THE BOOK WAS DRENCHED

pages missing in the book (449 to 454)

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_166537

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

The Sacred Books of the Hindus Series

VOL. XXXII

THE POSITIVE BACKGROUND OF HINDU SOCIOLOGY

BOOK I

INTRODUCTION TO HINDU POSITIVISM

BY

Dr. Geog.h.c. BENOY KUMAR SARKAR, *Vidya-vaibhava*

Post-Graduate Departments in Economics and Commerce, Calcutta University; Hony. Professor of Economics and sometime Rector, College of Engineering and Technology, Jadabpur, Calcutta; *Gast-Professor an der Technischen Hochschule*, Munich (1930-31); Hony. Doctor of Geography (*Academia Asiatica*, Teheran); Member, Royal Asiatic Society (North China Branch, Shanghai), *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* (Leipzig), *Correspondant de la Société d'Economie Politique* (Paris) and *de l'Institut Oriental* (Prague), *Corrispondente al Comitato Italiano per lo Studio dei Problemi della Popolazione* (Rome), *Institut International de Sociologie* (Geneva) and Royal Economic Society (London); Correspondent, *American Sociological Review* Editor, *Arthik Unnati* (Economic Progress).



PANINI OFFICE,

49, Leader Road,

ALLAHABAD

1937

Published by
Dr. LALIT MOHAN BASU, M.B.
Panini Office,
Sukumari Asrama,
49, Leader Road,
Allahabad.

Printed by
J. C. Sarkhel at the
Calcutta Oriental Press Ltd.
9, Panchanan Ghose Lane,
Calcutta.

PUBLISHERS' PREFACE*

By Dr. Lalit Mohan Basu M.B.

The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology by Professor Benoy Kumar Sarkar, of which Book I. of the second edition is being presented in this publication, has had an interesting origin and development. It was in 1910 while my father, the late Major Baman Das Basu, M.R.C.S. (London), I.M.S. (Retd.) was preparing his manuscript for the *Indian Medicinal Plants* (first edition, 1918, second edition, 1936) and organizing the Botanical Court of the All-India Industrial Exhibition at Allahabad that he came into contact with Professor Sarkar of the Bengal National College, Calcutta (National Council of Education, Bengal, est. 1906), as one of the visitors. Prof. Sarkar was then connected, as founder and organizer, also with the *Māldaha Jātīya Śikṣā Samiti* (District

* This bibliographical survey is based on Major B. D. Basu's Preface to his English translation of Sarkar's *Introduction to the Science of Education* (*London*, 1913), Sarkar's Prefaces to his *Folk-Element in Hindu Culture* (London, 1917), *Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig, 1922), *Economic Development* (Madras, 1926) and *Applied Eonomics* Vol. I. (Calcutta, 1932), the Publishers' Preface to Sarkar's *Greetings to Young India* (Calcutta, 1927), Major B. D. Basu's Preface to Sarkar's *Political Philosophies Since* 1905 (Madras 1928), the Publishers' Preface to *Nayā Bānglār Goḍā Pattan* "The Foundations of a New Bengal" (Calcutta, 1932), Shib Chandra Dutt's brochure, *Fundamental Problems and Leading Ideas in the Works of Professor Benoy Kumar Sarkar* (Calcutta 1932), Pankaj Kumar Mukherjee's *Economic Services of Zamindars to the Peasants and the Public as Analyzed by Professor Benoy Kumar Sarkar* (Calcutta 1934) and Professor Banesvar Dass's Preface to Sarkar's *Bāḍtir Pathe Bāngālī*, "Bengalis in Progress" (Calcutta 1934). Shib Chandra Dutt's *Conflicting Tendencies in Indian Economic Thought* (Calcutta, 1934) is a study, in the main, of the economic theories and policies of Mahatma Gandhi and Professor Sarkar. It contains also a bibliography of economic literature as produced by Indian economists since 1893. See also the last footnote of this Preface.

Council of National Education, Malda, Bengal, est. 1907) which used to run eleven primary and secondary schools in different parts of the district, at times with over one thousand boys and girls on the rolls. My father entrusted Prof. Sarkar with the translation into English of the Sanskrit work on politics, economics and sociology, entitled *Śukranīti* for the *Sacred Books of the Hindus Series* edited by himself for the Panini Office, which had been established in November 1891 by my uncle, the late Rai Bahadur Sris Chandra Basu Vidyarnava.[1] *The Positive Background* is Professor Sarkar's Introduction to his English translation of Śukrāchārya's *Nītisāra*, as *Śukranīti* is sometimes popularly known.

1906-1914

In 1910 Professor Sarkar had already initiated two series of books, one in Bengali and the other in English. The Bengali Series was entitled *Śikṣā-Vijnān* (Science of Education) and by 1912 was available in the following parts: 1. *Śikṣā-Vijnāner Bhūmikā*, "Introduction to the Science of Education" (1910, 64 pages) with a preface by Hirendra Nath Datta of the *Bangīya Sāhitya Parishat* (Bengali Academy of Literature). 2. *Prāchīn Grīser Jātīya Śikṣā*, "National Education in Ancient Greece" (1910, 150 pages) with a preface by Prof. Benoyendra Nath Sen, published by the *Bangīya Sāhitya Parishat*. 3. *Bhāṣā-Śikṣā*, "The Study of Language" (1910, 150 pages). 4. *Sanskrita-Śikṣā*, "Lessons on Sanskrit", in four parts (1911, 600 pages). 5. *Ingrājī Śikṣā*, "Lessons on English" (1911, 120 pages). 6. *Śikṣā-*

1 P. N. Bose: *Life of Sris Chandra Basu* (Calcutta, 1932), p. 156; R. Chatterjee: "Bamani Das Basu" (*Modern Review*, Calcutta, December, 1930).

Samālochanā, "Problems in Education" (1912, 150 pages) with a preface by Barada Charan Mitra, District and Sessions Judge.

About Prof. Sarkar's *Śikṣā-Vijnān* Series the National Council of Education *Report* for 1908 (p. 18) says as follows: "During the last two years he had been carrying on experiments both in and out of school so as to ascertain the best method to be pursued in teaching the various subjects at the different stages of development. He has already reduced into form his thoughts on the teaching of Bengali, Sanskrit, English, arithmetic, botany, zoology, chemistry and the historical subjects. He is also engaged in compiling a graduated series of text-books on these subjects according to his method of teaching."

In the *N.C.E. Report for* 1911 (p. 20) we read as follows: "Professor Benoy Kumar Sarkar's Pedagogic Series in Bengali, of which 10 parts were published last year, has been progressing, and the following parts are in preparation: 1. Lessons on Botany (according to the Inductive Method of Teaching). 2. Lessons on Chemistry (according to the Inductive Method of Teaching). 3. Lessons on Mathematics (according to the Inductive Method of Teaching)."

Professor Sarkar's method of teaching Sanskrit "without a first course of grammar" was appreciated by Mahamahopadhyaya Prof. Adityaram Bhattacharya of Allahabad University as an "effort to facilitate and popularize the study of Sanskrit." Prof. Bhattacharya said further: "The old method has done its part so long and will remain inevitable in the case of higher and thorough study. But if quicker methods of acquiring languages, living or dead, be discovered and introduced, humanity will bless

him whose inventive genius can succeed to achieve the object which every well-wisher of learning has at heart. At the very outset the attempt looks somewhat revolutionary. But in other fields it is such revolutionary departures from old track that has hastened the advance of arts and sciences."

Writing on this Series the *Modern Review* (Calcutta) observed as follows: "The author deserves our best thanks for the service he is doing to the cause of educational reform in our country."

An idea of the educational reform as embodied in Professor Sarkar's *Śikṣā-Vijnān* Series can be obtained to a certain extent from his *Śikṣānuśāsana* ("Educational Creed"), 1910, which is reproduced below in English:

"*A. General*

I. Aim and criterion of education twofold: the pupil must grow up to be (i) intellectually, a discoverer of truths and a pioneer of learning; (ii) morally, an organizer of institutions and a leader of men.

I. Moral training to be imparted not through lessons culled from moral and religious textbooks, but through arrangements by which the student is actually made to develop habits of self-sacrifice and devotion to the interests of others by undertaking work of philanthropy and social service.

III. To build up character and determine the aim or mission of life, (i) the "design," plan, and personal responsibility of a single guide-philosopher-friend, and (ii) the control of the whole life and career of the student are indispensable. These circumstances provide the precondition for true spiritual education.

IV. Educational institutions and movements must not be made planks in political, industrial, social, or religious agitations and propagandas, but controlled and governed by the Science of Education based on the rational grounds of Sociology.

"B. *Tutorial*

I. Even the most elementary course must have a multiplicity of subjects with due inter-relation and co-ordination. Up to a certain stage the training must be encyclopaedic and as comprehensive as possible.

II. The mother-tongue must be the medium of instruction in all subjects and through all standards. And if in India the provincial languages are really inadequate and poor, the educationists must make it a point to develop and enrich them within the shortest possible time by a system of patronage and endowments on the "protective principle."

III. The *sentence*, not word, must be the basis of language-training, whether in inflexional or analytical tongues, even in Sanskrit; and the Inductive Method of proceeding from the known to the unknown. concrete to the abstract, facts and phenomena to general principles, is to be the tutorial method in all branches of learning.

IV. Two foreign languages besides English and at least two provincial vernaculars must be made compulsory for all higher culture in India.

"C. *Organizational*

I. Examinations must be daily. The day's work must be finished and tested during the day. And terms of academic life as well as the system of giving credit

should be not by years or months but according to subjects or portions of subjects studied. Steady and constant discipline, both intellectual and moral, are possible only under these conditions.

II. The laboratory and environment of student-life must be the whole world of men and things. The day's routine must therefore provide opportunities for self-sacrifice, devotion, recreations, excursions, etc. as well as pure intellectual work. There should consequently be no long holidays or periodical vacations except when necessitated by pedagogic interests."

The Series in English was entitled the *Aids to General Culture* and comprised the following six parts: 1. *The Constitutions of Seven Modern States*,—based in the main on Woodrow Wilson's *State* (1910, 130 pages). 2. *Political Science*,—based on Seeley (1910, 80 pages). 3. *Economics*,—based on Bagehot's *Economic Studies* and *Lombard Street*, Keynes's *Scope and Method of Political Economy*, Pierson's *Principles of Economics* as well as the works of Gide and Marshall (1910, 172 pages). 4. *English Literature*,—based on the works of Hutton, Green, Brooke, Dowden, Shaw, Ward, Chambers, Raleigh, Marsh, Low, the *English Men of Letters Series*, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (American literature), *Cyclopaedia of English Literature* (1911, 224 pages). 5. *Ancient Europe*,—based on the works of Freeman, Bury, Schuckburg, Mahaffy (1911, 100 pages). 6. *Mediaeval Europe*,—based on the works of Hallam, Bryce, Harrison, Guizot, Oman, Emerton, Hassall, Thatcher and Schwill (1911, 160 pages).

The place of the two series of books by Professor Sarkar in the cultural life of the country was described by

Dr. Brajendra Nath Seal, King George V. Professor of Philosophy, Calcutta University, in the following words:

"Professor Benoy Kumar Sarkar's scheme of educational works is based on sound and advanced ideas of educational science and as such is well calculated to impart a valuable stimulus to the diffusion of culture in the country. Professor Sarkar's notes on medieval and modern history, on economics and on politics show wide knowledge of the subject matter and are evidently the outcome of a mind trained in habits of clear, patient and accurate thinking. His brochure on the study of language may serve as a useful summary of present-day ideas on the subject, and he has given practical illustrations of some of these in his *Lessons on English*, and on *Sanskrit*, which, so far as they go, especially the latter, are an improvement on existing guides and handbooks. Professor Sarkar's programme is certainly an ambitious one, but he is fully qualified to carry it out, and there can be no doubt that it will be found to be a healthy and stimulating force in the Indian educational world of today, especially with the correction and expansion it must receive in the light of practice and experience."

From 1906 when Prof. Sarkar made his *début* as a writer (*Amrita Bazar Patrika*, Calcutta, July 31, August 1) down to the publication of these two series his mental outlook was essentially practical and fundamentally modern. It was, besides, thoroughly Indian in scope and yet world-wide in range.

During 1910-11 two batches of scholars associated with Professor Sarkar's educational system in Malda, altogether fifteen in number, were sent out by him for higher studies to the universities of the U.S.A. The

following universities were selected by him: to sub-Yale, and the State Universities of Michigan [illegible]consin. Some of the scholars were sent later to the Purdue University (Indiana) and the State Univer[illegible] of Illinois, Iowa and Ohio. One was sent to the University of Berlin in Germany. The subjects selected by him for these scholars were as follows: physics, chemistry, biology, experimental psychology, economics, commerce and banking, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering and chemical engineering. These scholars were expected on their return to India to function, first, as educational workers, and secondly, as industrial pioneers, along the lines indicated in Professor Sarkar's books.

These two series of works in Bengali and English as well as the teaching of modern history and political science at Calcutta and cultural activities in the villages of Bengal associated with the District Council of National Education, Malda, constituted the intellectual and social atmosphere in the midst of which the English translation of *Śukranīti* was undertaken by Professor Sarkar in 1910. The translation was ready by 1912 and published at Allahabad in the *Sacred Books of the Hindus* Series during 1912-14 in several *fasciculi*. The Introduction to this translation, namely, the *Positive Background*, Book I., was also ready by 1913 and published in several *fasciculi*, coming out finally in 1914, previous to his departure from India on world-tour early in April of the same year.

When the first edition of the first volume was published my father as editor of the *Sacred Books of the Hindus Series* used to say: "One side of India was presented by Max Müller in his writings, *India What Can It teach Us? Chips from a German Workshop* etc., and especially

Dr. Brajendra Nath Seal in the *Sacred Books of the East Series.* This was Philosophical, the idealistic and the metaphysical or the mystical side. The other side of Indian culture,—the materialistic, the secular, the worldly, the objective side has been presented by Professor Sarkar. To understand the Hindu mind and Indian civilization scholars will have to devote attention to both the sides."

Sir Gilbert Murray (Oxford University) said that the book was not only full of learning but full of points that might throw light on the problems of his own studies. Prof. R. R. Marett, President, Folk-lore Society of London, observed: "It will be of the greatest value to an anthropologist." The economist, Professor Alfred Marshall of Cambridge, remarked: "It is an important contribution to our knowledge of India." According to the *Isis* (Brussels) "the postulate of Professor Sarkar is a novel and fruitful method in the study of Indian civilization."

The researches and investigations of Professor Sarkar from 1912 to this point are indicated in the following publications:

A. In Bengali

1. *Aitihāsik Pravandha,* "Historical Essays" (1912, 155 pages) with a preface by Principal Ramendra Sundar Trivedi. 2. *Sādhanā,* "Essays in Cultural and National Progress" (1912, 184 pages), with a preface by Akshaya Chandra Sarkar. 3. *Nigro Jātir Karmavīr,* "The Negro Hero of Action" (1914, 250 pages) 4. *Viśwa-śakti,* "World-Forces" (1914, 332 pages). 5. *Rabīndra Sāhitye Bhārater Vāṇī* "The Message of India in Rabindra Nath Tagore's Works" (1914, pages).

B. In English

1. *The Science of History and the Hope of Mankind* (London, Longmans Green & Co. 1912, 80 pages). 2. *Steps to a University* (*Śikṣā-Sopān*), A Course of Intellectual Culture adapted to the Requirements of Bengal (Calcutta, 1912, 53 pages). 3. *The Pedagogy of the Hindus* (Calcutta, 1912, 51 pages). 4. *Introduction to the Science of Education* (London, Longmans Green & Co., 1913, 173 pages), translated from Prof. Sarkar's original Bengali by Major B. D. Basu with a bibliographical introduction. The translation was undertaken at the suggestion of Mr. P. N. Bose, F.G.S. (London), Superintendent of the Geological Survey of India.

The Science of History and the Hope of Mankind was commented on by *Open Court* (Chicago) as follows: "The book shows an unusually broad conception of history not commonly found in scholars of Oriental birth. The main tendency is to show the paramount importance of world-forces for the development of every single nation."

The experiences of Professor Sarkar during this period found expression in the following *Creed of Life* formulated by him in 1914:

"A. The Conflict Eternal

1. Consider yourself to be *sacred*. Never allow others to exploit you for their ends.
2. Your soul is pure, majestic, free. Always remember this and try to *be yourself*.
3. It is easy to be misled by circumstances. Through God's *grace* you may be placed on your own path. Follow it up when you get it.

4. Life's *struggle* does not end anywhere. It continues for ever. Equip yourself accordingly.

"B. Ways and Means

1. Respect yourself and have *confidence* in your strength. You will then be able to help yourself.
2. You will have to be constantly on the alert to *create* your own opportunities to raise yourself. Opportunities may not present themselves before you without your seeking.
3. By always *contemplating* on the great and the good you will grow into the great and the good.

"C. The Power of Will

1. There is greater future before you than you can imagine at present. Never fear that you may fall down but always *hope* for the higher.
2. The more you *persevere* in your new life, the stronger and the more powerful you will grow. The struggle itself will increase your moral and spiritual resources.
3. Yourself is your *best friend* and helper."

It may be mentioned in this connection that from 1912 to 1914 Professor Sarkar was the editor of a Bengali monthly of nationalism and world-culture. It was called *Grihastha* (the Householder). He was a member also of the Executive Committee of the *Bangīya Sāhitya Parishat* (Bengali Academy of Literature). His association with the *Collegian*, the fortnightly Educational Journal of Calcutta, is also to be noted. (Pp. 27, 31).

1914-1925

It was in company with Sj. Shivaprasad Gupta of Benares, subsequently founder of the *Jnāna-maṇḍal* bureau of publications on world-culture in Hindi language, the daily *Āj* (Today), the *Kāshī Vidyāpīṭha* (National College) and the *Bhārata Mātā Mandir* (Temple of Mother India), as well as author of *Prithvī-Pradakṣiṇā* (Rounding the World) in Hindi, that Professor Sarkar started on the journey of investigations and researches in foreign countries.

From April 1914 when he sailed from Bombay for Egypt down to September 1925 when he came back to Bombay from Italy he was abroad for eleven years and a half. The travels covered Egypt (1914), England, Scotland and Ireland (1914), U.S.A. (1914-15), Hawaii (1915), Japan (1915), Korea and Manchuria (1915), China (1915-16), Japan (1916), U.S.A. (1916-1920), France (1920-1921), Germany (1921-1923), Austria (1922-1923), Switzerland (1923-1924), Italy (1924), Austria and Germany (1924-1925) and Italy (1925).

Prof. Sarkar devoted a book in Bengali to each country that he visited. His reports, based as they were on visits, interviews as well as researches in libraries, museums and art-galleries, dealt with industry, education, literature, arts and sciences as well as economic and social transformations. These were published in the monthly and weekly journals of Calcutta during 1914-1925. They became the basis of his twelve books under the common title, *Varttamān Jagat* (The Modern World).

The *Varttamān Jagat* Series of Professor Sarkar is described below with the dates of the first publication as books: 1. *Kabarer Deśe Din Ponoro*, "Fifteen days in

the Land of Tombs, Egypt" (1915, 210 pages). 2. *Inngrājer Janmabhūmi,* "The Homeland of the Briton" (1916, 586 pages). 3. *Vimśa Śatāvdīr Kurukṣetra* "The Armageddon of the Twentieth Century" (1915, 130 pages). 4. *Yankeestān, Vā Atiranjita Iyorop,* "The Land of the Yankees, or Europe Writ Large, the U.S.A." (1923, 824 pages). 5. *Navīn Eśiār Janmadātā,* "The Parent of New Asia, Japan" (1927, 425 pages). 6. *Varttamān Yuge Chīn Sāmrājya,* "The Chinese Empire in Modern Times" (1928, 450 pages). 7. *Parise Daś Mās,* "Ten Months in Paris" (1932, 312 pages). 8. *Parājita Jārmāni,* "Germany under Defeat" (1934, 600 pages). 9. *Switzerland* (1930, 75 pages). 10. *Itālite Bār Kayek,* "Several Times in Italy" (1932, 302 pages). 11. *Duniyār Ābhāwā,* "The Atmosphere of the World" (1925, 276 pages). 12. *Navīn Ruśiār Jīvan Prabhāt,* "The Life's Dawn of New Russia" (1924, 100 pages). The last-mentioned volume was not based on personal experience as Russia was not visited by Professor Sarkar. It describes, besides, the Russian events of 1905.

The twelve volumes of *Varttamān Jagat* cover nearly 4,500 pages.

Five other Bengali books, which, however, do not belong to the *Varttamān Jagat* Series, were prepared by Professor Sarkar during this period. The chapters were all published in the journals of Calcutta while he was still abroad. Most of them came out in book form subsequently. The titles and dates of publication as books are as follows:

1. *Chīnā Sabhyatār 'A, Ā, Ka, Kha,* "The A, B, C, of Chinese Civilization" (1923, 250 pages).

2. *Parivār, Goṣṭhī O Rāṣṭra*, "Family, Gens and and State," translation from Engels's *Entstehung der Familie, des Eigentums und des Staates* (1926, 250 pages).
3. *Hindu Rāṣṭrer Gaḍan*, "The Morphology of the Hindu State" (1926, 382 pages), published by the National Council of Education, Bengal.
4. *Dhana-Daulater Rūpāntar*, "The Transformations of Wealth," translation from Lafargue's *L'Evolution de la Propriété* (1927, 250 pages).
5. *Swadeshī Āndolan O Samrakshaṇ-Nīti*, "The Swadeshi Movement and Protectionism," translation from the historical section of List's *Das nationale System der politischen Oekonomie* (1932, 250 pages).

In 1916 while Prof. Sarkar was in Japan he made a resumé of some of his most fundamental ideas in regard to world-culture. These were enunciated as the *Postulates of Young India*. The table reads as follows:

"A. Statical

1. Humanity is fundamentally one,—in psychology, logic, ethics, aesthetics and metaphysics,—(i) in spite of physical and physiognomic varieties, and (ii) in spite of age-long historic prejudices.

2. There are no race-types or race-geniuses,—no Oriental or Occidental ideals of existence,—no national characteristics (e.g. Hindu, Saracen, Chinese, German, English, Greek, Egyptian etc.)—(i) in spite of local, geographical and linguistic modifications, and (ii) inspite of the so-called 'social minds' or group-units brought about

by the conditions of political homogeneity. Besides, types are in perpetual flux.

3. Differences are essentially individual. The personalities of men and women do not depend on the world's latitudes and longitudes. The same personality, the same character, the same idiosyncrasy, the same genius, and the same 'gift' are found to exist in individuals who live as the poles asunder, and do not necessarily exist as a mark of *ésprit de corps* among a group of men and women inhabiting a common area of the earth's surface.

4. Human life is never governed by religion which is everywhere a brilliant superstition consisting in the vain effort to understand the nature of God, but by the desire and power to live and flourish by responding to the thousand and one stimuli of the universe and utilizing the innumerable world-forces (*viśwa-śakti*). This desire and power is the basis of civilization, culture, *Kultur*, or *dharma*, and is spiritual in its very nature, if anything spiritual there be. So-called materialism has never existed in any epoch of civilization or in any phase of *dharma*.

"B. Dynamic

I. Political Development

1. The territorial limits of nationality, or political boundaries, i.e., state-areas have changed almost every generation. They have never been co-extensive with the so-called racial, cultural, religious, natural or even linguistic areas. They have been the results of the conjuncture of circumstances in each instance, which could

not be exactly foreseen by statesmen. And this both in the East and in the West.

2. So-called cultural unities have not necessarily led to national or political unities, nor have the so-called nation-states ever been the embodiment of single-homogeneous culture-types. Political unity inspite of cultural diversity, and political disunion inspite of cultural uniformity have been the verdict of universal history.

II. Cultural Development

1. The progress of the nineteenth century and the sixteen years of the twentieth in discoveries and inventions is a unique phenomenon in the history of six millenniums. But Eur-America, which is mainly responsible for this, and Asia, which has contributed almost nothing to it, had been equally "primitive" or pre-"scientific" and pre-"industrial" down to nearly the end of the eighteenth century, if judged by the standard of to-day. Neither politically nor culturally was there East or West till then. It is the subordination of the East to the West in recent times both in politics and culture that has inspired the bombastic jingo fallacy: "East is East, and West is West." The jingo need remember that the history of the Middle Ages was really the history of the Expansion of Asia towards Southern and Eastern Europe. The "superior races" of those times (c. A.C. 600-1600) were the Islamites and Buddhist-Hindu Tartars of Asia.

2. The new ideas, aspirations, movements, etc. engendered by the steam-and-machine age are revolutionary not only to Asians but also to Eur-Americans. The economic, political, military, social and domestic

polities of the West prior to the epoch-making triumphs of human intellect did not differ, except superficially and in a few trifling incidents, from the contemporary institutions obtaining in Asia. The institutions and ideals, the achievements and experiments, the motives and inspirations, the theories and hypotheses, the fads and hobbies prevailing today in England, Germany, France and America should not consequently be regarded by unbiased investigators of facts as anything (i) peculiarly occidental or (ii) non-oriental or (iii) unsuited to oriental "genius" or (iv) antagonistic to the "spirit" of the Orient or (v) materialistic. Scientifically speaking, all these are to be honestly known (i) as modern, constituting one of the phases of the world's evolution, and (ii) as spiritual to the same extent and in the same sense as anything in previous epochs of human culture since the Pharaonic and Vedic ages. These can, therefore, be availed of by and assimilated to, any system of human polity according to the stage and requirements of its growth (e.g., as has been done by Japan without practically changing any of her old-Asian institutions, ideals, prejudices and superstitions).

"C. Practical

1. India and the World.—India was never shunted off from the main track of humanity's progress, but has always grown in contact with, by giving to and taking from,—the moving currents of the world's life and thought. India had no epoch of "splendid isolation" but, like every other country, had her values tested by the universal standard of merit measurement. So-called

Hindu ideals there are none; there is nothing exclusively Indian in Hindu culture; any idea, fact or truth alleged to be the essential characteristic of the "spirit of Hindusthan" is at the same time the essential feature of the genius of other lands. Young India of today is, therefore, not to approach culture or *dharma* in terms of geographical limits or indigenous, i.e., national race-ideals but drink of it and add to it as a growing stream of universal life-promoting truths;—thereby compelling the world's recognition of its powers and services as a living member of the human race.

The modern world may be said to have thrown out the following challenge to Young India with its three hundred and fifteen million souls: "The number of first class men and women in the arts and sciences, liberal and applied, and in every walk of life, which India can exhibit today must,—on account of the relative strength in population,—be nearly five or six times that of those in England, Germany, France or Japan or three times that of those in the U.S.A. before you can have a legitimate claim to the world's respect. The world does not care to take note of your difficulties and hindrances and to meet you half-way. It is your own lookout to solve them by devising adequate ways and means." The sole mission of Young India is to ponder over this challenge, accept it boldly if possible, and make the necessary preparations to meet the world's demand in defiance of all apathies and antipathies.

2. India is not one, but many. The motto of Young India is to be not unity at any cost, but efficiency. Emphasis should be laid not so much on solidarity as on the acquisition of strength by all means."

The English works of Professor Sarkar prepared and published while abroad during 1914-1925 are enumerated below:

(1) *Chinese Religion through Hindu Eyes* (1916, Shanghai, 363 pages).
(2) *Love in Hindu Literature* (1916, Tokyo, 95 pages).
(3) *The Folk-Element in Hindu Culture* (1917, London, 332 pages).
(4) *Hindu Achievements in Exact Science* (1918, New York, 95 pages).
(5) *Hindu Art: Its Humanism and Modernism*, an introductory essay (1920, New York, 44 pages).
(6) *The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology*, Book II. (Political), Part I. (1921, Allahabad, 126 pages).
(7) *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (1922, Leipzig, 266 pages).
(8) *The Futurism of Young Asia* (1922, Berlin, 409 pages).
(9) *The Aesthetics of Young India* (1923, Calcutta, 120 pages).
(10) *The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology*, Book II. Part II. with an appendix on "Hindu Politics in Italian" (120 pages, Allahabad, 1926).

