *yukta*. The phrase just mentioned would then mean 'excessively addicted to non-observance of truth and policy.' This interpretation, natural as it is, admirably fits in with the facts recorded in the *Rāmācarīta* about Mahipāla. The king, we are told, threw his brother into prison under the false impression that Rāmapāla would deprive him of his sovereignty. If Rāmapāla had really designed to deprive his brother of the throne, his persecution might have been in accordance with the rules of truth and policy. But, as the poet himself observes, it was at the instigation of envious people (*māyidhvaninā*) that Mahipāla was led to suspect the possibility of danger from his brother.¹⁷ For a King who was 'inordinately devoted to the violation of truth and policy,' it was but natural to subject his blameless brother to

¹⁶ The reading *tayorarakṣane* has been definitely adopted by the joint authors of the new edition, who add in a footnote (p. 38 n) that Mm. Sastri's emended reading is wrong.

¹⁷ The reference is to verses 1. 36-37 of the group (*kulaka*) referred to above.
inhuman punishment at the instigation of envious persons. We are tempted, lastly, to ask the exponents of the second view, Supposing Mahipāla to have been guilty of impolicy only in regard to military affairs why did the numberless feudatories rise against him and attack him in a body?

The causes of the rising of the vassals.

Let us try to analyse the causes of the rebellion of the assembled feudatories against Mahipāla. From the use of the phrase mālitāntasāmantacakra,\(^{18}\) it may be inferred that the rising was not confined to one or two areas, but was extended over the greater part of Bengal. To us it seems that its main cause is to be sought for in Mahipāla’s attempt to lessen or destroy the privileges of the feudatories. We have no reason to wonder at the fact that the King, who was sufficiently impolitic to imprison his blameless brother at the instigation of unworthy people, would seek to interfere with the collective privileges of his chiefs. A parallel instance is furnished by English history. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the oppressive King John not only assassinated his blameless nephew Prince Arthur, but he also started such a course of general oppression in his kingdom that the nobles were compelled collectively to take up arms against him. What constitutes their unique glory is that they were not content with looking after their own interests, but also sought the well-being of the whole people.

If the above line of reasoning be accepted as correct, we have to conclude that the rebellion of the feudatories against

\(^{18}\) This occurs in the commentary on t. 31 above quoted.
Mahipāla was primarily a large-scale attempt to safeguard their collective interests. To test the soundness of this view, we have to begin by stating that in such a case the feudatories after their success in warfare would naturally proceed to enhance their authority in their respective jurisdictions. The brothers Śūrapāla and Rāmapāla, however deserving of compassion for their unmerited suffering, would therefore fail to win the support of the chiefs and would in fact be left almost helpless. We may well believe that when at length Rāmapāla sought to recover his lost ancestral dominion, he would have to beg for the support of the chiefs and promise gift of money and territory as inducements for their services. The account that we get from the Rāmacarita and contemporary copper-plate inscriptions, exactly fits in with this hypothetical reconstruction of events. From the Manahali grant of Madanapāla 19 it appears that Mahipāla’s two brothers Śūrapāla (or Surapāla) and Rāmapāla succeeded him one after another on the throne. We may surmise that Śūrapāla enjoyed a brief and precarious rule over some part of Bengal outside Varendrī, since no reference is made to his enjoying the sovereignty either in the Rāmacarita or in the Kamauli grant of Vaidyadeva. 20 Of Śūrapāla it is said in the above-named Manahali grant that he was equal to Indra and Kārttikcyā; he was bold and skilled in policy; the amplitude of his military equipment filled with alarm the hearts of his enemies inspite of their possessing excessive valour. 21 But there

19 JASB., lxxix Pt. 1 p. 68.
21 The relevant verse (no. 14) is as follows:—
tasyābhidanaśu mahendramabimā skandah pratāpasṛiyā-
mekah sāhasasārathir gacchataḥ śriśūrapālo ivaśaḥ/
is no mention of his success in warfare. Probably Sūrapāla, though himself endowed with the qualities of courage and valour and equipped with ample supply of war materials, was unable to win much success against the vast array of his enemies. Rāmapāla, Sūrapāla’s successor on the throne, was at first filled with utter despair, as we learn from the explicit statements in the Rāmacarita (1. 40-41). Here we are told that the Prince held his pair of arms to be useless; although surrounded by sons and friends, he regarded his valour as vain; he thought lightly even of his royal position, as he was bereft of his beloved Varendri land. We may guess that the league of chiefs which destroyed Mahipāla still preserved its cohesion intact. At length Rāmapāla settled his plan of action in consultation with his sons and ministers. Visiting amid great privations the territories of the forest-chiefs and other feudatories, he built up a league favourable to himself. The chiefs, who had risen in revolt against Mahipāla and brought about his ruin on account of his impolitic acts, were now induced by the diplomacy of Rāmapāla and his ministers to veer round to the royal side. They became the King’s principal helpers in recovering Varendri, the ancestral seat of Pāla sovereignty.

In support of the view set forth above, we may further state that it is only thus that we can account for the rapid decline and fall of the Pāla dynasty. It appeared at first sight that the old glory of the Pālas was restored to them after the recovery of Varendri. Rāmapāla with the help of his maternal uncle Mathana conquered Kāmarūpa and other lands. In the East a

yah svacchanda-mśarggavibbhamabharan vibhrat |su|sarvānyudha-
pāgalbhyaena manahsu vismayabhayan sadyas tatana duṣṇm||
King of the Varman dynasty honoured him with the gift of the best chariots and elephants.\textsuperscript{22}

But this success was in reality nothing but the unnatural glare of the lamp before its final extinction. The feudatories, after their victory over Mahipāla, doubtless enjoyed enough opportunities for increasing their authority. After Rāmapāla's destruction of Bhima's rule with their aid, they must have attained a predominant position in the Pāla Kingdom. Although Rāmapāla recovered his ancestral realm with the support of the chiefs, it fell under the yoke of Vijayasena, sprung from a line of feudatories in Rādhā, sometime after the eighth regnal year of Madanapāla and the composition of the Rāmacarita. The weapon which Rāmapāla forged for the destruction of Divya's line was turned into an instrument of destruction of his own son.

\textit{Significance of Divya's occupation of Varendri.}

Let us now try to unlock the secret of Divya's acquisition of Varendri. We have no evidence to show that Divya joined the great force of feudatories against whom Mahipāla had hurled his vacillating and fleeing troops only to court his own destruction. We think that the rising of the chiefs and Divya's occupation of Varendri were two unconnected events. But we may safely state that the rising was the principal cause of Divya's success. According to the author the Varendri land was occupied by Divya who was a dasyus and upadbhirati. This last term is taken by one group of scholars to mean 'a

\textsuperscript{22} For these successes see Rāmacarita III. 24: 44-47.
disguised rebel' on the authority of the commentary. According to this view, then, Divya had no intention of rising in revolt, but he was led to take this step by the turn of events which made it his imperative duty. According to the other school, Divya somented the rising against Mahipāla as an imperative act of duty and then covertly joined the same. In other words Divya, while pretending to seek the welfare of Rāmapāla, himself seized the throne after Mahipāla's death. Even if this were the view intended by the author of the Rāmacarita, we would hesitate to accept it as gospel truth. For the Rāmacarita gives us, as said before, only an one-sided version of the incident. We may however well doubt whether the above explanation is the right one. In view of the inhuman oppression to which Rāmapāla was subjected without any fault by his elder brother, it was natural for the former to attract the compassion of his subjects. If Divya had therefore seized the throne under pretence of securing Rāmapāla's welfare, would the people of Varendri have joined the side of the treacherous usurper against their lawful king of a well established line?

Can we then accept the first-named interpretation of upadhi vratin and explain the whole passage to mean that Divya was forced to accept the sovereignty, since there was no other alternative. We think that Divya's so-called 'vow' (vratī), which is referred to by the poet, consisted in the fact that he looked not after his personal or family interests, but after the security of the people of Varendri. The gravamen of the poet's charge is that Divya occupied Varendri on the pretext of secur-
ing the people’s welfare. Let us try to find out what opportunity presented itself before Divya for doing good to the Varendri people. When Mahipala sank beneath the weight of attack of the formidable chiefs, his brothers who were heirs to the throne lay probably still immersed in underground dungeons. It would seem that under such circumstances public order almost disappeared from the kingdom. The chiefs strengthened their position where they were well-established. Varendri unlike other tracts enjoyed the unique distinction of being the ancestral seat of the Pala Kings. Was it for this that while the Khaḍgas, the Sūras, the Senas and other independent or semi-independent dynasties arose in Rādhā and Vaiga, no such dynasty could be founded in Varendri? If in reality Varendri did not possess a powerful line of feudatories, is it unnatural to apprehend that it was faced with the great peril of anarchy after the eclipse of Mahipala II’s fortunes? Does it, then, involve a great stretch of imagination, if we hold that the afflicted subjects in the situation above-mentioned sought the protection of a high official endowed with good fortune like Divya? Assuming this reconstruction of facts to be the true history of Divya’s occupation of Varendri, we need not be surprised if the partizan-poet should give a distorted version of the whole affair by affirming that Divya’s real object was not to afford protection to the helpless subjects of Varendri, but to seize the throne for himself.

The question may now be asked, whether Divya acquired the ruling authority over Varendri by popular election. We have no direct evidence to enable us to answer this question. For our only authority consists of a hidden allusion in the work
of a partizan-poet.\textsuperscript{24} We have, however, enough reason to infer that the sovereignty of Divya and his heirs was based upon the firm foundation of loyal devotion of the subjects. In the Manahali grant of Madanapāla above referred to, we are told that Rāmapāla bore himself with patience, although troubled by the formidable attacks of the people on Divya’s side, just as Indra was patient in spite of his being troubled with the attack of the demons.\textsuperscript{25} Probably Rāmapāla suffered a severe reverse while attempting for the first time to recover Varendri from Divya’s subjects. Does not this mighty effort of the people of Varendri against the old line of Kings suggest that their whole stock of heart-felt regard was bestowed upon the new chief? When the mahāpratibhāra Sivarāja, ‘the crest-jewel of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas,’ was sent by Rāmapāla to invade Varendri as a preliminary to his own invasion, he proceeded in a significant fashion. He went about, as the poet tells us,\textsuperscript{26} enquiring about

\textsuperscript{24} It will be noticed that all that the author has attempted to do in the course of the present discussion is to suggest, on the basis of a closely reasoned chain of arguments, what he thinks to be the most probable hypothesis, viz. that Divya’s assumption of royal authority in Varendri was undertaken in the interests of the afflicted people during a period of anarchy. It has further been clearly stated that there is no direct evidence in favour of the contention that Divya was chosen by popular election. In view of the above undoubted facts it is amazing to find that a well-known scholar (Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Rāmacarita edition, Introduction pp. xvi-xvii n, and Ch. vi, History of Bengal, vol. i, p. 153 n) has thought it fit repeatedly to charge the author with seeking to support ‘the popular view’ that Divya’s advent was ‘merely a popular reaction against the oppression and wickedness of the King’ [Mahipāla II] and that ‘far from being rebellious (sic.) in character it was an assertion of the popular right to dethrone a bad and unpopular King and elect a popular chief in his place’. But prejudice often works wonders!

\textsuperscript{25} The relevant verse (No. 15) has been quoted above, See JASB., 1900.

\textsuperscript{26} I. 48-50.
the names of districts and villages so that he might grant immunity only to the lands dedicated to deities and Brāhmaṇas; his sword carried devastation into the Varendri land; Bhima’s sovereignty was everywhere smashed, as his guards were destroyed by Sivarāja’s might; the inhabitants of no city could live at ease. Does not this unwonted barbarity of the invader indirectly prove the excessive regard of the subjects for the newly established sovereign? Even when Sivarāja announced to his master the results of his blood-stained expedition, Rāmapāla could not stay in peace. He equipped a formidable expedition of which the magnitude is the surest index of the fact that the collective strength of the people of Varendri was arrayed against him. Describing immediately afterwards the fight between the forces of Rāmapāla and Bhima, the author gives us a series of nine connected verses referring in one sense to the bridging of the ocean by the Epic hero Rāmacandra and in another to the binding of King Bhima by Rāmapāla. The last of this group of verses means in one sense that Rāmacandra, having acquired a reliable friend in the person of the demon-King’s second brother (Vibhiṣana) and having built a bridge of rocks, bound down the terrible ocean. In another sense it means that Rāmapāla, having joined in the fray and won over to his side the people of all quarters, captured the panic-stricken Bhima who was seated on an elephant. Here, it will be noticed, the poet, although a partizan on the enemy’s side,

27 II. 12-20.
28 The verse is as follows:

samyagmanagatarasāsenāprathamasabodareṇa rāmeṇa
bhimaḥ sa sindhunagatoraṇaṁ rucayatā kilābandhī|| 2. 20.
while pointedly alluding to the incident of Vibriṣaṇa’s
treachery, fails to refer to a similar defection in Bhīma’s
camp. Does not this fact furnish the strongest evidence of the sincere
devotion of the people to Bhīma?

Estimate of Bhīma

While dwelling in the above pages on the incidents of
Divya’s career, we thought it necessary to refer incidentally
to his capable nephew Bhīma. To us it appears that to ignore
Bhīma while adjudging the achievements of Divya is not only
to commit an act of injustice towards the memory of the former,
but also to fail to visualize the character of the latter in its
proper setting. In i. 39 the Rāmacarita describes how Bhīma
won the throne. In the light of the commentary it means that
Divya’s brother Rudoka and after Rudoka his son Bhīma ac-
quired the dominion over Varendrī. But neither Divya nor
Rudoka was able to establish his rule on firm foundations. What
they failed to do was achieved by Bhīma. For he established his
sovereignty securely over Varendrī and proved his title thereto by
taking the title of King. In the verse just quoted the author
applies to Bhīma two adjectives kriyākṣama (‘competent to work
out any scheme’) and viivaraprabhakṛt (versed in striking at the
vulnerable point’) testifying to his high capacity. The other

29 The verse (i. 29) runs as follows:—

trastānuṣṭanujasya ca bhimasya viivaraprabhakṛtah/
sābhikbyayā varendrī kriyākṣamasya khalu rakṣaniyābhūt// 1. 39.

The commentary on the above in Rāmapāla’s case is as follows:—

sā bhūmi abhikbyayā nāmnā varendrī trastā asya divyokasya yo anujo
rudokāḥ tādiyatanayasya bhimamānumaḥ randraprabhāriṇaḥ kriyā-
kṛṣamasya alan-karminyasya yatbhotākramena rakṣaniyābhūt. sa
atra bhūpatēḥ varṇtamānaḥ.
qualities of Bhima’s character are noticed by the poet in the course of a series of verses describing his fight with Rāmapāla. From these we learn that Bhima, who by the way is here explicitly designated as King, was protector of those deserving protection; with his support the chiefs of his party were able to defend themselves from the victorious enemy; he was the seat of goddesses Sarasvatī and Lākṣmī; through him the whole world enjoyed complete prosperity and good men obtained unsolicited gifts; he possessed the charitable nature of the wish-giving tree; his numerous attendants and dependants, having won a secure position were engaged in doing good to others and vitalised the whole country; he eschewed the path of unrighteousness; in his heart dwelt the lord Siva and His spouse; he never transgressed the bounds of propriety; he showed no inclination towards avarice; he manifested his noble purpose by pursuing the path of righteousness. A king who could extort such high praise from the enemy’s partisan was not an ordinary ruler. In whatever caste he was born, he must be held to have

30 The verses are as follows:—

yamanupratiṣṭya pāṇīyānāṃ pātāramekamāmṛtyāṃ/
kṣamībhṛtaḥ sapakṣā raksāṃ jñoradhurduṣṭaḥ// 2. 21.
yasmin ratnānāmāṇya sarasvatyaśi svayaṃ lākṣmīḥ/
te pārījātaśajjprayurakarindrādayo’pyāsan// 2. 23.
viśvambharaṇa lākṣmirleḥ mṛtamāpyalambbi suśravanobhiḥ/
kiṃc labbate sma śambhūraśaṇam yaṃ samāśaṇaḥ// 2. 24.
aṣṭivān jagadākhibam dadhataḥ pārśrīyamartimino ghanāḥ/
acayutapadamādhirbhyā yasya ca kalpaṃpratikṣey// 2. 25.
sa bhavāṃsamupeto bhujangamavibbūṣitah svayaṃ devah/
yo’tantatoṣobhiḥ rajadīgghītītahatamāryādah/
sukṛtāpradāyāloḥena kṛtotsāhouhban mabāśayatām// 2. 27.
deserved the regard of the whole Bengali people. To us it appears that he can be compared only with one other king of Ancient Bengal. This is Gopāla, the founder of the Pāla dynasty.

If Bhīma had been favoured with Gopāla's good fortune, he might have breathed a new life into the decayed Pāla kingdom and kindled afresh the vital spark of Bengal. It might have been given to his powerful arms to bring under control the self-seeking chiefs of Bengal and found a new dynasty broad-based upon the support of the people. In one word, the last chapter of the Ancient History of Bengal might have been written in an altogether different and more successful vein. But an inexorable destiny decreed otherwise. In the clash with the formidable forces of Rāmapāla the newly founded kingdom of Varendri was smashed to pieces. With the slaying of Bhīma by the vengeful Pāla King vanished the last efforts to establish a kingdom indirectly based on popular will in Bengal. In this lies the greatest tragedy of Bengal history.

The epilogue.

After the downfall of the rule of Divya and Bhīma, their memories began to be blackened by the poets enjoying the patronage of the restored legitimate dynasty. The Rāmacarita compared Divya's occupation of Varendri with the abduction of Sitā by the demon-King Rāvaṇa. In the Manahali copper-plate inscription of Madanapāla the conflict between Rāmapāla and Divya's subjects was likened to the struggle between the gods and the demons.\textsuperscript{31} The Kamauli copper-plate inscription

\textsuperscript{31} The relevant verse (15) runs as follows (\textit{IASB.}, l.xix, Part 1, p. 68):—
of Vaidyadeva described Rāmapāla’s recovery of Varendri after killing Bhīma as equivalent to that of Śītā by Rāmacandra after slaying Rāvaṇa.\footnote{The reference is to verse 4 of the above (Ep. Ind., ii. p. 350):—}

What is more, the last-named record deprived Bhīma of his royal title, designating him merely as a general (kṣauṇināyaka). When later the curtain was rung down upon the Ancient History of Bengal amid the clash of arms during a terrible political revolution, the Bengali people, naturally forgetful of their past history, began to lose all recollection of the Pāla Kings and their adversaries of Divya’s line. It is strictly in accordance with historical justice that it has been left to our own times not only to recover this stirring chapter in the ancient history of our land, but also for the first time to subject the chief actors in the drama to the test of critical research.
A RARE INDIAN TEMPLE-TYPE IN CAMBODIA

It is a well-known fact that classifications of types of temples (prāsādas) or of buildings in general (vimānas) form a conspicuous feature of the Indian treatises on Fine Arts (Silpa-sāstras). The schemes of classification in these works are not uniform, but are very various, depending as they do upon different principles of grouping. There is, first, the broad division into nāgara, drāviḍa and vesara, which may roughly be rendered as ‘North Indian’, ‘Deccan’ and ‘Southern’ styles. This division is found not only in Mānasāra, the standard work on Hindu architecture, but also in such compilations as the Suprabhadāgama, as is shown by reference to the valuable Dictionary of Hindu Architecture by P. K. Acharya (s.v. prāsāda). The primarily geographical character of this classification is well brought out in a few verses of the recently published work, the Silparatna,1 to which sufficient attention does not appear to have been given so far. The verses2 are as follows:—

Himavad = Vindhyayor = madhyam sāttvikam bhūtalam

Vindhyasailādi-Kṛṣṇāntam rājasaṁ parikīrtatī ||

punah Kṛṣṇādi-Kanyāntam tāmasam bhūtalam bhavet||
nāgaram sāttvike deṣe rājase drāvidam bhavet||
vesaram tāmase deṣe krameṇa parikīrtitāh||

This may be freely rendered as follows: ‘The tract between the Himalayas and the Vindhyas is one of goodness, that bet-

1 Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. lxxv.
2 Pūrvabhaṅga Ch. xvi, 47-49.
ween the Vindhyas and the Kṛṣṇā is one of passion, while the
country between the Kṛṣṇā and Cape Comorin is one of dark-
ness. The nāgarā style is said to prevail in the country of good-
ness, the dvāвидḥ style in the country of passion, and the vesara
style in the country of darkness.¹

Another important classification which the Śilparatna²
shares with the Mānasāra is into twelve groups ranging from
buildings of one storey to those of twelve storeys. Each of these
is again divided into a number of sub-groups making the huge
total of ninety-eight types.⁴

The chapters on architecture in the Brhatśambitā of Varāha-
mihira (died 587 A.C.) as well as those of Matsya and Bhaveya
Purāṇas have in common another system of classification relating
to the division of temples (prāśādas) into twenty types.⁵ This
division is based on the joint principles of height (16, 12, 10, 9,
8, 7, 6, 5 and 2 storeys), breadth (50, 43, 34, 32, 30,
20, 16, 10, 8 and 4 cubits) and shape (those of the lion, the
elephant, the bird, etc. and those having sixteen and eight
angles). The curiously complex division is traced in the Brhat-
śambitā to the still older work of Garga which is probably con-
nect ed with the Gārgya Samhitā of which a Ms. is preserved
in the Trinity College Library at Cambridge.

Yet another scheme of classification with which we are
immediately concerned is found (with minor variations in the
titles and descriptions of the types) in the architectural chapters
of the Agni and the Garuḍa Purāṇas. In these works the
temples are divided into five types, called Vaiṛāja, Puṣpaka,
Kailāsa, Manika (in the Agni Purāṇa) [Mālikā in the Garuḍa Purāṇa] and Triviṣṭapa. Of these the first is said to be a square (caturāśra), the second rectangular (tadāyata), the third circular (vr̥ttā), the fourth oval (vr̥ttāyata) and the last octagonal (aṣṭāśra). Each of these five types is divided into nine sub-groups, bringing the total to forty-five. The same five-fold division is reproduced in an early mediaeval work, the Samarāṅgaṇaśūtradhāra attributed to king Bhoja (probably the renowned Bhoja Paramāra of Malwa who reigned from c. 1010-1055 A.C.). In chapter 49 of this work we are told that the Lord Brahmac created the five classes of golden palaces (vimāṇas), viz., the vairāja, the kailāsa, the puspaka, the manika, and the triviṣṭapa for himself, for Śiva, for Kubera, for Varuṇa, and for Indra respectively. He also made temples of stone and burnt brick of the same types for the adornment of towns. These five types are said to have the same shapes (square, rectangular, circular, oval and octagonal) as the types of the Agni and the Garuḍa Purāṇas. But while the earlier works mention only forty-five sub-types, the Samarāṅgaṇaśūtradhāra raises the number to sixty-four, by dividing the vairāja or square type into twenty-four sub-groups and the rest into ten each.

The nine sub-types of temples comprised in the Agni and the Garuḍa Purāṇas under the head vairāja includes a class of which unfortunately we have different readings in different text-editions and Mss. of the same. It is called nandaka in the Poona edition of the Agni Purāṇa, while the Calcutta edition reads it as naṇḍika. The Calcutta edition of the Garuḍa Purāṇa gives the reading nandana. In different Mss. of the

6 For references, see P. K. Acharya, op. cit., s.v. prāśūda.
Agni Purāṇa referred to in the Poona edition the readings are given as nandaka and nandana. It is a curious fact that not a single concrete reference to this type has been found in the general or epigraphical literature of India and till lately in the literature of the countries influenced by Indian culture. Happily, this want has now been supplied by a recent discovery in Cambodia. In course of his works of clearance among the group of temples at Rolúoh which belong to the reign of Indravarman I (877-889 A.C.), M. G. A. Trouvé discovered in 1932 and 1935 two inscribed foundation stèles of the temples of Práh Kô and Bâkoñ. These inscriptions have since been published by M. George Cœdès in his very valuable Corpus of inscriptions of Cambodia. 7 Stanza 34 of the Bâkon inscription, which follows an enumeration of the pious acts of the king, runs as follows:—

\[\text{yāsyāmi sugatim paścād = astv = ayaṃ lakanandanaḥ} \]

\[\text{Iti = va sa dayāviṣṭah kalpayāmasya nandikam} \]

What the poet intends to convey in this typical bit of kāvya is, as M. Cœdès has well explained, 7a that the king built a nandika with the intention that it would become public after his death.

The above verse furnishes a happy instance of the way in which Indian archaeology and the archaeology of Greater India may be made to complete and supplement each other. In the first place, it definitely fixes nandika as the correct designation of the type of temples of which the Indian Mss. and printed editions of the Agni and Garuda Purāṇas have given us several variant readings. In the second place, it helps to fix the lower

limit of origin of this particular type of temples. If a nandika could be built in distant Cambodia in the latter part of the ninth century of the Christian era, its beginnings in its original Indian home may safely be traced back at least to a century earlier. It may be recalled in this connection that small flat-roofed temples consisting of a cella with a terrace in front and often surrounded by a pillared hall are characteristic of a class of shrines in the Gupta period. Interesting examples of this kind are furnished by the temple No. 17 at Sanchi as well as the ruined temples at Bhumara and Nachna-Kuthara. We may safely classify such temples under the general head vairāja and even, as will be shown presently, under the sub-type nandika or its parallels. The apsidal temples of the Gupta Age like those at Ter and Chezarla would belong to the general type manika (or mālikā) of the Agni and Garuda Purāṇas.

We may next consider whether we can identify any of the known constructions of Indravarman I of Cambodia with the sub-type nandika. M. Parmentier in his illuminating article on the art of Indravarman, notices several characteristics of this art distinguishing it alike from the primitive and the classical Khmēr art. Among these features may be mentioned the system of isolated temples with side towers, the octagonal pillars, the decoration of entrepilasters and so forth. Frequent traces are also found of terraces in these constructions. It is easy to see that the square plan of Indravarman’s buildings agrees with the general type vairāja above-mentioned. Indeed, when M. Parmentier distinguishes the square plan of Indravarman’s build-

8 L’art d’Indravarman in BEFEO., t. xix, pp. 83 ff.
ings from the rectangular structure of the primitive art, we may describe the contrast in the technical language of the Indian Silpaśāstras. We may say that it marked the transition from the puṣpaka to the vairāja style of architecture. The side towers and the terraces present a more interesting problem. The Sama-
raṅgaṇasūtradhāra, as we have observed before, gives sixty-four sub-types (instead of the usual forty-five) of the five main groups of temples, and it adds a short description of each. One of the sub-types called nandi or nanda is described⁹ as follows:

ayam samantād-utkṣipto = vāhyā-lindaṁ vinā yadā
madhyamā = linda-saudha (sthām? stha)

karṇapraśādakai = ścritah

prathamā = lindagarbhau ca samutkṣiptatarau tatāh
syātām chādyadvaycchannaub tada nando

bbidbiyate

From the context it follows that this sub-class is taken by the author to be a modification of the one immediately described above, viz., vijaya, which again is a simplification of the preceding type prthuṣṭiṇya. As we understand this difficult and obscure text, it seems that the characteristic features of the nanda type (according to the above-named authority) are as follows: cella resting on four pillars ("garbham catustambham" of the prthuṣṭiṇya type), the third and outermost terrace (alinda) wanting, but still raised on all four sides above the ground level, the second and the middlemost terrace covered with side-towers, the first and innermost terrace raised higher up and covered with double roofing (gabled roof?).

⁹ Ch. 49, vv. 89-91.
From the close similarity of names we may identify the nandi or nanda of the Samarângaṇa with the nandika of the Agni and Garuḍa Purāṇas. In that case the terraces and side-towers of Indravarman’s buildings would fit in with the recorded descriptions of the nandika-nandi-nanda in the Indian technical treatises. That king Indravarman in all his constructions was not a mere copyist is shown by two similar verses in the same Prâh Kô and Bâkoṅ inscriptions to which we have referred above. Stanza 8 of the Prâh Kô inscription is as follows:—

śrīmatśinbāsanam śrīndra-yānam śrīndravimānakaṁ
śrīndraprāśādakaṁ haimaṁ bheje yas = svadbiyā kṛtam

This evidently means that the king designed new types of conveyances (yāna), palaces (vimāna) and temples (prāsāda) which he called after his own name.
ON THE IMAGE OF LOKESHVARA IN INDO-CHINA WITH SOME INDIAN PARALLELS

I

In the course of his luminous survey of the Lokesvara cult in Indo-China¹ published some years back, the late lamented M. Finot had occasion to speak of the group of temples now called Nāk Pān lying on the northern outskirts of Angkor Thom. The researches of Finot and Goloubew² had previously demonstrated that the temple was a sanctuary of Lokesvara erected in the middle of a tank representing the Anavatapta Lake. Among the antiquities recovered from this site were some fragments of sculpture which Finot³ took to represent two hands holding a bowl with the neck turned towards the bottom ("quelques fragments représentant deux mains portant un vase le goulot dirigé vers le bas"). With these fragments Finot aptly compared a standing figure of Avalokitesvara from Sarnath,⁴ where the god has a dhyāni Buddha in samādhi pose placed above his head and holds with both hands a bowl in front of his breast. The only difference noticed by Finot⁵ between the Indian and Indo-Chinese images was that while at Sarnath the bowl is held in its natural position, at Nāk Pān it is turned down-

¹ Lokesvara en Indo-Chine, in Études Asiatiques, tome 1, pp. 227-256.
² Le symbolisme de Nāk Pān, BEFEO, xxiii, pp. 401-5.
wards and in case of figure a it actually represents the flow of the liquid.

A careful scrutiny of the Nāk Pān fragments makes us hesitate to accept Finot’s suggested identification. In figure b, it will be observed, the bowl has its lid closed which is rather an unusual pose for holding it downwards. Again in figure a, what is called the flow of the liquid looks more like the big stopper of a bottle. That the artists of Cambodia were not unacquainted with the natural representation of vases held downwards will appear from some reliefs on pediments of the smaller pavilions at Nāk Pān which are reproduced by Finot. Here the vase held downwards is not only wanting in its lid, but the flow of the liquid is shown by long vertical lines. We have therefore to look elsewhere for explanation of these mysterious fragments.

If we turn M. Finot’s photograph upside down, we at once find it to represent a bowl held upright with both hands joined in a kind of āñjali pose (see Plate). It thus very closely approaches the Sarnath Avalokiteśvara image where similarly both the hands of the god are shown as holding the bowl in āñjali mudrā.

Have we any clue for discovering the form of Avalokiteśvara represented in these images? In Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharya’s description of the 108 forms of Avalokiteśvara known to the Macchandar Viḥal at Kathmandu, the varieties of Lokesvara holding the bowl or water-pot in both hands are Vaśyādhikāra Lokesvara (Pl. xliv, No. 8), Nilakanṭha Lokesvara (Pl. xlvii, No. 17), Piṇḍapātra Lokesvara (Pl. lxi, No. 73), and Dharma-

Pl. 11. Sculptural fragment from N̄āk Pān, Cambodia [Reproduced from L. Finot's article, Lokānātāna en Indo-Chine, Littles Asiatiques, 1, Pl. 23, fig. 6, with the kind permission of the French School of the Far East]

(To face p. 240)
Unfortunately all these forms are shown as holding the bowl in the samādhi pose. Nevertheless Dr. Bhattacharya has tentatively identified\(^7\) the Sarnath image with Nilakaṇṭha Lokeśvara. In favour of this identification it may be pointed out that the bowl held by the god in the Sarnath figure looks more like a vessel full of gems than a water-pot, while in the Sādhana texts quoted by the same scholar Nilakaṇṭha is the only form of Lokeśvara holding a bowl of gems in both hands.\(^8\) In the Nāk Pān fragments still more than in the Sarnath image, the bowl looks like a vessel for containing gems. We may thus tentatively identify them as belonging to the same group of Nilakaṇṭha Lokeśvara as the Sarnath image. It must, however, be admitted that the other attributes of the deity, such as the sacred thread made of deer skin, the absence of ornaments and the two cobras on either side, are completely wanting in the Sarnath image.

II

We shall next attempt to trace the Indian affinities of the types of Lokeśvara image noticed in the valuable paper of M. Finot above mentioned. From Finot’s description it appears that the Indo-Chinese images of Lokeśvara may be iconographically arranged under the following heads:

(1) Lokeśvara with two arms

To this class belong (a) two stone images preserved in the Tourane Museum,\(^9\) showing Lokeśvara with two broken fore-

6a The Indian Buddhist Iconography, loc. cit.
8 Cf. the epithet mānaratrānapariṇākapāladhārināṁ in the sādhana of Nilakaṇṭha Lokeśvara, op. cit., p. 48.
9 Finot, op. cit., p. 234.
arms resting upon two supports, a figure in the chignon and a frontal eye; (b) a small stone image in the Hanoi Museum, representing Lokesvara standing, with two arms, left broken, right holding flask, Amitabh in coiffure;\(^{10}\) (c) the bronze image in the temples at Binh-thuân representing Lokesvara with two arms holding an ewer and a lotus;\(^{11}\) (d) Lokesvara group on Nak Păn pediments, the god standing between two personages with right hand throwing water from his flask upon the hands of a worshipper and left hand making a gesture (mudrā) towards a person bearing two jars of water.\(^{12}\) Similar images of Lokesvara are found on the seven pediments of Krol Kô and also in the Ta Som temple and the small shrine east of Ta Prohm\(^{13}\); (e) the 'Pre-Khmer image of Lokesvara from the province of Rach-giá,\(^ {14}\) with two arms, left closed with a lotus bud and right opening for showing lotus flower.