To this is to be added a volume in German entitled *Die Lebensanschauung des Inders* (Leipzig, 1923,91 pages).

About *Love in Hindu Literature* the observations of *Current Opinion* (New York) are as follows: "The at-

tempt to take the divine poetry of Radha-Krishna literature which has always been regarded as an allegory of the mystical union between God and the soul and to secularize it is the task of Prof. Sarkar."

The *Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* was reviewed in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) in the following manner: "The book is a study in comparative Hindu political constitutions and concepts. He seeks to give a readable account, and this he has done with frequent allusions and much elegant writing." According to the *International Review of Missions* (London) the book is "a remarkably incisive and learned piece of scholarship."

About the *Futurism of Young Asia*, Professor Haushofer says in the *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* of Munich that "it can be regarded as a guide to the ideas of leaders of the Asian movement. Everybody who undertakes a deeper and more intensive investigation in this problem, in so far as the exhibition of surging ideas is concerned, will have to begin chiefly by analysing Sarkar's philosophical fresco of awakening Asia. The most magnificent of all presentations from the Asian standpoint known to me."

The Statesman (Calcutta) said as follows: "European writers, he alleges with some truth, have sought to belittle Indian achievements. There is truth in the criticism of the fallacies committed by Western scholars in the application of the comparative method to the study of race-questions. The criticism is undoubtedly justified and applies to many of the books which are regarded as standard work upon the manners and philosophy of the East."

According to the *Sozialwissenschaftliches Literaturblatt* (Berlin) the *Futurism* "reminds in many ways of Spengler on account of the stupendously many-sided erudition and the spiritual flexibility with which this scholarship traverses in a powerful manner all the regions and epochs of human culture" (*gemahnt vielfach an Spengler durch die verblüffend vielseitige Erudition und die geistige Gelenkigkeit mit der diese Gelehrsamkeit in gewaltigen Sprüngen alle Räume und Zeiten der menschlichen Kultur durchhüpft*).

The papers of Professor Sarkar in American journals during 1917-1921 are mentioned below :

1. Oriental Culture in Modern Pedagogics (*School and Society*, New York, April, 1917).
2. The Futurism of Young Asia (*International Journal of Ethics*, University of Chicago, July 1918).
3. The Influence of India on Modern Western Civilization (*Journal of Race Development*, Clark University, Worcester, Mass, July 1918).
4. Democratic Theories and Republican Institutions in Ancient India (*American Political Science Review*, Urbana, Ill., November 1918).
5. Hindu Political Philosophy (*Political Science Quarterly*, Columbia University, New York, December, 1918).
6. The Democratic Background of Chinese Culture (*The Scientific Monthly*, New York, January, 1919).
7. The Reshaping of the Middle East (*Journal of Race Development*, April, 1919).

8. Americanization from the Viewpoint of Young Asia (*Journal of International Relations*, Clark University, July, 1919).
9. The Hindu View of Life (*Open Court*, Chicago, August, 1919).
10. The Hindu Theory of International Relations (*American Political Science* (*Stimmen des* 1919). ...eum-Tech, February, 1923).
11. Conf...utscher Bericht über das heutige Indien (*Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Berlin, August, 1923).
11. Die Industrialisierung Indiens (*Mitteilungen Vereins Deutscher Ingenieure*, Berlin, November, 1924).
12. Bücherbesprechung (*Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, Jena, January, 1925).
13. Paesaggio atesina (*Rivista dell'Alto Adige*, Bolzano, April, 1925).

The French papers are based on some of the lectures delivered in French (1921) at the University of Paris (*Faculté de Droit*), the *Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, the *Musée Guimet* etc., and the German papers on lectures delivered in German (1922) at the University of Berlin, the *Deutsche Gesellschaft 1914*, the *Morgenländische Gesellschaft*, etc.

It is to be mentioned that while in the U.S.A. Prof. Sarkar was a contributing editor to the *Journal of International Relations* edited by President G. Stanley Hall of Clark University. At Berlin (1922-1924) he was the editor of *Commercial News* established by the Indo-europäische Handelsgesellschaft of which the Managing

21. The Public Finance of Hindu Empires (*Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Philadelphia, September, 1921).

These papers are based in the main on the Professor's lectures at the State Universities of California (1916) and Iowa (1916), Columbia (New York 1917) and Clark (Worcester, Mass. 1917) Universities, the University of Pittsburg (1918), Western Reserve University (Cleveland, Ohio, 1918), Amherst College (Mass, 1918), the Rand School of Social Science (New York, 1919), the University Forum of America (1919), the College of the City of New York (1920), the New York University (1920), and other American academic and learned societies between 1916 and 1920.

Professor Sarkar's Italian, French and German papers from 1920 to 1925 are enumerated in the following list[2]:

1. Gilde di mestier e gilde mercantili nell'India antica (*Giornale degli Economisti e Rivista di Statistica*, Rome, April, 1920).
2. La Théorie de la constitution dans la philosophie politique hindoue (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, Paris, August, 1920).
3. La France et l'Inde (*L'Intransigeant*, Paris, February, 1921).
4. La Démocratie hindoue (*Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques*, Paris, July-August, 1921).
5. Die Lebensanschauung des Inders (*Deutsche Rundschau*, Berlin, January, 1922).

2 For subsequent papers in French, Italian and German see p. 39.

6. Politische Strömungen in der indischen Kultur (*Deutsche Rundschau*, Berlin, March, 1922).
7. Die soziale Philosophie Jung-Indiens (*Deutsche Rundschau*, Berlin, April, 1922).
8. India's Overseas Trade (*Export-Import Review*, Berlin, September, 1922).
9. Moderne Indische Aquarelle (*Stimmen des Orients*, Kirchheim-Tech, February, 1923).
10. Ein deutscher Bericht über das heutige Indien (*Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Berlin, August, 1923).
11. Die Industrialisierung Indiens (*Mitteilungen Vereins Deutscher Ingenieure*, Berlin, November, 1924).
12. Bücherbesprechung (*Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, Jena, January, 1925).
13. Paesaggio atesina (*Rivista dell'Alto Adige*, Bolzano, April, 1925).

The French papers are based on some of the lectures delivered in French (1921) at the University of Paris (*Faculté de Droit*), the *Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, the *Musée Guimet* etc., and the German papers on lectures delivered in German (1922) at the University of Berlin, the *Deutsche Gesellschaft 1914*, the *Morgenländische Gesellschaft*, etc.

It is to be mentioned that while in the U.S.A. Prof. Sarkar was a contributing editor to the *Journal of International Relations* edited by President G. Stanley Hall of Clark University. At Berlin (1922-1924) he was the editor of *Commercial News* established by the Indo-europäische Handelsgesellschaft of which the Managing

Director was and continues to be Mr. Birendra Nath Das-Gupta B.S.E.E. (Purdue, U.S.A.), electrical engineer.

During this period Professor Sarkar contributed a large number of papers on industry, economic legislation, commercial progress and currency questions to the journals of India like *Forward, Modern Review, Mysore Economic Journal,* etc. These found a place subsequently in his book, *Economic Development* (Madras 1926). (See p. 31). While Professor Sarkar was at Bolzano in Italy he issued in 1924 a comprehensive *Scheme of Economic Development for Young India* which was published *in extenso* in many of the dailies, weeklies and monthlies of India during 1925. The main provisions of this "economic planning", all-embracing as it is, are as follows:

"A. Fundamental Considerations

1. Indian poverty is in reality unemployment on a continental scale.

2. Industrialism is the cure for poverty in so far as it can create employments in diverse fields.

3. Foreign capital is to be treated as a God-send, so far as larger schemes of industrialization are concerned.

4. At the present moment Indian capital should not be considered adequate for anything but modest enterprises only.

"B. The Programme: Economic Enterprises, Class by Class.

I. Peasants

1. Larger holdings wanted.
2. New employments for peasants to be opened in the "cottage industries."

3. Co-operative societies not only for credit but also for marketing, irrigation etc.
4. Combines for sale.

II. Artisans
1. Improved appliances to be introduced.
2. Schools for handicrafts a technical necessity.
3. Banks for handicrafts or cottage industries a financial desideratum.

III. Retail Traders
1. Schools for petty merchants (in combination with the schools for artisans), as in II. 2. above.
2. Banks for shopkeepers.

IV. Industrial Workers
1. Trade unions to be promoted.
2. Right to strike and other demands to be conceded when necessary.
3. Co-operative stores in order that workingmen may lower the cost of living.

V. Landowners of the Richer Categories.
1. Large scale farming to be undertaken.
2. Modern industries to be started.
3. Export-import business to be organized.
4. Insurance companies to be established.
5. Banks of all denominations to be founded.

VI. Exporters and Importers
1. Banks for foreign trade to be created.
2. Overseas insurance to be started.
3. Commercial News Bureaus to be organized.
4. Foreign language and commercial geography classes to be established.
5. Indian commercial agencies in foreign countries.

VII. Moneyed Classes

1. Modern industries of three categories, (a) small, (b) medium and (c) large or giant, to be established by these classes in the same manner as by the richer landowners.
2. Export and import.
3. Insurance societies.
4. Banks.
5. Legislation against usury, a social necessity.

VIII. Intellectuals

1. New professions to be sought for the members of the *intelligentsia* as technical or other assistants and directors in the new industries and trades.
2. Existing Government services to be Indianized on a liberal scale.
3. Co-operative stores and housing societies.
4. Handicrafts and Trades Schools for the children of the intellectual classes, as in II. 2. and III. 1. above.
5. Pioneers of economic development,—"economic general staff"—to be trained for every district by sending competent scholars to foreign countries."

With this *Scheme* Professor Sarkar brought to a head the results of all his papers on economic theories and developments published in the Indian journals on the basis of first-hand investigations in post-war Europe. (See p. 31).

From 1919 to 1922 Professor Sarkar used to send regular contributions about the cultural developments in Europe and America to the fortnightly educational journal of Calcutta, the *Collegian*. His section was known as

the "World of Culture". Through these contributions Indian intellectuals were introduced to a large number of prominent thinkers in the diverse arts and sciences. (Pp. 11, 31).

During the period of foreign travels and researches Professor Sarkar was elected a life-member of the Royal Asiatic Society, North China Branch, Shanghai (1916), a permanent *membre correspondant* of the *Société d'Economie Politique* of Paris (1920) and a member of the *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* of Leipzig (1921).[3]

1926-1937

On his return to India Professor Sarkar established at Calcutta in April 1926 the monthly journal of economics in Bengali entitled *Ārthik Unnati* (Economic Progress). This became the starting point of a new series of books in Bengali. They are enumerated below:

1. *Ekāler Dhana-Daulat O Arthaśāstra,* "The Wealth and Economics of our Own Times", Vol. I. The Diverse Forms of New Wealth (1930, 440 pages), Vol. II. The New Foundations of Economics (1935, 710 pages).
2. *Nayā Bānglār Goḍā Pattan,* "The Foundations of a New Bengal, Economic and Social" (1932), Vol. I. Theoretical (530 pages), Vol. II. Practical (450 pages).
3. *Bāḍtir Pathe Bāngālī,* "Bengalis in Progress" (1934, 636 pages).

In October 1928 Professor Sarkar established the *Bangīya Dhana-Vijnān Parishat* (Bengali Institute of Economics), with my father as the first President,

3 For memberships of other learned societies see p. 46.

in April 1932 the *"Āntarjātik Banga" Parishat* ("International Bengal" Institute), and in April 1937 the *Bangīya Samāj-Vijnān Parishat* (Bengali Institute of Sociology). The object of these three *Parishats* or Institutes is to promote investigations and researches in the different branches of economics, constitution, sociology etc. through the medium of Bengali. In all this work his chief colleague is Dr. Narendra Nath Law, editor of the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, and Managing Director of the Bangeswari Cotton Mills Ltd.

Nearly two dozen academically well-qualified Research Fellows and Research Assistants have been working in connection with these Institutes in an honorary capacity. Some of them have published books of substantial value, for instance, Shib Chandra Dutt: *Dhana-Vijnāne Sākreti*, "Apprenticeship in Economics" (1932, 330 pages), and *Conflicting Tendencies in Indian Economic Thought* (Calcutta, 1934, 234 pages); Rabindra Nath Ghosh: *Ṭākākaḍi*, "Money and Currency Problems" (1936, 220 pages); Pankaj Kumar Mukherjee: *Labour Legislation in British India* (Calcutta, 1937, 240 pages). A volume dealing with the contributions of 21 scholars to the conferences of the Bengali Institute of Economics has been published as *Bānglāy Dhana-Vijnān*, "Economics in Bengali" (1937, 750 pages).

In this connection may be mentioned also the Italian work entitled *La Politica Finanziaria Britannica in India* (Bologna, 1937, 230 pages) by Dr. Monindra Mohan Moulik Pol.D. (Rome), Research Fellow of the *Bangīya Dhana-Vijnān Parishat*, who went to join the University of Rome as a scholar of the *Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente* and obtained a doctorate in political

science. Dr. Moulik has prepared another work in Italian, *Saggi sull'India Contemporanea* as well as a book in English, *Agricultural Progress in Italy*. Both these works are in the press.

From 1926 to 1932 Professor Sarkar was the editor of the *Journal of the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce*. In 1929 he established *Indian Commerce and Industry* and in 1934 the *Indian Commercial and Statistical Review*. Since 1926 he has been contributing to the *Calcutta Review* (published by the Calcutta University) and especially for its Miscellany Section since 1933 monthly reports and articles on economic developments in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Czechoslovakia, Russia, U.S.A. and other countries as well as on contemporary sociological and political theories. For example, the ideas of Durkheim, Lapouge, Bouglé, Duguit, Lévy-Bruhl, Lasbax, Brunschvigg, Charmont, Joseph-Barthélemy, Lavergne, Faguet, Pareto, Rocco, Niceforo, Croce, Gentile, Redanò, Giorgio Del Vecchio, Michels, Bottai, Tönnies, Ammon, Simmel, Spengler, Max Weber, Meinecke, Van den Bruck, von Wiese, Krabbe, Jellinek, Haushofer, Koellreutter, Heyking, Freyer, Spann, Vierkandt, Oppenheimer, Dewey, Boas, Conklin, Hocking, Sorokin, Bernard, Hankins, Parmelee, Barnes, Goldenweiser, Bosanquet, Wallas, Bertrand Russell, McDougall, Barker, Hobhouse, Ginsberg, Masaryk, Zaghlul, Sun Yat-sen, Araki,—among others, have been introduced through these contributions to the reading public.

It may be observed at the same time that through his monthly *Ārthik Unnati* (Economic Progress) Professor Sarkar has been able since 1926 to introduce through

Bengali the economic writings of Pantaleoni, Gini, Benini, Carli, Graziani, Mortara, Tivaroni, Serpieri, Ciasca, Cabiati, Walras, Levasseur, Gide, Rist, R.-G. Lévy, Yves-Guyot, Truchy, Aftalion, Ansiaux, Hauser, Oualid, Boverat, Vieuille, Bousquet, Adam Müller, Sering, Diehl, Harms, Wagemann, Menger, Böhm-Bawerk, Schumacher, Zahn, Burgdörfer, von Zwiedineck, Mombert, Oppenheimer, von Wieser, Sombart, Wiskemann, Adolf Weber, Manes, Fisher, Dublin, John Bates Clark, Seligman, Mitchell, Taussig, Marshall, Hobson, Cannan, Keynes, Pigou, Bowley, Carr-Saunders, Hainisch, Cassel, Uyehara, Tushimato, Uyeda, Ohuchi, Yamamoto, Kuczynski, Studensky and so forth.

The work that is being done by Professor Sarkar through *Ārthik Unnati* and the *Calcutta Review* may to a certain extent be regarded as a continuation of the work that was done by him through the *Collegian* (Calcutta) from 1919 to 1922 while he was in foreign countries, in so far as the introduction of world-thought to Indian intellectuals is concerned. (Pp. 11, 27).

The English works of Professor Sarkar from 1926 to 1937 are mentioned below:

1. *Economic Development* (Madras, 1926, 464 pages). (See pp. 25, 27).
2. *The Politics of Boundaries* (Calcutta, 1926, 340 pages).
3. *A Scheme of Economic Development for Young India* (Calcutta, 1926, 42 pages).
4. *Hindu Politics in Italian* (Calcutta, 1926, 62 pages).
5. *Greetings to Young India* (Calcutta, 1927, 182 pages).

6. *The Political Philosophies Since* 1905 (Madras, 1928, 404 pages).
7. *The Pressure of Labour Upon Constitution and Law* (Benares, 1928, 60 pages).
8. *Comparative Pedagogics in relation to Public Finance and National Wealth* (Calcutta, 1929, 134 pages).
9. *Applied Economics,* Vol. I. (Calcutta, 1932, 320 pages).
10. *Comparative Birth, Death and Growth Rates* (Calcutta, 1932, 36 pages).
11. *Indian Currency and Reserve Bank Problems* (Calcutta, 1933, 1934, 94 pages).
12. *Imperial Preference vis-à-vis World Economy in relation to the International Trade and National Economy of India* (Calcutta, 1934, 172 pages).
13. *The Might of Man in the Social Philosophy of Ramakrishna and Vivekananda* (Madras, 1936, 28 pages).
14. *Social Insurance Legislation and Statistics* (Calcutta 1936, 470 pages).
15. *The Sociology of Population* (Calcutta 1936, 150 pages).
16. *Creative India* from Mohenjo Daro to the Age of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda (Lahore, 1937, 725 pages).

Writing on the author's *Indian Currency and Reserve Bank Problems* the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (London) observes: "It is well known that Prof. Sarkar, who has travelled and studied widely in Europe and America, holds views on politico-economic

problems now facing his country not identical with the strongly nationalistic opinions of many of his countrymen. The author has put forward with considerable force and statistical support the argument that the amount and Rupee value of India's exports (mainly agricultural) are not necessarily dependent upon the rate of exchange. Similarly Prof. Sarkar has pertinent observations on the subject of the export of gold from India in recent years. The very interesting articles on Price-Curves in the Perspective of Exchange-Curves contains useful statistics relating to the main staples of India illustrated by charts, designed to establish the author's thesis that economic recovery had already commenced in India."

The Insurance and Finance Review (Calcutta) says: "It was Prof. Sarkar who first raised his voice against the 'classical' economists, so to say, of India, for example, the Bombay millowners. In this monograph will be found the germs of the formation of a new school of economic thought in Bengal that approaches the economic problems of the day from an objective point of view without yielding to popular confusions or dictates of interested partisans in a controversy".

According to the *Hindu* (Madras), "on most questions Prof. Sarkar's views are not identical with those held by prominent businessmen in the country. On every question he has attempted to substantiate his case by facts and figures. One fails to see how the businessmen can pick holes in Prof. Sarkar's arguments. A highly stimulating treatise on certain aspects of Indian monetary and banking problems."

According to the *Economic Journal* (Journal of the Royal Economic Society, London) Prof. Sarkar's

Imperial Preference "gives a detailed account of the circumstances that in his opinion justified the Government and the legislature of India in concluding the Ottawa Agreement of 1932. The arguments are full and well-reasoned, and are copiously illustrated by figures and charts. Several books and pamphlets have appeared in India at the time and subsequently, condemning the policy of the Indo-British Trade Agreement, and it is satisfactory to have in Mr. Sarkar's book a realistic presentation of the opposite point of view from the pen of an independent economist. That Mr. Sarkar, who is a vigorous as well as prolific writer on the present-day economic problems of India, is not afraid of propounding views which run counter to those held by a large section of Indian politicians is clear from the contents of Mr. Shib Chandra Dutt's book, *Conflicting Tendencies in Indian Economic Thought*".

In the *Journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs* (London), the book is described by Prof. Coatman as "an interesting attempt to show how present-day Imperial economic policy stands with relation to the world-economic system. The author has made a somewhat ambitious attempt to elucidate the present chaotic condition of international economic relations, and to show the direction along which, in his opinion, these are developing. Naturally a very large part of the book is given to the special position of India, and the chapters devoted to this are valuable".

Prof. E. L. Bogart of Illinois describes Prof. Sarkar's *Applied Economics* in the *American Economic Review* in the following words: "Prof. Sarkar, a well-known Indian scholar, endeavours to determine a proper economic

policy for India. There is something reminiscent of Frederick List's stages of economic development in Prof. Sarkar's position. The author believes that fresh significance will be given to the study of economic organization and social structure if the relationships between the regions of the 'second' Industrial Revolution (England, France, Germany and the U.S.A.) and those now entering upon their first Industrial Revolution (India, China, the Balkans, South America etc.) are fully understood. He concludes that the standards of living in Western Europe and the U.S.A. can be raised only to the extent of a simultaneous development in the industrially less developed countries."

According to the *Allgemeines Statistisches Archiv* (Jena) "the author before making use of the figures has taken care to examine their dependability and significance. It is because of this caution coupled with an international and synthetic survey of economic events that he has been able to offer a judgment on the topics in question that is faultless both in theory and economic policy."

On Prof. Sarkar's *Economic Development* the *Sociological Review* (London) has the following observations in the words of Patrick Geddes: "This book is of interest to us, Westerners, on its own merits of extensive knowledge of us; as well as for its presentment of Indian outlooks beyond those commonly current. For, instead of abstract politics we have here concrete economics, and seen as fundamental to politics, largely of a new kind. To the general student of economics this treatment should be suggestive; indeed at its best it is exemplary. Prof. Sarkar has for many years been studying one European country after the other, and from many view-points,

so his book is a result not only of reading, but of wide personal intercourse and travel and full of economic information and social reflection from all these sources. With all his descriptive concreteness there are large and bold generalizations and frequent passages of social criticism and interpretation; and these ranging over France and Germany, from America to Japan and of course from India to Britain and home again; in fact leading up to a broad sketch of an economic policy, very comprehensive for Young India. Alike as widely informative and as actively stimulating, this book will be found well worth looking through and thinking over both in East and West."

The *International Labour Review* (Geneva) says about Prof. Sarkar's *Social Insurance* as follows:

"The work deals with all the branches of social insurance, namely, (1) sickness and maternity, (2) accident and occupational diseases, (3) invalidity, old age, widowhood and (4) unemployment. Every branch is described with special reference to practical management, as well as the financial results of administration. The experience of Germany, Great Britain and France in every branch of social insurance forms the basis of the author's investigations. But the experience of Italy, Japan, Czechoslovakia, the U.S.S.R. and the United States has also been laid under contribution. The more or less relevant Indian data have been placed in due perspective. The book is written with an eye to India's economic development, social progress and national efficiency. The facts and figures are addressed, first, to insurance men and financiers, secondly, to trade unions and labour leaders, and thirdly, to medical men and health workers."

The aim of the *Sociology of Population* is, according to *Man* (Royal Anthropological Institute, London), in the words of Prof. Fleure, "to show that whether we consider growth of population, or distribution, or standard of living, India is not unique but has an assemblage of problems which are also illustrated in other areas. It is a book which will give those who are interested in Indian and especially Bengalese life a certain amount of insight into the thought of Indian intellectuals. The declines in the growth-curve of population, in birth rates and mortality rates are clearly indicated; but whereas the West Europe birth-rate began to decline soon after 1880 that of India remained very high until 1910."

In the *American Sociological Review* Prof. D. B. Rogers says that "Sarkar's conclusions are consonant with prevalent contemporary scholarly expression on the eugenic treatment of classes and caste problems, differential fertility, and economic, religious, political and other forms of determinism. * * * *The Sociology of Population* has value for Occidental readers who are interested in the population, economic and sociological data the author has assembled for India and Bengal. The sections on industrialization and changing classes are significant contributions."

According to Prof. E. Wiskemann of Berlin, "in the entire range of European literature, as far as I know, there is hardly any work which is based on such a wide study of materials and tries to do justice to the problems from every side."

According to the *Giornale degli Economisti e Rivista di Statistica* (Rome) "the author succeeds in giving a notion of the incipient demographic revolution going on

in India on account of the ever-increasing fusions between the members of the diverse races, castes, religions, languages etc."

Prof. Haushofer observes in the *Geopolitik* (Heidelberg) that "the author is well-known to our readers on account of the reviews of his works of high merit. In this his latest work has been placed the Indian space-structure in the perspective of the world's population question. * * * It would be very instructive to follow Sarkar in his comparison of the life-curves of the Indian provinces with those of Europe, Japan etc."

In *Sociology and Social Research* (Los Angeles, U. S. A.) it is observed that "the principal contribution here is in the nature of a critique upon some of the popular eugenic proposals for race-betterment and upon neo-Malthusianism. There is also an answer made upon philosophical grounds to the Spenglerian idea of the decline of western civilization. Sarkar promotes the idea that new groups emerging from older ones arise to invigorate the march of progress. This is, of course, consistent with the Indian philosophy of evolution as expressed in the Vedantic literature."

About *Comparative Birth, Death and Growth Rates* (Calcutta 1932) the Journal, *Population* (London), observes: "India, according to Prof. Sarkar's able study, is moving westwards in its demography. But even if she 'should be in a position during the next generation to maintain an ascending growth curve in tune with the rising tide of industrialization, she would be but following, as in other phases of economico-cultural development, the pioneers from 1840 to 1901.' The pioneers are, of course, England, Belgium, Germany, etc."

Prof. Joseph Bérard in the course of a long article in the *Revue Internationale de Sociologie* (Paris) about the author's Italian work, *I Quozienti di Natalità, di Mortalità* etc. (Rome 1931), says in part as follows: "In 1921 Prof. Sarkar left an enduring impression in France by delivering a course of six lectures at the University of Paris in which he discussed his theme in a masterly manner. * * * In the study presented at Rome the Professor has exhibited the same qualities of perspicuity and precision which attracted his audience at Paris. * * * It is in fact a very precious document for studies in contemporary statistics and sociology."

About Professor Sarkar's *Politics of Boundaries* the *Modern Review* (Calcutta) says that it "suggests points of view startlingly new to the Indian reader. Prof. Sarkar is the one Indian who has studied international relations, especially in their economic aspect, at first hand in Germany, France and Italy. He does not merely copy news but has his own original contributions to make, and he can take in the whole situation at a glance, and deliver himself boldly as to the conclusions to be drawn from it. As against the romantic Mazzinian cult of the nation with the unity of laguage, race and culture Prof. Sarkar presents the realistic and positive theory of the state."

For two years and a half from May 1929 to October 1931 Professor Sarkar was in Europe for the second time. His investigations took him to England, France, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Switzerland and Italy. For two semesters (1930-31) he was a *Gastprofessor* (Guest-Professor) at the Technological University (*Technische Hochschule*) of Munich. During this period he lectured also at many universities of Germany as well as at the

University of Geneva (1929) and the Universities of Milan (1930), Padua (1930) and Rome (1931). The lectures were delivered in German, French and Italian.

Professor Sarkar's papers in these languages as published since 1930[4] are mentioned below:

1. Aspects économiques et politiques de la civilisation hindoue (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, Paris, June, 1930).
2. Indiens Entwicklung im Vergleich zu Eur-Amerika (*Deutsche Rundschau*, Berlin, July, 1930).
3. Vergleichender Industrialismus und die moderne indische Volkswirtschaft (*Forschungen und Fortschritte*, Berlin, July, 1930).
4. Istituzioni politiche e sociali dell'antico popolo indiano (*Annali di Economia*, Milan, 1930).
5. Aspetti e Problemi della moderna economia indiana (*Annali di Economia*, Milan, 1930).
6. Technisches Studium in Indien (*Bayerische Industrie und Handelszeitung*, Munich, Dec. 1930).
7. Die Wirtschafts-Bestrebungen des indischen Volkes der Gegenwart (*Weltwirtschaft*, Berlin, December, 1930).
8. Die Industrialisierung Indiens und Oesterreichs Handel mit Indien (*Wirtschaftliche Nachrichten der Industrie-und Handels-Kammer*, Vienna, December, 1930).
9. Modernisierung der indischen Landwirtschaft

4 For other papers in French, Italian and German see p. 23.

(*Berichte über Landwirtschaft*, Berlin, February, 1931).