(2) Lokesvara with four arms

Under this category may be mentioned (a) a bronze image from Quangtri, now preserved in the Hanoi Museum; the four arms of this image hold lotus, flask, conch (?) and rosary;\(^ {16}\) (b) the bronze image in the two temples at Binh-Thuân;\(^ {16}\) (c) terracotta medallions of Quâng-binh\(^ {17}\) representing Lokesvara as seated in mahārāja-lilā with four arms, the upper right supporting the head; (d) a stone image recovered from the ruins from Bayon by M. Parmentier;\(^ {18}\) here Lokesvara stands upon lotus; Amitabhā

---

\(^{10}\) Ibid., p. 234.  
\(^{11}\) Ibid., p. 235.  
\(^{12}\) Ibid., p. 248.  
\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 238.  
\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 235.  
\(^{15}\) Ibid., p. 246, Pl. v.  
\(^{16}\) Ibid., p. 248.  
\(^{17}\) Ibid., pp. 249-50.  
\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 234.
in chignon, the four arms holding lotus, flask, book and rosary; (e) two seated figures at Nāk Pān with four arms, one of which holds a book.\textsuperscript{19}

(3) \textit{Lokeśvara with eight arms}

To this class belong (a) the great image at Don Tei, the right arm holding a book (all others broken), the left holding rosary, \textit{cakra, vajra}, lotus (?), sword, image of Buddha, etc. (b) the images on certain votive \textit{caityas} lying between the Angkor Thom and Bantūy Chmār sites; here the god has eight arms of which six hold lotus, rosary, book (twice?), arrow, \textit{aṅkuśa}, while the two lowermost arms in varadamudrā.\textsuperscript{20}

As for the first group it may be mentioned that the lotus bud held in the closed left hand and the same flower exhibited with open petals in the right hand are exactly the attributes of the second variety of Rakta-Lokeśvara described in three \textit{sādhana-mālā} MSS. utilised by Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharya in his work \textit{The Buddhist Indian Iconography}. The text of the \textit{dhyāna} of this deity as quoted by Dr. Bhattacharya runs as follows\textsuperscript{21}:

\begin{quote}
'Raktavarnam Amitābhagarbhajaṭāmuktaṭadharam vāmakarag-\textit{dbhitaraktapadmaṁ} tacca daksinaṇakareṇa vikāśayantāṁ.'
\end{quote}

Dr. Bhattacharya, after taking the above to mean that the god should carry the red lotus in the left hand and open its petals with the right admits\textsuperscript{22} that \textit{‘vikāśayantāṁ’} in the above may also mean ‘exhibiting,’ in which case the god would have the lotus in both of his hands. The pre-Khmūr Lokeśvara from the province of Rach-giā mentioned under class 1 (e) shows that the

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 248.  \textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 254.
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 46.  \textsuperscript{22} P. 47 n.
latter is the correct interpretation. In the work above-mentioned Dr. Bhattacharya was unable to discover any actual representation of the Rakta-Lokesvara type. The Cambodian image, however, offers such a specimen. Of the group of four-armed images, the one from Bayon with the lotus, rosary, flask and book may be compared with that of Mūlavāsa-Lokanātha of Dakṣināpatha which is twice illustrated in Foucher's *Catalogue* Nos. I 25 and I 27. The description of this figure by Foucher is as follows:—'No. 25. (Dakṣiṇāpathe Mūl—?)pavāsa-Lokanāthā āriṣasthāna. Bodh. blanc, debout, à quatre bras: 1° inférieurs: m.d. en geste qui rassure, m.g. tenant le lotus et le flacon: 2° supérieurs: m.d. tenant le rosaire. m.g. le livre....'. 'No. 27: Dakṣināpathe Mūlavāsa-Lokanāthā: Identique à la min. I, 25 [above] sauf le rosaire de la m. supérieure d. oubliée.' Slightly different from the above is the figure (No. I, 36) labelled Daṇḍabhūktau Yañāpindī-Lokanāthā whose description is as follows: Bodh. blanc, à quatre bras: 1°. inférieurs. m.d. en charité, m.g. tenant le flacon (?), 2° supérieurs: m.d. tenant le rosaire, m.g. le lotus rose....' Probably the Indo-Chinese stèles with lotus, rosary, book and indistinct object belong to the same class. Among the 108 forms of Avalokiteśvara represented in the Macchandar Vihal of Kathmandu there is none which is exactly similar to the above. But we have one form which approaches the same: This is known as Jaṭā-


24 Benoytosh Bhattacharyya, *The Indian Buddhist Iconography mainly based on the Sādhanamālā and other cognate Tantric texts of Rituals*. Appendix B.

25 See Benoytosh Bhattacharyya, *op. cit.*, No. 12, and Pl. xlv.
mukuta Lokesvara. In this form the god has one head with
the effigy of Amitabha appearing above; he has four arms, the
upper right holding rosary, the lower right in varadamudra, the
upper left a lotus stalk, and the lower left a water-pot.

The Indo-Chinese type of four-armed images with rosary,
book, vara and bhumiśparsa mudra has no match in any Indian
example. But the Eastern Indian School knows a type with the
attributes rosary, book or water-vessel, vara and lotus. The
same type is represented in Foucher's Catalogue I, 23 under the
caption Suvarṇṇapure Śrīvijayapure Lokanātha āriṣatbāna.
This is described as follows: —'Bodh. blance, debout, à quatre
bras: 1° inférieurs: m.d. en charité, m.g. repliée tenant le
lotus; 2° supérieurs: m.d. tenant le rosaire, m.g. le livre; à sa
d. autre lotus...'. A slightly different type is known to the
Eastern School with the attributes rosary, vara, kamanḍalu and
lotus.

Of the Indo-Chinese type of Lokesvara with eight arms, it
has not been found possible to observe an Indian parallel.

26, R. D. Banerji, Eastern Indian School of Mediaeval Sculpture, p. 88 and
the references there given.
28 Kramrisch, Pāla and Sena Sculptures, Fig. XLVIII.
THE VEDIC CEREMONIES OF ROYAL AND IMPERIAL CONSECRATION AND THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Introductory

Among the immense mass of ceremonies comprised in the Vedic sacrificial ritual, four are singled out in several śrautasūtra texts as the Kṣatriya’s (or the King’s) sacrifices. These are the Rājasūya, the Āsvamedha, the Puruṣamedha and the Sarvamedha. Of these the Puruṣamedha (or “human sacrifice”) and still more the Sarvamedha (or “all-sacrifice”), it has been shown, were more or less of the nature of later priestly inventions modelled on the genuine Śrauta sacrifices. As regards the Āsvamedha which ŚB. (xiii. 2. 2. 1) significantly calls ‘the King of sacrifices’, its performance necessarily lay within the competence of a ruler of undisputed supremacy. In analysing

1 Vait. Sūtra, xxxviii. 15 with which Caland (Das Varānasīsūtra des Aśtāvargveda, Amsterdam 1910, p. 113) compares Baudh. Karmāntasūtra 1. 11:—atha rājāyajñā rājasūyoyāśvamedbāḥ punuṣamedbāḥ sarvamedbāḥ etc. With the Vait. Sūtra text Eggeling similarly compares (ŚBE. Vol xliv. Introd. p. xvii) Mahābh. xiv. 48 where Vyāsa specially recommends these four sacrifices for performance by Yudhīṣṭhīra as king. See also VŚŚ. iii. 3. 1. 1: rājīna rājasūyah.


3 Cf. TB. iii. 8 9. 4 where we read, “Verily, poured away is he who, being weak, performs the Āsvamedha (parā bha vā eṣa sicyate yo’balo’śvamedbena yajate). Indicative of the high standing of the Rājasūya is the fact that the texts of different schools agree in glorifying it with the epithet Varuṇasavaya (meaning according to Śāyaṇa the consecration to the universal sway exercised
the principles of Vedic consecration ceremonies, therefore, we must rely mainly upon the Rājasūya texts, although for purpose of completing our survey we shall notice the ritual of the Vājapeya sacrifice to which the Brāhmaṇa along with the Kṣatriya is entitled.  

The Rājasūya

The fullest account of the Rājasūya has been handed down to us in a number of Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas as well as Śrautasūtras of the Yajus school. From the statement in one of these Śrautasūtra texts it appears that the Rājasūya ceremony was of several varieties. Indeed A.B., (viii 5-23), while omitting by Varuṇa). Sec, e.g., TS. v. 6. 2. i; TB. ii. 7. 6. 1, SB. v. 4. 3. 2 & 21. Also cf. SSS xv. 12. 1-5 which states how Varuṇa desiring to attain supremacy (śraisthyam svārājyam-ādhipatyam) performed the Rājasūya and directs one desiring the same to perform the same ceremony.

Jayaswal (Hindu Polity, Pt. ii. p. 14) introduces his elaborate analysis of constitutional ceremonies of the Brāhmaṇa period with the following words:—"In the Sūtras (sic) there are three ceremonies for consecrating heads of Society. There is the first and foremost the Rājasūya,......there is secondly the Vājapeya,......and thirdly there is the Sarvamedha." This view ignores the authority of the sūtra texts above quoted which include the Áṣvamedha and the Puruṣamedha in the list of royal sacrifices. On the other hand the Vājapeya, as Jayaswal himself admits, did not originally partake of a political nature and was only afterwards adopted for royal and religious consecration. Jayaswal, finally, in taking Sarvamedha to be "an exceptional ceremony performed by Emperors" attaches to it greater reality than is warranted by the texts.

5 See V.S. ix. 35—x. 34, SB. v. 2. 2-5. 5, and KSS. xv. 1-10 (for White Yajus ritual) and KŚ. xv. 1-10. MS. ii. 6. 1-13. iv. 3. 1-4. 10 (kīlakāṇḍa), T S. i. 8. 1-21 and TB. i. 6. 1-8; 10 and ÁŚ. SS. xviii. (for Black Yajus ritual). For references to Rājasūya in other schools, see B.SS. xii. ÁSŚ. ix 3-4, and SSS. xv. 13-27, as also PB. xviii. 8-11 and LSS. ix. 1-3 finally Vait. S. xxxvi.

6 See ÁSŚ., uttaraśatka iii. 3 introducing and concluding its account of the Rājasūya with the words atha rājasūyah and iti rājasūyah respectively.
all mention of the Rājasūya, describes two unique forms of royal consecration known respectively as Aindramabābhīṣeka ("the great consecration of Indra") and Punarabhīṣeka ("renewed consecration"). In the present Essay we propose to consider, first and foremost, the significance of the ritual as described in the Yajus texts and afterwards that of the A.B. ritual.

**Sacrificers’ status before consecration**

In proceeding to analyse the constitutional principles underlying the Rājasūya, we are confronted at the outset with the question of the sacrificer’s status before consecration. From the fact that "the King-elect" (sic.) is designated as "he" before the sprinkling ceremony and only called ‘King’ thereafter, Jayaswal concludes that "he becomes invested with the royal office and powers" only after the completion of the ceremony and is "an ordinary citizen" before that time. If this were so, the consecration of the King would be an act of profound constitutional importance for the reason of investing a private citizen with the royal status. In examining this view we shall do well to admit in the first instance that the sacrificer is presented to the assembled folk as King only after his consecration. On the other hand the authoritative texts of the Yajus as well as other schools agree in the view that the performer of the Rājasūya is already a King. It remains to add that the epithet "King-

8 Cf. KŚŚ. xv. 1 (rājña rājasūyo'niṣṭhiño vājapeyena); ĪŚŚ. ix. 1 (rājā rājasūyena yajeta) on which Agni-svāmin comments prāptābhīṣekaro kṣatriyo rājasūyena yajeta. Also cf. Man. SS. cited in Deva’s commentary on KŚŚ. xv. 1. 5 (quoted in Weber Über den Rājasūya, p. 8):—rājā rājyakāmo rājasūyena yajeta. Weber also compares (p. 8 n) Vaitāna S. xlii. 40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lists of Ratnins</th>
<th>At the Ratnadhavimśi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TS. 1. 8. 9. 1 ff.</strong></td>
<td><strong>MS. II. 6. 5; IV. 3. 8. KS. xv. 4.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>1. Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rājanya</td>
<td>2. Rājanya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pariṇākṣa</td>
<td>4. Pariṇākṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('neglected wife')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('leader of the host')</td>
<td>7. Kaṭṭa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Śūta</td>
<td>8. Śūta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('minstrel')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Smṛgrātṛ ('charioteer') &amp; Govikarta ('huntsman')</td>
<td>11 &amp; 12 Takṣan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Akṣāvāpa ('thrower of the dice')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(To face p. 249)
elect” applied by Jayaswal to the Rājasūya sacrificer is a gratuitous assumption. For we have hardly any positive evidence of elective monarchy in Yajus Śaṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa times.

**Ratnabāvīṃśi**

Of the complex of rites included in the Rājasūya we have first to mention the unique ceremony of the *ratnabāvīṃśi* (“Jewel-offerings”), occurring among the preliminaries of the sacrifice. This consists in the King’s making offerings to the appropriate deities on successive days at the houses of several specified persons. The lists of these persons according to the different texts are given in the accompanying chart.

In the above lists it will be seen that the Brahman priest (*Purohita* in *SB*.), the Chief Queen and the officers severally called *senāni*, *sūta*, *grāmaṇī*, *kṣattrī*, *samgrahītṛ*, *bhāgadugha* and *akṣāvāpa* are common to all. To this central group, as it may be called, are added *rājanya* and *pariṇkṛtī* according to all Black Yajus texts, while *MS* and *KS* further add *govyacha* (or *govikarta*) and *TB* the *vāvāta*; the *MS* making yet further additions of *takṣan* and *rathakāra*. On the other hand *SB*, while substituting the sacrificer himself for the *rājanya*, adds *gonikartana* and *pālāgala*. It is difficult to account for the omission in all these lists of the royal princes who figure in other parts of the Rājasūya ritual. Whatever that may be, we may conveniently arrange the names under several groups. We have, first, the Brahman-*purohita*, then the Queen (or Queens) and further, the group of officers of the royal court and household

---

9 For the son’s part see *SB*, v. 4. 2-8; for the brother’s part see *ibid*, v. 4. 4. 16-17.
down to the meanest ones. The *rājanya* in all the Black Yajus texts and the *taksan-rathakāra* in MS. probably indicate an attempt to apply the principle of representation to the class of nobles and the most favoured section of the common freemen respectively.

What then is the constitutional significance of the above ceremony? According to Jayaswal it involves the sacrificer’s ‘worship’ of the personages concerned, including not only the King’s wives and the ministers, but also ‘the headman of the village corporation’ and ‘the conquered helot.’ But in fact the worship is offered by the sacrificer to the appropriate deities in each case. In truth the texts themselves leave us in no doubt about the significance of the ceremony. MS. iv. 3. 8., in introducing its description, applies to *ratnins* the epithet of ‘limbs of the ruling power’ and observes that the kingdom of one whose *ratnins* are full of strength and vigour becomes strong and vigorous. More emphatic is the testimony of TB., i. 7. 3. 1 which states that the *ratnins* are ‘the givers’ as well as ‘the takers’ of the kingdom and as such they bestow the kingdom upon the sacrificer. In thorough accord with the above is the explanation of SB., (v. 3. 1. 1-12) mentioned in connection with each of the

11 It is worth stating that Jayaswal subsequently ibid., p. 22 tones down his statement so far as to take the whole procedure to “symbolise the obtainement (sic) of the approval of the differentiated organs of Government” for the sacrificer’s consecration to kingship.
12 *ksatrasya vā etanyāṅgāni yasya vā etāni tejasvini bhavanti tadraṣṭram tejasvī bhavati.*
13 *ete vai rāṣtrasya pradātāraḥ ete pāḍātānḥḥ/ya eva rāṣtrasya pradātāraḥ ye pāḍātāraḥ ta evaṁ ye rāṣtram prayacchanti/rāṣtram eva bhavati.*
ratnins, viz. that he (or she) assuredly is one of the King's jewels (ratnas) and that it is for him (or her) that he is thereby consecrated and him (or her) he makes his own faithful follower. According to the above view, then, the group of persons aforesaid, viz. the priest, the queen, the officials and the class (or caste) representatives, are endowed with such high constitutional status as to deserve the epithets of 'limbs of the ruling power' and bestowers of the kingdom. The object of the ceremony, accordingly, is to win for the King the allegiance of these important personages. On the strength of this description of a mere sacrificial routine and in the absence of more concrete data, it would of course be improper to draw any definite conclusions about the actual constitutional powers exercised by the above persons in the Vedic State. We may, however, point out how another Brāhmaṇa passage, quite independently of the sacrificial formula, corroborates the high constitutional position enjoyed at this period by some of the ratnins. We refer to PB., xix. 1. 4 giving a list of eight viras ('persons of distinction') among whom, as we are told, the King is consecrated and who sustain the kingdom. This list consists of the King's brother, the King's son, the purobīta, the Chief Queen, the sūta, the grāmāṇi, the kṣattr and the saṅgrabhītṛ, of whom all but the first two are found also in the ratnin lists.

Coming to individual names, we find that the Brahman priest occupies the first place in all the ratnin lists with the exception of ŚB., where the purobīta (his equivalent) is given the second position. Of the dominant position occupied by this functionary, we have evidence in other Vedic texts, notably in AB., viii. 24-28, where in course of a long eulogy of the Puro-
hita’s office he is called rāstragopa (‘protector of the kingdom’). It is, however, noticeable that in the SB. list the purohitā comes after the senāni, just as in the PB. list of viras above mentioned, he comes after the king’s brother and son. It, therefore, follows that while the majority of priestly authorities agree in assigning the highest position in the Vedic State to the representative of the holy power, others give this place to purely secular personages. The Vedic State, then, even according to the views of the priestly authors themselves, was not uniformly dominated by the spiritual power.

We now come to the Chief Queen and other Queens of lesser rank. Jayaswal¹⁴ explains their inclusion in the ratnīn list on “the principle of completing the spiritual self of the King-elect”, which is expressed in the SB. formula of the sacrificer’s mounting the post along with his wife at the Vājapeya. In this view of the case the Queen’s participation in the Rājasūya would be entirely assimilated to that of the wife at any other Srauta sacrifice. Not only, however, is the above description of the ratnīns decisive about the character of the ceremony as a State function, but MS. (iv. 3. 8), explaining the offering at the houses of the Mahiṣi and the Pariyor, definitely says that he thereby makes them an object of subsistence among the subjects.¹⁵ Moreover the viras of PB., among whom the Chief Queen is included, are expressly described as sustaining the kingdom. We have, therefore, no other choice than to accept the position that the Chief Queen and other queens occupied a high official status

¹⁵ imāmevacanāni praśabhyas upaśanavāyaṃ karoti.
in the Vedic State. It will be noticed that in all the lists the Chief Queen comes immediately after the Brahman priest and the rājanya (in SB. after the senāni, the purohita and the sacrificer), while the queens of lesser rank come immediately thereafter.

Coming to the rājanya (prince or noble) who takes the second place in all the Black Yajus texts and the taksan (carpenter) and rathakāra (chariot-maker) who are placed almost at the end in the MS. list, we have to state that they evidently stand for representatives of the corresponding classes (or castes). We may trace the political importance of these classes with some certainty as far back as AV. times. In AV. III. 5. 6-7 skilled chariot-makers and smiths, rājans and rājakṛts, sūtas and grāmanis are expressly specified among the persons whom a King at his consecration desires to make his dependents (upasti). The rājans and rājakṛts of this passage are probably represented by the rājanya of the ratnīn lists, while the chariot-makers and smiths evidently have their representatives in the individual taksan and rathakāra of the same list. While the high constitutional position of the rājanya does not require any explanation, that of the two artisan classes is an index of the status assigned to industry in the Vedic State. Whatever that may be, we have in this particular ceremony of the Rājasūya an undoubted reference to the principle of representation of classes, of which we shall notice other examples in the sequel. We may probably detect in the substitution (which indeed is almost meaningless in the present context) of the sacrificer for the rājanya in the SB. list and inclusion of the taksan and rathakāra in MS., a certain amount of priestly manipulation so as to limit in the
one place and to extend in the other the principle of political representation.

We come now to the last group of ratnins consisting of specified officers of the royal court and household. As for the senāni (commander-in-chief) it will be observed that with the single exception of ŚB. which places him at the head of the list, all other texts agree in assigning him a position below the Brahman, the Rājanya and the Queen (or queens). With this we may compare the omission (strange as it may seem) of the senāni from the list of eight viras who according to PB., sustain the kingdom and also from the group of persons to whom the sacrificial sword is successively passed round at a later stage of the Rājasūya ritual. Clearly, therefore, in the eyes of these authors the military branch of the administration held the subordinate place in comparison with the civil. The Vedic State, according to this view, was the reverse of a Kriegstaat. The sūta and the grāmani along with the kṣattr are known from RV. and AV. times, unlike the samgrabhip and bhāgadugha who are mentioned for the first time in the Yajus Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. That the sūtas and grāmanis occupied a distinctive position in the State from early times is proved by the AV. text above quoted, where they are included among the persons whom the newly consecrated King expressly desires to be made subject to him. In the reference to the individual sūta, grāmani and other officers of the ratnin list as also in the undermentioned ceremony of the passing round of the sacrificial sword, we may probably detect a fresh application of the principle of representation in the Vedic polity.16

16 According to Jayaswal, (op. cit., Pt. i. pp. 20-21) the ratnins were
Devasūhaviniṣṭi

The central ceremony of the Rājasūya, viz. the abhiseḍanīya, begins with offerings to a number of deities, the so-called 'Divine Quickeners' (Eggeling) [otherwise translated as 'Gods that instigate the Gods (Keith)] (Devasūs), and it ends with a game of dice. In the formula accompanying the devasū oblataions, which is common to all schools, the gods Savitṛ, Agni, Soma, Rudra, Bṛhaspati, Indra, Varuṇa and the like, dignified with appropriate epithets, are invoked to quicken the sacrificer for various kinds of authority. In the Black Yajus texts the sacrificer immediately follows with the words: —

'This kingdom hath verily been conferred'.

"high functionaries of the state selected on the principle of class and caste representation" and corresponding to the rājakṛts (or kingmakers) of the AV. passage above cited. Now while the takṣan and the rathakāra of the ratnīn list were probably representatives of the karmāras and rathakāras of the AV. text, they cannot be proved to have been State functionaries." The same objection evidently applies to the Chief Queen and other queens included in the list of ratnins. Again, while the Purobīta and the grāmanī were doubtless of the Brāhmaṇa and Vaiśya caste respectively, we have no indication of the caste to which the others belonged. Further we do not know on what grounds the aksauṣaṇa and govīkarta evidently belonging to the lowest grade of officers are styled 'High Functionaries.' Even admitting that these last two were Śūdras, we cannot take their inclusion to signify, as Jayaswal does, a great constitutional change, namely the express recognition of the Śūdra as a part of Society." Even in AV, we have passages (e.g. xix 32. 8 and Ibid. 62) expressing the desire to be dear to the Śūdra as well as to the Ārya. Finally since the AV. passage mentions rājanah rājakartārah side by side with sūtas and grāmanīs, it is difficult to understand how these officers could be said along with others, to be "the old rājakṛts, the kingmakers."

17 TS. i. 8. 10; KS. xv. 5-8; MS. ii. 6. 6, VS. ix. 39-40; TB. i. 7. 4; SB. v. 3. 3-12 etc.
18 TS. i. 8. 10; Āp. SS. xviii. 12. 1-10 etc.
Explaning the above ceremony, SB., v. 3. 3. 6 & 9 states inter alia that thereby Indra Jyeṣṭha leads him to Jyaistya (‘lordship’ or ‘eminence’) and Varuṇa Dharmapati makes him dharmapati (lord of the law).

Concluding its explanation on the last point, SB. says,

“That truly is the supreme state (paramātā in the original) where one is lord of the law, for whosoever attains to the supreme state to him they come in matters of law.”

In the above extract it will be seen that two specific forms (or aspects) of royal authority viz. Jyaistya and Paramātā are expressly sought to be derived in the White Yajus text from divine favour. The Black Yajus texts more directly derive the kingdom (rājya) from the same source. We find it therefore difficult to agree with the explanation of the foregoing formula given by Jayaswal in another context, viz. that “the gods might give him virtues for national rule, but they could not give him kingship of the land”. Elsewhere, however, as we shall see later, the Yajus Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa texts, explaining the Rājasūya ritual imply the kingship to be derived from non-divine sources and invoke for it protection by the subjects.

In the passage of the SB. just quoted relating to Varuṇa Dharmapati, Jayaswal detects7 the deliberate formulation of a new theory of legal administration. “The sacred formula,” he says, “only contemplates the protection of the law as a necessary duty of the king, but the commentator takes it in the sense

19 In the above Eggeling translates Indra Jyeṣṭha as ‘Indra the most excellent’ and ‘jyaisthya’ as ‘excellence’ or ‘lordship,’ Keith translates Indra jyeṣṭhaṁnam as ‘Indra of the nobles.’ In the corresponding Ap. SS. passage xviii. 12. 6 Caland translates jyeṣṭhaṁnam as ‘über die Ansehnlichsten.’ Dharmapati is translated by Eggeling as ‘lord of the law’ and by Keith as ‘lord of right.’

that one of the chief features of a full-fledged State must be that the law is administered by the king or his officers. The old theory had been that the law of the community was administered by the community,” It must, however, he remembered that the Vedic king’s control over the administration of criminal justice has been traced back to RV., and AV. passages mentioning spies (spaśah) of Varuṇa and other deities. Probably the SB. passage belongs to the developed stage of the Vedic polity when the King’s Justice prevailed over all private jurisdictions.

We may next notice the significance of the several forms of authority with which the sacrificer is sought to be invested in the above-mentioned formula of Invocation of the Divine Quickeners. In TS., i. 8. 10 the priest prays that the sacrificer may be quickened amitrāya mahate kṣatrāya mahate ādhipatyāya mahate jānarājyāya. Similarly MS., ii. 6.6, giving the mantra for the devasū oblations, invokes the gods to quicken him for asapatnām mahate kṣatrāya mahate jānarājyāya. Slightly different from the above is the formula of VS., ix. 40:—

asapatnām mahate kṣatrāya mahate ijaiṣṭhyāya mahate jānarājyāya etc.

The amitrāya (‘for freedom from foes’) of the first list is the same as asapatnām (‘without a rival’) of the other two, while ijaiṣṭhyā of the third list is identical with the ādhipatyā of the first, both meaning ‘lordship’ or ‘over-lordship’. Jānarājya, common to all the three lists, is translated by Eggeling as ‘man-rule’ and by Keith as ‘rule over the people’. We suggest it to mean ‘rule over the whole folk’ as distinguished from ‘rule over the single tribe’. Vedic monarchy, then, at its
highest was held to involve not only undisputed authority, but also the rule over a complex of tribes.

In the same invocation formula the king is referred to as ‘the son (or descendant) of such a man and the son of such a woman’ (VS. ix. 40, MS. ii. 6. 6.), as ‘the descendant of such a man’ (TS., i. 8. 10) and so forth. This illustrates one of the fundamental characteristics of the Vedic State, namely the human origin of kingship. The king is here described simply by the names of his parents, and not the slightest attempt is made on such a solemn occasion to trace back his ancestry to the gods. Not inconsistent with this view is the fact that elsewhere, as we shall see later, SB. identifies the royal sacrificer directly with Indra, or even declares him to be a visible form of Prajāpati.

In the concluding stage of the devasū offerings the priest presents the sacrificer to the assembled folk with the words:

‘This is your King, ye (people): Soma is the King of us Brāhmaṇas’. The same formula is repeated in VS., x. 18 relating to the besprinkling of the sacrificer and with slight variants in TS. i. 8. 12, KS. xv. 7, MS. ii. 6. 9 connected with the ceremony of preparation of the sacred waters, these two ceremonies forming part of the later Rājasūya ritual. In this unequivocal assertion of the Brāhmaṇa’s independence of the earthly king, we can probably trace the transference to the political sphere of those general ideas of social and religious pre-eminence of this class which are frequently met with in the Yajus Saṁhitās, and the Brāhmaṇas. It is, however, characteristic of the weak organisa-

22 The above verse occurs in VS. ix. 40. For ‘people’ variant forms are substituted in TS. i. 8. 10, KS. xv. 5-8; MS. ii. 6. 6 27; TB.i. 7. 4 etc.
tion of the Brahmanical order and not less of its mentality that the only corollary drawn by ŚB. from its explanation of the corresponding VS. text is the claim of immunity of the Brāhmaṇa’s property.23 This claim is supported by several incidental references in the same Brāhmaṇa,24 and it afterwards becomes a fundamental axiom of public finance in the Smṛti-Arthaśāstra State.

A very different interpretation of the above formula is given by Jayaswal in the work we have quoted so often.25 "The King", he says, "is consecrated as King of the whole people including the Brahmins and the priest expresses this by calling him Soma." The explanation of the ŚB., "which marks the last stage of the Brāhmaṇa period", is "questionable", since it is "inconsistent with the existence of the indicative ‘this’ (esba), the naming of the people or nation and the homage when the Brahman resigns his privilege in the person of the King."

[Here follows the reference to VS., x. 28 to be noticed below]. Now the antithesis between vo (‘your’) or te (‘ye’) and asmākam (‘our’) in the above formula, which is common to all schools, clearly establishes the claim of Soma’s sovereignty over Brāhmaṇas independently of the king’s sovereignty. The naming of the people to which Jayaswal refers makes no difference, as they are similarly contrasted with the Brāhmaṇas. The indepen-

23 Cf. ibid. v. 4. 2. 3:—"This man, O ye people, is your king, Soma is the king of us Brāhmaṇas!" He thereby causes everything here to be food for him (the king); the Brāhmaṇa alone he excepts; therefore the Brāhmaṇa is not to be fed upon, for he has Soma for his king."

24 Cf. ibid. xii. 6. 2. 18; 7. 1. 13 etc, stating that when the king gives all land to the priests, the gift does not cover the property of the Brāhmaṇa.

gence of the Brāhmaṇas, however theoretical it might be, is hinted at in SB. in connection with a later Rājasūya ritual. We refer to its explanation of the mantra of the rathavimocanīya (‘unyoking of the chariot’) offerings. There we read that the sacrificer’s kingship is thereby rendered free (i.e. unopposed) over the ksatria (nobility) as well as the Viś (people)—a passage where one cannot fail to notice the striking omission of the Brāhmaṇa. As for the VS AB and other texts quoted by Jayaswal—the explanation of the late TS commentary by Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara does not appear in this connection to be of much account—their contrary statements about the subordination of the Brahmaṇas to the King do not by themselves invalidate the clear reference in the formula of all the Yajus Saṃhitā schools.

Preparation of waters for Consecration

After the Devasū oblations comes the ceremony of collection of waters of various kinds (significantly called ‘bestowers of the kingdom’) for the purpose of the King’s consecration. Explaining the reference to different kinds of waters, SB (v. 3. 4. 5 ff.) says inter alia that the King is thereby made the lord as well as the offspring of the people. 28 Again it says,

‘And so there is in his kingdom even one belonging to some other kingdom and even that man from another kingdom he absorbs.’ 27

Here in the first place we are introduced to the conception of the king’s double relation to his people. This is based upon the two-fold principle of authority and of direct origin from the people. With the first and more characteristic principle we may

26 Viśamevainametat patim karoti.....Viśamevainametad garbham karou.
27 api ha vā’syānyārāṣṭriyo rāṣṭre bhavatyapanyārāṣṭriyāmavaharate.
match *SB.*, xi. 2. 7. 16 declaring that Brahma and Kṣatra are established upon the Viś, while the second has its parallel in *ibid.*, xii. 7. 3. 8 stating that Kṣatra is produced from out of the Viś. In the second place the reference to the absorption of men of some other kingdom probably hints at the practice, for which analogy is found in Anglo-Saxon history, of the King’s drawing upon foreign residents for his band of retainers.

After the collection of the sacred waters the priest offers oblations (called after Pṛthīn Vainya “the first consecrated of men”) to twelve deities, namely, Agni, Indra, Varuṇa and so forth. *SB.*, v. 3. 5. 5-9, in the course of its explanation of the corresponding formula (*VS.*, x. 5), identifies Brāhaspati and Soma with Brahma and Kṣatra respectively and it says that the priest thereby sprinkles (endows) the sacrificer with Brahma and Kṣatra respectively. Here we have one of those numerous references to the influence of the spiritual and temporal powers in the Vedic State, which are found in the Yajus Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas.

After the *Partha* oblations just mentioned the sacrificer puts on various garments symbolising the development of an embryo till it reaches maturity. The priest then strings for him a bow, the symbol of his princely rank. Explaining this formula (*VS.*, x. 8), *SB.* v. 3. 5. 27 utters the dictum referred to elsewhere, namely that the sacrificer is Indra in a two-fold way, both as a Kṣatriya and as a sacrificer. The same maxim is repeated in *SB.*, v. 4. 3. 4 & 7 explaining a mantra (*VS.*, x. 21)—where indeed the King calls himself Arjuna (an epithet of Indra)—used for the sacrificer’s taking down the chariot from the stand and mounting the same at a later stage of the sacrifice. The Vedic
King, in other words, is identified with the typical Indo-Aryan deity not merely through the sacrifice, but by virtue of his very birth.

The above ceremony is followed by a series of formulas (the so-called ‘Āvid formulas’) announcing the King to Agni, Indra, Pūṣan, Mitra, Varuṇa, Sky and Earth, Aditi. This formula is preceded in the White Yajus text (VS., x. 9) by the announcement of the sacrificer to mortals. In the Black Yajus texts (TS., i. 8. 12, KS., xv. 7, MS., ii. 6. 9, TB., i. 7. 6. 7, Āp. SS., xviii. 12. 7 etc.) it is followed by his announcement by name and parentage and tribe (viś), and it ends with the formula mentioned elsewhere, namely that while the sacrificer is the King of the people concerned, Soma is the King of the Brāhmaṇas. Explaining this formula with reference to Agni and Indra, SB., v. 3. 5. 32-33 identifies these deities with Brahma and Kṣattra respectively, and it observes that thereby Brahma and Kṣattra approve of his consecration and approved by them he is consecrated. Here we have one more reference to the dominant influence of the two powers in the Vedic State, of which we have spoken above.

We have just observed that the Āvid formulas of the Black Yajus texts refer to the sacrificer by the name of his tribe (viś). This method of announcement is also adopted in the White

28 Āp. SS. xyii. 12. 7 explains this point by a number of examples:—

athāṁ nambhyā navedātayesa vo bharaṁ rājēti|
esa vaḥ kuruvo rājeti kuruṇyāṁ|
esa vaḥ pāncāla rājeti pāncālam|
esa vaḥ kuruṇānāla rājeti va kuruṇānālau|
esa vo janatā rajeyanyān rājñāb|
Yajus formula relating to the concluding stage of the Devasū oblations, to which reference has been made above. It therefore follows that the Vedic State at the time of the formulation of the mantra was yet in the tribal stage. We have, however, a striking variant of the above formula in TS., i. 8. 12 where we read that the King is notified ‘in this folk (viś), in this kingdom (rāṣṭra)’. This would suggest that some of the Vedic States at any rate had already emerged from the tribal to the territorial stage.

Mounting of the Quarters

At the close of the above ceremony the King figuratively mounts the four quarters and the zenith to symbolise his assumption of universal sovereignty. In the accompanying formula which is common to both Yajus schools, the appropriate metres, chants, stomas, seasons (‘deities’ in the Black Yajus ritual) along with Brahma, Kṣatra, Viś and (instead of the Śūdra) other objects, are invoked successively to protect the sacrificer.