10. Entwicklungstendenzen im Privatversicherungswesen des indischen Volkes (*Neumanns Zeitschrift für Versicherungswesen*, Berlin, Feb. 1931).
11. *Die weltwirtschaftliche Bedeutung Indiens* (*Karlsruher Akademische Mitteilungen*, Karlsruhe, February, 1931).
12. Banken und Bankiers im heutigen Indien (*Bankwissenschaft*, Berlin, 1931).
13. Strukturelle Erneuerung in der indischen Industrie und Wirtschaft (*Zeitschrift für Geopolitik*, Berlin, April, 1931).
14. Umfang und Kapitalkraft der industriellen Unternehmungen in Indien (*Maschinenbau*, Berlin, April 1931).
15. Die weltwirtschaftliche Bedeutung der indischen Eisenbahnen im Rahmen der internationalen Eisenbahnstatistik (*Allgemeines Statistisches Archiv*, Jena, 1931).
16. Il Movimento industriale e commerciale dell' India ed i suoi rapporti internazionali (*Commercio*, Rome, June 1931).
17. Die internationalen Handelsbeziehungen und Handelspolitik Indiens (*Magazin der Wirtschaft*, Berlin, July, 1931).
18. Die Entwicklung und weltwirtschaftliche Bedeutung des modernen Indien (*Auslandkundliche Vorträge der Technischen Hochschule Stuttgart*, Band 2, *Indien*, Stuttgart, 1931).
19. I Quozienti di Natalità, di Mortalità e di Aumen-

to naturale nell'India attuale nel quadro della demografia comparata (*Congresso Internazionale per gli Studi sulla Popolazione*, Rome, Sept. 1931).

20. Die Struktur des Volkes in der sozialwissenschaftlichen Lehre der Schukraniti (*Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, Cologne, 1931).
21. Internationaler Warenverkehr und Kulturaustausch in der indischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte (*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1931).
22. Modernisierungen im indischen Wirtschaftsleben (*Essener Volkszeitung*, Essen, 1931).

The French paper is based on the lectures delivered in French at the University of Geneva and the *Institut National Genevois* (1929-30) in Switzerland. The Italian papers are based on the lectures delivered in Italian (1930-31) at the Università Bocconi of Milan, the Royal Universities of Padua and Rome, and the International Congress of Population held at Rome (September, 1931). The German papers are based on the lectures delivered in German at the Technological University of Munich (as Guest-Professor), the Universities of Kiel, Innsbruck (Austria), Leipzig, and Würzburg, the Technological Universities of Stuttgart, Karlsruhe and Dresden, the Commercial University of Nürnberg, the Agricultural University of Berlin, the *Deutsche Akademie* (Munich and Augsburg), the Eucken Society (Jena), the Radio-Wien (Vienna, Austria), the Chambers of Commerce at Bielefeld and Solingen, etc. during 1930-31.

Subsequent papers in French, German and Italian are indicated below:

23. Les Races, les Classes et les Forces transformatrices au point de vue du Métabolisme Social (International Congress of Sociology, Brussels, August, 1935).

24. Neu-Orientierungen in Optimum und wirtschaftlicher Leistungsfähigkeit (International Congress for the Scientific Study of Population Problems, Berlin, August-September 1935), published in *Bevölkerungsfragen* ed. by Harmsen and Lohse (Munich, 1936).

25. I Dati Secolari e Sociologici nella Letteratura Buddistica Pali (International Congress of Orientalists, Rome, October, 1935).

26. La Sociographie hindoue aux débuts du capitalisme moderne (*Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, Paris, November-December, 1936).

27. Le Métabolisme Social (*Revue de Synthèse*, Paris, February, 1937).

28. Die soziologischen Wechselbeziehungen der demographischen Dichte (*Archiv für Bevölkerungswissenschaft*, Leipzig, April 1937).

29. La Situation démographique de l'Inde actuelle *vis-à-vis* les récoltes, les industries et les capitaux (International Congress for the Scientific Study of Population Problems, Paris, July-August, 1937).

30. Les Equations de la Mobilité Sociale (International Congress of Sociology, Paris, July-August, 1937).

The following list describes some of the papers of Professor Sarkar published in the Indian journals since 1931:

1. "Cartels in Japan: A Study in Industrial Organization" (*Journal of the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce*, December, 1931).
2. "The World Crisis in its Bearings on the Regions of the Second and the First Industrial Revolutions" (*Journal of the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce*, 1932).
3. "Comparative Birth, Death and Growth Rates: A Study of the Nine Indian Provinces in the Background of Eur-American and Japanese Vital Statistics" (*Journal of the Indian Medical Association*, Calcutta, May, 1932).
4. "Social Idealism in Goethe's Lyrics and Dramas" (*Prabuddha Bharata*, Awakened India, Calcutta, July and August, 1932).
5. The Agricultural, Commercial and Industrial Banks of America" (*Insurance and Finance Review*, Calcutta, December, 1932).
6. "Accident Insurance in Comparative Legislation and Statistics" (*Insurance World*, Calcutta, January 1933).
7. "Economic Planning for Bengal" (*Insurance and Finance Review*, Calcutta, March 1933).
8. "The Technique and Finance of Health Insurance" (*Journal of the Indian Medical Association*, Calcutta, November 1933).
9. "The Strength and Limitations of Economic Japan" (*Calcutta Review*, November 1933).

10. "Principles of Land Mortgage Banks" (*Calcutta Review*, March 1934).
11. "The Trend of Indian Birth Rates in the Perspective of Comparative Demography" (*Indian Journal of Economics*, Allahabad, April and July, 1934).
12. "Control of Coal Output" (*Commerce*, Calcutta, November, 1934).
13. "Pensions in Great Britain" (*Calcutta Review*, February, 1935).
14. "Insuring Against Sickness" (*Journal of the Indian Medical Association* (Calcutta, May, 1935).
15. "Trade Balance and Public Finance: The Experience of Fascist Italy" (*Calcutta Review*, June, 1935).
16. "India's Advances in Industrialism" (*Commercial Gazette*, Calcutta, March, 1936).
17. "The Expansion of Spirituality as a Fact of Industrial Civilization" (*Prabuddha Bharata*, Calcutta, May, 1936).
18. "The Theory of Wages in the Light of Social Insurance and Public Finance" (*Indian Journal of Economics*, Allahabad, July 1936).
19. "Social Service in German Winter Relief" (*Prabuddha Bharata*, Calcutta, October, 1936).
20. "The Sociology of Crimes and Punishments" (*Calcutta Review*, January, 1937).
21. "Religious Categories as Universal Expressions of Creative Personality" (*Calcutta Review*, April and May, 1937).

22. "The New Labour Laws and Socio-Economic Planning in France" (*Calcutta Review*, June, 1937).
23. "Land Reform in Czechoslovakia" (*Commercial Gazette*, Calcutta, August 1937).
24. "The Problem of Correlation between Exchange Rates and Exports" (*Indian Journal of Economics*, Allahabad, October, 1937).

It is to be mentioned that Professor Sarkar was one of the Presidents in the Economic Section of the International Congress of Population at Rome in 1931. At the International Congress of Population, Berlin, 1935, he was one of the Vice-Presidents. He was invited to be a Vice-President likewise of the International Congress of Population at Paris (1937).

In 1932 the *Comitato Italiano per lo Studio dei Problemi della Popolazione* (Rome), in 1933 the *Indischer Ausschuss der Deutschen Akademie* (Munich), and in 1937 the *Institut Oriental* (Prague) elected Professor Sarkar as one of the honorary members.[5] He is a life-member of the Royal Economic Society, London (1935), as well as a member of the *Institut International de Sociologie*, Paris and Geneva (1935), and the American Sociological Society (1935). He is a member likewise of the Indian Economic Association and an honorary member of the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce.

In 1933 he was the President of the Folk Section, and in 1934 of the Economics Section, of the Taltala Literary Conference, Calcutta. In 1936 he presided over the Sociological Section of the First Indian Population Con-

5 For other memberships of learned societies, see p. 28.

ference at Lucknow, the District Industrial and Health Exhibition at Chittagong and the Ramakrishna Centenary Convention of Religions at Rangoon, Malda and Karachi. Of the International Parliament of Religions (Ramakrishna Centenary) at Calcutta (March 1937) he was a Secretary.

The bicentenary celebration of Washington's birth was organized by Professor Sarkar at Calcutta in February, 1932 and the Goethe Death Centenary celebration in March of the same year. In order to carry on and promote studies and investigations in German institutions, sciences and arts he established the *Bangīya Jārmān Vidyā Samsad* (Bengali Society of German Culture) in June 1933, which has been functioning regularly ever since.

The *"Kalikātāy Māldaha" Samiti* ("Malda in Calcutta" Society) was established by Prof. Sarkar in September, 1933. It seeks to promote social intercourse among the people of Malda residing in Calcutta as well as to organize the discussion of topics relating to the general welfare of the people of Malda.

Since 1926 Professor Sarkar has been connected with the Calcutta University in the Post-Graduate Departments of Economics and Commerce. He continues on the staff of the National Council of Education, Bengal, as Hony. Professor of Economics at the College of Engineering and Technology, Jadabpur, which has replaced the old Bengal National College (est. 1906).

During 1925-37 his contacts with the intellectual, economic and social movements of the country remained as intimate as they had been previous to 1914. As president, principal speaker or guest-in-chief,

Professor Sarkar has had to take part in diverse activities, as some of the public lectures[6] mentioned below for the period from December 1925 to May 1929 will indicate: "The Beginnings of a Renovated World" at the Bengal Technical Institute (now College of Engineering and Technology), Jadabpur, Calcutta (December 1925); "Economics and Journalism" under the auspices of the Indian Journalists' Association (Calcutta, January 1926), "The Foundations of Economic Progress", a series under the auspices of the National Council of Education, Bengal (February, 1926), "The World-conquest of Youth" under the auspices of the Bengal Youth League (Calcutta, March 1926), "Empire Development and World-Economy" at the Rotary Club, Calcutta (July 1926), "Indian Match Factories and Anti-Trust Legislation" at a conference of the manufacturers of matches from all parts of India (Calcutta, December, 1926);

"The Next Stage in Economic Life" at the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce (March 1927), "My Name is 1905, I am known as Young Asia" at the *Bangiya Sāhitya Parishat*, Bengali Academy of Literature (April, 1927), "The Field of Activities for Young Bengal" at the All-Bengal Youth Conference (Maju, Howrah, April 1927), "The Schoolmasters of New Bengal" at the Howrah District Teachers' Conference (Howrah, April 1927), "The Tools for Repairing the Brains" at the All-Bengal Teachers' Conference (Santipur, April, 1927), "The Earnings and Social Values of Clerical Labour" at the Assam Ministerial Officers' Conference, Shillong (June 1927), "The New Logic of Patrio-

6 These lectures were announced as well as reported in the dailies.

tism" at the National Council of Education, Bengal (Calcutta, August, 1927), "Transformations in Economic Science" at the Dacca District Youth Conference (August 1927), "Contemporary Political Theories", a series at the *Kāshī Vidyāpiṭha* (National College), Benares (October 1927);

"The New Creations of Khirodprasad" at the *Bangīya Sāhitya Parishat* (Bengali Academy of Literature), Calcutta (February 1928), "Bengali Banking in Comparative Bank Statistics" while opening a bank in Calcutta (March, 1928), "Health in Social Economics" at the *Bangīya Dhana-Vijnān Parishat* (Bengali Institute of Economics), Calcutta (December 1928);

"Bengalis as Overseas Traders" at the Bengali Institute of Economics (January 1929), "The Beginnings of Rationalization in India" at the Bengali Institute of Economics (February 1929), "The Economics of Transportation" at the Bengali Institute of Economics (March 1929), "The Growth of Insurance Sense in India" at the Albert Hall, Calcutta (March 1929), "Economic Terminology in Bengali" at the Bengali Institute of Economics (April 1929), "The Bill Habit as an Element in Banking Habit" at the Albert Hall, Calcutta (May 1929).

From May 1929 to October 1931 Professor Sarkar was out of India. Since his return to Calcutta he has participated as before in cultural and social activities of the people as shown in the following lectures as president or otherwise:[7] "The Economic Research Institutes and Seminars of Europe" at the *Bangīya Dhana Vijnān Parishat* (Bengali Institute of Economics), Calcutta

7 These lectures were all announced and reported in the dailies.

(November 1931), "The Library Movement at Home and Abroad" at the All-Bengal Library Conference, Calcutta (November 1931);

"The Industrialism of Young Bengal in its bearings on World-Economy," while opening the Industrial Exhibition organized by the All-Bengal Provincial Conference at Berhampore (December 1931), "The Bengali, India and the World" at Krishnath College, Berhampore (December 1931);

"Vivekananda as Embodiment of Energism" at the Vivekananda Society's annual meeting (Calcutta, January, 1932), "Industrial Bias for Bengali Students" at the High School, Kushtia (Nadia, February 1932), "Insurance for Workingmen" at the Indian Insurance Institute, Calcutta (April 1932), "India and the Ottawa Agreement" at the University of Lucknow (November 1932), "Institutions of Physical Culture at Home and Abroad" at the Baghbazar Gymnasium (Calcutta, December 1932);

"The Tonic of Machinery at the Prabartak Sangha (Chandernagore, April 1933), "Insurance Agents as a New Socio-Economic Force" at the Indian Insurance Companies Agents' Conference, Calcutta (April 1933), "The Thousand-Handed Bengali People" at the Taltala Literary Conference, Calcutta (April 1933), "The Youth Movement in Germany from Herder to Hitler" at the Jetty Institute, Port Commissioners' Office, Calcutta (June 1933), "Spirituality in Modernism" at the Govardhan Literary and Musical Association, Howrah (August 1933), "Societal Transformations in East and West" at the Rotary Club, Calcutta (August 1933), "The Masses of Bengal and the Literature of the Bengali Masses" at the Bengali People's Conference (Mymensingh, September

1933), "Advancing Bengal" at the Hindusthan Sangha, Howrah (October 1933), "The Remaking of the Bengali People" at the Sir Gooroodas Institute, Calcutta (November 1933), "The Bengali Heroism of Rammohun" at the Calcutta University Students' Rammohun Centenary meeting (Calcutta, December 1933), "Bengali Manufacturers and Merchants" at the Hrishikesh Park Health and Industrial Exhibition, Calcutta (December 1933);

"World-Forces and Young India" at the National Medical Institute, Calcutta (January 1934), "Vivekananda the Double-Edged Knife" at the Vivekananda Society, Calcutta (January 1934), "The Japanese Example in Diet" at the Bagshara High School, Howrah (March 1934), "The Propagation of Hindi in Bengal" at the Albert Hall, Calcutta (May 1934), "Bengali Virility" at the Ramakrishna Mission School, Sarisha (May 1934), "The Unrecognized Achievements of the Bengali People" at the Suburban Reading Room, Calcutta (June 1934), "Industrial Training in Schools" at the Sunday's Debating Club, Calcutta (August 1934), "The Food Values of Bengali Dietary" at *Byāyām Samiti* (Physical Exercise Association), Baranagore (October 1934), "Spirituality Old and New" at the Sunday's Debating Club, Calcutta (November 1934);

"The New Physique of Young Bengal" at the Hazra Bagan Sporting Club, Calcutta (January 1935), "Standards in Food and Health" at the Ramakrishnapur *Byāyām Samiti* (Physical Exercise Association), Howrah (February 1935), "The Messages of Ramakrishna" at a public meeting to inaugurate the Ramakrishna Centenary Celebrations, Calcutta (February 1935), "The Expansion of Bengal" at the Entally Academy, Calcutta (March 1935),

"Bengali Industrialism" at the Konnagar Aided Schools (March 1935), "Achievements of the Non-higher Castes" at the All-Bengal Scheduled Castes' Conference, Jhenidah, Jessore (May, 1935), *"Yantra-Yoga"* (Technocracy) at the Sanskrit College, Calcutta (August 1935), "East and West" at Tarun Mandir, Calcutta (September 1935), "World-Forces" at the Social Service League, Behala (September 1935), "The Carnegies of India" at the Carnegie Birth Centenary Celebration, Calcutta (November, 1935);

"Food, Health and Efficiency" at the Entally United Sporting Club, Calcutta (January 1936), "Neo-Capitalism" at the Lucknow University Union (February, 1936), "India's Advances in Industrialism" while opening the District Industrial and Health Exhibition at Chittagong (February, 1936), "Greater Bengal in Industry and Commerce" at the High School, Andul, Howrah (March 1936), "The Expansion of Sprituality as a Fact of Industrial Civilization" at the Convention of Religions, Ramakrishna Centenary, Rangoon, Burma (April 1936), "Japan, Bengal and World-Economy" at the Y.M.C.A., Bhowanipur, Calcutta (April 1936), "Dharmapala and Young Asia" at the Mahabodhi Society, Calcutta (April 1936), "The World-Conquests of Bengali Culture" at the Literary Conference, Midnapore (May 1936), "Winter Relief as a Form of Social Service" at the *Bangiya Jārmān Vidyā Samsad* (Bengali Society of German Culture), Calcutta (May 1936), "The Ramakrishna Empire and the World-Conquests of Hinduism" at the Convention of Religions (Ramakrishna Centenary), Malda (June 1936), "The Theory of Prices" at the *Bangiya Dhana-Vijnān Parishat* (Bengali Institute of Economics), Calcutta (June 1936),

"The Standard of Living in regard to Calories" at the Economic Society of the Scottish Church College, Calcutta (September, 1936), "Industrial Careers for Young Bengal" at the Bholanath Bisweswar Academy, Rajshahi (October 1936), "The Equations of World-Culture" at the Sanatan Dharma College, Lahore (October 1936), "The Control of Poverty" at the Servants of the People Society, Lahore, (October 1936), "Ramakrishna as a Prophet of the Young and the New" and "Ramakrishna-Vivekananda and the Religion of Progress" at the Ramakrishna Centenary Convention of Religions, Karachi (November 1936), "Equations between East and West" at the Ramakrishna Ashram, Karachi (November 1936), "Ramakrishna-Vivekananda as a World-Force" at the Bengali High School, New Delhi (November 1936), "Sindh and the Ramakrishna Centenary" at the "*Āntarjātik Banga*" *Parishat* ("International Bengal" Institute), Calcutta (December 1936);

"The Ramakrishna Empire" at the Ochterloney Monument, Calcutta (January 1937), "Ramakrishna as an Epoch-maker" at the Ramakrishna Centenary Celebrations, Jamshedpur (February 1937), "Religious Categories as Universal Expressions of Creative Personality" and "Religion, Society and the Individual" at the International Parliament of Religions, Ramakrishna Centenary, Calcutta (March 1937), "Economic Foundations of Relative Peace" at the Y.M.C.A., Chowringhee Branch, Calcutta (March 1937), "Buddha a Living Force Today" at the Mahabodhi Society, Calcutta (May 1937), "Demographic Transformations in Town and Country" at the *Bangīya Samāj Vijnān Parishat* (Bengali Institute of Sociology), Calcutta (July 1937), "The People in German

Thought from Romanticism to Neo-Democracy" at the *Bangīya Jārmān Vidyā Samsad* (Bengali Society of German Culture), Calcutta (August 1937), "Satis Mookerji, a Father of the Ideas of 1905" at the Vidyasagar College Hostel, Calcutta (September 1937), "Masaryk as a Modern *Rishi*" at a public meeting of the Czechoslovaks of Batanagar, near Calcutta, convened to pay homage to their departed President (September 1937), "The Programme of the Thirteenth Session of the International Congress of Sociology at Paris in September 1937 as described in the *Revue Internationale de Sociologie* (Paris), July-August 1937 by Prof. Duprat of Geneva" at the *Bangīya Samāj Vijnān Parishat*, Calcutta (October 1937), and "The Technique of Banking" while opening a branch of the Bengal Central Bank, Calcutta, at Pabna in North Bengal (October 1937).

A programme of policies for *Deśonnati* (national welfare) was formulated by Professor Sarkar in 1932. The policies are indicated below:

"I. Rural Welfare Policy

1. Utilization of the existing "developmental" institutions (sanitary, co-operative, economic, administrative, technical and educational) with a view to better the condition of the villages and raise the material and cultural status of the peasant, artisan and allied classes.

2. Protecting the landowning (*zamindar*) and money-lending (*mahajan*) classes with a view to enable them to use their financial resources in the interest of agriculture, land-reclamation and rural industries.

"II. Economic Policy

1. Promoting the industrialization of Bengal: (a) by mobilizing (i) *zamindari* capital, (ii) *mahajan* capital, and (iii) *chashi* (peasant) capital (through co-operative societies and savings banks), as well as (b) by (i) state aid and (ii) import of foreign capital.

2. Compulsory sickness insurance among all wage-earners and salaried persons.

3. Legislation (i) to reform the Hindu and Mussalman laws of inheritance and partition in regard to land, (ii) to introduce the principle of "selected heirs" such as can be authorized to buy out the co-sharers, and (iii) to facilitate the consolidation of holdings.

4. Appointment of a permanent Bureau of Economic Development for investigations, research and counsel on current problems.

"III. Sanitary Policy

Enactment of Public Health Act.

"IV. Social Policy

1. Expansion of opportunities for Mussalmans, the depressed classes, and aboriginals in every sphere of life's interests.

2. Appointment of a permanent Bureau of Social Development (Races, Castes and Religions) as an organ of public administration.

"V. International Policy

1. Establishment of Bengali trade agencies in foreign countries in order to promote the sale of Bengal's agricultural produce.

2. Appointment of Economic Commissions in foreign countries to facilitate the import of machineries and capital on favourable terms.

3. Utilization of the Empire Development and allied schemes (tariff, currency, etc.) in India's interests."

Since 1926 interviews with Professor Sarkar on questions of public importance like the currency problems, Indian emigrants in South Africa, the Banking Enquiry Committee, the exchange ratio, insurance, tariff policy, unemployment, public finance, labour movement, economic depression etc. have often been published in the dailies of Calcutta like *Forward*, *Liberty*, *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, *Hitavadi*, *Advance*, *Ananda Bazar Patrika*, and *Commercial Gazette* (weekly). These and other journals like the *Panchajanya* (Chittagong), *Sonar Bangla* (Dacca), *Insurance and Finance Review*, *Insurance World*, *Insurance Herald* etc., have likewise published special articles from him in their *Pujah* (autumn festival) or anniversary numbers during this period.

The public lectures and interviews may be regarded as Professor Sarkar's addresses or open letters, so to say, to the Bengali, and very often, to the Indian people. From beginning to end the *Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* has grown as the work of a scholar who is a man at the service of the masses. The results of his publications in the scientific journals of India, Europe and America have always been communicated by him to the people in and through their most diverse institutions and organs. It is from the people, again, that he has derived the problems for investigation and research. Altogether this book is the product not merely of researches carried on in libraries but also of intercourse with men and things.

The data, so far as this particular book is concerned, have come of course from the Indian, and, from the nature of the case, old Indian texts. But the "world-view" has been a constant factor in the author's intellectual atmosphere. The institutions and theories of the West, ancient, medieval and modern, have been brought into intimate contact with those of India in a definite and often elaborate manner. In this work the East speaks to the West and the West to the East on a platform of scientific comradeship.[8]

Panini Office,
Allahabad, 9th October, 1937.

8 In the compilation of this bibliographical survey I have derived considerable help from the material kindly placed at my disposal by several scholars intimately associated with Professor Sarkar for a long time, some of them since 1907. Thanks are due, among others, to Professor Banesvar Dass, B.S. Ch.E. (Illinois), College of Engineering and Technology, Jadabpur, Calcutta (National Council of Education, Bengal), Mr. Birendra Nath Das-Gupta, B.S. E.E., (Purdue), Director, Indo-Swiss Trading Co. (Calcutta, Delhi and Bombay) and Managing Director, Indo-Europa Trading Co. (Hamburg), Mr. Nagendra Nath Chaudhury, M.A. (Northwestern University, Chicago), author of *Mārkin Samāj* (American Society) and *The Tragedies of Modernism*, who has been preparing a book in Bengali on Professor Sarkar's educational, economic and sociological ideas, Advocate Pankaj Kumar Mukherjee, M.A., B.L., author of *Labour Legislation in British India*, Secretary, *"Āntarjātik Banga" Parishat* ("International Bengal" Institute) and *Bangīya Samāj Vijnān Parishat* (Bengali Institute of Sociology) as well as Dr. Monindra Mohan Moulik Pol. D. (Rome), Research Fellow, *Bangīya Dhana-Vijnān Parishat* (Bengali Institute of Economics), Secretary, Bengali Institute of Sociology, and author of *La Politica Finanziaria Britannica in India* (Bologna). See the footnote* at the commencement of this Preface.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

In the second edition the *Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* comprises the following volumes:

Book I. *Introduction to Hindu Positivism.* This is an entirely new work. No material corresponding to it was published in the first edition (1914, 1921, 1926).

Book II. *Hindu Materialism and Natural Sciences,* A Study in the Utilization of the Earth, Minerals, Plants and Animals. This corresponds to Book I. (Non-Political) of the first edition, published in 1914.

Book III. *Hindu Politics and Economics.* This corresponds to Book II. Part I. (published in 1921) and Part II. (published in 1926).

The 1914 volume of the first edition was prepared at Allahabad, the 1921 volume at New York and the 1926 volume at Paris, Berlin and Bolzano (in Italy). Each volume bears the marks of the local libraries used. Book I. of the second edition has been prepared at Calcutta and I have used chiefly the Library of the Calcutta University.

Thanks are due specially to my friend, Dr. Narendra Nath Law, Editor, *Indian Historical Quarterly,* for his kindly instructing the research staff of this journal to place at my disposal for indefinite periods such books and journals of his library as I might want.

For occasional scientific collaboration I have to thank Professors Nalinaksha Dutt, Pali scholar, and Durga

Mohan Bhattacharya, Sanskritist, both associated with the *Indian Historical Quarterly*.

It is a pleasure likewise to be able to record gratefully the constant contacts with the numerous scholars of Europe and America in diverse fields of social science, who have remembered me, both at home and abroad, with their valuable reprints and books, many of which have contributed to the wealth of the present work.

It is to be mentioned that in the present publication I have made use of the material brought together for my talks in Bengali before the Sociological Division of the *"Āntarjātik Banga" Parishat* ("International Bengal" Institute) between April 1932 and April 1937 and before the *Bangīya Samāj Vijnān Parishat* (Bengali Institute of Sociology) since April 1937. The talks dealt not only with Indian sociologists of old but also with modern indologists and Orientalists as well as contemporary sociologists of the world.

Dr. Lalit Mohan Basu is, I am happy to observe, continuing the work of his father, my senior friend and colleague, Major Baman Das Basu (1867-1930), who was the general editor of the *Sacred Books of the Hindus* when my English translation of *Śukranīti* and the different volumes of the first edition of the *Positive Background* were published by the Panini Office of Allahabad. My thanks are due to him for his friendly interest in the second edition.

The index has been kindly prepared by my wife, Ida Sarkar, to whom I am also indebted for the indexes to several other works.

Calcutta, BENOY KUMAR SARKAR
October 16, 1937

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Publishers' Preface By Dr. Lalit Mohan Basu, M.B.	1
Author's Preface to the Second Edition ...	59

CHAPTER I.

Positivism in Hindu Culture

From Comte to Tönnies	1
The Historico-Comparative Method	3
The Synthesis of the Transcendental and the Positive in Hindu Institutions and Ideals ...	5
What is the Positive?	10
The Positivistic Strands in Hindu Literature ...	12
The Place of the *Śukranīti* in Positivism ...	15
The Sociology of Müller, Sénart and Weber Under Challenge	17
The Dualism of Pareto, Fichte and Del Vecchio Acceptable in Social Philosophy ...	23
"Back to Kant"	27
Sorokin's Denunciations of Monism and Avoidance of Racial Obsessions in Sociology ...	27
India's Affinities with Eur-America in Sorokin's Analysis	29
Recognition of the Positive Background by Formichi, Bottazzi, Hillebrandt, Meyer, Breloer and Keith	36
The "New Indology" in Lüders and von Glasenapp	40
Secularization of Hindu Politics in Masson-Oursel and Berr	46
Survivals of Traditional Indology	49

CHAPTER II.