29 So strongly was the tradition fixed in the White Yajus ritual that KṢ, xv. 4. 17 prescribes adherence to the tribal name on the ground that no rule is laid down regarding the name of the kingdom yasyāśca jāte rājā bhavati desasyānavaṃbhītvāt.

29a In another remarkable passage (ii. 3) TS. not only distinguishes between the tribal and territorial kingships but treats the latter as the completion of the former. Here we are told that the king by partial performance of a rite attains the people (viś), but not the kingdom (rāṣṭra), while he attains both by its full performance.

30 VS. x. 10-14, TS. i. 8. 13, KṢ. xv. 7, MS. ii. 6. 10.

31 Phala and Varcas (‘fruit’ and ‘lustre’) in VS., ‘bala’ and ‘varcas’ (host and lustre) in TS., puṣṭam and phalam (‘abundance’ and ‘fruit’) in MS., puṣṭam and varcas (‘abundance’ and ‘lustre’) in KṢ.
This ceremony, therefore, significantly symbolises the influence of the three higher castes in the Vedic Polity.  

The besprinkling with the sacred waters

In this ensuing ceremony the sacrificer is sprinkled with holy water by four distinct persons, as the authorities add with priestly pedantry, from as many different kinds of wooden vessels.

In the White Yajus ritual (Ś.B., v. 3. 5. 11-14 and 4.2.2.) these persons are:—

Adhvaryu (or purohita), svā (king’s kinsman or brother), mitra-rājanya (friendly rājanya) and vaiśya.

In the Black Yajus ritual the persons mentioned are:—

Adhvaryu, Rājanya, Vaiśya and Janya (T.B. i. 7.8.7).

Adhvaryu, Brahman (or Kṣatriya), Vaiśya and Janya mitra (Āp. SS. xviii. 16. 1-5).

Adhvaryu, Brahman (or Kṣatriya), Vaiśya and Janya mitra (Hir. quoted in Caland, Āp. SS. tr., p. 145).

Brahman, Vaiśya, Brāhṛtya and Janya (Mān. SS. quoted Caland, loc. cit.).

32 Jayaswal, (op. cit., Pt. ii. pp. 28-29 and 29 n), taking phala of the VS. text to stand for the Śūdra understands the above to convey ‘a point of the greatest constitutional importance’, namely that ‘the King is to be protected by the four estates of the realm’. Now apart from the risk of taking a fixed religious formula as the only criterion of concrete constitutional facts, the interpretation of phala as Śūdra is unsupported by any evidence. In fact the pairs ‘fruit and lustre’ ‘abundance and fruit’, and the like (about which Jayaswal is significantly silent) evidently show that they belong to the same category. Again, we find repeatedly in the Yajus Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa texts that the King is sought to be invested with abundance, prosperity and so forth. Finally, it is in complete accord with the spirit of these texts to exclude the Śūdra from all higher civil and religious rights.
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Brahman, Vaiśya, Bhrātrīya and Janya mitra (M.S. iv. 4. 2).

What is the constitutional significance of the above ceremony? According to Dr. K. P. Jayaswal (Hindu Polity, Pt. ii, p. 25) "the Abhisekaniya is two-fold, the first part is the sprinkling of the waters by what may be described as different estates of the realm and the second is the theological anointing on the head by the priest just before the king-elect ascends the throne (āsandī)." We are not concerned here with this 'second part' except simply to point out that in the White Yajus ritual (V.S., x. 25; Ś.B., v. 4. 3. 27) the ceremony consists in the priest's drawing down the sacrificer's two arms to the dish of curds placed on a tiger-skin with the following formula: —

'I draw you down, the arms of Indra, the doer of mighty deeds.'

In the Black Yajus ritual (Cf. TS., i. 8. 15) the ceremony consists in the sacrificer's putting his hands in the clotted curds for the All-Gods with the formula: —

'By the precept of Mitra and Varuṇa, the directors, I yoke thee with the yoking of the sacrifice.'

There is then no question of the priest's anointing the sacrificer on the head in connection with the above ceremony.

As regards 'the first part' which alone corresponds to the besprinkling ceremony we have described above, Jayaswal first remarks that in the White Yajus texts "the Śūdra is absent and the kinsman seems to be a tautology." He then observes that Janya of the T.B. list stands for the Śūdra "in the sense of a man of the hostile tribe as in Ait. Br., viii. 26 and as originally he was." But in the passage last quoted janyāṇi is equated not
with the hostile tribes, but with the king's rivals who vie with and hate him (sapatnā vai dviṣanto bhrāṭṛyā janyāni in the original). Some of these rivals at any rate presumably were of Kṣatriya caste. In the next place Caland (op. cit., p. 145) has shown by a comparison with the parallel texts of MS. and Man. Ś.S. that janya mitra is the complete form of janya of the T.B. and that it means a friend from a foreign country ('ein Freund aus der Fremde'). By the same comparison Caland has proved the correct reading of the Āp. Ś.S. text to be janyo mitram [in place of janyamitram and other variants given in Garbe's edition (Bib. Ind. ed. p. 66)].

It thus appears that the relevant texts do not support the case for the Śūdra's participation in the besprinkling ceremony. As regards the part played by the persons actually mentioned, we may first refer to the dogmatic exposition of the texts themselves. To begin with the White Yajus ritual, SB., v. 3-5. 11-14, explaining the result (or the cause) of the besprinkling by the Brahman, one of the King's own and the friendly rājanya respectively, states that the sacrificer is thereby sprinkled (endowed) successively with priestly dignity, with sustenance and with support. As for the Black Yajus ritual MS., iv. 4.2 declares the consequence of the ceremony to be that the sacrificer is endowed by the Brahman with priestly dignity, he acquires strength from the people, he wins vigour as well as food and the like from the rival, and he gains through the janya a friend. According to T.B., (i. 7.8.7) the Brahman endows him with priestly dignity, the Rājanya with vigour and food, the Vaiśya with abundance and the Janya is the means of gaining him friends. Equating the King's 'own man' and the friendly Rājanya of the SB. with
the Rājanyā—Kṣatriya—Bhrātryā and with the Janya mitra of other texts respectively and allowing for the occurrence of the Adhvaryu (or Brahman) priest in all lists, we may estimate the significance of the besprinkling ceremony in the following way. In so far as the Adhvaryu and the Rājanyā (or their equivalents) as well as the Vaiśya are concerned, they involve the participation of representatives of the three higher castes in the central ceremony of the Vedic coronation. This marks the closest approach to the principle of representation of Estates that the Vedic State ever attained. On the other hand the participation of the janya mitra (‘a friend from a foreign country’) probably indicates the importance of the foreign ally for the Vedic State, thus anticipating the subṛt of the stock list of seven limbs (saptāṅga) of the Arthaśāstra-Smṛti polity of later times. We may sum up by saying that the besprinkling ceremony of the Rājasūya represents, not as Jayaswal thinks, the single principle of representation of estates, but rather the combination of this principle with that of political alliances of the Vedic State.

The sacrificer’s enthronement

After the King has descended from the chariot, he is ceremonially seated on a wooden throne, when the priest touches him on the chest with the following mantra:—

‘Varuṇa, of sure vows, hath set him down,
In the waters, with keen insight, for lordship.’

Commenting on the above SB. boldly transfers the epithet (dbhṛtauṛata) of the god Varuṇa to the King as well as the learned Brāhmaṇa (gṛotriya), while it adds the remarkable words:—

33 See TS. i. 8. 16; VS. x. 27, SB. v. 4. 4. 5. Dbhṛtauṛata translated by Keith as ‘of sure vows’ is rendered by Eggeling as ‘upholder of the sacred law’.
That he should speak only what is right and do what is right, or that he as well as the Srotriya is capable; for these two are the upholders of the sacred law among men.\textsuperscript{34}

This passage, by attaching the notion of unrivalled moral greatness to the King along with the learned Brāhmaṇa, marks a distinct phase in the evolution of Vedic kingship. The Vedic King, according to this view, is the embodiment of the moral law, being matched only by the learned Brāhmaṇa.

In the White Yajus ritual there takes place immediately afterwards the curious ceremony of the priests’ silently striking the king with sticks on the back. Explaining this ceremony ŚB., v. 4. 4. 7 observes that\textsuperscript{35} they thereby guide him safely over judicial punishment, whence the King is exempt from punishment. According to KŚŚ. xv. 7. 6. the priest thereby cleanses him from sin, or else carries him beyond death.\textsuperscript{36} The significance of this rite has been understood differently by scholars. According to Weber\textsuperscript{37} it indicates the height of priestly authority. On the other hand Jayaswal,\textsuperscript{38} while characterising the explanation of ŚB. as “an amusing piece of euphemism” explains that the rod is “the symbolic sceptre of justice”;

\textsuperscript{34} niṣāsāda dhrṣṭavata iti dhrṣṭavato vai rājāḥ na va’esa sarvasmāśiva vada
nāyaḥ na sarvasmāśiva karmaṇe yadeva sādhu vada yat sādhu kuryāt
tasmāi vā eṣa ca srotriyaśca etau ba vai dvau manusyeṣu dhrṣṭavatāḥ
tasmādaḥ niṣāsāda dhrṣṭavata iti.

\textsuperscript{35} athainam prabhāstastastasnimeva dāṇḍairghnanti tam dāṇḍair ghnanto|
dāṇḍavadbhamatinayanti tasmādṛṣṭa daṇḍyo yadenāma dāṇḍavadbhamat
tinayanti.

\textsuperscript{36} pāpmānam te’pahanneti tvā vadbam na yāmīti vā.

\textsuperscript{37} Über den Rājasūya, p. 63: —Dieses Ceremoniem ist für die zur Zeit seiner Entstehung geltende unbedingte priesterliche Hoheit charakteristisch.

hence the action conveys "the view of the sacred common law that the King was not above but under the law". Now if we confine ourselves, as we must, to the interpretation of the Brāhmaṇa and Śūtra texts just quoted, we have to understand the above as a ceremony of the king's purification or acquisition of special privileges, not that of assertion of priestly domination. In the next place it seems doubtful how far the significance of dānḍa as the symbol of justice—so well-known to the Smṛti-Arthaśāstra polity—can be traced back to the Vedic times. What seems certain is that $&B$, indirectly supported by the $K&SS$, claims for the King the exceptional privilege of immunity from punishment—a claim which does not appear to be justified by any other Vedic text and is afterwards definitely denied in the Smṛti-Arthaśāstra Polity.

While the King remains seated on the throne, there takes place according to all ritualistic schools an interesting dialogue between him and the assembled priest (or priests). Five times, according to the White Yajus ritual,39 the King addresses the Brahman priest as ‘O Brahman!’ The latter replies as many times with words beginning with ‘O Brahman’ and followed in turn by the phrases; ‘Thou art Savitar, of true impulsion’, ‘Thou art Varuṇa, of true power’, ‘Thou art Indra, mighty through the people’, ‘Thou art Rudra, the most kindly’. In the Black Yajus ritual as also in the ritual of other schools40 the King addresses the four chief priests (Adhvaryu, Brahman, Hotṛ, Udgātṛ) successively as ‘O Brahman’, only to be greeted

39 VS. x. 28, $&B$ v. 4. 4. 9-12. $K&SS$. xv. 7. 8.
in turn as 'Thou, O King, art the Brahman priest, Thou art Sāvitṛ of true instigation'; 'Thou, O King, art the Brahman priest, Thou art Indra of true force' 'Thou O King art the Brahman priest, Thou art Indra, the kindly'. 'Thou O King art the Brahman priest, Thou art Varuṇa of true rule'. According to Jayaswal\textsuperscript{41} this signifies that "the Brahmin may not now be addressed by his privileged designation of superiority which is given to the King by the whole nation including the Brahmin": Thus "the sovereign and the popular representative character of the King is pointed out." Now we may admit that the above formulas involve for once (at least in theory) a clear renunciation of the Brāhmaṇa’s status in favour of the King as well as the King’s identification with certain leading deities of the Vedic pantheon. But we do not think that the text warrants the quasi-legal and political conception of sovereignty. It only implies, according to our view, the foremost social status of the King in the Vedic State. With this may be compared the still more direct reference in ŚB. v. 4. 2. 7 explaining the Rāja-śūya ritual of the priests’ pouring the remainder of the consecration water into the Brāhmaṇa’s vessel after the besprinkling ceremony. By this act we are told the Brāhmaṇa is made an object of respect after the King.

The game of dice.

In the next important ceremony, namely the King’s playing a game of dice, we find a striking difference between the White and Black Yajus rituals. According to the White Yajus

texts the sacrificial sword is passed round successively from the adhvaryu (or purobita) to the King, the King’s brother, the sūta (or else the sthapati), the grāmanī and the tribesman (sajāta) to the accompaniment of a proper mantra. Then the Adhvaryu and the tribesman prepare the gaming ground with the sacrificial sword and the Adhvaryu wins for the King a cow staked by the tribesman. In the Black Yajus texts, on the other hand, the sacrificial sword is passed round in succession from the Brahman priest to the King, his dear son or friend, the purobita, the ratnins and so on to the aksāvāpa. After the aksāvāpa had marked the gaming ground a Brahman, a Kṣatriya, a Vaiśya and a Śūdra play for a cow. Finally the king invites with auspicious epithets the samgrahitṛ, the bhāgadugha and the ksattṛ to become witnesses.

In discussing the constitutional significance of the above ceremonies, we may begin by stating that they express, explicitly according to the White Yajus texts and implicitly according to those of the Black Yajus, the priestly author’s view of the proper gradation of official ranks in the Vedic State. To begin with the former, ŚB. v. 4. 4. 15-19, explaining the initial ceremony, says that the person passing round the sacrificial sword

42 VS. x. 29, ŚB. v. 4. 4. 15-23, KSS. xv. 7. 11-20.
43 TS. i. 8. 16, TB. i. 7. 10, VSS. iii. i. i. 45 Ṙp. SS. xviii. 18. 14-18, ibid., 19. 6-8. Pratibita translated as ‘his dear friend or son’ by Keith. (TS. tr. p. 127 n 2) is rendered as ‘dem ihm an nächsten stehenden Sohn’ by Caland, (Ṛp. SS. tr. p. 151).
44 Upadraśārāḥ of Ṙp. SS. xviii. 19. 8. is tr. as ‘Zuschauer’ by Caland. The auspicious epithets referred to are suśloka (‘far-famed one’) suṃaṅgala (‘most prosperous one’) and satyārājan (‘true king’) applied to the samgrahitṛ, bhāgadugha and ksattṛ respectively.
makes the one to whom it is passed in each case weaker than himself. In the case of the Brāhmaṇa it adds a special *apologia* to the effect that "indeed the King who is weaker than a Brāhmaṇa is stronger than his enemies." Summing up its explanation it says, "And as to why they mutually hand it on in this way, they do so lest there should be a confusion of classes and in order that (society) may be in the proper order." According to this passage, therefore, the test of a good State and society is the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power—a position which marks the extreme sacerdotalist view on this point. Of other persons in the list the superiority of the *sūta* to the *grāmaṇi* is in accordance with their relative positions in the *ratnīn* list to which reference has been made above. The equivalence of the *sthapati* ('chief judge' or 'governor') to the *sūta* is an interesting additional reference to the Vedic administrative organization. Lastly, the staking of a cow by a tribesman and the king's winning the stake from him probably symbolises the assertion of the royal sacrificer's rule over the common freeman. Coming to the Black Yajus ritual, it is significant of the changed conception of gradation of official ranks that the *purobita* comes after the king and his dear son or friend. On the other hand it is remarkable that the *purobita*, like the Brahman in the *ratnīn* lists, here also stands ahead of this class. The staking of a cow by the representatives of the four castes and the King's taking three officials well-known to the *ratnīn* list as his witnesses, probably symbolises the solemn assertion of rule of the royal sacrificer over every class of his subjects.

In the formulas of ceremonies above mentioned beginning with the King's enthronement and ending with the game of
die, Jayaswal traces a number of allusions to the king's coronation-oath. "The King-elect," he says, "is unanimously regarded to have taken (sic) a vow (dbṛṭavrata) before he is seated on the throne. The vow, promise or oath is again alluded to in the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa (1.7.10.1-6), satyasava 'of true sacrifice', satyadharma 'of true conduct', satyāṁrte varuṇah 'Varuṇa is authority in truth and falsehood', satyarāja 'true King'.

The vow or engagement is not cited here. But it is given in the very Indra ceremony in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa." Now the phrase dbṛṭavrata of the mantra, which by the way, is pronounced after (not before) the King's sitting on the throne, is applied in all the texts quoted by Jayaswal to the god Varuṇa. The ŚB. alone transfers this epithet by a bold stroke to the King as well as the Śrottriya, and it understands the phrase, as stated above, not in the constitutional sense of the King's observance of the coronation oath, but in the moral sense of the King's acting and speaking rightly. The phrases satyasava, satyadharma, satyānjjas, etc. are applied, it is true, to the King not only (as Jayaswal says) in TB, but also in other texts of the Black Yajus Sāṁhitās relating to the priests' address to the King. It is also true that TB, 1.7.10.1-6 cited by Jayaswal explains the formula to mean that the King is thereby made Savitṛ satyasava, Indra satyānjjaḥ and Varuṇa satyadharma. In the same context TB. further says that Varuṇa is satya and anṛta and the priest thereby wins for the King both these attributes. But there is no warrant for taking the epithet satya of these passages (as also

46 VS. x. 27, TS. i. 8, 16, TB. i. 7. 10. 2, AB viii. 18 to which we may add KS. xv. 8, MS. ii. 6 12 AB. viii. 13.
of *satyārājan* applied to the *Kṣattṛ* in another ceremony mentioned above) in the specific constitutional sense of the coronation-oath. Of the significance of the *A.B.* passage quoted by Jayaswal in this connection we shall speak in another place.

Before leaving our analysis of the Rājasūya ritual, we may pause to notice some points of constitutional importance arising from its exposition according to the Sāmaveda school. Explaining the use of appropriate chants at the consecration ceremony, *PB.* (xviii. 10. 8-9) says that thereby “he takes the priesthood (*Bṛhma* in the original) from the nobility (*Kṣatra*)” and “therefore the Brāhmaṇas are able to punish in return their supporters (i.e. the nobles)”. Again it says that thereby “he encompasses for him (i.e. the King) the people (*viś*) on both sides, the people will not retire from him (but serve him)”. In these two extracts is embodied the priestly author’s view of the Brāhmaṇa’s independence of the Kṣatriya and of the subjection of the Vaiśyas to the King.

*Royal Consecration in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa—General remarks*

The *AB.* begins its distinctive account of royal consecration with a few isolated notices of the component rites. First, as regards eligibility to the sacrifice we are told*47* that by virtue of the original creation of Prajāpati, the Brāhmaṇa was made ‘the eater of oblations’ (*ḥutāda*), while the Rājanya, Vaiśya and Śūdra were made ‘those who do not eat the oblations’ (*ahutāda*). In the same context *AB.* mentions a legend to explain how ‘the sacrificer even now finds support in the holy
power and the Brāhmaṇas,’ while the Kṣatriya sacrificer even now goes to the sacrifice only after shedding his distinctive weapons and assuming the form of the Brāhmaṇa. In the above passages we are presented with what may be called the Brāhmaṇa’s Divine Right to the privileges of sacrifice, so much so that even the Kṣatriya can exercise his rights only in a Brahmanical guise. The extreme view marked by the above text may be contrasted with passages like SB. iv. 5. 2. 16 which by implication declares both the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya to be equally entitled to the eating of oblations.

Turning to the next point AB. (vii. 20) takes it for granted that the Brāhmaṇa, the Rājanya or the Vaiśya, before consecration, begs the sacrificial ground (devayāna) from a Kṣatriya. It accordingly takes up and answers the question, ‘Whom is the Kṣatriya in such a case to ask?’ We may perhaps take it to point to the King’s ownership of the unappropriated land, for which, however, we have hardly any other evidence in the Vedic texts.

We are next introduced, in connection with libations for preventing the decay of sacrifices and gifts (iṣṭāpūrtasyā pariṣṭā-nih), to a parallel set of prayers to the gods Indra and Agni for favour of the holy and the lordly powers respectively. At the beginning and the conclusion of the sacrifice similarly we have prayers (AB. vii. 22) to the following effect:—

‘May the holy power guard me from the lordly power’. ‘May the lordly power guard me from the holy power.’ 47a

Explaining these prayers, AB. says that he who has recourse to the sacrifice has recourse to the holy power, and the holy

47a brahma mā kṣatrād gopāyatu.....kṣatraṁ mā brahmaṇo gopāyatu.
power thus delighted guards him from the lordly power. Again it says that he who has recourse to the kingship has recourse to the lordly power and the lordly power thus delighted guards him from the holy power. These passages, it will be observed, refer to what may be called the inherent antagonism of the temporal and spiritual powers in the natural setting of a King participating in an essentially Brahmanical ceremony.

The above doctrine of the essential antagonism of the two powers is brought out still more forcibly in the ensuing ceremony and its dogmatic exposition (AB. vii. 23-24). The Kṣatriya, we are told, has before consecration Indra as his deity, along with the appropriate metre and stoma and is Rājanya in relationship. Because of his becoming a Brāhmaṇa after consecration Indra takes his power and the appropriate metre etc. his other qualities, saying, ‘He is becoming other than we: he is becoming the holy power: he is joining the holy power.’ Hence the Kṣatriya before consecration should offer a libation with prayer to Indra not to take his power and to the rest not to take away his other qualities. After consecration a Kṣatriya has Agni for his deity along with the appropriate metre and stoma and is the Brahman in relationship. Because of his assuming the Kṣatriya character at the end, Agni takes his brilliance and the corresponding metre etc. his other qualities. Hence after the final offering he should offer libations with prayer to Agni etc. not to take away his brilliance and other qualities.

The immediately following exposition of other parts of the ritual accords with the Brahmanical monopoly of religious privileges referred to above. Speaking of the mode of announcement of the consecration (dikṣayā āvedanam) AB. vii. 25 takes
it for granted that a consecrated Brâhmaṇa is announced under his own name. Taking up then the question 'how is one to announce the consecration of Kṣatriya,' it says that this should be done with the ārṣeya ('rṣi descent') of the King's purobita. Next with reference to the question 'should the Kṣatriya eat the sacrificial share' (yajamānabhāga), AB. (vii. 26) answers equally characteristically that this should be handed over to the Brahman priest who stands to the Kṣatriya in the relation of the purobita, his half-self. These passages requiring the Kṣatriya sacrificer to be represented by his Brahman priest reflect once more the doctrine that sacrifice is the monopoly of the Brâhmaṇa.

The following explanation of the proper food of the King at the sacrifice is of considerable importance as embodying in a nutshell what was perhaps the normal aspect of the civil status of the Brâhmaṇa, Vaiśya and Śûdra in the Vedic State. The Kṣatriya sacrificer, we are told (AB. vii. 27-34), should not take soma or curds or warter, the food of the Brâhmaṇas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras respectively. For in that case there will be born in his offspring one like a Brâhmaṇa, Vaiśya or Śûdra and the second or third from him may become a Brâhmaṇa, Vaiśya or Śûdra. In explaining the evil consequences of this act the author mentions (vii. 29) what is doubtless the fullest and most remarkable summary of the civil disabilities of the three castes. The Brâhmaṇa, according to him, is 'an acceptor of gifts, a drinker (of soma), a seeker of livelihood. one to be moved at will', the Vaiśya is 'tributary to another, to be eaten by another, to be oppressed at

48 purobitāyanāṃ vā etad kṣatriyasya yad brāhmaṇaḥ dhātmo ha vā eṣa kṣatriyasya yat purohitub.
will' and lastly, the Śūdra is ‘the servant of another, to be removed at will, to be slain at will’. It follows from this description that the Śūdras formed the class of hereditary slaves without the right of personal security, while the Vaiśyas not only bore the burden of taxation, but what is more remarkable, had little or no security of person and property. These statements find some support in the legends of creation of the four varṇas (TS. vii. i. 4-6, PB. vi. i. 6-11) where we are told that the Vaiśya is to be eaten and the Śūdra is dependent on others. What seems unique in the above passage is the relative absence of civil rights even of the Brāhmaṇas. This is a striking reminder of the limitations to which the authority of the Brahmāṇa with all his high pretentions was actually subject in the Vedic State. 

The relations of the two powers are again set forth in course of the ensuing exposition (AB. viii. i ff.) of the rules relating to the śastras and stotras of the sacrifice. We are here told that ‘the holy power is prior to the lordly power’ and again that ‘on the holy power is established the lordly power, on the lordly power the holy power.’ These passages reflect two aspects of the priestly author’s view regarding the mutual relations of the spiritual and temporal powers in the Vedic State,

49 ādāyy-āpāyy-āvasāyī yatākāmaprayāpyaḥ.....anyasya balikrdanyasya  
dyo yatākāmapravēyeyāḥ.....anyasya presyaḥ kāmoṭhāpyo yatākāma-  
vardhyeyāḥ.

50 In connection with the above passages giving the classical statement of the status of the three castes in the Vedic State, we may well doubt whether it represents the views of the author (or authors) of the AB. It is professedly a quotation from another teacher and ill-suits its present context which contemplates the king’s status to be inferior to that of the Brāhmaṇa.

51 brahmaṇi khalu vai kṣatram pratiṣṭhitam kṣatre brahma.
centering around the superiority of the former and the inter-

dependence of both.

\textit{Punarabhisêka}

It is at the end of these preliminary remarks on isolated
points of doctrine and ritual that \textit{AB} begins its description of
the consecration ceremony proper. This ceremony has two
forms both of which are unknown to the other schools viz.
\textit{Punarabhisêka} (‘renewed consecration’) and \textit{Aindramabâbbhisêka}
(The great consecration of Kings after Indra’s fashion’).

Beginning with the first-named sacrifice, \textit{AB}. viii. 5 men-
tions successively the collection of materials, the mounting on
the throne, the consecration with the sacred waters, the descent
from the throne and so forth. In the formula the sacrificer is
said to mount the throne \textit{râjyâya sâmrâjyâya bhaujyâya svâ-
râjyâya vairâjyâya pârâmesêbyâya râjyâya} (a second time) \textit{mâhâ-
râjyâyaścbipatyâya svâvaśyâyatiśbâya}. Whatever may be the
precise significance of this string of eleven epithets, the passage
involves at any rate the idea of an Imperial State as distinguished
from a simple monarchy. We shall presently see how the same
type of State is reflected in the course of exposition of the great
consecration ceremony of Indra.\textsuperscript{52}

After descending from the throne the sacrificer thrice utters
the formula of salutation to Brahman (\textit{namo brahmañe}).

\textsuperscript{52} Weber, (\textit{op. cit.} p. 112 n), after contrasting the series of epithets piled
upon the king in the above extract with his exclusion from the soma drink,
concludes from the double occurrence of \textit{râjyâya} in the list that originally it
stood alone in the formula and all the other ten epithets were later additions.
In this case—the ceremony in its primitive form would refer to a simple
monarchy.
'Verily thus,' says the author, 'the lordly power falls under the holy power.' Here we have one more reference to the superiority of the spiritual to the temporal power, which seems to be the dominant note of the Vedic State according to our authors.

Mahābhīṣeka of Indra

Immediately after its description of the Punarabhiṣeka, AB. (viii. 12-23) introduces us to its account of the Great Consecration of Indra by the gods in heaven and that of the King by the priest on this earth. Common to both ceremonies are the collection of materials, mounting the throne by the sacrificer, proclamation of the sacrificer (by the All-Gods in heaven and by the King-makers on this earth), besprinkling of the sacrificer and so forth. In the formula for mounting the throne (viii. 12 and 17) Indra and the King are made to state that they are mounting the same for sāmrājya bhaujya svārājya vairājya pārameṣṭhīya rājya māhārājya etc. Similar strings of epithets are used in the formula used before and after the consecration (viii. 13-14, 18-19). In connection with the formula (viii. 14 & 19) we may observe that the specific groups of deities are mentioned as consecrating Indra as well the King in the different quarters of the sky for as many forms of lordship. Thus we read that the Vasus in the East anoint him for sāmrājya, the Rudras in the South for bhaujya, the Ādityas in the West for svārājya, the All-Gods in the North for vairājya, the Maruts and Aṅgirases in the upward quarter for pārameṣṭhīya, and lastly the Sādhyas Aptyas in 'this firm middle' for rājya etc. Explaining this formula with reference to Indra AB. further states that for this reason the Kings of the East, South, West, North and Middle
are consecrated respectively for sāmrājya, bhaūjya, svārājya, vairājya and rājya and called by the corresponding titles. Although the reference to the upward quarter is obviously a piece of fiction, we have in above extract the fullest attempt at what may be called the regional classification of constitutions, that is found in the Vedic literature. If we could distinguish the precise significance of the terms in question, we would have here an exhaustive account of the constitutions known to the Vedic people.53 We may pause here to point out that AB., in introducing the Aindramahābhīṣeka of Kings, claims it to ensure not only 'superiority, pre-eminence and supremacy over all Kings' but also the position of 'sole ruler' 'from the one end up to the further side of the earth bounded by the ocean.'54 In this remarkable passage we are introduced to the conception of universal monarchy extending over the land up to its natural limits as well as that of paramount sovereignty.

At the beginning of the Indra Consecration of the earthly King, as AB. viii. 15 tells us, the priest proposes and the Kṣatriya repeats with faith (śraddhā) the text of a solemn oath binding the latter under terrible moral sanctions to keep his trust by the former.55 According to Jayaswal56 the above con-

53 For a similar example of regional classification of constitutions see V.S. xiv. 13 and xv. 10-14 where in the formula for construction of the fire altar, the east, south, west and the zenith are respectively called mabīṣi, virāṭ, smārāt, svārāt and adhipati.

54 sarveśāṁ rājāṁ śrāvīṣṭhyamatiśrām paramatāṁ......pṛthivyai samudraparyantāyā ekaraṅ.

55 The text of the oath proposed by the priest is as follows:—

'From the night of my birth to that of my death, for the space between these two, my sacrifice and my gifts, my peace, my good deeds, my life and mine offspring mayest thou take, if I play thee false.'

tains the text of the coronation-oath which is "simply alluded to and not repeated in other Brähmanas." Now the phrases yadi me druhyeb ('if thou dost play me false') and yadi te druhyeyam ('if I play thee false') uttered by the priest and the Ksatriya respectively, are conclusive evidence of the fact that the beneficiary of the oath is not the body of subjects, but the individual priest. With this we may compare the similar, but more equitable mutual oath of King and priest in the royal consecration ceremony of the Kaññikasūtra (xvii. 6. 7).

In the proclamation formula to which reference has been made above, among other titles applied to the divine and the human sacrificer are mentioned 'eater of the people' (vizāmattā), 'protector of Brahman' or 'of Brähmanas' (brahmaṇo goptā in Indra’s case, brāhmaṇānām goptā in case of the King) and 'protector of dharma' (dharmaśya goptā). The first title crystallises the Vedic author’s view of the Vaiśya’s civil disabilities to which reference has been made above. In the other two epithets we are introduced to the two-fold function of the King,—the protection of dharma and Brähmanas—which becomes a commonplace in the later Smṛti-Arthasastra State.

Vājapeya (The drink of strength)—General remarks

While the complex of sacrificial rites which we have examined so far relates exclusively to the King, it is far otherwise with the ritual complex to which we now turn. ŚŚ.Ś. (xvi. 17.

57 It is worth remarking that Weber (Über den Vājapeya, p. 155 n) takes the above extract to be characteristic of the high pretentions of the priestly hierarchy, in as much as even the sole ruler of the earth bounded by the ocean has submissively to swear to be true to his priest.
4), which has in this respect evidently preserved the original character of the Vājapeya sacrifice, declares it to be open to the Brāhmaṇa, the Rājanya and the Vaiśya. In all other ritual texts we are told that it is open to the Brāhmaṇa and the Rājanya (or even only the Rājan).\footnote{Cf. Āp. S.S. xviii. 1. 1.:—śaradi vājapeyena yajeta brāhmaṇo rājanyo vardhi-kāmaḥ. VSS. xiii. 1. 1.:—brāhmaṇo rājanyo u śaradi vājapeyena yajeta. More generally in LSS. viii. 11. 1.:—yaṁ brāhmaṇa rājānaśca pauraskūrīta sa vājapeyena yajeta. Directly excluding the Vaiśya is KSS. xiv. 1.: vājapeyāḥ śaradyavaśiśasya.}

This deliberate exclusion of the Vaiśya from one of the most important sacrifices illustrates one phase of the contrast between the Vaiśya and the two upper castes in the Vedic polity. It would seem that while the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya were entitled to the full exercise of religious rights, there was a tendency to deprive the Vaiśyas of the same.

The objects of performing the Vājapeya are almost as varied as the classes who are entitled to the same. SSS. xv. 1. 1. prescribes it for one desiring abundance of food. On the other hand ŚB. v. 1. 1. 13, comparing the Vājapeya with the Rājasūya, says that one attains the position of samrāṭ by performing the former and that of rājan by performance of the latter, the position of samrāṭ being higher than that of rājan. Reversing this order TB. 1. 7. 6. 1 declares that Vājapeya is samrātsava (‘consecration to the position of samrāṭ’) and Rājasūya is varuṇasava (‘consecration to the universal sovereignty of Varuṇa’). According to Ā.ŚS. ix. 9. 1 Vājapeya should be performed by a King or a Brāhmaṇa desirous of lordship (ādhipatya). Again in V.ŚS. iii. 1. 2. 47 we are told at the
end that the performer of Vājapeya is called samrāt. With these texts we may compare what the Yajus Saṃhitā and the Brāhmaṇa texts declare to be the result of performance of the besprinkling ceremony to be noticed below. In these extracts we once more come across the Vedic author's conception of the imperial State.

While the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas are alone according to most authorities eligible to the sacrifice, it is worth noticing that they are sharply distinguished in the accompanying ritual. Again and again we find different mantras laid down for these classes, the Brāhmaṇa addressing his prayer to Bṛhaspati and the King to Indra. 59 We find even the priestly Bṛhaspati with his heaven being distinguished from the warrior Indra and his heaven. 60 Illustrative of these differences is ŚB. v. i. i. 11 which justifies the eligibility of the Brāhmaṇa and the Rājanya by saying that it was performed by Bṛhaspati and Indra representing the two classes respectively. 60a These passages illustrate one of the fundamental features of the Vedic polity, namely the complete separation of the temporal and spiritual powers.