Hindu Culture and Sociology in Śukranīti

PAGE

Nītiśāstra as Social Science 53
The Four Branches of Human Science in Hindu Thought 54
Universality and Relativity of the *Śukranīti* ... 56

CHAPTER III.

Landmarks in the History of Hindu Political Development

"Greater India" comprised in the Geography of Hindu Culture 59
Cultural Developments down to the Mohenjo Daro Complex (c. B.C. 5000-2500) ... 62
The Vedic-Hindu Epochs (c. B.C. 2500-600 B.C.) 64
Hindu Republics 70
Maurya India (B.C. 322-185) 70
De la Vallée Poussin and Foucher on the Problem of Unity 72
Haushofer and Wüst on the Unreality of "Higher" Units 74
From the Āndhras and Kuṣāns to the Senas and Cholas (c. B.C. 240-1310 A.C.) 76
The Gurjara-Pratīhāras (c. 800-1200) and *Kleinstaaterei* 85
The Moslem Question 88
A Parallel Between Asia and Europe ... 91
Vaidya on c. 1000 A.C. 93
Kāśmīr (650-1339) 94
Vijayanagara (1336-1565) and the Marathas (1640-1818) 96

PAGE

The Sikhs 97
Reassertion of the Hindus as Political Powers (c. 1650-c.1850) 99
The Geopolitics of Culture-Contact and Social Mobility 101
(a) Mixture with Non-Indian Races ... 101
(b) The Impact of the Lower Orders ... 102
(c) Vrātya and *Varṇasaṃkara* ... 105
(d) The Paretian Doctrine of the Circulation of Elites Modified 108
(e) The Race-Pessimism of Today Unjustifiable 110
(f) Contemporary Vertical Mobilities ... 112
The Diversity of the *Nītiśāstras* 114

CHAPTER IV.

Mohenjo Daro Monuments vis-à-vis Vedic Texts (c. 3500-2000 B.C.)

Mohenjo Daro Monuments vis-à-vis Vedic Texts (c. 3500-2000 B.C.) 116

CHAPTER V.

Vedic Ideology (c. 2500-600 B.C.)

The Categories and Chronology of Vedic Literature 119
Vedic Positivism 125
The Perspectives of Vedic Political Thought ... 127
The Pluralistic Make-up of the Vedic Culture-Complex 131

PAGE

The *Puruṣa-Sūkta* No Index to Caste Origins or Social Order 135
The Vaiśya in the *Taittirīya* "Social Award" ... 139
Non-Aryans, "Lower Classes" and Śūdras in Vedic Polity 140
The Vrātya in the Vedic Milieu 145
Śākya the Buddha, a *Riṣi* with a non-Vedic *Upaniṣad* 148
Divinity due to Kingship, Not Kingship due to Divinity 151
Vedic Origins of Hindu Political Speculation ... 155
Vedic Ethics through Western Eyes ... 156

CHAPTER VI.

Pali Literature As a Source of Studies in Economics, Politics and Sociology (c. B.C. 600-300)

The Secular Aspects of Pali Texts 159
The Buddha-Kauṭalya Complex 162
The *Dharma, Artha* and *Nīti Śāstras* of the Buddhists 163
Buddhist Institutions and Ideals *vis-à-vis* Vedic Complex 166
Śākyan Positivism 168
Śākya as Remaker of Man 170
Law and Constitution in the *Vinaya* 173
The Social Institutions and Theories of the the *Nikāyas* 173
Asoka's Political Philosophy 176
The Dynamics of Buddhist Thought 177

CHAPTER VII.

The Dharma-Artha-Kāma Speculations in a Pluralistic Universe (c. 600-300 B.C.)

	PAGE
Non-Śākyan and Anti-Śākyan Forces ...	186
Jaina Teachings	186
The *Dharma-Sūtras*	191
The Chronology of *Dharma* Literature according to Meyer	196
The *Arthaśāstras*	203
The *Kāmaśāstras*	205
The Culture-Complex and "Old Masters" ...	205

CHAPTER VIII.

The Kauṭalya Question

Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra	209
Shamasastry, 1905	211
Smith, 1908	213
Hillebrandt, 1908	214
Hertel, 1910-14	219
Mookerji-Law-Jayaswal-Sarkar, 1910-14 ...	220
Jacobi, 1911-12	223
Jolly, 1911-16	226
Formichi, 1914	230
Bottazzi, 1914	231
Smith, 1914-19	232
Vallauri, 1915	238

PAGE

Shamasastry, 1915 238
Fleet, 1915 239
Keith, 1916 240
K. V. R. Aiyangar, 1916-35 241
Thomas, 1916-22 243
Sarkar, 1918-22 245
R. G. Bhandarkar, 1919 251
Sastri, 1920-23 253
Winternitz, 1921-24 254
Hopkins, 1922 259
Pargiter, 1922 260
Charpentier, 1922 260
Stein, 1922 260
The Reliability of Megasthenes Questionable ... 261
The Fortification of Pāṭaliputra 262
Building Materials in Maurya India ... 264
Pāṭaliputra Not Mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra* ... 265
Kauṭalya on Forts Objective but Theoretical ... 267
Hillebrandt, 1923 272
Jolly, 1923-25 275
Ganapati Sastri, 1924-25 282
Jayaswal, 1924 282
Law, 1924 284
Monahan, 1925 286
Meyer, 1926-27 288
Arthaśāstra the Work of One Person ... 290
The New Indology 290
Kauṭilya, a Title of Honour 290
Statesmanship *vs.* Scholarship in Kauṭalya ... 291
Compilation and Originality in the *Arthaśāstra* ... 292
Kleinstaaterei 292

PAGE
Fourth Century, B.C. 293
Arthaśāstra not Younger than *Dharmaśāstra* ... 294
Arthaśāstra not Condemned by the *Ṛṣis* ... 295
Mahābhārata Politics later than *Arthaśāstra* ... 296
Chemical and Metallurgical Knowledge in the *Arthaśāstra* 297
The Megasthenes Question 298
Kauṭalya and Vātsyāyana 298
Keith, 1928 299
S. K. Aiyangar, 1929 302
D. R. Bhandarkar, 1929 303
Johnston, 1929 308
Pran Nath 1929-31 313
Kane, 1930 318
De la Vallée Poussin, 1930 319
Dikshitar, 1932 320
Breloer, 1934 323
Indian Tradition as Starting Point ... 324
Megasthenes in Agreement with Kauṭalya ... 325
Kauṭalya as Chancellor of Chandragupta ... 327
Arthaśāstra as Document of Planned Economy 329
Kauṭalya = Tribonian 333
Arthaśāstra as a Comprehensive Document of Hindu Polity for All Ages 335
The Problem of Variations in Hindu Polity ... 336
The Welfare-State of Kauṭalya 338
Climate as Alleged Determinant in Hindu Polity 340
Planned Economy Old and New 343
Doses of Economic Freedom in the *Arthaśāstra* 350
Society and State in Hindu Politics ... 351
Kauṭalya and His Boswell 354

CHAPTER IX

From Kauṭalya to Varāhamihira (*c. B.C. 300-600 A.C.*)

	PAGE
Mahāyāna Humanism	... 363
The Positivism of the *Jaina Siddhānta*	... 367
Dharmaśāstras (*Smritis*)	... 370
The Tamil Classics	... 372
The Joy of Life in Literature ...	... 373
The Eighteen *Purāṇas*	... 374
The Epics	... 376
Varāhamihira	... 376
The *Vārttāśāstras*	... 377
The *Śilpa Śāstras*	... 379
Kāmandakīnīti	... 381
Hindu Positivism in Indo-China, Insulindia, Tibet and China ...	... 386
From Epicurus to Gregory the Great	... 394

CHAPTER X.

From Harṣa to Hemādri (*c. 600-1300*)

Six Fundamental Formative Forces in Positivism	400
Bhāṣyas and *Nibandhas* of *Smritiśāstras* ...	403
1. Medhātithi and Viśvarūpa ...	... 404
2. Śrīkara	... 405
3. Jitendriya, Bālaka and Yogloka	... 408
4. Vijnāneśvara	... 408
5. Gopāla and Lakṣmīdhara ...	... 409
6. Jīmūtavāhana and Ballālasena	... 410
7. Hemādri	... 412

PAGE

Nītiśāstras 415
1. Brihaspati's *Sūtra* 415
2. Somadeva's *Nītivākyāmrita* 420
3. Bhoja's *Yuktikalpataru* 425
4. Lakṣmīdhara's *Rājanītikalpataru* and 5. Gopāla's *Rājanītikāmadhenu* 429
6. Hemachandra's *Laghu Arhannīti* ... 430
7. Someśvara's *Mānasollāsa* 432
Vārttāśāstras 436
Śilpaśāstras and *Vāstuśāstras* 439
Hindu Positivism in South Eastern Asia, Tibet, China and Moslem Asia 444

CHAPTER XI.

From Chaṇḍeśvara to Rāmmohun

(*c. 1300-1833*)

Hindu Impacts on Islam 466
The Humanism of the Modern Indian Languages 469
Democratic Strands in Hindu Social Thought ... 472
Śilpaśāstras 475
Purāṇas 477
The Positivism of Bengali Poetry 478
The Doctrine of Political Deliverers as *Yugāvatāras* in Vijayanagara 494
The Hindu Tradition in Maratha Politics ... 497
The Anti-Foreign and Democratic Tendencies ... 497
The Positivism of the *Dāsabodha* 500
Rāmdās's Utopia of *Ānandavanabhūvana* ... 502
The Pluralistic World of Śivāji 505

PAGE

The Cultural Nationalism of Śivāji ... 507
Śivāji as *Avatāra* in the *Śiva-Bhārata* ... 511
Rājanīti: 513
1. Chaṇḍeśvara's *Rājanītiratnākara* ... 513
2. Mādhava's *Rājadharmaprakaraṇa* of *Parāśara-Samhitā* 522
3. Vaiśampāyana's *Nītiprakāśikā* ... 525
4. Abul Fazl's *Ain-i-Akbari* as a Semi-Moslem and Semi-Hindu *Nītiśāstra* ... 529
5. Nīlakaṇṭha's *Nītimayūkha* ... 546
6. Mitra-Miśra's *Rājanītiprakāśa* ... 549
7. Rāmadās's *Mahārāṣṭradharma Bārhwāwā* 560
8. The Marathi *Rājanīti* of Rāmachandra-pant (1716) 577
The Fundamental Defect in Rāmachandra-pant's Positivism 589
The *Nīti* Tradition in Rāmachandrapant ... 593
9. The Peshwa's Diaries (1708-1817) ... 599
10. The Last Text of *Nītiśāstra*: Chitnis's Marathi *Rājanīti* (1810) 602
Smriti Nibandhas 610
Law Scholars of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries 610
Raghunandana 611
Legal Thought of the Seventeenth Century ... 615
Bālambhaṭṭa and Jagannātha 617
Rammohun (1772-1833) 618
The Realism of Rammohun as Champion of *Vedānta, Purāṇas*, and *Tantras* 619
The *Smriti* and *Niti Śāstras* of Rammohun ... 624

CHAPTER XII.

Hindu Philosophy's Contributions to Positivism

The "Sensate" and the "Ideational" ... 631
The Geometry of "Between-men" Relations in the *Dharma* and *Artha Śāstras* 650
The Variables and the Constants in Hindu Positivism 660

Index I. Persons 669
Index II. Subjects 678-697

with this type of disquisitions. And they have not failed to capture also the indology as cultivated by the Asians, including Indians, especially those scholars who are as rule wrongly described as philosophers simply because they have edited, annotated, translated or paraphrased some old Hindu philosophical texts. Nor is this all. The social thinkers of Asia also have fallen a victim to the fallacious sociological methods and messages of the modern West, to which the postulate of an alleged distinction between the Orient and the Occident is the first principle of science.

It is to furnish such *sûtras*, formulae and conventions of Eur-American and Asian indology with correct perspectives that the chapters of the first edition of Vol. I. of the *Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* as well as of the *Folk-Element in Hindu Culture* were published in Indian journals during 1910-14. It was the special object of the *Positive Background* to rescue Hindu culture from such one-sided and monistic interpretations whether they came from indologists, sociologists, geographers, climatologists, ethnologists, regionalists, political ideologists and economists. At the same time attention was drawn to the universal or cosmopolitan facts and tendencies in Hindu societal and ideological development. That the processes and forces in Indian social life are not peculiar to the regions, climates or races and religions of India but thoroughly "human, all too human" was the one clear conclusion of these investigations, comparative in essence as they were. The fundamental uniformity in the "world-view" (*Weltanschauung*) between India and Eur-America was the

ideological atmosphere of the researches carried on during those years.

The principles of the writings of that period were developed at length on diverse fronts of sociological investigation through my papers in Eur-American journals.[7] The general attitude of Eur-American indologists, culture-historians, philosophers, economists, and sociologists in regard to Hindu civilisation and "view of life" was described in my *Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922, p. 155) as follows:

"The impression has got abroad since Max Müller wrote the *History of Sanskrit Literature* (1860, pp. 18, 25, 29-31) and *India What can It Teach us?* (1883, pp. 97-101, 105, 107, 117) that the literature of the Hindus deals mainly with vague idealism, unpractical mysticism, and other-worldly absurdities, at best with metaphysical philosophizing. Besides, a few alleged pessimistic passages from one or two Buddhist books in the Pali language are erroneously taken to be the watchword of all Hindu speculation."

In all the publications of those years the methodology of prevailing indology was criticized as being generally

7 See the *School and Society* (New York 1917), the *International Journal of Ethics* (Chicago 1918, 1920), the *American Political Science Review* (1918, 1919), the *Political Science Quarterly* (New York 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921), the *Journal of Race Development* (U.S.A. 1919), the *Journal of International Relations* (U.S.A. 1919, 1921), *Open Court* (Chicago 1919), *Giornale degli Economisti e Rivista di Statistica* (Rome 1920), *Revue de Synthèse Historique* (Paris 1920, 1930), *Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques* (Paris 1921), *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (1921), *Deutsche Rundschau* (Berlin 1922, 1930), *Annali di Economia* (Milan 1930), *Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie* (Cologne 1931), and *Revue Internationale de Sociologie* (Paris 1936),—for the papers by the present author.

speaking fallacious on three grounds. First, it ignored, overlooked or failed to attach due importance to the positive, materialistic, secular, energistic and allied institutions and theories of the Hindus. In the second place, it was prone,—even subconsciously or automatically,—to compare the ancient and medieval conditions of India with those of modern and even contemporary Eur-America. And finally, it neglected as a rule to observe the distinction between institutions and ideals, i.e., factual achievements, and "pious wishes."

The attempt in all these writings consisted, first and foremost, in exhibiting the data (both institutional and ideological) of Hindu culture from the positive, objective, humanistic and worldly side. Secondly, comparison with Western conditions was introduced on a large scale, but care was taken to point out, first, that it was against the ancients and medievals of the West that the ancients and medievals of the East were to be weighed in the balance, and secondly, that the institutions were not to be mixed up or compared with ideals whether for Asia or for Europe, but that *Realpolitik* was to be compared with *Realpolitik* and idealism with idealism.

It is as an illustration of the application of this methodology that on fundamental points, as indicated in the preface to the *Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922, p. viii), the volume delivered "a front attack on the traditional Western prejudices regarding Asia such as are concentrated in Hegel, Cousin, Max Müller, Maine, Janet, Smith, Willoughby and Huntington." About the same time the *Futurism of Young Asia* (Berlin 1922) was published to indicate how as a result of the application of this method in the near

future the social sciences were likely to be transformed and the relations between the East and the West placed on a really humane although rigidly scientific and philosophical basis. A main feature of this work consisted in the establishment of the uniformities, parallelisms, analogies and identities between Asia and Eur-America on the most diverse fronts.

The new sociology maintained by the present author will not stand the "religious interpretations" of civilization as presented by de Coulange in his *La Cité Antique*. Nor is it prepared to accept the somewhat similar but modified position of Max Weber. In his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie* (1922-23) Weber speaks of the commanding rôle of religion in economic life. But his thesis is untenable as an explanation of historical facts. It may be admitted that religion was a social force in Hindu culture only in the sense in which it is used by Durkheim in his *Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse* (Paris 1912), namely, that the very concept of society is in every region and age essentially religious. But using Max Weber's language we can concede that in India as elsewhere religion was but one of the diverse determinants of *Wirtschaftsethik*, i.e., economic ethics. While dealing with the landmarks of Hindu literature we should therefore take care not to be misled simply because of its religious externals and envelope.

It is indeed desirable to resume to a certain extent the methodology of Zimmer's *Altindisches Leben* (Berlin 1879).[8] Oldenberg[8] can also be taken to a certain

8 "Die vedischen Worte für schön und Schönheit und das vedische Schönheitsgefühl" (*Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Göttingen, 1918), Eng. transl. in *Rūpam* (Calcutta) for October 1927.

extent as a reasonable guide in so far as he maintains that "the Vedic poet saw beauty first of all in the human form, and in the appearance of the gods who resembled human beings."

The Dualism of Pareto, Fichte, and Del Vecchio Acceptable in Social Philosophy

The specialization in the positivistic, secular, humane, scientific, rationalistic, and energistic data or factors of Hindu culture should not, however, be misunderstood as emphasizing or accentuating them to the exclusion of the idealistic, mystical, religious, and allied facts and ideas. It is not as an illustration of the monistic "historical materialism" or "economic interpretation" that has taken a final shape at the hands of Karl Marx or Achille Loria that the present study ought to be listed.

Dualism or rather pluralism is, on the contrary, the key to the methodology of the present author in the interpretation of *viśva-śakti* or world-forces. The position of a modern Italian thinker, Pareto,[9] in his *Trattato di Sociologia Generale* in this regard is acceptable. In his judgment historical materialism marked a noteworthy scientific progress in so far as it placed in clear light the contingential character of certain phenomena, namely, the moral and the religious, to which an absolute character was ascribed

9 Florence, 1916, Vol. I. p. 426, Vol. II. pp. 276-277., also *Manuel d' Economie Politique* (Paris 1909), pp. 18-19, R. Michels: *Corso di Sociologia Politica* (Milan 1927), pp. 14-16, 25.

and is still ascribed by many. Further, it has, says he, certainly a part of truth because it asserts the interdependence of economic and all the social phenomena. But the error lies in changing this interdependence into a relation of cause and effect.

Equally acceptable is another Paretian viewpoint, namely, the one to the effect that the "economic man" is no more the whole man than is the "religious man," the "ethical man" etc. Extra-economic actions cannot be ignored in the examination of the complete personality. In regard to scientific purposes, again, says Pareto, it is possible to be "analytical." But *la practica è essenzialmente sintetica* (practice is essentially synthetic).

It is the synthetic view that the present author stands for, and, as he claims, is the factual reality of Indian history and Hindu culture. Perhaps it is possible to connect the general scientific orientations of the present study in regard to the problem of religion *vis-à-vis* other items of human life with those of the classical German philosopher Fichte in his *Reden an die Deutsche Nation* (1808), Address VIII.

The Apostles and the early Christians, says he, placed their faith in Heaven in such an extraordinary manner as to be entirely indifferent to the things of life, the state, *irdisches Vaterland*, the earthly fatherland, and the nation. This attitude is appraised by Fichte as an unnatural condition, as something outside the rule of the world-process, indeed as a rare exception. It is, further, says he, a very abnormal or perverse use (*verkehrter Gebrauch*) of religion, such as has been very often made in Christendom and other faiths, which without reference to the existing circumstances, recommends this retreat-

ing from the interests of the state and the nation as real religious disposition (*Zurückziehung von den Angelegenheiten des Staates und der Nation als wahre religiöse Gesinnung*). In the regular order of things, however, earthly life itself is to be regarded really as life (*soll das irdische Leben selber wahrhaftig Leben sein*) in which one can feel happy and which, naturally in expectation of something higher (*freilich in Erwartung eines höheren*), one can gratefully enjoy.

In Fichte's analysis, it is indeed true that religion is the consolation of unjustly oppressed slaves, but it is still on account of the religious sense above all that people try to protect themselves against slavery and thus prevent religion from degenerating into a mere consolation of the prisoners. It fits the tyrant quite well, says Fichte, to preach religious resignation (*Dem Tyrannen steht es wohl an religiöse Ergebung zu predigen*) and to direct to Heaven those whom he does not wish to accord any nook or corner on Earth (*und die denen er auf Erden kein Plätzchen gestatten will an den Himmel zu verweisen*). In Fichte's words, we others should make it a point not to run after assimilating this concept of religion and, if we can, we ought rather to prevent the conversion of the Earth into a Hell and thereby awaken a greater longing for Heaven.

Fichte considers the natural "drive" of man,—such as only in a condition of real necessity can be given up,—to consist in discovering the Heaven on this Earth and the eternally enduring things in his earthly day's work, in planting the imperishable and the immortal even in the temporal and in teaching in a manner that can be seen by the mortal eyes.

It is the object of the *Positive Background* to demonstrate that Hindu culture, as it has historically grown through the ages and in diverse regions of India as well as Greater India, bears testimony to this Fichtean *natürliche Trieb des Menschen* (natural impulse or drive of man) and *regelmässige Ordnung der Dinge* (regular order of things). All the activities and ideas of the Hindus in regard to the *irdisches Vaterland* (earthly fatherland), the establishment of Heaven on Earth (*Himmel auf dieser Erde*) and the discovery of the eternal in the ephemeral or the transient are so many phases of Hindu positivism which it is the purpose of the present work to unravel.

And in this position we can agree with Giorgio del Vecchio[10] whose analysis leaves no doubt about the supreme value of each element in the personality. In his examination the orientations derived from the self are as "real" as those from the "not-self." *Cotesta dualità resta insopprimibile come legge immanente del nostro essere* (This duality remains irreducible as the immanent law of our being). The two terms, fundamental but antithetic, are equally (*egualmente*) legitimate and valid, says he.

The entire reality is to be referred equally (*egualmente*) to both these principles. Each one dominates and embraces the other but does not definitely eliminate it, because in its turn is dominated by and comprised in the other. Such idealism as is pragmatic enough to recognize the equal validity of diverse factors or elements in our *coscienza* (conscience) and *azioni* (actions), as does

10 "Etica, Diritto e Stato" in *Rivista Internazionale di Filosofia del Diritto* (Rome 1934).

not consider any single motive by itself to be sufficient for human life and refuses to recognize in this or that particular tendency the intimate essence or supreme law of human nature can be affiliated to the philosophy underlying the structure of the *Positive Background* as presented here.

"Back to Kant"

Thus oriented we meet indeed Immanuel Kant in another way. This philosopher's attitude to the universe is epoch-making. As is well-known, he postulated the thoroughgoing distinction between Nature (*Prakriti* ?) and Man (*Puruṣa* ?) or rather the complete independence of the sense-world from the moral world according to each a dignity and law of its own. It is the Kantian dualism[11] in a new guise that can render unto Religion the things that are Religion's and unto the other forces the things that naturally belong to them. Without necessarily holding the brief for Oswald Spengler in other items we are prepared to cry with him for "Back to Kant."

Sorokin's Denunciations of Monism and Avoidance of Racial Obsessions in Sociology

At the moment of writing the second edition (1936) it is possible to note that the cry for positivism in the approach to the problems of Hindu culture as well as the futuristic demand for reform in the methodology of social sciences, as raised during 1910-14, have to a certain extent justified themselves. Not only indologists and other

11 J. Dewey: *German Philosophy and Politics* (New York 1915) pp. 20-30.

Orientalists but students of anthropology, psychology, economics, politics and sociology have embarked upon a transvaluation of values according to an humaner, albeit more rational method. Perhaps the scientific world is gradually approaching the condition that was looked for in my *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916 p. xv.), where it was claimed that the twentieth century demands a new synthesis, a fresh transvaluation of values, and as prolegomena to that, a new logic,—in order that the *idola* of the nineteenth century might be subverted.

An important publication of recent years may be singled out in this connection. This is the Russian-American sociologist Pitirim Sorokin's *Contemporary Sociological Theories* (New York 1928). This work, encyclopædic as it is in its structure, is well calculated to furnish the "new logic",—the "critique" of sociological reason with which to demolish the *idolas* or superstitions associated with all the latter-day *isms* in social science. From the standpoint of the present author as developed since 1910 this historical and critical study by Sorokin is to be appraised as an embodiment, although mainly in a somewhat destructive form, of the "futurism" that is a desideratum in the study of human achievements and potentialities, race-questions and class-problems. Sorokin's denunciations of monistic interpretations constitute a conspicuous and sound landmark in the evolution of societal science. Another valuable achievement of his studies is to be found in the thoroughly objective manner in which he handles the data of the past and the present, the East and the West. He is not obsessed by the alleged "modernisms" but can discover their germs in the

ancients and primitives. Nor is he possessed by the doctrine of "chosen races", but gives every race its due. Coming nearer home, i.e., to the special field of our present investigations, it is possible to mention several documents of substantial importance such as may be regarded as containing the rudiments of a "new indology", as demanded by the present author.

India's Affinities with Eur-America in Sorokin's Analysis

We may commence even with Sorokin himself. In his sociological investigations Indian facts and ideas occupy a prominent place. He may, therefore, be cited as an instance not only of the "new logic" but also of the "new indology".

Comparative sociography furnishes the data of Sorokin's *Social Mobility* (New York 1927). In this work the analogies, parallelisms, identities and affinities between the facts, institutions and movements of India and those of the rest of the world which it was a special object of the *Futurism of Young Asia* (Berlin 1922) to demonstrate have been brought out in a conspicuous manner. The treatise does not deal with ideas, ideals or theories but with the actual processes of life as developed in the diverse regions and races of the world.

In the factual sociography of the world Sorokin does not consider India to be *sui generis*. "Interoccupational stratification" is considered by him to be a social fact of the past and the present. While describing the superimposition of the caste-occupational groups in the Hindu system he points out that three of the eight guilds established by Numa or Servius Tullius in ancient Rome were

more important from the social standpoint than the others. Among the guilds of medieval Europe there were some which were more "privileged" than the rest. The "six corps" of France and the *guilda mercantoria* of England are instances in point. Among the occupational groups of the contemporary societies also he finds "if not a juridical, at least a factual stratification" (pp. 99-100, 128).

The rise and fall of groups as distinguished from the rise and fall of individuals is a form of social mobility in the vertical line. Indian sociography has arrested Sorokin's interest in this regard. The processes involved in this group mobility as manifest in the ascendency of the Brahmaṇical aristocracy are considered by him to be identical with those that led to the gradual rise of the Christian Bishop, Clergy and the Church as a whole after Constantine. The rise and fall of the French legists as well as of the bourgeoisie and the royal aristocracies in Russia, Germany and Austria, nay, the elevation of the Russian communists after 1918 to the place occupied by the Czarist aristocracy, all embody the principles underlying the growth of what may be called the Hindu Brahmanocracy (p. 134).

While establishing his thesis that there has scarcely been any society whose strata are absolutely closed Sorokin brings into bold relief the facts of vertical social mobility even in the caste society of the Hindus. He quotes Manu and Gautama to demonstrate that not only did the Brāhmaṇas fall but that the outcastes also rose. It is pointed out that "in the seventh generation," as says Gautama (IV), "men may obtain a change of caste either being raised to a higher or being degraded to a lower

one." He admits that in vertical mobility, although less intensive, Indian history was but repeating the stories of Greece, Rome, Egypt, China and medieval Europe (pp. 139-141, 161).

According to Sorokin, in every country the intensity of vertical social mobility, fluctuates from period to period. India is no exception to the rule which is illustrated by China, Greece, Rome, as well as medieval and modern Europe. In order to demonstrate the universal character of the social processes in India he exhibits the epochs of caste-rigidity as well as of caste-decline as a series of "social waves" (pp. 145, 161).

In the discussion of the rôle of learning as a "social elevator" or ladder and of the educational institution as a "channel of vertical circulation" India has her place by the side of China, Turkey, modern Western societies etc. It is pointed out, however, that it is to the upper social strata only that education and initiation are confined, these being forbidden to the Śūdras. Even in this item Sorokin does not find India to be exceptional. Similar situations, says he, "we find in some periods of the European societies also." He quotes the decree of Richard II in England to the effect that "no bondman or bondwoman shall place their children at school, as has been done, so as to advance their children in the world" (pp. 171-172).