**Chariot-race**

Among the rites of the Vājapeya one of the most important is a chariot-race which is won by the sacrificer in a contest with

59 Cf. VS. ix. 10-12. ŚB. v. i. 5. 2-12 etc.

60 Weber, (op. cit. p. 15) notes that the Vaiśyas also had according to ṢṢṢ. their own tutelary gods (namely, the Maruts) and their heaven.

60a "Now truly this is the Brāhmaṇa's own sacrifice, in as much as Bṛhaspati performed it, for Bṛhaspati is the Brahman and the Brāhmaṇa is the Brahman. And is also that of the Rājanya in as much as Indra performed it, for Indra is the kṣatra and the Rajanya is the kṣatra."
sixteen other competitors. In the course of these rites a Rājanya shoots an arrow for fixing the goal of the race. Explaining the rite SB., (v 1. 5. 14) says:—

'And as to why a Rājanya shoots he, the Rājanya, is most manifestly of Prajāpati (‘the lord of creatures’); hence, while being one, he rules over many'.

This doctrine of the King’s rule by virtue of his divinity is not characteristic of the Vedic State where the monarch, as we have shown above, is emphatically declared to be of human origin.

Another rite connected with the chariot race illustrates the depressed state of the Vaiśya to which we have referred above. In this ritual a Vaiśya or a Rājanya, mounting one of the seventeen chariots for the race, is made to exchange a cup of honey for one of surā given by the priest. Explaining the ceremony both SB., v. 1. 5. 28 and TB., i. 3. 3. 7 declare that the priest thus imbues the sacrificer with truth and smites the Vaiśya with untruth.

Mounting the sacrificial post

At the end of the chariot-race the sacrificer and his wife mount the sacrificial post, signifying their approach to the gods. In the accompanying formula which is common to both White and Black Yajus schools, they declare that they have come to heaven, have become Prajāpati’s children and have become immortal. 61 This points to the doctrine of the sacrificer’s attaining the divinity by means of the sacrifice, which is so characteristic of the Yajus Saṃhitā and the Brāhmaṇa texts.

61 VS. ix. 21. TS. i. 7. 9, MS. i. 1. 11. 3, KS. xiv. 1, TB. i. 3. 7. 5, Āp.ŚS. xviii. 5. 14.
After the sacrificer is mounted on his post, he is presented with salt by Vaiśyas according to the White Yajus ritual. Explaining this rite SB., v. 2. 1. 17 states that the Maruts representing the Viś are food—a maxim mentioned in an earlier passage (v. 1. 3. 3) with reference to the offering of the victim to the Maruts. In the Black Yajus ritual the four chief priests present salt to the sacrificer with an accompanying formula. This of course implies the absence of any constitutional significance in the ceremony concerned.

After the sacrificer has dismounted from his post and is seated on the throne (according to SB.,) or at the time of dismounting (according to Āp. SS., xvi8. 5. 20), he is addressed by the priest with a remarkable formula. In the VS., text (ix. 22) it runs as follows:—

'This is thy kingship, thou art the ruler, the ruling lord! Thou art firm and steadfast! Thee for the tilling, thee for peaceful dwelling, thee for thrift.'

Explaining this formula SB., v. 2. 1. 25 says that 'thereby he endows the sacrificer with the royal power', 'makes him the ruler', 'makes him firm and steadfast in this world', and 'means to say, 'Here I seat thee for the welfare of the people'. Quoting the above texts of the VS. and SB., Jayaswal takes them to signify that the kingship depended upon 'this sacred act of delivering the trust' and 'not on any other principle such as that of

62 SB. v. 2. 17 etc.
63 TS. t. 7. 9; MS. i. 11. 3. Āp. SS. xvin. 5-6, however, requires the salt to be given by the (four) Vaiśyas or the four chief priests. (See Caland's tr.).
64 iyam te rā t yasasī yamana dhruvo'si dharmah kṣrayai tuḥ kṣetāya tuḥ rayrayai tuḥ pośāya tuḥ.
succession or inheritance”. In considering this view we may mention at the outset that the phrases ‘for tilling’ etc., while singularly inapplicable to the Brāhmaṇa sacrificer, suit the King with peculiar aptness.\(^{66}\) The above passage, then, evidently implies, as Jayaswal thinks, that the Vedic kingship was a trust. We may, however, observe that none of the other Yajus Samhītā texts applies this formula to the Vājapeya sacrificer, although they use similar formulas in different contexts.\(^{67}\) This may perhaps be taken to signify the limited extent to which the doctrine of trust was applied to the Vedic King.

*Besprinkling ceremony*

After some further ceremonies the priest besprinkles the sacrificer who is seated on a black antelope skin. In the accompanying formula the sacrificer is said to be consecrated to the sāmrājya (supreme lordship) of Bṛhaspati (VS., ix. 30 and ŚB., v. 2. 2. 14), to those of Bṛhaspati and Indra (KS. xiv. 2. MS., i. 11. 4) or to those of Agni, Indra and Bṛhaspati (TS., i. 7. 10, TB., i. 3. 8). According to ŚB., this means that the priest thereby makes him attain to the fellowship of Bṛhaspati and co-existence in his world. The priest winds up by acclaiming the sacrificer as ‘All-ruler’ and commending him to the protection of the gods of whom he has become one (ŚB., v. 2. 2. 15). While the above extracts hint at the familiar doctrine of the King’s attaining the divinity through the sacrifice, the mention of Bṛhaspati is of some significance. As Weber justly points

---


67 For the use of similar formulas at the āgniṣṭoma ceremony see TS. iv. 3. 7 MS. ii. 8. 3, KS. xvii. 3. A similar formula is used as the Adhvaryu puts the rope over the sacrificial horse at the Āśvamedha (TS. vii. 1. 11).
out, the single reference to this god in the Madhyandina recension of VS., which is not shared by the Känva recension of the same Samhitā as well as by all the other Samhitās, indicates the reconstruction of the whole stuff in the special priestly sense.

Conclusion

Let us attempt, in conclusion, to sum up as far as possible the leading characteristics of the Vedic State as embodied in the ceremonies of royal and imperial consecration above described. In making this attempt it is well to remember that the above ceremonies with their accompanying formulas necessarily reflect the Vedic polity only in some of its aspects and in the setting of a standardized (though not rigidly fixed) sacrificial routine. It must, again, be admitted that the expositions of the rituals with their formulas, according to the different Vedic schools and sub-schools, were strongly coloured with their characteristic beliefs and prejudices. In the absence of more concrete facts such as those of the Anglo-Saxon charters and laws, it is impossible to judge how far the imperfect and one-sided picture drawn by our present authorities corresponds to the Vedic State in its true historical light. Subject to this important qualification the following conclusions may be drawn from our survey of the consecration ceremonies about the nature of the Vedic State:

(1) Monarchy was the type of constitution universally known to the Vedic State. Of a regularly constituted Council of Nobles or Popular Assembly there is hardly any trace.

(2) The monarchy was generally in the tribal stage. But territorial kingship had already emerged in some quarters. What is more, the texts refer to various forms of universal monarchy embracing a complex of tribes and extending over the whole land up to its natural frontiers.

(3) The king emphatically never claimed divine origin. On the other hand he could be held to have derived his authority from the gods or even could be identified with them not merely through the sacrifice but by inherent right. Though the kingship could be regarded as a trust, there is no distinct trace of a coronation-oath. The king’s office implied authority over the people, but the latter also could be declared as the source of kingship and stated as protecting the king.

(4) The king was head of the civil and military administration, although some of his officers still held titles of members of his household. Already it was held that the king’s justice prevailed over private jurisdictions and that he was exempt from judicial punishment. The protection of Dharma and of Brāhmaṇas was already recognized as one of the king’s functions.

(5) Of the branches of administration the military as a rule was subordinated to the civil. Among the civil officers the purohita held the dominant position. The queens also had a constitutional status. The officers of the royal court and household as well as the artisan classes held an equally conspicuous place in the constitution. There was a regular gradation of ranks from the king down to the meanest official.

(6) The principle of political representation was applied not only to groups of officers, but also and above all to classes and sections of the people.
While the Śūdra was of little account in the Vedic State, the Brāhmaṇa, the Rājanya and the Vaiśya were its component factors. In particular the Brāhmaṇa and the Rājanya were regarded as the two ruling powers in the State. Not only were the provinces of these two powers sharply distinguished from each other, but between them there was an inherent antagonism which, however, could be modified into inter-dependence, while the spiritual power at other times claimed superiority over the temporal power or vice versa.

The Śūdra was practically without religious rights, while those of the Vaiśya and even the Kṣatriya tended to be restricted in favour of the Brāhmaṇas. Again, perhaps normally while the Śūdra had no civil rights, those of the Vaiśya were dependent upon the favour of others. The Brāhmaṇas claimed to form a State within or rather beyond the State under the kingship of the divine Soma. But actually they only asserted (not always with success) the immunity of their person and property.

The Vedic State was so inseparably associated with political alliances that a friendly ally took part in the actual besprinkling of the king.

*ABBREVIATIONS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RV.</td>
<td>=Ṛgveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV.</td>
<td>=Atharva Veda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS.</td>
<td>=Taittiriya Saṁhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS.</td>
<td>=Vājasaṅeyya Saṁhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS.</td>
<td>=Maitrāyaṁi Saṁhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS.</td>
<td>=Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB.</td>
<td>=Satapatha Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB.</td>
<td>=Aitareya Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB.</td>
<td>=Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PB. - Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa
Āp. SS. = Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra
ĀŚS. = Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra
BŚS. Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra
KŚS. Katyāyana Śrauta Sūtra
LŚS. Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra
ŚŚS. Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra
VŚS. Varāha Śrauta Sūtra
Vnt. S. = Vaitāna Sūtra

The translations from TS., SB., AB., PB., and Āp. SS. are reproduced from the respective versions of Keith (HOS. Vols. xviii-xix), Eggeling (SBE. Vols. xii, xxvi, xli, xliv), Keith (HOS. Vol. xxv), Caland (Bib. Ind. ed.) and Caland (Konn. AK. van Wet. te Amsterdam).
PERIODS OF INDIAN HISTORY

Without denying the essential unity of history, it is not only possible but desirable to divide it into well-marked chronological periods. In the history of India three periods are often distinguished by the authors of text-books as well as advanced works. These are characterised as Hindu, Muhammadan and British. There is about this scheme of division an air of delusive simplicity which is sufficient to recommend it to popular acceptance. It seems to imply the three most important elements of the political life of India at the present time as successively ruling the destinies of the country in the past. And yet when it is subjected to a close scrutiny, it is found to be beset with special difficulties which preclude its acceptance for purposes of serious study.

To begin with the so-called Hindu period of Indian History, it is usually taken to extend from the earliest times to the Muhammadan conquest. Unfortunately the term Hindu, owing to the course of historical events, has a somewhat ambiguous connotation. As is well-known, this term was not known to the Ancient Indians, but was coined from the river-name Sindhu by the Ancient Iranians from whom it was afterwards adopted by the Greeks, who passed it on to the Arabs and Persians.\(^1\) In this original sense of the word, it stands for the

\(^1\) Thus Vedic Sanskrit *Sindhu* > Avestan *Hindu*. Old Persian *Hi(n)du* > Greek *Indoi*, and Arabic *Hind*. An exact parallel is found in the case of Ancient Greece where this geographical name was given more or less vaguely to the country by the Romans. *It was apparently derived by the Romans from
people or group of peoples occupying a certain definite area and possessing a distinctive type of culture. In popular parlance, however, and even in official nomenclature in modern times, 'Hindu' is held to be synonymous with a follower of the Brahmanical religion and 'Hindus' are distinguished as such from Buddhists and Jains, not to speak of the adherents of alien faiths reaching the country in later times. Now if we make use of the latter and popular sense of the term, it may properly be held to exclude those centuries during which Buddhism was the dominant religion. In fact we should confine its scope only to the subsequent centuries which were marked by the dominance of Brahmanical Hinduism. Such is the view of Mr. C. V. Vaidya who distinguishes² three periods in the early history of India, viz., 'Aryan' (c. 4000 or 2000 B.C.-300 B.C.), 'Aryo-Buddhist' or 'Buddhist' (c. 300 B.C.-600 A.D.) and 'Hindu' (c. 600-1200 or 1300 A.D.). It is unnecessary to expose the fallacy of this view which seeks to project into the past the narrow and limited connotation associated with the word 'Hindu' in later times. But it may well be taken to illustrate how owing to the ambiguity inherent in the term in question, it is possible to restrict its application to a very limited period of the Ancient History of India.

The difficulty is minimised, but not extinguished, when we understand the term Hindu in its wider original sense. It is a historical truism that the Hindu type of culture, like the Hellenic culture in classical antiquity, resulted from the fusion of the Illyrians who applied the name of an Epirot tribe (Græci) to all their southern neighbours' (Encycl. Brit. s.v. Greece).

of the intrusive Aryan and the indigenous non-Aryan elements. In India, naturally enough, owing to the larger size of the country, this blending of the two distinct cultures was a much slower and more difficult process than it was in Ancient Greece. In so far as the North (the territories between the Himalayas and the Vindhyas) is concerned, it must have practically commenced during the Brāhmaṇa period (c. 800-600 B.C.?). Thus while the Rgveda, the oldest literary monument of the Indo-Aryans, takes us scarcely farther eastwards than the Jumna, the Brāhmaṇas include ‘Vidarbhā’ (Berar?) in the South and Magadha and Aṅga in the East within their ken. In the tract to the south of the Vindhyas the diffusion of the Aryan culture came necessarily later. Thus the earliest references to the Pāṇḍya, Cola and Kerala kingdoms are given by the grammarian Kātyāyana (c. 400 B.C.), while his great predecessor Pāṇini’s acquaintance extends only to the Aśmakas on the upper course of the Godāvari. Allowing a century for the mingling of the Aryan and non-Aryan cultural elements, we arrive at c. 500 B.C., as the approximate date of the rise of Hindu culture in the North and 300 B.C. as the corresponding date for the South. It follows from the above that the ‘Hindu period’ of Indian history strictly so-called may be traced back at the earliest to c. 500 B.C. in the North and c. 300 B.C. in the South. This of course makes the expression wholly inappropriate for the designation not only of the Palaeolithic, Neolithic and Chalcolithic, but also of the Early Vedic Ages.

The above arguments find a striking corroboration in Vincent Smith’s standard text-book on the History of India. In this work the author divides the Early History of India into
three sections, viz. 'Ancient India' (from the earliest times to c. 322 B.C.), (2) 'Hindu India' (c. 322 B.C.—647 A.D.), and (3) 'Mediaeval Hindu Kingdoms' or 'the Hindu period' (c. 647-1200 or 1300 A.D.). Here, it will be observed, there is a frank recognition of the insufficiency of the term 'Hindu period' to serve as a label for the Ancient history of India. But no attempt is made to substitute a more suitable title. Incidentally it may be remarked that no sufficient reasons exist for distinguishing the second and the third sub-periods under the titles 'Hindu India' and the 'Hindu period respectively.'  

If this difference is made to rest on the incorporation of the Rajput ruling houses within the Hindu pale, which is the leading fact of the last sub-period, it may be urged that this was not a new phenomenon, but was paralleled in the earlier period by the admission of Greeks, Scythians, Parthians, Kushans and others into the orthodox society. Equally unfortunate is the choice of the date of accession of the Mauryas as the dividing-line between Ancient and Hindu India. For whatever might be the significance of the dynastic revolution which substituted the Mauryas for the Nandas, no one will claim for it that it was attended for the first time with the diffusion of Hindu culture throughout the country.