Among other channels of vertical circulation he mentions the religious organizations of Buddhism and Hinduism as similar to those of the Christian Church, Mohammedanism and Confucianism in their rôle as social ladders or elevators (pp. 168-169). In the field of successful money-making as social ladder, also, India

has been cited for illustrations like other countries (pp. 177-178, 181).

According to Sorokin all the mechanisms—the "sieves"—by which individuals are socially "tested", "selected" and "distributed" among different social strata are to be found in the Indian social organization. We find that India does not present a peculiar case. The almost sacred character of the family was as much a dominant feature of India as of Greece, Rome and medieval Europe down to the fourteenth century. The marriages in those societies were regulated by "eugenic" practices. In India as elsewhere the family served as a powerful testing and selective agency (pp. 184-186).

The functions of the school as a testing, selective and distributive agency were as prominent in India and China as in the modern Eur-American societies. Incidentally, it is interesting to observe that according to Sorokin the Brāhmaṇas constituted the most "powerful aristocracy of biological and social selection." In order to pass successfully the test of the Hindu educational institutions the students had to display not only an ability to learn the Vedas but "extraordinary moral and social qualities." "Only men with an extraordinary will power and spirit", says he, "could meet such a test" (pp. 191-192, 194-195, 210, 545-546).

One of Sorokin's inductive generalizations in regard to the vitality and health of *élites* is as follows: "The leaders and the higher classes of almost all societies seem to have been on the average superior physically to the lower classes." The care given to physical health in connection with the training of Indian Kṣatriyas as well as Brāhmaṇas was according to him a universal feature

in the ancient world and is universal even today (pp. 269, 270, 272, 279).

If Sorokin's *Social Mobility* is a study in facts and *Realpolitik*, his later work *Contemporary Sociological Theories* is, as the title indicates, a treatise dealing with ideology. In this work also indological material has been introduced by the author at every important stage of his discussions bearing on the present-day schools of sociology. He tries to exhibit the old Hindu thinkers as colleagues and comrades of the thinkers in ancient Eur-Asia, and all of them as precursors, suggestive or full-fledged, of the thinkers of the modern world.

Along with ancient Greece ancient India is referred to in connection with the early enunciations of the "mechanistic school" of sociology, the standpoint, which interprets social phenomena in terms of physics, chemistry etc. The "materialistic atomism" of the Hindus is an item in point (p. 4). The "thinkers of ancient India" have likewise their place "among the great multitude of people who have tried to emphasize the various effects of geographical conditions on man's behaviour and psychology and on social organization, social processes and the historical destinies of a group" (p. 100).

The "bio-organismic school of sociology" is described as having predecessors among the Hindus as among the Chinese, Greeks and Romans. In regard to the comparison of a society, particularly of a state in its social classes, institutions and social processes with an organism, especially with man or with his body and soul, or with parts of his body and bodily processes Sorokin commences with passages from Manu and then passes

on to Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Seneca and others (pp. 197-198).

According to Sorokin what is now termed "eugenics" was very extensively practised in ancient India as in Palestine and Greece. He quotes Manu, Āpastamba, Gautama, Nārada and Viṣṇu to show that the Hindus like the Jews of the *Old Testament* and the Greeks of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*, Plato and Aristotle attached considerable importance to "blood," "race", "selection," "heredity" (pp. 219-220, 358).

In regard to ancient eugenics Sorokin's *Social Mobility* (New York 1927), which, as we have seen, is mainly a study in institutions and facts, has likewise much to say. In this work also he places the Hindu "ideas" of "blameless marriage", "blamable marriage" etc. alongside of those of Plato, Hammurabi and Confucius (pp. 184-186, 208-209).

The "sociologistic school" of sociology is described by Sorokin as that which interprets social or psychical facts as due to "interactions" and as the results of "correlation with a certain social condition." Among the first exponents of this school also he finds the *Dhammapada* and the *Upaniṣads* as well represented as Confucianism and Plato's *Republic* (pp. 435-436). The bulk of the old Indian philosophy and ethics (especially that of Buddhism), says he, is based upon the idea that our "I" or "Self" with its empirical properties, sufferings and joys is a product of social contact and exists as long as the contact exists.

Sorokin is convinced that the consciousness about the importance of "economic factors" in human behaviour, social organization and the historical destiny of a society

did not originate with Marx and Engels but that it can be traced back to "immemorial times." Among the ancient representatives of this kind of thought he finds Buddha, Viṣṇu, Manu, Nārada, *Vedānta-Sūtras*, Brihaspati, Gautama and Āpastamba in the company of Confucius and Mencius of China, and Thucydides, Plato and Aristotle of Greece, as well as Cicero, Livy and Pliny of Rome (pp. 514-515).

Like the so-called "economic interpretation" of history or culture the so-called "psychological interpretation of the dynamics of the universe" also is found by Sorokin to be in evidence among the thinkers of the ancient world. Manu, the *Upaniṣads* and the *Dhammapada* are quoted by him in the same breath with the Chinese philosophers as well as Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Polybius, the Church Fathers and the majority of the medieval thinkers (p. 601).

In Sorokin's sociological analysis there is a kind of "sieve" within each channel of vertical circulation whose function is to sift the individuals and accord them their proper place. He believes that every society from the earliest times has followed the "principle" that the social placement of individuals must be according to talent. This "ideology" he detects in Indian as much as in Chinese, Greek and Roman writers (*Social Mobility*, 1927, pp. 182, 208).

In my studies on Hindu culture (1910-22) attention was directed to two fallacies of Orientalists and traditional sociologists. One was monism and the other was their inveterate obsession by the dogma of alleged distinction between the East and the West. It is interesting that Sorokin's works have not only challenged the monistic

interpretations of culture and social relationships but the ideologies of race-distinctions also. In his historico-comparative and statistico-psychological investigations there is no place for India as a country in splendid isolation, geographical or cultural. The "facts" and "ideas" examined by him point to no extraordinary dominating or monistic impacts of region, climate or race. India's affinities with the rest of the world in institutions as well as ideology are thus automatically established wherever affinities are in evidence. From the standpoint of general sociology Sorokin's work as a reformer is to be appraised as considerable, nay, revolutionary. And its impacts on indology ought to be profound. For one thing, they are immensely calculated to militate against the indology as established by Max Müller, Sénart and Max Weber.

Recognition of the Positive Background by Formichi, Bottazzi, Hillebrandt, Meyer, Breloer and Keith

The "new indology" has found able exponents among Italian scholars. In the present author's *Hindu Politics in Italian* (1925-26) attention was specially invited to the works of Formichi (1914), Bottazzi (1914) and others. Italian approaches to Hindu politics and sociology from the angle of secularism and humanism are discussed subsequently in connection with the "Kauṭalya Question" (Chapter VIII).

An exponent of this new indology in Germany is Alfred Hillebrandt who in his *Altindische Politik* (Jena 1923, pp. 1-2) commences his study with a criticism of the old indology almost in the manner of the *Positive Background*. "One who takes only the religious and philosophical literture of ancient intellectual life", says

Hillebrandt, "will tend to the belief that it was exclusively given over to the eternal and transcendental questions and considered the things of this world as but nothing. The majority of modern writings, even of those which are directly based on the original sources, devoted as they are to the object of understanding the theory of the oneness of the *Vedānta* or the *Nirvāṇa* of Buddhism have created the impression as if the sages of India lived only on one thought, namely, as to how to escape the series of births and pains and to fly the actual world."

Hillebrandt's own position is then recorded as follows: "But this was not so," says he. "By the side of the forest ascetic and peripatetic monk such as fled the world there was the unnumbered mass with its living and activities, there was the state with its solicitude for supervising and directing this life and work, and the groups of those whose concern was to investigate the requirements of life and help the state."

According to Hillebrandt, "India possessed not only the world-escaping thinkers but also political heads and realists who were not inferior in equipment to the former." "These latter", says he finally, "did not live in the world of dreams but entirely in the actual world. They took men and things as they are, with "fine understanding of their weakness."

The recognition of the positive background of Hindu culture forms the fundamental *milieu* in Johann Meyer's German translation of the Kauṭalyan *Arthaśāstra* (Leipzig 1926-27) as well as Bernhard Breloer's *Kauṭalya-studien* (1927-34). The subject has been dealt with at length in a subsequent chapter (VIII).

As representing a transformation of the same character in the orientations of European indologists may be cited A. B. Keith's *History of Sanskrit Literature* (Oxford 1928, p. 450). In the same spirit as Hillebrandt Keith refers to the prevailing indology as follows:

"The Vedic literature, permeated as it is with religion, affords a quite false impression of the Vedic Indian as a person given to reflection and religious practices without regard to practical life."

In his own judgment "nothing of course can be farther from the truth; the East, in lieu of bowing before the West in disdain or otherwise, confronted Alexander with an obstacle which he did not attempt to penetrate, and his garrisons had soon after his death to be withdrawn."

The proper approach to Hindu culture has been described by Keith in a comprehensive manner such as accords to the "positive" aspects their due. "If we are to judge India aright," says he, "we must add two other objects to the *Dharma*, religious and moral duty, which is dwelt on in the Vedic texts. Already the *Hiraṇyakeśi Grihya-sūtra* (II, 19, 6) knows of the three objects in life, *Dharma*, *Artha*, politics and practical life in general, and *Kāma*, love etc. The epic (I, 2, 381) recognizes this set, the *Viṣṇu Smriti* (LIX, 30) and Manu accept it. It is found in Patanjali (on Pāṇini II, 2, 34, *Vārttika* 9), in Aśvaghoṣa and in the *Panchatantra*."

One might easily challenge Keith as to whether *Artha* and *Kāma* were really ignored in the Vedic complex. He, therefore, anticipates that challenge by making his position perfectly clear. The Vedic antiquity of the economic and sexological elements in Hindu

culture is established by him when he says by way of self-criticism that the "older system" (Vedic) no doubt combined these subjects as parts of *Dharma* in wider sense; the *Dharma-śāstras* deal with royal duties, capitals and countries, officials, taxes and military preparations as they do with justice, and the epic (XII, 58, 1) in a list of authorities of the science of kings (*rāja-śāstras*) includes Brihaspati, Viśālākṣa, Uśanas, Manu, son of Prachetas, and Gauraśiras who pass also for authorities on *Dharma*." Further, we are told that "the *Brihadāraṇyaka Upaniṣat* (VI, 3) incidentally shows that a wide knowledge of the arcana of love was prevalent in Brāhmaṇical circles, the holy Śvetaketu becoming a recognized authority later on the topic." "Gradually there must have sprung up," says he, "schools who studied *Artha* and *Kāma* in themselves and this is attested to us by the *Smritis* and the epics."

In these clear-out and synthetic statements of the British indologist we have already the principles of positivism accepted in a forceful manner. The principles of positivism and humanism as developed between 1910 and 1922 have become integral parts, so to say, in the intellectual apparatus and cultural orientations of Indian indologists as well. Not only the direct quotations but the very words and phrases and the mode of presentation as well as the style of treatment found in the indological investigations of Indian scholars bear testimony to their assimilation, in a general manner, of the "new logic" as desired by the present author during those years.

It only remains to observe that, as has been often repeated in the present work as elsewhere, sociol-

ogically or philosophically speaking, the futuristic logic of "positive background" does not contemplate, as it should not, any "monistic interpretation" of culture from the materialistic side. The monistic economic, political or other interpretations of cultural origins or developments are as wrong and misleading as the monistic mystico-religious interpretations.

Attention may incidentally be drawn also to *Chinese Political Thought* (London 1932) by E. D. Thomas and E. T. Williams. The universal elements in the culture of the Orient, as exhibited in my *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (1916), *Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (1922) etc., have been utilized by the joint authors of this work, dealing as it does with some fundamental ideas of the Far East, in order to establish Oriental positivism in the field of politics.

The "New Indology" in Lüders and von Glasenapp

One of the latest exponents of this "new indology" is Heinrich Lüders of Berlin, the *doyen* of Sanskritists in Germany. In *Der Orient und Wir* (Berlin 1935), a book of six chapters by different scholars, Lüders has a paper on India.

Lüders invites attention to the work of the Indian scholars of today, such as are interested in the study of ancient and medieval India, with approval. He points to the conclusions of modern Indian archæological and historical scholarship to the effect that the Indians were *nicht nur in sich gekehrte stille Denker gewesen* (not merely self-ruminating passive thinkers) and that their achievements can be placed by the side of the Occidental

at any rate of the same period (*ihre Leistungen sich den abendländischen zum mindesten der gleichen Zeit, zur Seite stellen können* p. 92).

His own position has been clearly exhibited by himself. It is not true, says he, that the strong tendency towards the inner and the other-worldly absorbed all the energies and led to inactivity and retreat from life (*Es ist doch nicht so, dass die starke Richtung auf das Innere und das Jenseitge nun etwa alle Kräfte absorbiert und zu Lebensabkehr und Untätigkeit geführt hätte*). In his judgment this was not the case even in Buddhism in which the nothingness of life was most strongly brought out (p. 86).

According to his analysis one should not overlook the fact that it was after all only a small percentage of the people (*nur ein kleiner Prozentsatz des Volkes*) that practised *Weltflucht* (retreat from the world) and entered the Order to achieve *Nirvāṇa* which could be attained only in the monastic class. The laity which believed in the Order did not think of giving up the worldly activities (*dachte nicht daran ihre weltlichen Beschäftigungen aufzugeben*) and the renunciation of secular life was not demanded from them (*es wurde nicht von ihr gefordert*). Lüders refers also to the Jaina communities of today in which, as he says, the laity consists mostly of the commercial people. It is just the richest class that belongs to the Jaina laity in the same manner as the old texts report of the composition of the Buddhist laity of yore. The attempt of Brāhmaṇism to establish an *Ausgleich* (balance) between the life in the world and the flight from the world has also demanded Lüders's attention. The relations between the first three *āśramas* (stages) of

the social polity in which *tätiges Leben* (active life), the study of the Vedas and the establishment of the family are prescribed and the last stage which is characterized by the *Streben nach der Erlösung* (effort to achieve salvation) indicate this balancing of the two motives in Brāhmaṇism, says he (pp. 83, 87).

The political history is summarized by him as also showing that the Indian people by no means spent their days in inactive brooding (*in tatenlosem Hinbrüten*). In pre-and post-Christian times were established Empires (*Reiche*) in India which exceed all political forms on European soil in area (*an Ausdehnung alle staatlichen Gebilde auf europäischem Boden übertreffen*). Lüders refers to the comprehensive political manual of Kauṭalya in which *der Verwaltungsapparat eines riesigen Reiches wie das der Mauryas bis in alle Einzelheiten hineingeschildert wird* (the administrative machinery of a gigantic Empire as that of the Mauryas is described in all its details). Incidentally be it observed that to Lüders the "Kauṭalya problem" does not seem to exist as an unsolved question.

The Indians are described as having pursued a powerful expansion and colonial policy for centuries (*Jahrhunderte hindurch haben die Inder eine mächtige Expansions-und Kolonialpolitik getrieben*). The countries of Further India, Pegu, Kamboja, and Champa were, it is pointed out, once "colonies of Brāhmaṇical India" long before Buddhism came to these regions (p. 87).

Lüders hints at some difference between the secular and religious literature of India. He is emphatic that the history and secular literature does not in any way make India appear so alien and negative to life (*keines-*

wegs als so lebensfremd und lebensverneinend) as perhaps she might appear to be judged on the basis of religious literature alone (*wie es vielleicht nach der religiösen Literatur allein geurteilt scheinen möchte*, p. 91).

In the above is to be found the recognition of the position of the *Positive Background* (1914) as well as of the *Futurism of Young Asia* (1922). The same position has recently found another strong exponent in Helmuth von Glasenapp. Two of his papers in the *Jahrbuch der Shopenhauer-Gesellschaft* may be referred to. One is entitled "Buddhas Stellung zur Kultur" (Buddha's Attitude Towards Culture), 1934, and the other "Lebensbejahung und Lebensverneinung bei den indischen Denkern" (Life-affirming and Life-denying in Indian Thinkers), 1935. The second has arisen out of a criticism of Albert Schweitzer's *Die Weltanschauung der indischen Denker* (Munich 1935), in which the conventional idea of the Orientalists is represented in the most extreme manner, namely, that the "world-view" of the Indian thinkers is the "Nay" to or denial and negation of life and is entirely different from that of the Westerns which is alleged to consist in the "Yea" to or affirmation of world and life.

Von Glasenapp's review of Schweitzer's book is both critical and constructive. In the first place, he refers to the fact that during the first 1500 years of Christianity the world-denying (*weltverneinenden*) tendencies are strongly in evidence. During the Renaissance and the Reformation also they are described as important especially in Roman and Greek Christendom. He doubts if it is possible to take these negative features as foreign to the real nature of Christianity.

Then he goes over to the chief thesis. And in this connection he examines the alleged life-denying ideas of the Indians in their working on practical life. To him it is clear that in this respect an essential difference between the "life-denying Indians" and the "life-affirming Westerns" does not exist (*ein wesentlicher Unterschied nicht besteht*). He points to the fact that the political and cultural life of the country was not unfavourably influenced by the life-denying world-view. It is, for instance, established by him that it was just during the period of the unlimited influence of Brāhmaṇism, Buddhism and Jainism that political power, cultural efflorescence and colonial expansion were at their height. He makes it a point also to bring out the fact that Buddha, Śaṅkara and other saints were described by the Indians as men who *eine grosse Aktivität entfalteten* (developed a great activity) and who exhibited "considerable understanding for the most varied spheres of life."

The fundamental standpoint of von Glasenapp is to be found in his remark that the life-denying feature is by no means so prominent (*tritt keineswegs so hervor*) in Indian spiritual life as one should conclude from the extracts in Schweitzer's book. His logic is as follows. Should anybody, says he, use the works of the mystics and the literature of the monastic orders exclusively in order to exhibit the world-view of the Christian thinkers, the report would with justice be objected to as giving a whole picture which does not correspond to the factual conditions (*die nicht den tatsächlichen Verhältnissen entspricht*). The ascetic writings in India also can give but a fraction (*nur einen Bruchteil*) of her literature. Even the Buddhist literature which was produced in the main

to serve the purposes of monks has references to works in which the world-denying tendency is either not at all or very little represented. According to Indian view *Erlösung* (*mokṣa*, salvation) is only one of the four objectives of human life, the other three being love (*kāma*), possession (*artha*), and discharge of duties (*dharma*). A survey of Indian world-view which should lay a claim to comprehensiveness must therefore have to exhibit also those works of Indian poets and thinkers in which the *Daseinsfreude* (joy of life), *Tatendurst* (thirst for action), *heroischer Sinn* (heroic sense), *Lebensklugheit* (worldly wisdom) and *werktätige Nächstenliebe* (practical philanthropy) have found expression. The epics, the *Purāṇas*, the *Jātakas* and the poetic maxims (e.g. in Böhtlingk's German collection) furnish many illustrations of these aspects. Finallly, von Glasenapp refers to the existence of "a whole series of philosophical systems" in India from which ascetic thought lies remote. The *Liṅga* cult, Śāktaism, and Kriṣṇa-worship with its fertility-rites point in the clearest manner to the fact that a one-sided life-denial never found a place in the sphere of religious belief also.

In reality, therefore, life-denying and life-affirming are appraised as having existed alongside of each other in India. And these two elements have been taken as constituting an "organic unity" in Indian world-view, and this is said to serve as much the metaphysical requirements as the practical life of the Indian people. Von Glasenapp's methods of analysis and conclusions find themselves in essential agreement with those of the present author developed between 1910 and 1922.

Secularization of Hindu Politics in Masson-Oursel and Berr

The "new indology" is in evidence to a certain extent in French scholarship also. *L'Inde Antique et la Civilisation Indienne* (Paris 1933) is the work of several authors headed by Paul Masson-Oursel, who contributes nearly half the material. The general editor, Henri Berr, embodies the new spirit when he declares in the *avant-propos* that Indian character has been defined in a very incomplete manner (*d'une facon très incomplète*). "The great mass of the peoples of India," says he, "is represented as plunged in dream or mystical contemplation, as lost in the hope and anticipation of *nirvāṇa*. People exaggerate their detachment from the worldly reality (*On exagère leur détachement de la realité terrestre*)." He suggests that it is necessary to distinguish the milieux and the epochs of such phenomenon (p. xii).

According to Masson-Oursel, scholars ignore much the fact that India was one of the greatest maritime and colonising powers of the past (*une des plus grandes puissances maritimes et colonisatrices du passé*). The extension of Indianism is described as a "mighty radiance" (*puissant rayonnement*), of which the area extended from Madagascar to Tonkin (pp. 128-129).

The emancipation of the political power from that of the priests has been well recognised by him. The state in India has thus been understood to be untheocratic "in spite of the assertions to the contrary in the sacerdotal literature". *Rien ne domine le pouvoir royal* (Nothing dominates the royal power), as he quotes the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. The secular character of the Hindu state he

discovers in the very science which governs it, namely, *Arthaśāstra*. Kauṭalya's treatise, says he, proceeds from an entirely lay inspiration (*procède d'une inspiration toute laïque*). Masson-Oursel is convinced that the Brāhmaṇas did not possess in the society the power which their literature leads us to suppose. The politics, not theoretical but concrete, depended on the authority of the Kṣatriyas and on the infinitely diverse circumstances rather than on the Brāhmaṇic ideals, says he. In spite of the monopoly of *dharma* by the Brāhmaṇas the Kṣatriyas considered themselves to be the organizers of justice no less than the wielders of force, and that is why, in his view, the "pretentions of the priest remained more speculative than operative" (pp. 99-101).

Leaving the question about the relations between *dharma* and *artha*, *dharmaśāstra* and *arthaśāstra*, Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas open, we notice at any rate that Masson-Oursel has caught the real spirit of Hindu states, namely, that they were at bottom conducted by *motifs utilitaires*. The "positivism" or non-religious and secular character of Hindu politics has been grasped by him in a distinct manner.

The position is summarized by Berr as follows. The power of the Brāhmaṇas was restrained by varied circumstances which served to furnish the nobility and the military element with considerable importance and sometime preponderance. An ample evolution of politics was consummated always on account of real necessities, namely, the need for external or internal defence. The situation was rather that of a gendarmerie than of anarchy. In spite of all, even the tendency towards unification of groups, so powerful elsewhere, was not

non-existent in India. Royalty was established by the nobles and it "appeared as an institution entirely human and did not claim any divine right." To the *fait accompli* of political power the Brāhmaṇas were forced to accord their religious consecration (pp. xi-xii).

The French publication is, however, not completely emancipated from the traditional *indianisme*. By the side of positivism and rational as well as realistic interpretation of Hindu economic and political activities we come across ultra-idealistic statements to which conventional indology is used.

India has been described by Masson-Oursel as the *terre par excellence de l'ascetisme* (the land specific of asceticism), which seeks to enrich the spiritual life by detaching the individual from his *milieu*. And this country is alleged to owe its complex originality to its separation from the rest of the planet (p. 1). These two statements with which the work begins contradict some of the more important conclusions established by the author himself, as we have seen above, namely, the "utilitarian motives", devotion to *artha* etc. as well as the *extension de l'indianité* from Madagascar to Tonkin.

Another statement is worded as follows:

"It is not before our own times that India becomes a *patrie* (fatherland) to her own children" (p. 116). One remembers Sénart's expression already quoted.

We are told, further, that "no unity was ever established in the Indian *milieu* which would be comparable not only to our modern states but to our ancient cities" (p. 98).

Such passsages indicate that the bearings of positivism on Indian culture-history and the data of compara-

tive methodology have not been fully assimilated as yet. It is interesting, however, to observe that in Berr's preface the "individuality" of India is *non-politique mais psychologique*, i.e., not to be found in politics but in psychology (p. v). We see, therefore, that in any case the political aspects of Hindu civilization have been lifted out of their splendid isolation. The recognition of India's affinities with the rest of the world in political genius by the French scholars of today constitutes undoubtedly an important event in the reconstruction of Hindu positivism.

Survivals of Traditional Indology

These instances of the recognition of the positive background of Hindu culture by indologists should not lead one to surmise that *orientalisme* or indology has been finally emancipated from the sway of monistic, one-sided and unscientific approaches or conclusions. Traditional Orientalism has not yet been subverted but is still quite in evidence. Works like Betty Heimann's *Studien zur Eigenart indischen Denkens* (Tübingen 1930) and Albert Schweitzer's *Die Weltanschauung der indischen Denker* (Munich 1935) are contemporary specimens of conventional indology such as was popular in the nineteenth century. These survivals are not few and far between.

Another work which, like these two, is the farthest removed from the positive data of Hindu culture is *Die indoarische Gesellschaftsordnung* (Tübingen 1935) of Alfred Geiger. At the very outset Geiger postulates a number of *Grundzüge* or fundamental principles in regard

to the *indisches Volkstum* (Indian people) and its *Gesellschaftsordnung* (societal order). And just those *Quellen,* sources or authorities are *vornehmlich* (preferentially) selected by him which belong to or illustrate the "peaks of Indian history as signalized by those principles." The author's study thus becomes not an objective or historical analysis of what the *indisches Volkstum* (Indian people) factually was and has grown to be but a statement of what he considers to be the basic features of Indian civilization, and a rejection of all those facts, data or principles which do not suit his own postulates. He wants to pass off his own ideas about India as India itself and look for only those evidences from Indian literature which serve to prove his point. And this he does,—not unconsciously like many other indologists and sociologists but quite deliberately and in a planful manner with all the honesty of a scientific researcher.

In his postulates the spirit of India is not to be found in the *Sāṅkhya Kārikā* and the *Yoga-sūtra* which throw light on Indian dualism, the *Tripiṭaka* which illustrates older Buddhism, the Jaina texts, the *Mahāyāna-sūtras* of later Buddhism, the work of Rāmānuja, Madhva, and Vallabha, i.e., the opponents of Śaṅkara's Vedantism, as well as in the *Tantra* literature of Śaivaism. All these sources are of importance to him only in so far as they furnish an index to the "deviations" from what he considers to be the *Geist* or spirit of India (p. 6).

"Still more worthless for our purposes" (*noch weiter zurück an Bedeutung*) have been appraised the numerous texts which lie between the tendencies and, although very objective, exhibit but mixtures, as he says. Among

such works "still more worthless for our purposes" are to be found the Brāhmaṇical stories and fable-collections (*Purāṇas, Hitopadeśa, Panchatantra*) and their Buddhist counterparts (the *Jātakas*) and the political science of Kauṭalya (p. 7).

It is interesting to observe that Hillebrandt's *Altindische Politik* (Jena 1923) describes Indian social, civic, and political life just on the strength of those authorities which have been rejected by Geiger as "*noch weiter zurück an Bedeutung für unsere Zwecke.*" Naturally, therefore, Geiger has not been able to rise up to the "new indology" which was accepted and promoted, among others, by Hillebrandt. Not less interesting is the fact that Hillebrandt's work was published in the *Herdflamme* Series edited by the Austrian sociologist, Othmar Spann, the same scholar, whose general views have played an important rôle in the thesis of Geiger. Needless to observe that the methodology of Geiger, as manifest in his selections and rejections,—is the very butt of scientific and philosophical criticism as furnished by the *Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* and the *Futurism of Young Asia*.

CHAPTER II.

HINDU CULTURE AND SOCIOLOGY IN ŚUKRANITI

The Greek philosopher Plato was for some time tutor to a king of Syracuse in Sicily. Machiavelli, the Florentine deplomat, who has bequeathed his name to a school of politicians, was the author of a work that proved to be the Bible of kings and princes in mediaeval Italy and Europe. The *Schoolmaster* of Roger Ascham was written for the princesses of an English royal family.[1] The sage Śukrāchāryya, or at any rate, his *nom de plume*, belongs to the same gallery of world's *Rājagurus* or royal tutors. And his *Nītiśāstra* or 'Treatise on Morals' is dogmatically asserted to be the sole authoritative text book on political science that should be used by Hindu kings and statesmen (IV, vii, lines 851-856). This opinion of Śukrāchāryya about the position of *Nītiśāstra* has been referred to by Kāmandaka also (II. 5) as follows: "According to the school of Uśanas (Śukra) there is only one division of learning, namely, *Daṇḍanīti* and the origin of all kinds of learning lies in this one." It would, therefore, be interesting to find out for which Hindu Court or Courts this manual was intended, or which may be said to have supplied data for the rules and generalisations embodied in it.

1 B. K. Sarkar: *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922) pp. 163-166.

Nitiśāstra as Social Science

The scope of a *Nītiśāstra* is more or less like that of a *Dharma-sūtra* or *Dharma-śāstra*, one of three divisions of *Kalpa-sūtra*, which is one of the six *Vedāṅgas* or auxiliaries to the Vedas. The province and relative position of *Dharma-sūtra* in Sanskrit literature are thus described by Oldenberg :[2] "The frame within which the exposition of the *Dharma-sūtras* is enclosed is an essentially broader one than in the case of the *Grihya-sūtras*. * * * The same phenomenon may also be observed in Buddhist *Vināya* literature, where the exposition of the life of the community was at first given only in connection with the explanation of the list of sins (*Pātimokkha*). * * * It was not till later that a more comprehensive exposition, touching all the sides of the life of the community, was attempted. * * * The *Grihya-sūtras* begin to treat of the events of the daily life of the household, * * * confine themselves principally to the ritual or sacrificial side of household life, as is natural owing to their connexion with the older ritualistic literature (*Śrauta-sūtra*). Then the *Dharma-sūtras* take an important step further; their purpose is to describe the whole of the rites and customs which prevail in private, civil and public life. They naturally among other things touch upon the ceremonies treated in the *Grihyasūtras*, but they generally merely mention them and discuss the question of law and custom which are

2 Introduction to the *Grihyasūtras* of Gobhila, Hiraṇyakeśin etc. in the *Sacred Books of the East Series* XXXIII-IV; B. K. Sarkar : Die Struktur des Volkes in der sozialwissenschaftlichen Lehre der Schukranti in the *Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie* (Cologne, 1932, Jahrgang XI, Heft I).

connected with them, without undertaking to go into the technical ordinances as to the ways in which these ceremonies are to be performed."

The Four Branches of Human Science in Hindu Thought

Man as an individual and in relation to Nature, other men, society, economy, law, state etc. was thus the subject matter of a vast literature of *śāstras* or *vidyās*, each of which specialized itself in one or other of these social fields. To use old Hindu categories, these specialized sociological studies may be classified in the following manner:

I. Worldly and secular interests of man as an individual and as a member of the society giving rise to certain social *vidyās*:

1. *Kama-śāstra*,[3] dealing with the purely physical and physiological as well as sexological aspects or factors of the human personality.

2. Comprehensive social, political, economic, religious and ethical aspects or factors of the human personality dealt with in certain groups of *vidyās*:

(*a*) *Dharma-śāstra*, the discipline which deals with duties and *mores*.

(*b*) *Artha-śāstra*, the discipline which deals with finance, constitution, civics, army etc.

Dharma-śāstra is more encyclopaedic and all-embracing than *Artha-śāstra* while the latter is more

3 The words *Kāmaśāstra*, *Dharmaśāstra*, *Arthaśastra* and *Mokṣa-śāstra* have been used here without reference to the titles of books such as are to be found in Sanskrit literature but simply as philosophical categories.

constitutional and economic in its make-up. One can also say within certain limitations that "private law" is in the main the topic of the former whereas the latter deals in the main with the "public law".

II. Other-worldly, non-secular and transcendental interests of man and society,—giving rise to certain metaphysical and ethical *vidyās*. The disciplines consecrated to these unmaterial or transcendental aspects and factors of the human personality,—the problems of salvation,—are known as *Mokṣa-śāstra*.

Nitiśāstra is in its scope identical with *Arthaśāstra* and as such covers many of the topics dealt with in *Dharmaśāstra*. In the *milieu* of *Śukranīti* we have to move about with the categories chiefly of *Dharma* and *Artha*, i.e. the duties and desirables of man as an individual and in society.

It is clear, therefore, that in every history of Hindu philosophy, rightly investigated, there should be chapters devoted to *Arthaśāstra*, *Nitiśāstra* or the like. To deal with Hindu philosophical categories without touching upon *Artha*, i.e., the conception of property, law, state, citizenship etc. would be as incomplete, partial and therefore misleading as to write on the history of Greek philosophy without touching upon the *Republic* of Plato or the *Politics* of Aristotle.[4]

4 The chapter on "Speculations in the Medical Schools" in S. N. Das Gupta's *History of Indian Philosophy* Vol. II, (Cambridge 1932) pp. 272-436 is to be appreciated as being in the right place. A similar chapter on the socio-economic relations, legal ideas and ethico-political interests of man is also a desideratum in a comprehensive treatise dealing with Hindu philosophical systems.

Universality and Relativity of Śukranīti

Be this as it may, it is possible to doubt at the outset if the class of writings called *Dharmaśāstras, Arthaśāstras,* and *Nītiśāstras* to which *Śukranīti* belongs (1) were the work of a single individual or school, and (2) were ever the Gazetteers designed to embody the actual state of things, or Statute-Books meant for the guidance of the people and rulers, of any particular epoch or region. It may be presumed that like Plato's *Republic* and *Laws,* More's *Utopia,* and Harrington's *Oceana, Śukranīti* is the product of the same inspiration that has lain at the bottom of all efforts to portray the ideal constitution of "nowhere", describing things 'that never were on sea or land' in the history of the world's speculative literature. Thus about *Manu Saṁhitā,* Elphinstone remarks in his *History of India* (1889, p. 12): "We must remember that a code is never the work of a single age, some of the earliest and rudest laws being preserved and incorporated with the improvements of the most enlightened times. * * Even if the whole code referred to one period it would not show the real state of manners. Its injunctions are drawn from the model to which it is wished to raise the community, and prohibitions from the worst state of crime which it was possible to apprehend. * * * Though early adopted as an unquestionable authority for the law, I should scarcely venture to regard it as a code drawn up for the regulation of a particular state under the sanction of a government. It seems rather to be the work of a learned man, designed to set forth his ideas of a perfect commonwealth under Hindu institutions."

According to this view it may be inappropriate to trace the production of *Śukranīti* to the patronage

or influence of any of the numerous polities and royal courts in Hindu India. But even the most idealistic literature is not absolutely independent of age and clime. The time-spirit and place-spirit are too powerful to be totally ignored by human genius even if it should consciously attempt this. We may ignore in this connection the monistic "regionalism" or geographical "interpretation" of history as developed by Demolins, who carried to extreme lengths the somewhat radical ideas of Le Play. But there is no difficulty in accepting the more reasonable views of Brunhes as developed in *La Géographie Humaine* or of Worms in *La Sociologie*[5] in regard to the influence of place on man's activities. Thurnwald's *Die Gestaltung der Wirtschaftsentwicklung aus ihren Anfängen heraus* also can be depended upon as a sober treatment of the place-factor in economic and other human achievements. The social environment and physical surroundings,—both the aspects of the great envelope of man,—cannot but leave their marks upon his intellectual consciousness and literary activities of any considerable magnitude.

Leaving aside for the present, therefore, the most vexed of all questions in Indian history, the determination of the personality, identity and individuality of our author, we propose to investigate the physical and social influences that are likely to have contributed to the *Gestalt* or form of *Śukranīti*, as available from a study of the data furnished by it. This investigation is really a study of

5 R. Worms: *La Sociologie* (Paris 1926), pp. 66-67. A generally acceptable position in regard to the influence of region is that of C. Vallaux: *Le Sol et l'état* (Paris 1911).

the education received by our author himself, and of the literature drawn upon by him in the preparation of his work, in one word, a presentation of the whole culture embodied in, and pre-supposed by, *Śukranīti*. A study of this culture and the "relativity" of *Śukranīti* to this *milieu* of physical and social forces and influences, would, however, incidentally furnish some of the evidences pointing to the age and *locale* of the work.

The relativity of *Śukranīti* to the social influences may be easily presumed like that of *Manu Saṅhitā as* has been done by Elphinstone. "It is evident that it incorporates the existing laws', says he, "and any alterations it may have introduced with a view to bring them up to its preconceived standard of perfection, must still have been drawn from the opinions which prevailed when it was written." So also the influence of physical and geographical factors on the work, and consequently its "relativity" to a particular region of the earth's surface cannot be missed.

CHAPTER III.

Landmarks in the History of Hindu Political Development

Even superficial students of *Śukranīti* do not fail to perceive that the executive system, judiciary, military administration as well as other incidents of social, economic and political life described in it indicate a high degree of development, and are adapted not to simple village-republics and tribal commonwealths or city-states that we meet with in certain periods of Indian and European history, but are the outcome of the complex requirements of 'country'-states or Imperial organisations.

While trying to locate *Śukranīti* in one or other of the Indian *milieux* in regard to space or time it is necessary to call attention to certain inevitable complications and difficulties. The very category, "India", presents a number of complexities which it should not be proper to ignore.

Greater India Comprised in the Geography of Hindu Culture

The contributions of the Hindu mind to political, economic and other sociological and indeed the most diverse sciences are to be found not only within the geographical boundaries of India as known today but in regions far beyond these limits.

In a sense the geography of creative India is as wide as Asia itself. It is the result of *l'aptitude colonisatrice, la faculté pour l'homme de sortir de ses frontières pour aller séjourner*, the colonizing aptitude, the capacity of man to move out of his frontiers in order to live abroad, as Emile Lasbax would say.[1] This indeed constitutes the celebrated *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VII, 15) cult of *charaiveti* (march on). The cultural expansion of India outside the Indian frontiers both by land and sea, i.e., the establishment of "Greater India"[2] was accomplished by two processes of "social metabolism." First, there was the intellectual conquest of non-Indian regions by Indian *vidyās* and *ḳalās*, arts and sciences, involving the Indianization or Hinduizing of the most diverse races of men from one end of Asia to the other. In the second place, non-Indian races (the Barbars, Greeks, Scythians, Parthians, Yuechis, Huns,

1 *La Cité Humaine* (Paris 1927), Vol. II. pp. 219-220.

2 The concept of Greater India as a factor in world-culture was developed at length in the study circles of the Dawn Society, Calcutta, established by Satis Chandra Mukerjee in 1902, and is a special feature of the following works:

R. K. Mookerji: *History of Indian Shipping* (London 1911), which is based to a certain extent on the author's articles published in the *Dawn Society's Magazine* (Calcutta, 1906-9).

B. K. Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916), based on personal investigations in China, "The Influence of India in Modern Western Civilization" (*Journal of Race Development*, Clark University, U.S.A. July 1918), *The Futurism of Young Asia* (Berlin 1922), chapter on "International India", *The A. B. C. of Chinese Civilization* (Calcutta 1923, in Bengali).

Subsequent publications are noted below:—P. C. Bagchi: *India and China* (Calcutta, 1927), a pamphlet, R. C. Majumdar: *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*, Vol. I. *Champa* (Lahore 1927), and "Indo-Javanese Literature" (*Indian Culture*, Calcutta, July 1934); B. R. Chatterjee: *India and Java* (Calcutta, second edition 1933; P. N. Bose:

Turks, Tartars and others) with or without affinity to the races indigenous to India were during certain periods politically the masters of certain Indian regions and races.[3] The political boundaries of Indian states were therefore often to be found in extra-Indian territories (Afghanistan, Central Asia, Tibet). In the first instance, the establishment of Greater India implied nothing but the infiltration

Indian Colony of Siam (Lahore 1929); H. B. Sarkar: *Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali* (Calcutta 1934). *The Journal of the Greater India Society* (Calcutta), est, 1934, is likewise to be consulted.

See also L. Finot: "Hindu Kingdoms in Indo-China" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta), December 1925; Sylvain Lévi: *L'Inde et le Monde* (Paris 1927); G. Tucci: *Indo-Tibetica* (Rome) Vol. I. (1932), Vol. II. (1933); Tucci and Gherst: *Cronaca della Missione Scientifica Tucci nel Tibet Occidentale* (Rome 1934). B. K. Sarkar's English summary of these Italian works is to be seen in the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta), June 1934 and 1935. For Central Asia see M. A. Stein: *Ancient Khotan* (London 1907), *Ruins of Desert Cathay* (London 1912) and for Moslem Asia see Sachau: *Alberuni's India* (London 1910).

3 D. R. Bhandarkar: "Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population" in the *Indian Antiquary* 1910; E. J. Rapson: *Ancient India* (Cambridge 1914) and chapters XXII-XXIII of *The Cambridge History of India* (1922); B. K. Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916); chapters on the "Tartarisation of Aryanized Dravidians" and "Caste System and Military History"; J. Marshall: *A Guide to Taxila* (1921); E. Meyer: "*Blüte und Niedergang des Hellenismus* (Leipzig 1925): S. Lévi: "Pre-Aryen et Pre-Dravidien" (*Journal Asiatique*, Paris 1923), Eng. transl. by P. C. Bagchi (Calcutta 1929); N. R. Ray: "Some Additional Notes on Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, December 1928; A. B. Keith: *A History of Sanskrit Literature* (London 1928); R. P. Chanda: "The Indus Valley in the Vedic Period" *Memoir of the Archæological Survey of India*, No. 27); R. Grousset: *Historie de l'Extrême-Orient* (Paris 1929); H. C. Ray: *Dynastic History of Northern India* (Calcutta 1932), Vol. I., pp. 274, 309, 311, 569 (Tibet in the Ganges Valley); S. K. Chakravarti: "The Persian and Greek Coins and their Imitations in Ancient India" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta, March 1934); B. N. Dutt: "Races of India" (*Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, 1935).

of Hindu ideas, ideals, institutions and *mores* among politically sovereign races, tribes or nations. And in the second instance, we have but Indian illustrations of "captive Greece capturing Rome"; for the foreign races, although politically ruling, became more or less assimilated to the Indian modes of life and thought and served but to promote the Greater India movement of the Hindu cultural agencies.

A fact of special importance bearing on the state-systems, in India as in Europe, cannot be over-looked in the present context. We have to remember that *Kleinstaaterei* or the system of territorially and demographically petty states is an eternal fact of history both in the East and the West.[4] While thinking of treatises like *Śukranīti* it would not be proper to orient oneself exclusively to the *milieu* of vast Empires and Kingdoms. The rôle of lesser states in the making of political institutions, political theories, and political treatises is not to be belittled.

Cultural Developments down to the Mohenjo Daro Complex

A survey of the epochs of technocracy in its wide sense as well as of culture-history comprising group-life in all its social relations and forms would place India in the following perspective in so far as what may be called the "ancient" period (*c.* 5000-600 B.C.) is concerned:

4 For the place of small states in history see Bury: *History of the Later Roman Empire* (London 1889), Freeman: *Historical Geography of Europe* (London 1903) and the volumes of *Cambridge Mediaeval History*.

A. First Stage: c. 5000-2500 B.C.
   1. Assyro-Babylonian.
   2. Egyptian-Pharaonic.
   3. Dravidian-Mohenjo Daro (c. B.C. 3250-2750 B.C.?)
   4. Chinese.

The Mohenjo Daro culture[5] has not yet been adequately studied so as to yield the precise socio-anthropological links between the thoughts and institutions of Vedic India as well as those of pre-Vedic and post-Vedic ages. But already it may not be unsafe to trace the beginnings of *Dharma* and *Artha* ideologies or institutions in the *milieu* of the Mother Goddess, the Śiva-like figure, the phallus, the tree (*pipul*) worship, the Nāga, the cross-legged figure, the pictographic seals, the *Swastika*, the partially syllabic scripts etc. of the Mohenjo Daro complex.

B. Second Stage: c. 2500-600 B.C.
   1. Mycenaean-Cretan.
   2. Hebrew-Jewish.
   3. "Indo-Aryan"
      i. Vedic-Hindu.
      ii. Persian-Iranian.
      iii. Hellenic-Homeric.
   4. Chinese.

5 P. Mitra: *Prehistoric India* (Calcutta 1927), Chapter on Mohenjo Daro; S. V. Venkateswara: *Indian Culture through the Ages*, Vol. I. (London 1928) pp. 2-9; J. Marshall: *Mohenjo Daro and the Indus Civilization* (London 1931); N. N. Law: "Mohenjo Daro and the Indus Valley Civilization" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta) March 1932. J. Przyluski: "The Goddess in India and Iran" in the *I. H. Q.*, Sept. 1934; A. K. Sur: "Pre-Aryan Elements in Indian Culture" (*Calcutta*

The Vedic-Hindu Epochs

The Vedic-Hindu (*c.* 2500-600 B.C.) institutions and ideologies, especially, those of the *Atharva* and the *Brāhmaṇas*, along with the aboriginal, *Vrātya*, pre-"Aryan," non-"Aryan" and Dravidian institutions and ideologies constituted the very socioplasmic complex, so to say, out of which in the long run the *Dharma* and *Artha* literature emerged. Thus considered, some of the passages in *Śukranīti* as of other texts of political, economic and sociological thought can be traced back to these "Aryan" or "Aryo-Dravidian" foundations of Hindu civilization.

The political stories of the *Purāṇas*, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* have, among other things, the exploits of the pioneers of the period from *c* 2500 to 600 B.C. as their themes. The tradition of the Vedic *aśwamedha* (horse-killing) sacrifice was preserved in the *Mahābhārata* as elsewhere; and in the political ideas associated with this sacrifice the *Niti*, *Artha*, and *Dharma* literature served but to carry forward the messages of the *Yajurveda-Mahābhārata* complex.[6]

Review, April 1931, November and December 1932, *I. H. Q.*, March 1934). L. Renou: *Bibliographie Vedique* (Paris 1931); J. Przyluski: "The Three Factors of Vedic Culture" (*Indian Culture*, Calcutta, January 1935).

6 A. B. Keith: Chs. IV-V. (*Rig Veda*, etc) in *the Cambridge History of India* Vol. I. (1922); P.-E. Dumont: *L'Asvamedha* (Paris 1927), pp. ii, 2-4, 376. For the place of *aśwamedha* in the career of Empire-builders see the account of the Bhâra-Śivas etc. in K. P. Jayaswal: "The History of India" (150-350 A.C.) in the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* (Patna), May-June 1933. In regard to the continuity of Indian domestic and social rites and ceremonies from the most primitive times through the ages see the extensive chapter on "Vedic Ritual" in L. D. Barnett: *Antiquities of India* (London 1913).; *cf.* J. W. Hauer: *Der Vrātya* Vol. I. (Stuttgart 1927), pp. 223-240, 334-335 (The Vrātya as Aryan of the Non-Brahmanical Cult.).

It is perhaps possible to detect among the authors of Vedic cycle a knowledge of the armageddon of the *Mahābhārata* between the Kurus and the Pāṇḍus, descended, as both were, from the Bhāratas.

The date of this great battle of Kurukṣetra has been placed somewhere about 1500 B.C.[7] On this basis the approximate relative chronology of the leading races and regions in Northern India is being indicated below together with the Vedic and the Jātaka sources of information :

1150 B.C.	Parīkṣit of Kuru Land (Delhi region), a scion of the Bhāratas.	*Rig Veda* and *Atharva Veda.*
950 B.C.	Janaka of Videha (North Bihar)	*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*
950 B.C.	Ajātaśatru of Kāsī (Benares)	*Brihadāraṇyaka Upaniṣat*
650 B.C.	-550 B.G. Mahākośala of Kośala (Oudh)	*Jātaka*s
550 B.C.	Bimbisāra of Magadha (contemporary of Śakyasiṅha the Buddha)	*Mahāvaṅśa.*

7 S. N. Pradhan : *Chronology of Ancient India* (Calcutta 1927), pp. 268-269. But see H. C. Ray Chaudhuri; *Political History of Ancient India* (Calcutta 1932) pp. 19-22 24-26. The dates used in the present work differ in certain respects from those in the *Cambridge History of India* Vol. I. (1922), pp. 699-703. A comprehensive account of the Kurus, Pānchālas, Matsyas, Surasenas, Chedis, Vaśas, Avantis and Usinaras is offered in B. C. Law : *Ancient Mid-Indian Tribes* Vol. I. (Calcutta 1924). See also the continuation in his *Ancient Indian Tribes* Vol. II. (London 1934). For the socio-political conditions of Northern India on the eve of the advent of Śākya the Buddha see the five chapters in N. Dutt : *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism* (London 1925), pp. 82-194.

These pioneering races and regions are to a certain extent the races and regions of *Purāṇa, Mahābhārata,* and *Rāmāyaṇa* fame also. It is in and about the activities of the group-life of these regions and races, i.e., about their "social metabolism" of all forms and orders, that some of the political, economic and social institutions and ideals of the *Purāṇas* and the Epics were developed.

The Bhāratas, the race that has given the title to the great epic, the *Mahābhārata,* were some of the heroes of the *Rig-Veda.* Some of the most prominent characters in the Epic, e.g., Sāntanu, Parikṣit, Janamejaya, Vaśiṣṭha, Viśvāmitra and others are also Vedic, being connected with Bharata, the founder of the Bhāratas. The region Kuru or the race inhabiting the Kuru Land, which is the chief theatre of Epic activities, was likewise a Vedic region or race.

The heroes of the epic *Rāmāyaṇa* as well as of some of the *Purāṇas* like the *Vāyu Purāṇa* were derived in name at any rate from the Rigvedic tradition. Such names as Ikṣvāku, Daśaratha, Rāma, Hariśchandra etc. were known to the authors of the Vedic cycle.

As the *Purāṇas* and the *Mahābhārata* as well as the *Rāmāyaṇa* have plenty of passages in common with the *Nīti-śāstras,* the Vedic ancestry of some of the ideas of this *Śāstra* literature is automatically assured. The Vedic atmosphere, be it understood carefully, is not however to be seen in the whole treatises of *Dharma, Artha* or *Nīti* but in certain passages only. It is not to be assumed, moreover, that the famous kings of the Vedic tradition were identical with those of the non-Vedic, extra-Vedic or post-Vedic tradition, or that

the Vedic stories were reproduced *in tote* in the subsequent literature.[8]

While dealing with the Mohenjo Daro and the Vedic cultures it is interesting to observe that the importance of the *Purāṇas* in "pre-historic" archæology is being stressed in certain quarters. We are being told that the *Purāṇas* are but histories with dates and details, and record an uninterrupted account of more than six thousand years of India's distant past.[9] The situation is not clear by any means. But the claims that are being advanced in favour of the *Purāṇas* do not fail to throw some light on the positivism of the early founders of Hindu culture.

There are various *Purāṇas* and though, in the main, they do not vary in the accounts of the past, they are characteristically different from one another. Each *Purāṇa* has its own hero and its own god to be worshipped by the masses and its own mode of religious practice to propagate. The *Skanda* is a *Śaiva Purāṇa* and its hero is Rāmachandra whose kingly qualities are almost unsurpassed even to the present day.

8 F. E. Pargiter: *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* (London 1922) pp. 37-43, 52-57, 325-327; E. W. Hopkins: *The Great Epic of India* (New Haven 1920), pp. 2-6, 17-22, 60-65, 368, 386; H. C. Ray Chaudhuri: *Political History of India* (Calcutta 1932) pp. 9, 16-18, 25, 49, 71-73, 81-82, 109-111.

M. Winternitz: *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I. (Calcutta 1927), pp. 317-320, 389-396, 405-407, 422-424, 470-475 (*Mahābhārata*); L. von Schröder: *Indiens Literatur und Cultur* (Leipzig 1887), pp. 34-36; See the chapters on "Atharvanic Influences" and "The Draupadi Saga" in N. N. Ghose: *Indo-Aryan Literature and Culture* (Calcutta 1934); cf. H. C. Chakladar: "Eastern India and Āryāvarta" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta March 1928).

9 Report of a lecture at the Bangīya Sāhitya Pariṣat, Calcutta, on 21 September, 1935 delivered by G. S. Bose, author of *Purāṇa-Praveśa* (Calcutta 1934).

In recent *Purāṇa*-scholarship Rāma and his ancestors are being treated as no mythological figures, and it is said that his date can be ascertained with accuracy from Purāṇic information. Rāma is taken to have flourished about 2124 B.C. He was an exile for fourteen years, returned to Ayodhyā with Sītā when he was forty-two, ruled for eleven years and died when he was only fifty-three. He was a great warrior, but he was a greater ruler and the brief eleven years of his reign were marked by constant progress.

Rāmachandra once went on pilgrimage to a religious site called *Dharmāraṇya*. This *Dharmāraṇya* was a district of great antiquity. The flourishing country about *Dharmāraṇya* had been devastated many times since its foundation by Dharma early in the *Tretā Yuga*, i.e., about 3800 B.C. When Rāmachandra went to visit the place he found that it had been depopulated and devastated by an Asura raider who, as a monument of victory, had placed an iron pillar thereabout. The Asura came to be known as *Lohāsura* or the "Iron Demon."

The interesting and apparently fantastic reconstruction of the biography of Rāma and the history of his civic and social exploits may be described in the following manner.

Rāma is said to have re-established this ancient province and renamed it as *Satya Mandir*. He founded cities, villages and temples on ancient sites. He made a gift of numerous villages in this district to learned *Brāhmaṇas*. This grant was inscribed on a copper-plate and an account of the inscription containing names of the villages granted by Rāma to the *Brāhmaṇas* has been preserved in

the *Purāṇas*. This copper-plate itself was in existence even to the time of Yudhiṣṭhira (1416 B.C.). Later on, this inscribed copper-plate as well as all traces of the iron pillar seemed to have been lost. Thanks to the *Purāṇas*, we are told, even at the present day it is possible to identify quite a number of the villages granted by Rāmachandra to the learned Brāhmaṇas. The modern districts of Kheri, Sitapur, Gonda, Bahraich, Rampur, Budaon and Bareilly in the United Provinces are said to present the site of *Dharmāraṇya* as reclaimed by Rāmachandra. The present towns of Sitapur, Bareilly, Gonda, Chandan, Chowky, Dudhwa, Gola and Misrikh are some of the sites mentioned in the copper-plate grant. The location of the iron pillar is not certain. Very likely it stood in the village known at the present time as Lohakham in the Rampur State. The area corresponding to *Dharmāraṇya* is full of ancient mounds. It is within this area that the Banskhera copper-plate grant of Harṣavardhana containing the name of a place Vardhamāna was discovered. The name Vardhamāna appears in the *Purāṇas*. In Rāmachandra's time and even earlier the district contained numerous sites of Sun-worship, remnants of which are still to be found. Sun-worship did not come to India from Persia. The Sun represents one of Rāma's ancestors,—named Vivaswan; and the Brāhmaṇas who used to act as priests were known as Mehi Brāhmaṇas from the name of the district Moherak which was another name of *Dharmāraṇya*.

There is reason to believe, says this rather romantic account, that the ancient site of Set Malot in the Gonda District is the place where Rāma built his *Satya Mandir*.

The *Purāṇas* say that the temple was of bricks. At later periods Jaina and Buddhistic shrines grew up round about the ancient Hindu temples. The *Purāṇas* also mention this. However sceptical we be in regard to the foregoing reconstruction of Rāma's biography, we may concede that a thorough excavation of the mounds and sites located in accordance with the *Purāṇic* descriptions is likely to reveal ancient Hindu relics.

Hindu Republics

At this stage it is desirable to be acquainted with the non-king *gaṇa* polities of the Hindus. These republican states have to be placed in three periods[10]:

1. *c.* B.C. 600-450: The republican clans of the *Jātaka* literature.
2. *c.* B.C. 350-300: The republics encountered by Alexander.
3. *c.* 150-350 A.C.: The survivals of the previous republican clan-states between the fall of the Maurya and the rise of the Gupta Empire.