Let us now turn to the second division of Indian History, the so-called 'Muhammadan period.' With very few exceptions, modern authors have applied the term to the interval of nearly five centuries between the conquest of Northern India by the

---

3 The designation ‘The Hindu period’ is also adopted by James Kennedy (Imperial Gazetteer, Vol. ii, Chap. viii) for the period 650-1200 A.D.
Muslim Turks and the downfall of the Mughal empire. There are, however, strong and weighty reasons against the use of the term in the way suggested. The first difficulty arises from the wide and indefinite connotation of the term Muhammadian which is indifferently applied to Arabs, Turks and Afghans on the one side and converts from Hinduism on the other. The principal objection, however, is based on the fact that it conveys an altogether erroneous impression of the period to which it is applied. It ignores the fact that during the centuries in question there existed side by side with the Muslim States numbers of independent Hindu kingdoms in different parts of the country. Some of the Hindu dynasties attained such importance that they presented a formidable barrier against the advance of the Islamic power and not unfrequently carried their arms into the enemy’s country. Such were the powerful dynasties of the Eastern Gangas of Kalinga and the Gajapatis of Orissa, who preserved the independence of the eastern coast far down into the middle of the sixteenth century. Such, again, were the ruling houses of Rajputana, and especially the Guhilotis of Mewar whose exploits earned for them the title of Hindua Suraj, i.e. ‘the sun of the Hindus’. Such, lastly, was the empire of Vijayanagar which maintained for nearly three hundred years the line of the Tungabhadra and the Krishna against the assaults of the Muhammadian powers of the Deccan. Indeed there were certain parts of the country, which, owing to the difficulties of their communications or their remoteness or some other cause, were never completely subdued by the arms of Islam. This was the case with Assam and Nepal in the North, with the forest regions of the modern Central Provinces, Chota Nagpur Plateau
and Orissa Feudatory States in the middle, with Travancore and Cochin in the extreme South. Of still greater significance is the fact that the Islamic power in India was not maintained through the centuries at a steady level, but periodically suffered serious set-backs. In truth, we may distinguish in the history of this power two great periods of advance alternating with two other periods of decline. The first period opens with the advent of the vigorous Houses of Ghazni and Ghor who won for Islam the dominion over the richest and most extensive parts of Northern India. It reaches its culmination in the reign of Muhammad bin Tughluq whose empire at its greatest extent (c. 1338-39) embraced twenty-four provinces extending from the Punjab to Mysore and the Coromandel coast. For more than two hundred years after this time the history of Muslim rule in India is, on the whole, written in decay. The mighty Sultanate of Delhi is broken up into fragments, while the invasion of the fierce Timur sucks the life-blood out of its last remnants. Meanwhile the stage is cleared for the revival of the Rajput power in the North and the rise of the powerful empire of Vijayanagar in the South. The second wave of Muslim advance breaks upon Northern India with the accession of Akbar, the real founder of the Mughal dynasty, in 1556. The advance thenceforth is on the whole steadily maintained till the latter part of the reign of Aurangzib (c. 1700). "Under him the Mughal empire reached its greatest extent and the largest single State ever known to India from the dawn of history to the rise of the British power was formed. From Ghazni to Chatgaon, from Kashmir to the Karnatak, the continent of India obeyed one sceptre and beyond this region in far off Ladak and Malabar the suzerainty of the
same ruler was proclaimed from the pulpit." 4 From the closing years of Aurangzeb's reign onwards the Muhammadan power in India is at a low ebb. Gradually the empire of the Great Mogul is dissolved into fragments, of which only the dominions of the Nizams of Hyderabad attain any degree of importance. The devastating invasions of the Persian Nadir Shah and the Afghan Ahmad Shah Abdali not only drain the Mogul dominion of its last resources, but rob it of the province of the Punjab. The great province of Bengal, Behar and Orissa succumbs to the rising British power, while the adjoining State of Oudh is reduced to the position of its dependent ally. The heir of Aurangzeb, driven from his capital, becomes for a time the pensionary of the Company. Meanwhile the hardy and active Marathas, roused to a sense of their unity by the genius of Shivaji, break open their provincial barriers and spread their conquering hordes over the greater part of the country. Even the colossal disaster at Panipat fails to cripple them for any length of time, and they remain the most formidable indigenous power till they are outwitted by the diplomacy of Wellesley and thwarted by the arms of Wellington and Lake.

The foregoing arguments will make it clear that neither of the terms Hindu and Muhammadan is fit to serve as the title of the great divisions of Indian History. The same objections do not apply to the term British period for reasons which are sufficiently obvious. It therefore behoves us to consider whether we can profitably substitute more suitable terms for those which

4 Sir Jadunath Sarkar, History of Aurangzeb, Vol. I, Introd. p. xi. This verdict, however, hardly does justice to the claims of the Maurya Empire under Asoka, which rivalled, if not exceeded, the extent of Aurangzeb's Empire.
we have been examining so far. Here we may apply the analogy of European History with its well-known divisions into Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern periods. There is a danger indeed in pressing the analogy too far. In Europe because of reasons into which we need not enter here, great movements have often modified the life of the people to its very core. But in India owing to the intense conservatism and passivity of the people and their imperviousness to all influences other than religious, even the great historical events (apart from religious movements) have failed till lately to touch the inner springs of their thought and action. Not without reason was invented the old adage of the 'Unchanging East'. Nevertheless from the point of view of the historian of India we can broadly distinguish (as some have already done) the counterparts of the three main divisions of European History. Between Ancient and Mediaeval India the line of division has sometimes been drawn at the death of Harṣa (c. 647 A.D.).

No sufficient reason exists for adopting this view, for the changes which followed the death of the great emperor—not excluding the rise of the Rajput dynasties and the regrouping of the States were not different in kind from the events of the earlier times. Equally inconclusive is the view which makes the division between Ancient and Mediaeval India coincide with the rise of the Guptas. For the Gupta period, however,


eminent a rôle it may have played in the development of art and literature, cannot justly be regarded as the border-line between two great periods of Indian History. In truth like the Periclean Age of Athenian History with which it has been aptly compared, its function was not to open a new epoch, but to bring to a completion the influences that had been maturing during the preceding centuries. Nor can we subscribe to the view, supported as it is by high authority, 7 which finds in the establishment of the Kushan dynasty the much sought-for division between Ancient and Mediaeval India. For the Kushan empire in Northern India, however inspired by foreign influences, did not differ in its essential features from the preceding Indian empires. Indeed it seems to us to be most convenient to draw the dividing line between the two periods in the last years of the 12th and the early years of the 13th centuries in Northern India and almost exactly a century later in the South. Then was founded for the first time an extensive Muhammadan empire in the country. Of the contrast between these two periods—the one preceding and the other following the Muhammadan conquest—it is easy to form an exaggerated opinion. For it must be remembered that the new rulers owing to the paucity of their numbers and their lack of administrative capacity left the work of civil administration at first largely to the Hindu princes and chiefs owning a more or less definite alle-

7 Cf. Rapson, *Ancient India*, p. 147. This view is implicitly embodied in the scheme of chronological division adopted in the *Cambridge History of India* which gives its first volume comprising the period 'from the earliest times to about the middle of the first century A.D.' the significant title of *Ancient India*. 
giance to the paramount power. It must also be admitted that the famous system of administration which was built up later by the genius of Sher Shah and Akbar was anticipated in all its leading features by the best Hindu sovereigns of earlier times. Even the growth of vernacular literature which has been acclaimed by a well-known historian as one of 'the gifts of the Muslim Age to India', was not an innovation, as it was paralleled earlier by the development of the Pāli canonical and non-canonical literature of the Buddhists as well as the Ardha-Māgadhi and Apabhraṃṣa canonical works of the Jainas. Nevertheless the Muslim conquest, because of the new influences which it introduced into the country, may fitly be called the harbinger of a new Age. With it came not only a new and fiercely monotheistic faith, but also new ideas of Government, new schools of jurisprudence, new languages and literatures with their canons of literary taste and models of style, new styles of architecture, a new code of social manners and new modes and fashions of living. These influences in course of time left a profound stamp upon the upper and educated classes of the Hindu population. Above all, the Muhammadan conquest brought a new factor into the complex mass of Indian humanity, a factor which owing to the inflexibility of its religious creed has retained to this day something of its exotic character.

We have selected the conquest of Shihabuddin Muhammad Ghori as a convenient landmark of the transition from Ancient to Mediaeval India. Like all great historical movements, however, this was a slow process which was spread through several

8 Sir Jadunath Sarkar, *India through the Ages*, pp. 77-81.
centuries. Its beginnings may be traced to the conquest of Sindh (711-712 A.D.) by the Arabs, which drove a wedge of Muhammadan dominion into the country. Then came in succession the fall of the outworks of the Indian defence and the outposts of Hindu civilization in the Afghan highlands, the conquest of Peshawar by the Amir Sabuktigin, and the destructive inroads of his famous son Sultan Mahmud. Other signs of the coming change were the corruption of Buddhism, the growing rigidity of caste, the neglect of the art of warfare and the advance of monasticism. The victories of Shihabuddin carried forward, but did not complete, the transition from the Ancient to the Middle Ages.

Turning to the Modern period, we think we can most conveniently trace it from the administration of the Marquis of Wellesley9 (1798-1804). The transition from Mediaeval to Modern India, like that from the Ancient to the Middle Ages, extends over a long period of time. Its beginnings may be carried back to Vasco de Gama’s discovery of the Cape route in 1498, which for the first time brought a West-European power into direct contact with India. Among further steps leading to this movement may be mentioned the transfer of command of the Indian ocean from the Arabs to the Portuguese, the elimination of the French from the Indian stage in the Carnatic wars,

9 In his paper ‘Periods in Indian History’ (Indian Antiquary, February, 1930) to which reference has been made above, Mr. F. J. Richards suggests 1500 A.C. when ‘the Sultanates gave place to the Mughals’, as marking the transition from Mediaeval to Modern India. It is however difficult to accept this view since the advent of the Mughals did not bring in its train such fundamental changes as to make it the starting-point of a new Age.
the conquests of Bengal by Clive, and the wars and alliances of Warren Hastings. It was, however, left to Wellesley to plan and carry out those feats of diplomacy and warfare that made the British the paramount power in India except the Punjab. In trying to discover the specific features of the Modern period, we must, again, beware of the risk of exaggeration. Thus the system of administrative organisation which is one of the crowning triumphs of British rule in this country, however, enriched and perfected by the lessons of modern wisdom and experience, follows in the main the lines of the best administrations in the past, though we have in recent constitutional developments the promise of a more glorious future. And yet we must admit that the advent of the British rule has introduced a number of momentous changes which make it the herald of a new age—the Modern period of Indian History. It has broken down the isolation of the country to an extent undreamt of before. ‘India has now been switched on to the main currents of the great moving world outside, and made to vibrate with every economic or cultural change there’.10 Within the limits of the country itself the Railway, the Telegraph and the printing press combined with the influences of a common administration and system of education have helped to break down provincial barriers and created for the first time a truly national consciousness. Above all the net-work of schools and colleges, which is one of the principal gifts of British rule, has helped to sow the seeds of western ideas broadcast among the keenest and most intelligent section of the people. These ideas have fructified in the

10 Sir Jadunath Sarkar, *India through the Ages*, p. 94.
intellectual Renaissance which has not only opened to India the stores of Western learning and restored to her much of her lost cultural heritage, but has quickened into a new activity almost every branch of the national life.
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Vetāla-paśeṣaṃśatī, 206-7
Vetravarman, 182
Vibhiṣaṇa, 227-8
Vidagdha Śākalya, 50
Vidarbhā, 34, 294
Vidas (Bīdas), 7-8
Vidatha, 153
Videha, 40-2 49
Vidhurapāṇidī Jātaka, 88, 90
Vigrahapāla III, 215
Vijayasena, 223
Vikramādiya, 207
Vināda, 31
Vinaya Piṭaka, 57, 88, 90-1
Vipāś river, 26
Virbhāṣaṇa, 188
Virajasa, 109
Viramitrodāya of Mitra Miśra, 114, 122
Viravara, 206
Virocana, 44
Viśāṇins, 28
Viṣayapaṭi, 182
Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa, 122
Viṣṇugupta (Kauṭilya), 81
Viṣṇurākṣita, 186
Viṣṭi, 175
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Viśvaśiti sacrifice, 96
Viśvāmitra, King, 33
Viśvāmitra, 26, 31
Viśvantara Sāsādana, 34, 36
Viśvarūpa, 106

Vitahavya Śrāyasa, 33
Vitaśoka, 75
Viśāda-cintāmaṇi of Vācaspatimīśra, 100
Viśāda-ramākara of Caṇḍeśvara, 96
Vogel, J. Ph., 178, 192, 201
Vṛćivats, 27, 33
Vṛjikas, 67
Vyāsa, 246
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Watters, T., 194
Weber, A., 1, 6, 18, 248, 268, 279-282, 284, 287
Wellesley, Lord, 298, 302-3
Wellington, Lord, 298
Whitney, W. D., 22, 145, 148, 150, 175
Wintermitz, M., 3, 10-1, 18, 21, 77
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Yadu, 24-5
Yadus, 26
Yājñavalkya, 4, 32, 40-2, 49-50, 94, 96-8, 100-2
Yaksus, 29
Yamunā river, 29-30
Yāśka, 156
Yāskas, 7
Yavyāvati, 27-8
Yogini-tantra, 205
Yudhiṣṭhira, 110, 121, 246
Yutas, 56-8
Yuvārāja-bhaṭṭiśaṅkara, 185
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Additions and Corrections.

Page 10
Line 21
For Yajujnīśa
Read Yajujnīśa

Page 13
Line 20
For Pārīśita
Read Pārīśita

Page 17
Line 18
For Do
Read Do

Page 22
Line 18
For Pañcaviṁśa
Read Pañcaviṁśa

Page 25
Line 20
For Purukutsāṁi
Read Purukutsāṁi

Page 33
Line 2.3
For Jahnus
Read Jahnus

Page 34
Line 5
For Sanaçrūta
Read Sanaçrūta

Page 48
Line 28
For Tura
Read Tura

Page 54
Line 25
For bhrātaraḥ
Read bhrātaraḥ

Page 67
Line 12
For rājaśabdopajīvin
Read rājaśabdopajīvin

Page 81
Line 20-21
For Divyāvadāna
Read Divyāvadāna

Page 85
Line 25
For MacCrindle
Read MacCrindle

Page 89
Line 11
For Mahānānārada kassapajātaka
Read Mahānānārada kassapajātaka

Page 91
Line 26
For it
Read is

Page 99
Line 25
For VII
Read VIII

Page 101
Line 7
For yasta
Read yasya

Page 102
Line 15
For paraviṣayābhimukhau
Read paraviṣayābhimukhau

Page 112
Line 18
For Vedārthopanibaddhatvāt
Read Vedārthopanibaddhatvāt

Page 113
Line 23
For tāvacchāśrāṇiśobhante
Read tāvacchāśrāṇiśobhante

Page 116
Line 19
For Śārvabhaumaḥ
Read Śārvabhaumaḥ

Page 117
Line 5
For prthivyai Śārvabhaumaḥ
Read prthivyai Śārvabhaumaḥ

Page 118
Line 24
For vināśakṛt
Read vināśakṛt

After line 13 add Kautilya in his Arthasastra (11.13) mentions Gauḍa among the sources of silver (rūpyam). But this seems to be a solitary reference lacking confirmation.

Page 121
Line 26
For śiśyavat
Read śiśyavat

Page 122
Line 27
For tvabhiśektavyo
Read tvabhiśektavyo
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Brāhmaṇas,</td>
<td>Brāhmaṇas,²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ratanahaviniṣi</td>
<td>Ratanahaviniṣi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>kinsemen</td>
<td>kinsemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>dharmadhṛt</td>
<td>dharmadhṛt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>yathākāmāja yeha</td>
<td>yathākāmāja yeha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>rajñāivam</td>
<td>rajñāivam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144-45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Omit Dr. Jayaswal... was situated.</td>
<td>Isānaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Isānaḥ</td>
<td>naṅ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>nam-</td>
<td>bahubrihi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>naṅ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>nam</td>
<td>interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>interpretations</td>
<td>hetu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>hetu</td>
<td>adhipati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>adhipati</td>
<td>adhikaḥ pati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>adhikaḥ pati</td>
<td>vivudhādhipaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>yathākāmāja yevo</td>
<td>vṛddhāvyaṃya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>vṛddhāvyaṃya</td>
<td>parisarpāna-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>parisarpāna-</td>
<td>yuvāraja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>yuvāraja</td>
<td>Kumārāmāty-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kumārāmāty</td>
<td>Kaṃkairoḍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kaṃkairoḍ</td>
<td>Cauradḍharaṇikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cauradḍharaṇikā</td>
<td>Navaratanapariṅka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Navaratanapariṅka</td>
<td>Mānasaḷaṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mānasaḷaṣa</td>
<td>santatiḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>santati</td>
<td>parisaṇṭati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>parisaṇṭati</td>
<td>ratnāṇi vividhāṇiṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>ratnāṇi vividhāṇiṣya</td>
<td>vaṣṭrāṇi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>vaṣṭrāṇi</td>
<td>trpi -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>pramāṇataḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>tripi</td>
<td>dadyāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>willingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>dadyāt</td>
<td>Kāli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>willingly</td>
<td>fortunate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kāli</td>
<td>Manhali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>fortune</td>
<td>Vālmikiḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>to be the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dvya</td>
<td>Divya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>militānta</td>
<td>militānta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>āravdhānī</td>
<td>āravdhānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>rasaśenā</td>
<td>rasaśenā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>bhūmī abhūkhyāyā</td>
<td>bhūmī abhūkhyāyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>yo anujo</td>
<td>yo 'nujo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>rajīta</td>
<td>rajīta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>śītā</td>
<td>śītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>kṣobhāhūta</td>
<td>kṣobhāhūta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>dvayacchannauḥ</td>
<td>dvayacchannauḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Amitābha</td>
<td>Amitābha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bhūmiseśa</td>
<td>bhūmiseśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>āriṣasthāna</td>
<td>āriṣasthāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>asvamedhena</td>
<td>asvamedhena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>niṣṭhino</td>
<td>niṣṭino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>prāptābhīṣeko</td>
<td>prāptābhīṣekalḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>etanāyāṅgāni</td>
<td>etanāyāṅgāni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>tejasvi</td>
<td>tejasvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mahiṣi</td>
<td>Mahiṣi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>rājakartāraḥ</td>
<td>rājakartāraḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jaiṣṭhyāsa</td>
<td>Jaiṣṭhyāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jaiṣṭyāsa</td>
<td>Jaiṣṭyāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>jyeṣṭhānām</td>
<td>jyeṣṭhānām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>bhavatayapanyā</td>
<td>bhavatayapanyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>secreδ</td>
<td>secreδ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>warter</td>
<td>water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>12-13, 30</td>
<td>Brahmāna</td>
<td>Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>anyasya</td>
<td>anyasya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>mahiṣi</td>
<td>mahiṣi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>atiśṭhān</td>
<td>atiśṭhān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>prthīvyai</td>
<td>prthīvyai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>'macs</td>
<td>'makes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>steadfast</td>
<td>steadfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Adhvarya</td>
<td>Adhvarya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Taittrīya</td>
<td>Taittrīya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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