Maurya India

We may now commence our survey of the more well-known among the leading royal or imperial polities

10 B. K. Sarkar: *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922) pp. 139-150; B. C. Law: *Kshatriya Tribes of Ancient India* (Calcutta 1923); De la Vallée Poussin: *Indo-Européens et Indo-Iraniens*: *L'Inde jusque vers 300 av. J. C.* (Paris 1924), *L'Inde aux Temps des Mauryas et des Barbares, Grecs, Scythes, Parthes et Yuehtchis* (Paris 1930) pp. 12-16, 32, 34. What may be described as a "geo-political" study of India during this period is furnished in N. Dutt: *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism* (Calcutta 1925). See also B. C. Sen: "Studies in the Buddhist Jatakas" (*Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, Vol. XX., 1930).

of the Hindus about which precise historical dates and factual details are available. The first in chronological order happens also to be the most extensive of the Hindu Empire-systems. This was the Maurya Empire[11] (B.C. 322-185). It embraced modern Afghanistan, the whole of Upper India, the Deccan and Southern India excluding, however, the extreme south (Chola, Pāṇḍya, Kerala, Satyaputra and Ceylon).

Indian spirit has been characterized by Emile Sénart as follows: "A general consideration strikes me. In the field of speculation his natural mysticism sways the Hindu spirit, the concatenation of formulæ sustains it and the intoxication of abstractions stimulates it. But in every other domain it is little creative (*en tout autre domaine il est peu créateur*)."

It is interesting to find, therefore, that De la Vallée Poussin,[12] who considers the above remarks of Sénart as worthy of meditation, has the following in connection with the Maurya administration. "The Hindu genius," says he, "which we often consider as essentially mystical and fantastic, revealed in all the fields of social, political and economic life incontestable gifts of organization.

11 D. R. Bhandarkar: *Asoka* (Calcutta 1925), R. K. Mookerji: *Asoka* (London 1927), De la Vallée Poussin: *L'Inde aux temps des Barbares, Grecs, Scythes, Parthes et Yuetchis* (Paris 1930), section on *jugements sur Asoka* pp. 114-119. S. S. Desikar: "The Mauryan Invasion of Tamilakam" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Calcutta, March 1928; E. J. Rapson: *Ancient India* (Cambridge 1914) pp. 78-79, 107-108. For Poros's war of defence against Alexander and the Kautalyan battle arrays see B. Breloer: *Alexanders Kampf gegen Poros* (Stuttgart 1933), pp. 78-82, 169-172, 191-192. See also K.N.S. Pillai: *The Chronology of the Early Tamils* (c. 50 B.C.—200 A.C.), Madras 1932, pp. 192-194.

12 *L'Inde* (Paris 1930) pp. 72. 298.

One is struck by the sagacious measures which contribute to the convenience of commerce, which assure the security of towns against robbers and fire, the police, hygiene and the fixing of prices."

De la Vallée Poussin and Foucher on the Problem of Unity

But according to him,[13] all the same, the history of India exhibits the alternatives of concentration and *émiettement* (crumbling) or disruption. "India is naturally disrupted," says he, and he quotes Foucher's *Gāndhāra*, Vol. II, as follows: "This is the law of her history,—the periodical reconstruction and disintegration of her empires. And there is not yet an example of any of them having endured for more than three hundred years."

In regard to Foucher's opinion De la Vallée Poussin makes the following observations: "But India is not amorphous. *C'est une opinion classique mais erronée* (this is a classical opinion but erroneous); because it did not know of anything but the central government, when there was one, and the village. On the contrary, India is divided into a large number of petty states of the feudal or communal type, *rājās*, and cities, units solidly constituted and sufficiently organized for defence, in normal times, against external dangers."

This explanation does not however serve to refute the "classical but erroneous opinion" such as has become stereotyped in the English-speaking world in the writings

13 *L'Inde* (Paris 1930) pp. 75-76.

of Smith, Rapson and others. The refutation has to be found in other directions. It is only necessary for the students of Indian history to arm themselves with any text-book of the historical geography of Europe as well as the figures about area and population, and watch the kaleidoscopic changes in political boundaries and therefore the ethnic constitutions of the European states. The truism will then force itself upon everybody that *émiettement* or disruption into petty states or *Kleinstaaterei* has been an eternal fact of European politics right up to our own days. The short duration of the dynasties of the Roman Empire is too well-known. The European Middle Ages exhibit dozens of Maurices by the side of one Justinian, legion of Charles the Fats by the side of one Charles the Great, and myriads of Adolfuses and Wenceslauses by the side of one Frederick II, the "wonder of the world." Students of Dante do not have to come out of Europe all the way to India in order to discover the processes of *émiettement*. A statement in Engelbert's *De Ortu et Fine Romani Imperii* should leave no doubt about Europe's record in regard to the item in question. "The Roman Empire," ran a mediæval opinion cited by him, "was and is always troubled by wars and rebellions; hardly ever were the gates of the temple of Janus shut; the greater number of Roman Emperors have died violent deaths; and the Roman Empire has been the cause rather of disorder than of peace."[14]

14 C.N.S. Woolf: *Bartolus of Sassoferato* (Cambridge 1913) p. 286. B. K. Sarkar: *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922), pp. 17, 21-26.

Haushofer and Wüst on the Unreality of Higher Units

The facts of Hindu political evolution and culture-history like those of the historic races in the diverse regions of the world should but lead to the conclusion at which the exponents of a new science, namely, *Geopolitik* (Geopolitics) have been arriving under the leadership of Karl Haushofer.[15] According to Wüst a world-view such as can actually transcend the limitations of space is impossible both as a concept and as a fact. The so-called "higher unit" which is alleged to be established by the break-up of a previous world-view of a different character through assimilation, absorption, transformation etc. is very questionable and in the long run is liable to disruption. It is impossible to emancipate the world-view from its space-limitations. The attempts to establish artificial world-languages, e.g., Esperanto, Ido, Novial, Volapuek, have not been able to advance beyond their crude beginnings. Coudenove-Kalergi's Pan-Europa movement is like the League of Nations idea a still-born phenomenon. The abolition of the Caliphate by Kamal Pasha is but the last item in an inevitable development, namely, the disappearance of Pan-Islam, unnatural as it is. By enunciating the doctrine that every world-view is by nature nothing but national or territorial although it can to a certain extent transform the space and even transcend it Wüst has exposed the philosophical bankruptcy of internationalism as a cult. It is demonstrated by other writers that neither religion nor art, nor language, nor technocracy, nor economic

15 *Raumüberwindende Mächte* (Leipzig 1934) pp. 167, 170-178, 195, 207, 230-232, 259, 272-273, 277, 340-341, 351-352.

developments, nor colonialism nor imperialism can in the last analysis lead to the genuine transcending of space or region. All the so-called international or internationalizing endeavours are essentially *raumgebunden* (space-limited and space-conditioned).

There is no mysticism or metaphysics in Haushofer's social philosophy. In the midst of all internationalizing ideologies his geopolitics teaches the world to remain awake to the one great reality of life, namely, that it is nothing but nationalism that rules mankind and that the eternal problem of today is, as our *Mahābhārata* has taught for all ages, to study the science and art of *Macht*, i.e., *śakti* or power. In geopolitics the student of Hindu societal theories will thus come across such dicta of Somadeva's *Nīti-vākyāmrita* as *na hi kulagatā kasyāpi bhūmih* (no body's territory is derived from his family) and *vīrabhogyā vasundharā* (it is by the powerful that the Earth can be enjoyed).

Finally, in the state-systems of the Hindus for over half a millennium the sociologists will have to see but a verification of the law enunciated by Jacques de Morgan in *Préhistoire Orientale* (p. 216) that history knows nothing but *précipiter les masses humaines les unes contre les autres* (hurling the human groups against one another). This is what he calls the "perpetual renewal or renovation in which history consists." The Hindu state-systems have likewise exhibited the *perpetual combat contre la mort* (eternal struggle against death) and the solicitude for *la paix dont la possession, en fin de compte, n'est reservée qu'aux justes qui sont forts* (peace, the possession of which, in the last balance-sheet is reserved only to those righteous who are strong). In

Lasbax's analysis of the new social forces in operation since the last Great War (1914-18), this struggle and this solicitude such as inspired the Hindu state-makers of all ages are today inspiring the nations of the world to remain equipped with "defensive patriotism" and with "collective health" in view of the wars that are going to break out tomorrow (*des guerres surgiront encore*).[16]

From the Āndhras and Kuṣāṇs to the Senas and Cholas[17]

It is neither necessary nor possible to enumerate all the dynasties in the diverse regions of India. We shall single out a few only,—but not unmindful of the fact that those myriads of states that are left out of the following count, whether foreign or Indianized-foreign, may have been no less important as furnishing the inspiration for the *Dharma, Artha* and *Nīti* treatises in which we are interested. The list is as follows:

1. The Empire of the Āndhras (*c.* B.C. 240-A.C. 250) in the Deccan. For a certain period their contemporaries in the North were the Indianized Scythians or Tartars, the Kuṣāṇ Emperors (A.C. 15-226).

De la Vallée Poussin has a section entitled "*Conquête de l'Inde par les Grecs*" (Conquest of India by the Greeks), referring to "*les rois grecs*" (the Greek kings).[18] About the princes of the House of Euthydeme he says "*ils font la conquête de l'Inde*" (They make the conquest

16 E. Lasbax: *La Cité Humaine* (Paris) Vol. II. (1927) pp. 352-357.

17 De la Vallée Poussin: *Dynasties et Histoire de l'Inde depuis Kanishka jusqu'aux invasions musulmanes* (Paris 1935).

18 *L'Inde* (Paris 1930) pp. 234-237.

of India). Such expressions are perhaps not more reasonable than those like "Europe" being conquered by the Persians, the Saracens, the Tartars or Mongols of Western, Central and Northern Asia, such as Asian historians have a right to use for certain periods of military contact in Eur-Asian history.[19] The "expansion of Asia," i.e. the establishment of Greater Asia in Europe was achieved by the force of Oriental arms, the "edge of Damascus blades."

The following passage from Foucher's *Gāndhāra* Vol. II, is cited by De la Vallée Poussin with approval: *"L'art de conquerir l'Inde à l'aide des Indiens ne date pas de Dupleix"* (The art of conquering India with the help of Indians does not commence with Dupleix). The reference is to the part played by Indian mercenaries in the Greek campaigns in certain areas of the Punjab. But the student of history can quote plentiful instances of Europeans being exploited by non-Europeans against Europeans. The arts of treason, treachery, internecine warfare, feuds between dynasties, cities or districts etc. are quite orthodox and traditional European commodities. In his *Histoire du commerce entre le Levant et l'Europe*[20] Depping makes it clear as to how the Ottomans were aided in the conquest of Europe by

19 For an examination of such fallacies prevalent as they are among the historians, sociologists and philosophers of Eur-America see B. K. Sarkar: "The Futurism of Young Asia" in the *International Journal of Ethics* (Chicago) July 1918, "Democratic Ideals and Republican Institutions in India" in the *American Political Science Review*, November 1918, "An English History of India" in the *Political Science Quarterly* (New York, December 1919), and *The Political Institutions and Theories of Hindus* (Leipzig 1922) pp. 19-22.

20 Vol. II. (Paris 1830), pp. 207-214, 222-224.

the pro-Islamic politics of certain Christian Europeans against other Christian Europeans.

In modern history likewise the "impossible Turk" of Western Asia has known how to keep Europe under Asian yoke with the help, diplomatic and otherwise, of Christian Europeans. Nor has Japan failed to demonstrate to the world that it is with the alliance of Christian European powers that the Asians can compel the Christian Europeans to understand the limits of their military ambitions.

II. The Bhāra Śiva and Vākāṭaka Empires (150-348 A.C.). "The history of the Imperial Hindu revival," says Kasiprasad Jayaswal, "is not to be dated in the fourth century with Samudragupta, not even with the Vākāṭakas nearly a century earlier, but with the Bhāra Śivas half a century earlier still." Again, "if there had been no Bhāra Śivas there would not have come into existence a Gupta Empire and the Gupta Vikramādityas."[21]

In Jayaswal's judgment "the real contribution of the Bhāra Śivas is the foundation of a new tradition—or rather the revival of an old tradition—the tradition of Hindu freedom and sovereignty. The national law-book, the *Mānava Dharma Śāstra,* had laid down that Āryāvarta was the God-given land of the Āryas and that the Mlechchhas must live beyond that and outside. This was their political and international birth right prescribed by

21 K. P. Jayaswal: "History of India c. 150 A.C. to 350 A.C. (Nāga-Vākāṭaka Imperial Period)" in the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* (Patna) May-June 1933, pp. 4, 7. This is to be consulted for the Gupta Empire also.

the sacred law of the land. It had to be vindicated. The tradition initiated by the Bhāra Śivas was kept up by the Vākāṭakas and was taken over by the Guptas and fully maintained by the subsequent emperors from Chandragupta Vikramāditya to Bālāditya."

III. The Gupta Empire (320-550 A.C.).

According to the German art-historian and art-critic Hermann Goetz,[22] this period was an epoch of "hyper-civilization" of the greatest splendour, what is technically known as "decadence" in contemporary literary criticism. He compares the conditions in Gupta India to those of Rome of the Caesars, as well as the Rokoko and the *fin de siècle* in eighteenth century Europe. "Its commerce and traffic were flourishing; not the aristocracy, not the peasants, not the workmen but the great merchants, the bankers and industrials were the leading classes." And its relations extended to China and Japan, to Turkestan and Rome, to Cambodia and Java. It is in this period that Hindu culture commences to become a world-power, as described in my *Chinese Religion through Hindu Eyes* (1916).

IV. The Vardhana Empire (606-647) in Upper India and the Chālukya Empire (550-753) in the Deccan.[23]

22 *The Relation between Indian Painting and Culture*, a lecture delivered at the School of Oriental Studies, London on 10th November 1924. See also Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916), Chapter on "The Beginning of Hindu Culture as World-Power;" and D. R. Bhandarkar: "Identification of the Princes and Territories in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*" (Calcutta) June 1925.

23 C. V. Vaidya: *History of Mediæval Hindu India* (Poona), Vol. I, (1921) Book I. (Harsha); R. K. Mookerji: *Harsha* (London 1926).

V. The Kingdom of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the Deccan[24] (eighth to fourteenth century A.C.).

VI. The Empire of the Cholas in Southern India beyond the Deccan (ninth to fourteenth century A.C.) "The Chola dynasty was singularly prolific in kings of more than ordinary capacity," says Smith in his Introduction to Aiyangar's *Ancient India*, "from the middle of the ninth century to the end of the reign of Kulottūṅga in A.D. 1118. It is clear from the details on record that the administration of the kingdom was 'highly systematised' from an early date. For instance, there is abundant evidence that the lands under cultivation were carefully surveyed and holdings registered at least a century before the famous Domesday record of William the Conqueror. The re-survey of 1086 was exactly contemporaneous with the English record. The Cholas were great builders; not only of cities and temples but also of irrigation works."

According to Aiyangar this is the period of high water-mark of Hindu progress all round. Modern Hinduism assumed the shape in which we find it today. The indigenous literature as well as classical Sanskrit received considerable patronage. Religion had been re-adjusted to the requirements of the masses, and administration had come to be highly organised upon surprisingly modern lines. Revivalism in religion and reinvigoration were the order of the day. The story of one of the greatest monarchs of this period, Rājendra Chola (1013-1042), the son of Rājarāja the Great, who, according to the inscrip-

24 For an account of the Pallava, Chola, Chālukya, Rāṣṭrakūṭa and other kingdoms in South India, see Aiyangar's *Ancient India*, pp. 31-38, 158-191; A. S. Altekar: *The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their Times* (Poona 1934).

tions, carried his arms successfully across Kaliṅgam, subdued Dakkana Lāṭam, Vāṅgāladeśam and the territory of Dharmapāla, fought battles on the Ganges and in Burma, and earned the proud surname of Gaṅgāikoṇḍa Chola, has been preserved in the Kanarese work, *Rāja-Śekhara-Vilāsam*. At the commencement of the 13th century the great Chola Empire was dismembered between the Yādavas of Deogiri, Kākātiyās of Orangal, Hoysālās of Dvārsamudra and other petty chieftains.

VII. The Kingdom of the Pālas and their successors, the Senas, in Bengal (eighth to twelfth centuries A.C.)[25] synchronous with the ascendancy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the Deccan and the Cholas in the South.

The period embraced by the long reigns of Dharmapāla and of his son Devapāla covers nearly a century, including the period spent in consolidating the district of Bengal by Gopāla after his *election* by the people. This was a period of the greatest activity of the Bengali people in various directions, as will appear from the monumental relics discovered and collected by the Varendra Research Society (Rajshahi). This period has another importance, as we know from the book of Lāmā Tārānātha. It is during these long regions of Dharmapāla and his son Devapāla, that an eastern school of sculpture and painting

25 For an account of the hegemony of the Pālas in Northern India as successors of Harṣavardhana to Imperial titles and pretensions see the Bengali publications of the Varendra Research Society of Rajshahi, and R. D. Banerji's *Memoir on the Pālas* (Asiatic Society of Bengal 1915). Subsequent to these pioneering researches of 1911-15 are to be mentioned H. C. Ray: *The Dynastic History of Northern India* (Calcutta) Vol. I. (1931), and R. G. Basak: *History of North Eastern India* (Calcutta 1934). See also the Bengali work by D. C. Sen: *Brihat Vaṅga* (Calcutta 1935).

was established by Dhīmān, born in Varendra, and by his son Vītapāla. The reputed minister Guravamiśra enabled his master Dharmapāla, originally a lord only of the Eastern quarter, to extend his dominions to all the quarters, over all the territories between the Himalayas on the North and the Vindhya mountains on the south between the two seas. The Lord Gauḍa (probably Devapāla)[26] suppressed the Utkalas, humbled the Hūṇas, and crushed the pride of the Lords of Drāviḍa and Gurjara.

It may be observed, in passing, that these researches of Indian scholars in the mediaeval history of Eastern and Southern India from archæological, linguistic, commercial and other standpoints have unearthed important facts of Bengali and Tamil antiquities which prominently demand recognition in the standard works on Indian culture-history. The Pālas, Senas and Cholas of mediæval India can no longer be treated as subordinate or petty princes ruling over the "smaller kingdoms" in one of the alleged periods of disintegration which, according to Smith, Foucher and others, Indian history is said to repeat after every epoch of consolidation. They must be

26 See the reading of the *Garuḍa stambha* inscription interpreted by A. K. Maitra in "The Stones of Varendra" in the *Modern Review* for August, 1912.

An important historical puzzle that awaits final solution is the relation between the Cholas and Pālas in the 10th century. South Indian tradition points to the overthrow of the Bengalis by the Tamil Napoleon, East Indian tradition points quite otherwise. The Varendra School evidently accepts the overthrow of the Dravidians by the Pālas, as here and also in R. Chanda's Bengali work, *Gauḍa Rājamāla*. South Indian scholars, however, accept the overthrow of the Pālas and Vāngālas as a historical fact (cf. Aiyangar's *Ancient India*). Mookerji records the Tamil view on pp. 174-177 of his *Indian Shipping*. See also R. D. Banerji's *Memoir on the Pālas of Bengal* (Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1915).

ranked as to a certain extent on a par, in prestige, titles, pretensions, influences, and achievements, with the famous Vardhanas of the 7th cent. A.C., the Guptas of the 4th-5th cent. A.C. and the Mauryas of the 4th-3rd cent. B.C. Dharmapāla (*c.* 800 A.C.), the Buddhist Emperor of Eastern India, with his immediate predecessors and successors, Vijayasena (1097-1159), the Śaiva ruler of United Bengal, as well as Rājendra Chola, the great Śaiva monarch of the South, with his predecessors and successors, constitute remarkable contemporary Imperial families which must have a place by the side of such renowned Indian Napoleons, Empire-builders, and statesmen as Chandragupta Maurya, Asoka, the benevolent "Caesaro-papist," Chandragupta the Gupta, Samudragupta the Vikramāditya, and Harṣavardhana, who preceded them in solving the same problems in administration, commerce, religion and culture on the stage of Hindustan.

The period of the mighty Pālas, Senas, Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Cholas has witnessed the solution of problems which are of paramount importance in Indian history, literature, fine arts, philosophy and religion. For, it was during this age that the ocean of Tantrism finally swallowed up in a common philosophy the divergent channels of Mahāyāna Buddhism[27] and latter-day Brāhmaṇism; that Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivaism,—the corner-stones of modern Hindu life,—received the official stamp; the parents of

27 For the diverse aspects of Buddhism in evolution see H. P. Sastri: "Northern Buddhism" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta, March, June and September 1925), N. Dutt: *Mahayana Buddhism and its Relation to Hinayana* (London 1930) and *Panchavimśati Sahasrikā Prajnāpāramitā* (London 1934).

present-day vernaculars were encouraged and 'protected'; noble religious edifices were built, huge sealike tanks were excavated; magnificent images were sculptured in bronze and stones; the navigation of the sea was pushed forward; commercial and cultural intercourse between the Southerners and Easterners was promoted; and India became really the School of Asia by supplying faith, literature, fine arts and material necessaries to China, Nepal, Tibet, Japan, Java, Burma, Cambodia and other lands beyond the seas. This period does, in fact, carry forward and develop the impulses, aspirations and tendencies of Hindu national life testified to by Yuan Chwang, the Chinese Master of Law; in Harṣavardhana's time.

The Pālas, Senas, Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Cholas are really the spiritual successors of that great Empire-builder and statesman of the seventh century. The epoch of their hegemony in Indian history is a brilliant sequel to the splendid epoch of empire-building, religious toleration, colonizing activity, and social amalgamation which it had been the policy of the great Harṣa to foster and direct. Their services to the making of Indian national culture deserve the same careful handling, therefore, from historians as those of Harṣa.

And now that excavations, explorations, readings and interpretations of old vernacular manuscripts, copper-plate inscriptions, architectural monuments, numismatics, study of folklore, folk-songs, folk-arts and village traditions, Sanskrit literature, old sculptures and paintings, call up before us a picture of political and religious life, commercial and social intercourse, art-development and literary progress no less definite and clear than what we

have for any other period of Indian history, the necessity of looking upon the Pāla-Sena-Rāṣṭrakūṭa-Chola period as a really creative phase of Hindu India cannot be too strongly advocated.[28]

The Gurjara-Pratīhāras and Kleinstaaterei

The Empire of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras, who may be described as the cognates and agnates of the latter-day so-called Rajputs (c. 800-1200), had their capital at Kanauj on the Ganges.[29] They were synchronous with the Kāśmīris, Rāṣṭrakūṭas, Cholas, Pālas and Senas among the great powers of India.

It is during this period of the Gurjara-Pratīhāra Empire that some of the oldest among the Rajput *Vaṅśāvalī* or genealogical chronicles owed their origin or rather in which the oldest dates for the establishment of certain Rajput dynasties, e.g. those of Jaipur, Jodhpur, Alwar etc., have been placed in subsequent years.[30] It should be observed also that in a study of Hindu states the continuity of Rajput principalities,—although with periods of submergence in Turkish and Moghul times,—from the days of the Gurjara-Pratīhāra Empire until today, i.e., for a period of nearly one thousand years has to

28 B. K. Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916), and *Folk-Element in Hindu Culture* (London 1917). My position in regard to the post-Harṣa Hindu Empires (c. 650-1350), as indicated in the first edition of the present work in 1913-14, has been well vindicated in and through subsequent publications, e.g. H. C. Ray: *The Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I. (Calcutta 1931) pp. xxxiv-xxxvi.

29 R. S. Tripathi: "The Pratīhāra Administration" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta) March 1933.

30 H. Goetz: *Die Stellung der indischen Chroniken im Rahmen der indischen Geschichte* (Munich, 1924), pp. 9-11.

be accepted as an item of major importance in Hindu cultural evolution.[31] The Gurjara-Pratīhāra Empire comprised at times the western Punjab, Kāśmīr, Nepal, Kathiawar, the U.P., Bihar, North Bengal, Orissa, and Assam. Only Sind appears to have been outside the sphere of its sovereignty, which covered, as it did, virtually the whole of Northern India.

The limits of the Gupta and the Vardhana Empires were evidently exceeded by the Empire of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras. According to contemporary Arab writers it was this Hindu power that proved a veritable stumbling block to the Arab satraps of Sind in their career of *digvijaya* (world-conquest) in Western and Northern India.

For a long time 647 A.C., the year of Harṣavardhana's death, used to be taken as a landmark in Indian politics. We have already seen in connection with the Pālas, Senas and Cholas that as Harṣa's successors they were sovereigns of no mean order by any standard of polity or culture. The middle of the seventh century ought therefore to have no special value with historians.

Recently the year 916 has been accepted as exhibiting a suitable landmark, for about this date the Pratīhāra Empire began to show signs of break-up. Besides, it is alleged that the tenth century of the Christian era

31 H. B. Sarda: *Maharana Kumbha* (Ajmer 1917), H. C. Ray: *The Dynastic History of Northern India* (Calcutta) Vol. I. (1931) pp. xxxvii, 10, 569-571, 579, 587-590, 608-09. The foreign origin of the Rajputs is disputed by C. V. Vaidya in the second volume of his *History of Mediæval Hindu India*, which is given over exclusively to the Rajputs (Poona 1924), as well as by G. S. Ojha in his *History of Rajputana*, Vol. I. (Ajmer, 1927), ch. II, in Hindi.

which saw the dismemberment of the Gurjara-Pratīhāra Empire witnessed also the arrival of the Mohammedan Turk in India.[32]

To the student of Indian history the attempt to see a beginning or an end at 916 or for that matter in the tenth century should be as unwarrantable as that at 647 or in the middle of the seventh century. In the first place, disruptions, dynastic partitions, the system of pentarchies, heptarchies or centarchies, *Kleinstaaterei, émiettement* etc. ought to be treated as but certain normal phases of societal "metabolism" in the whirligig of politics. For vast continents like Europe, China, or India consolidations, concentrations, unifications or the like ought, inductively speaking, to be appraised more as the exceptions than as the rule. The eagerness to extol unification, imperial expansion, administration, centralization, whenever such phenomena happen to be encountered over extensive areas in India, is scientifically considered, rather senseless. European historians of modern and recent times, used as they are to appreciating unity in their little fatherlands have unscientifically projected the conditions of their petty states into the atmosphere of the Indian subcontinent, expecting or rather demanding unification of unwieldy areas as the test of political aptitudes or cultural efficiency. To those researchers who are not misled by such fallacies Bengal, Gujarat, Orissa, and so forth, nay, even parts of these areas should appear to be no insignificant territorial units. The maintenance of Hindu sovereignty over areas like these is no index to decay,

32 V. A. Smith: *The Oxford History of India* (1919), p. xiii; H. C. Ray: *The Dynastic History of Northern India* (Calcutta) Vol. I. (1932), pp. xxxviii, xxxix, 596.

degeneration or downfall. The words, "disruption," *Kleinstaaterei,* or *émiettement* should not be used at all,—or at any rate, in a derogatory sense,—even if India in the same manner as Europe should happen to be the theatre of several dozen independent states, arrayed as they might conceivably be in all sorts of *ententes cordiales,* armed neutralities or other relations known to the Kauṭalyan doctrine of *maṇḍala* ("geopolitical" complex of international relations).[33]

The Moslem Question

In the second place, no special importance can be attached, in connection with the topic under discussion, either to the foreign (in the present instance, Moslem) invasions or to the establishment of kingdoms or empires by the Moslem Arabs or Moslem Turks in diverse parts of India. While discussing the sovereignty of Hindu states in India one cannot afford to leave the Deccan and Southern India out of sight. Not until Islam, whether under Arabs or Turks or Moghuls, succeeded in becoming the "paramount" political power *de jure* or even *de facto* in India should the student of history think of closing an epoch and commencing a new.

It is good to be clear on one point. The demarcation of epochs is primarily an arbitrary action, not only in regard to India but virtually in regard to every

33 B. K. Sarkar: "The Hindu Theory of International Relations" in the *Political Science Quarterly* (New York) August 1919; "Realities in the Relations between East and West" in *Prabuddha Bharata* (Calcutta, February, 1934).

country. The categories, prehistoric, primitive, ancient, early, medieval, modern, contemporary and what not are no less arbitrary. One is at liberty to fix upon any date and select one's own technical terms or categories of thought.[34]

The following considerations ought to be carefully noted in connection with our present topic.

The capture of some of the cities in Sind by the Moslem Arabs during the second decade of the eighth century (712-13) might, for certain purposes, if one so desired, be certainly regarded as initiating a new chapter in India's life *vis-à-vis* Islam.

Then the wars of the Arabs with the Hindu rulers of the Helmund and Kabul Valleys from 650 to 860 A.C. could with equal legitimacy be treated as constituting a substantial second step in a new direction. Besides, the powerful Hindu Sahi dynasty of the Punjab came to an end as a result of the Arab attacks by 1021. This annihilation was likewise no insignificant beginning for the *digvijaya* of Islam in India. In regard to the commencement of a new epoch not only the fall of the Punjab but even the fall of Afghanistan might serve as a convenient landmark in the eyes of any historian.

34 It is interesting that C. V. Vaidya's *History of Mediæval Hindu India* (Poona) Vol. I. (c 600-800), 1921, Vol. II. (c 750-1000), 1924 and Vol. III. (c 1,000-1,200) 1926, interprets the mediæval Hindu period as the period "from the accession of Harsha, the last Buddhist Emperor of India, to the death of Prithvīrāja the last Hindu Emperor of India" (Preface to Vol. II). One can hardly accept the proposition that the category "Emperor of India" ought to be applied either to Harṣa or to Pṛithvīrāja. Besides, the last great "Buddhist" sovereign was Dharmapāla (795-830?) or Devapāla of Bengal, and the last great "Hindu" sovereign Baji Rao I. (1720-1740), the Peshwa or perhaps Ranjit Singh (1780-1839), the Punjabi.

The discomfiture of some of the Gurjara-Pratihāra (Rajput) states at the hands of the Mussalman Turks in the tenth century has surely to be appraised as the fourth term in the same series of Islamic expansion or Hindu decline. Naturally there cannot be any harm in selecting just these events as the constituents of a landmark. And yet it is questionable if this fourth dose, cumulatively with the previous three, was big enough to raise the new foreign rulers to the status *de jure* or *de facto* of "paramount" power (Sultanate) in India.

The continuity of Hindu political sovereignty over somewhat large areas, no matter what be the territorial or populational dimensions or what be the international relations subsisting between them, should be considered to be the chief item in regard to the problem of demarcation into epochs or periods of Indian history, so far as our attention is concentrated on ancient and medieval developments.

In the tenth century Hindu India was politically quite extensive in the North as well as in the Deccan and the South. The political power of Hindu states endured for several centuries before many of them factually realized the necessity of *kowtowing* to, i.e., establishing subordinate alliance with, the Mussalman Turks (or Pathans) or finally got swallowed up in the new Moslem Empire.

The drama of Indian history should, then, have a great Act closed not before the beginning of the thirteenth century (c. 1205) with the overthrow of the Senas of Bengal by a lieutenant of Muhammad Ghori and not before the beginning of the fourteenth century (1310) with the overthrow of the successors of the Cholas by a lieutenant of Alauddin Khilji.

The Hindu period of Indian history closes neither with Harṣavardhana (647 A.C.) nor with the subjugation by Mussalmans of certain Gurjara-Pratihāra (Rajput) states in North-Western India in the tenth and eleventh centuries. For, in the first place, a large number of politically sovereign states continued for a long time to be possessed by the Hindus. And secondly, the social expansion, religious assimilation, commercial progress and Imperial achievements such as we are wont to associate with the brightest eras of previous Hindu history were going on in Eastern and Southern India, politically unhampered as of yore by Islamic states, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The natural lines of progressive Hindu evolution were not disturbed in these regions while the buffer-princes of Kabul, Lahore, Delhi, Ajmer, Kanauj, Malwa and Gujarat were performing their heroic duties as by geographical position the gate-keepers of India against the inroads of aggressive Islam. Altogether, we do not experience in India under these conditions anything essentially different from the situations in Europe during the epochs of domination by the Saracens, the Mongols or Tartars, and the Ottoman Turks.

A Parallel Between Asia and Europe

Here one can aptly cite a few observations from Hermann Goetz in regard to the parallelism between Asia and Europe. "The great curves in the evolution of civilization are everywhere the same," says he, "and herein the East follows the same laws as Europe. The invariability of the Orient is only a seeming appearance,

and the belief in it is not older than the industrial revolution of Europe in the last 150 years."

It is interesting that sentiments bearing on the identity or parallelism between the East and the West should have at last begun to manifest themselves among Eur-American scholars, who, as is too well-known, are responsible for the unscientific and fallacious doctrine of the fundamental distinction between the Eastern and the Western views of life as well as lines of evolution.[35]

In connection with his survey of the different periods of Indian culture-history Goetz makes the following remarks in regard to that of the Gurjaras (Rajputs):

"Just as in Europe art and Latin literature flourish for a short time under the Carolingian and Ottonian Emperors before their own national individuality comes to full development, similarly there is growing up a new Sanskrit literature, philosophy and historiography, but they never attain the high standard of the Gupta period. Thus grows up a new architecture, building the temples and their sculptures in a sort of Barock style in the finest, most luxurious and pathetic shapes. What the

35 Goetz: *The Relations between Indian Painting and Culture, a* lecture delivered at the School of Oriental Studies, London, on November 10, 1924. See also his *Epochen der indischen Kultur* (Leipzig 1929).

The prevailing fallacy has been examined by the present author in the following among other works: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916), *Love in Hindu Literature* (Tokyo 1916), *The Folk Element in Hindu Culture* (London 1918), *Hindu Art Its Humanism and Modernism* (New York 1920), *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig, 1922), *The Aesthetics of Young India* (Calcutta 1922), *The Futurism of Young Asia* (Berlin 1922), *Die Lebensanschauung des Inders* (Leipzig 1923); cf. the trend in the evolution of this fallacy since the epoch of romanticism as exhibited in the present author's *Political Philosophies Since 1905* (Madras 1928) pp. 29, 51, 105-108, 299-302.

Cathedrals of Rheims and Chartres are to the West, are perhaps to India the *Śikharas* of the Orissan and Chandel temples. The painting of this time imitates the great examples of Ajantā, but where the latter create large frescoes of rich composition here there have remained only small miniatures in the manuscripts of the Buddhist *Śāstras* in honour of the primeval mother *Prajñāpāramitā*, small pictures of gods, goddesses and saints as much drawn after traditional patterns, as the sculpture of the temples is forming even the simplest details according to the rule of the *Śilpaśāstras*."[36]

Vaidya on c. 1000 A.C.

While dealing with the period of what may be described as a "pentarchy" in India, i.e. the synchronous hegemony of five powers, the Kāśmīris, the Gurjara-Pratīhāras, the Pālas or Senas, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and the Cholas, we come across an interesting estimate by a Deccani scholar of Poona, C. V. Vaidya.[37] According to him during the ninth and tenth centuries India "undoubtedly enjoyed greater happiness than in any century

36 In the same key as Goetz's but more universal and generalized are the works of Hartmut Piper on the Laws of World-History, namely, *Der gesetzmüssige Lebenslauf der Völker Chinas und Japans* (Leipzig 1929) and *Indien* (Leipzig 1931). The methods of comparative race-biology that he has applied to European historical facts he has employed also in regard to China, Japan and India. The equations that he establishes between the East and the West are very often suggestive, although not always acceptable.

37 *History of Mediæval Hindu India* Vol. II (Poona 1924) pp. 247, 250-251, 255. See also the appendix on extracts from important *Smritis* (Manu and Yājnavalkya excepted) showing the freer social condition of India in the ninth and tenth centuries.

of her known history, whether previous or subsequent." His position is described below:

"Mauryas ruling south from the north or Āndhrabhrityas ruling north from south were an evil," says he. But during the period in question "the three great empires of Kanauj, Malkhed and Manghyr were ruled by entirely local ruling dynasties. There was no domination of either the Maratha over the Bengali or the Bengali over the Assamese." Again, Śūdras were considered fit to be dined with; and the *Parāśara Smriti* ordained that Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas might take to the agricultural occupation and yet keep to their Vedic ritual. Besides, *anuloma* marriage was practised among the three higher castes. A Brāhmaṇa was permitted to marry a Kṣatriya or even a Vaiśya girl, the progeny being treated as Kṣatriya or Vaiśya respectively. In the same family there was thus room for Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas.

Kāśmīr

We have now to mention the Kingdom of Kāśmīr in the extreme North (*c.* 650-1339), which was ruled by Hindu kings till about the middle of the fourteenth century.[38]

Historians as a rule have a peculiar weakness for large states or the expansion of states. Sociologically, however, a large state or an enlarged state is not necessarily something to enthuse over. In the present author's way of envisaging human history or world-culture disruptions such as imply the multiplicity or

38 H. C. Ray: *The Dynastic History of Northern India* (Calcutta) Vol. I. (1933) Chapter III.

prevalence of small states are not matters of shame to mankind. In the history of *Geopolitik* and international relations, objectively considered, the forces that work for concentration or expansion are no more permanent or abiding than are the forces that work for decentralization or dismemberment. Every realistic student of world-history and human civilization should rather be used to treat the nuclei of small and warring groups as the normal phenomena in political morphology or socio-cultural *Gestalt*.[39]

Gabriel Tarde's *"l'opposition universelle"* must be taken to be as fundamental a society-making force as Gumplowicz's "race-struggle." An undue emphasis on the "Pan"-ideas from the "ideals" of Pan-Hellenism and Pan-Indianism (*Pax Sārvabhaumica*) to the "ideals" of Pan-Asianism and Pan-Europa can but shunt off the scientific studies in sociology and historical topics along misleading lines.[40] The metabolistic processes of political disunion and statal pluralism are as positive data of ancient, medieval and modern India as of Europe today, yesterday and day before yesterday.

Corresponding to the Kingdom of Kāśmīr and synchronous with it should therefore be mentioned in the same breath several other kingdoms of equal importance

39 *cf.* the doctrine of *Naturprozess* in L. Gumplowicz: *Rassenkampf* (Innsbruck 1883) ch. IV. See also H. Barnes: "The Struggle of Races and Social Groups" in the *Journal of Race Development* (Clark University U.S.A.) April, 1919.

40 The "geo-political" and "pan" categories may be seen analyzed in Karl Haushofer: *Geopolitik der Pan-Ideen* (Berlin 1931), and *Raumüberwindende Mächte* (Leipzig 1934); also R. Hennig: *Geopolitik: Die Lehre vom Staat als Lebewesen* (Leipzig 1931). See also B. K. Sarkar: "Haushofer's Cult of Geopolitik" in the *Calcutta Review*, April 1934.

in Indian evolution. The Kingdom of Kāmrūp (Assam) in the extreme East, the Kingdom of Kerala in the extreme South, the Kingdom of Orissa, and so forth are statal organisms which cannot be ignored by any means in a survey of this period.[41] It is, however, to be observed that it cannot be the scope of the present study to enumerate all the states of Indian history.

To appreciate the tenacity of small states and societal pluralism one has only to note the statistics of population in the diverse states of Europe today.[42] The absence of alleged "nationality" principles also is a dominant feature in the demographic make-up of many European states at the present moment.

Vijayanagara and the Marathas

1. The Empire of Vijayanagara (1336-1565) in the South was perhapes the most important seat of independent Hindu culture during the period of Moslem hegemony.[43] In any case, it emerged as an organ of Hindu sovereignty to withstand the inroads of the Moslem Turks into the South anticipating by three centuries the rise of the Marathas and the Sikhs as the bulwark of Hindu freedom against Moslem expansion.

41 R. D. Banerji: *History of Orissa* (Calcutta 1931), R. G. Basak: *History of North-Eastern India* (Calcutta 1934), chs. on Assam and Orissa. N. N. Vasu: *Social History of Kamrup* (Calcutta 1926), 2 vols. K. P. P. Menon: *History of Kerala* (Ernakulam 1933), 3 vols., preface by T. K. K. Menon. Some of the dynasties of medieval Hindu India may be seen in H. C. Ray, *Dynastic History*, Vol. II. (Calcutta 1935).

42 *Annuarie Statistique de la Société des Nations* (Geneva 1932) p. 22; Woytinsky: *Die Welt in Zahlen* (Berlin) Vol. I. (1927) pp. 41-52.

43 Sewell: *A Forgotten Empire* (London 1900); Heras: *The Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagara* Vol. I. (Madras 1927); B. A. Saletore: *Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire*, 2 vols. (Madras 1934).

2. The Empire of the Marathas (seventeenth and eighteenth centuries).[44] The Maratha power represents the *risorgimento* of Hindu political energism against the Moslem-Moghul Empire. The Marathas were in contact with the new forces—Portuguese, French and British—from Europe.

The Sikhs

Finally remain to be listed the Kingdoms of the Sikhs in the Punjab (seventeenth and eighteenth centuries).[45] Like the Marathas the Sikhs also rose as the champions of Hindu sovereignty against the Moghuls and had contact with the Europeans.

In the Deccan the bulwark of Hindu independence was built up by Śivāji the Great (1627-1680), the Frederick the Great of India, in his empire of the Marathas. This was continued during the eighteenth century under the Peshwas or ministers (1714-1818). Fragments of Maratha states still exist more or less as "feudatories" of Great Britain. The second great reaction against political Islam manifested itself almost simultaneously in the militant nationalism of the Sikhs in the Punjab. From Guru Govind (1675-1708), organizer of the Khalsa polity, down to Ranjit Singh (1780-1839), monarch of a united Punjab including Kāśmīr, nay, down to 1849, it was the

44 J. N. Sarkar: *Shivaji and His Times* (Calcutta), G. S. Sardesai: *Main Currents in Maratha History* (Patna 1933), S. N. Sen: *Administrative System of the Marathas* (Calcutta 1923), *Military System of the Marathas* (Calcutta 1928).

45 M. A. Macauliffe: *Sikh Religion* (Oxford 1909), 6 vols, J. D. Cunningham: *History of the Sikhs* (London 1918), L. Griffin: *Ranjit Singh* (Oxford 1898), H. K. Trevaskis: *The Land of the Five Rivers* (Oxford 1928), K. Singh: *History and Philosophy of the Sikh Religion* (Lahore 1914), Part I.

Hindus (Sikhs) who held Northern and North-western India. It is worth while to emphasise that Ranjit Singh, the contemporary of the Bengali Rammohun Roy (1772-1833), was the sovereign ruler of a powerful state.

From the Bengali and the South Indian angles of vision the lower terminus of political sovereignty exercised by the Hindu races is likely to be somewhat distorted. It is therefore very necessary to observe that Hindu states were enjoying independence down to the middle of the nineteenth century. The eighteenth century of Indian political history was dominated by the Hindus.

With the annexation of the Punjab by Raghunath (Raghoba) in 1758 during the Peshwaship of Balaji Baji Rao (1740-1761) the Maratha Empire extended from the Himalayas in the North to the southern extremity of the Indian Peninsula. The Peshwa's power endured as a sovereign authority,—although territorially much reduced,—down to 1818.

Ranjit Singh, the "lion of the Punjab," was a contemporary of Rammohun, it is worth while to repeat. The entire Punjab (including Kāśmīr and Jammu) was ruled by him as an independent Hindu state. It was not until 1849 that the Punjabis lost their independence.

The administrative genius of Ranjit Singh preserved in the Punjab during the early nineteenth century the tradition of Indian positivism. He was thus a great contemporary, junior of course, rather a distinguished successor, of the Marathas of the Deccan and Tipu Sultan of Mysore. He was already imbued with the modern spirit in so far as the translation of French and English works into Punjabi found in him a thoughtful patron. In this he was but carrying out the

same principles as inspired his contemporary Rammohun (1772-1833) in Bengal who had to live under different political conditions. Among Ranjit's political achievements is to be named his resuscitation of the institutions of rural democracy.[46]

Reassertion of the Hindus as Political Powers (c. 1650-1850)

Students of social metabolism and political morphology will understand that down to the beginning of the thirteenth century in the North and of the fourteenth century in the South the category, "Hindu period or periods" of Indian history, has a substance and a meaning, if periods have to be grouped according to religion or race. It is possible likewise to describe the period from the thirteenth or fourteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth or the beginning of the eighteenth with an expression like the "Mussalman period" on the strength of international and "geopolitical" relations in India.

During this period the Mussalmans enjoyed a genuine hegemony and paramountcy, although very often through the medium of small Moslem states in conflict with one another. But already towards the end of the fourteenth century (with the decline of Tughlaks) the "Rajputs" were reasserting themselves and establishing sovereign states. They had to submit to the Moghuls in the sixteenth century but again re-conquered their freedom with the decline of the Moghuls in the eighteenth.

46 Lectures at the Ranjit Singh Birth Anniversary, Lahore (November, 1935) by Sardar Sewa Ram Singh, Sardar Man Singh, Sardar Kissen Singh Thapar and others, reported in the *People* (Lahore).

Besides, by the middle of the seventeenth century and of course during the entire eighteenth century, new Hindu races, the Sikhs and the Marathas, were militant and succeeded in transforming themselves into manufacturers of states of substantial and dangerous importance. During this century and a half the Moghul Empire and other Mussalman states were placed on the defensive by the Hindus who pursued an aggressive rôle. The Mussalmans, therefore, could not claim to be anything more than colleagues and peers of the Hindus who were simultaneously holding their own in diverse regions of India, e.g., under the Rajputs of old standing as well as under the new-born Marathas and Sikhs.

The continuity of Hindu rule of the sovereign type was broken, say, for five hundred years from 1206 (Sultan Kutbuddin) to 1707 (Aurangzeb's death). But even during this period of Hindu political submergence the Cholas maintained their independence down to 1310, Vijayanagara to 1565, and the Rajputs reasserted their power off and on between the Tughlaks (*c* 1388) and the Moghuls (c 1527) as Northern contemporaries of Vijayanagara.

The Sikhs had no state-making tradition of any sort. It was the militaristic energism of certain Punjabi races, the Jats, that enabled them to transform the devotional *Bhakti*-cult of Nānak into a tremendous political power with a characteristic *Gestalt* or morphology.

Like the Sikhs the Marathas also of the seventeenth century commenced their "political" career virtually on clean slates. There is no doubt, however, that the social complex, as M. G. Ranade makes it clear in *The Rise of the Maratha Power,* did not fail to furnish the Marathas

with the traditional conceptions and ideals of Hindu statecraft. It is only in the Rajput states that one will have to look for the real continuity, although under modified forms, of the state-making processes, as prevalent, say, in Gurjara-Pratīhāra times.

It is but an accident of history that fragments of Rajput, Maratha and Sikh states have been permitted to go on during the period of British paramountcy since 1818, 1848 or rather 1857.

The Geopolitics of Culture-Contact and Social Mobility

Certain considerations of a general character bearing on what Tönnies, Richard, Simmel, Ross, von Wiese and Bouglé would call the doctrine of social relations or social processes[47] emerge from a bare chronology of the leading state-systems of India from the Mohenjo Daro period (c 3500 B.C.) down to 1818 A.C. The politics of the "Hindus," i.e., the so-called Dravidians, the so-called Aryans and the Aryo-Dravidians, were not the politics of the Hindus in isolation. "Culture-contact" was a leading formative force in the social metabolism operating through the evolution of Hindu states.[48]

(a) *Mixture with Non-Indian Races*

International as well as inter-racial relations,—the politics of boundaries, the "geopolitics",—constituted

47 G. Richard: *La Sociologie générale et les lois sociologiques* (Paris 1912); Spykman: *The Social Theory of Georg Simmel* (Chicago 1925). On Tönnies and Simmel see B. K. Sarkar: *The Political Philosophies since 1905* (Madras 1928) pp. 95, 121, 273, 284. See also L. v. Wiese: *Systematic Sociology* (New York 1932).

48 "International India" in B. K. Sarkar: *The Futurism of Young Asia* (Berlin 1922).

the anatomy of India's political history as that of Europe's political history through the ages. These contacts between the races such as have contributed to the making of political India were of the most diverse character. No less heterogeneous than those in Europe were the contacts of the indigenous Indian tribes, races or nations with the non-Indian tribes, races or nations. These extra-Indian peoples may be somewhat chronologically enumerated as follows:

(1) Assyro-Babylonian, (2) Iranian-Persian, (3) Hellenists, (4) Parthians, (5) Scythian-Yuechi-Sakas (Tartars), (6) Huns, (7) Tibetans, (8) Chinese, (9) Arabs (Islamized), (10) Turks (Islamized), (11) Moghuls (Islamized), (12) Europeans.

In certain instances the Indian peoples had to submit to these non-Indian peoples (excepting perhaps the Chinese) as subject races. In other instances the independent Indian states had to carry on their activities in a system of *maṇḍala* or geopolitical "sphere", which comprised both Indian and non-Indian states. This is an important consideration the value of which cannot be overlooked in a survey not only of political literature like the *Nītiśāstras* but of every Hindu *vidyā* and *kalā*, art and science, philosophy and religion. India's debt to non-Indian races is no less an historic reality than her contributions to their progress.

(b) *The Impact of the Lower Orders*

Our attention is invited by the chronology of the Indian state-systems to another set of "geopolitical" forces. We are led to witness the incessant dynastic expansions, contractions and dissolutions, the ups and

downs in the fortunes of families as well as the constant activities of soldiers and generals on the go. During the five thousand years or so exhibited here the Indian peoples seemed all the time to carry out in life the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* (VII. 15) ideal of being ever on the move, *"charaiveti," "charaiveti"* (go on, march on etc.) and to function, so to say, as the living embodiments of "social mobility," both horizontal and vertical.[49] All these movements from region to region and family to family could not but set in motion strong demographic convection-currents, leading very often to metabolistic re-arrangements in or transformations of social stratification, —the fall of the high and the elevation of the low.

It is an interesting fact that the origins of not only the Rajput dynasties but of many other ruling families in Indian history through the ages are somewhat dark, shady and shrouded in mystery. Another interesting item that we come across almost invariably in regard to the establishment of the Indian dynasties is, as the analysis of inscriptions leaves no doubt, that subsequent generations tried to get their forefathers or founders recognized either as Kṣatriyas or somehow related by blood to some well-known royal families. We are forced to suspect and to believe that the originators of many of the ruling dynasties in India were not born with blue blood in their veins but came from the ranks, and were often perhaps "natural-born." Not all of them rose indeed from the very lowest of the low, but most probably many of them

49 P. Sorokin: *Social Mobility* (New York 1927), ch. VIII, 'The Channels of Vertical Circulation."

must have been born in the lower strata of society. From the "heroic ages" of the Vedic complex, the *Purāṇas* and the Epics down to the Mauryas, Pālas, Senas and the Rajputs of all grades the story of origins is more or less uniform in being indefinite and anything but clear.

A statistical analysis of the stories regarding the origins of Indian ruling dynasties through the ages, as derived from literature as well as from inscriptions, ought to be valuable as the subject of a monograph. It is likely to throw light not only on race-intermixture and caste-fusion but also on the importance of the *viṣ*, the "folk" and the demos in societal remaking and perhaps likewise on the place of bastards in the establishment of royal and aristocratic families in India. Among the manufac[illegible] of states and the makers of epochs the rôle of "[illegible]nit origin" and illegitimate birth may be found to be not negligible.

It is the personal qualifications,—the proficiency in the use of arms as well as the diplomatic handling of situations,—that accounted for the ascendency of many lowly individuals to the position of generals and premiers and finally to kingship. The demand for military skill and diplomatic tact was perennial in the Indian society here and there and everywhere. In India as elsewhere the army has functioned as a great "ladder." And as the dynasties were changing and the boundaries of states were moving in season and out of season the adventurers from every nook and corner were in a position to exploit the conditions and build up their social, economic and political fortunes.[50] Individuals of lower castes could

50 "Caste System and Military History" in B. K. Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai, 1916).

thereby get themselves admitted as Kṣatriyas, Brāhmaṇas and what not. The Indian aristocracies of all denominations were very often the instances of social mobility of the vertical type. This aspect of "geopolitics" was as common in India as in Europe.

For, the world submits inevitably to the man, who, whatever be his origin, is audacious enough to take up the ambitious messages of the *Atharva Veda* as the guiding principles of life and actually venture upon carrying them out. In this *Veda* (XII, i, 54) *Puruṣa* (man) is made to declare to the Earth as follows:

Aham asmi sahamāna
Uttaro nāma bhumyām
Abhīṣādasmi viśváṣād
Āśām āśām viṣāsahi

"Mighty am I, Superior by name, upon the earth, conquering am I, all-conquering, completely conquering every region."

The respect for personality and individual valour, the Buddhist *viriya*, the *parākrama* of the Gupta inscriptions that finds expression in this and similar passages of the *Atharva Veda* and other Vedic texts furnished the atmosphere of energists and enabled them to look for chances wherever there was a muddle. And in the sphere of energism and individualism the *Sūdra* and the *Vrātya* found the world as wide for themselves as the *Ārya*.

(c) *Vrātya and Varṇa-saṅkara*

And here we encounter a new form of race-contacts in political evolution. These consisted in blood-fusion between the diverse tribes, races or nations within the

boundaries of India herself. These contacts were engendered as much by migrations as by military marches, conquests and settlements, and by economic necessity. The alleged inferior, despicable, "fallen", depressed and similar orders of the Indian population found in these stirs and turmoils the chances for self-assertion. Another class of people likewise got opportunities of elevation in this kind of dynamic unrest. These were all those groups or communities which somehow or other did not happen to belong to but rested outside the groups representing the culture, wealth or political influence of the region. A very common name for both these classes,—the "fallen" and the "outsiders"—was *Vrātya* in certain periods.[51]

But because of this kind of mobilization the *Vrātya* and others of the same standing came to acquire or conquer for themselves positions of dignity in the social structure. The demographic make-up of the state-systems of five thousand years or so in diverse regions of India was marked by *varṇa-saṅkara*, miscegenation, confusion of castes, elevation of the fallen, Aryanization of the non-Aryan, Hinduization of the non-Hindu. The rôle of the *Vrātya* as a creative factor in Indian demography is fundamental. Equally fundamental is the place of *varṇa-saṅkara* (caste-mixture) as well as *anuloma* and *pratiloma* marriage (union of the "higher" with the lower castes) in the social system of the Hindus.

The "legal fiction" or "pious wish" of caste "restrictions" was positively broken in upon by the *Real-*

51 J. W. Hauer: *Der Vrātya* Vol. I. (Stuttgart 1927), pp. 223-240, 334-335.

politik of race-mixture and inter-caste marriage, i.e *varṇa-saṅkara*. The purity of stocks was thus as much a myth in India as in Europe. The intermingling between castes or races implied a veritable democratization of Indian society and culture. The *Vrātya* and the *varṇa-saṅkara* were thus some of the "folk elements" which served to enrich and strengthen the foundations of Hindu civilization.[52]

The impact of the *Vrātya* and *varṇa-saṅkara* on Indian culture has had important bearings on the origin and character of the *Nītiśāstras* as of all the other theoretical disciplines and practical arts and crafts. Not the least important feature of this aspect of Indian as of European "geopolitics" consists in the fact that castes and races might rise and fall or disappear but that civilization advanced almost invariably from precedent to precedent,—nay, perhaps more liberalized and more democratized.[53]

The normal data of Indian political history yield then the following results. Culture-contact as an element in social mobility, or social mobility as an element in culture-contact was responsible in India as elsewhere for "internationalism" as understood in the sense of impacts of the geographically extra-Indian

52 B. K. Sarkar: *The Folk-Element in Hindu Culture* (London 1917); cf. in this connection the analysis of problems in the relations between the higher and the lower classes in P. Sorokin: *Social Mobility* (New York 1927) chs. x, xi, xii; and *Contemporary Sociological Theories* (New York 1928) pp. 547-551.

53 In regard to the question of alleged "superior" and "inferior" races see F. Hankins: *The Racial Basis of Civilization* (New York 1924) which critically examines the doctrines embodied in Aryanism, Anglo-Saxonism, Nordicism etc.

peoples on the Indian and *vice versa*. Then there arose transformations in economic, social and political stratification within the Indian boundaries in every region as well as every age. Thirdly, the mingling of races, Indian as well as extra-Indian, in flesh and blood was a constant determinant in the entire process of family, community or society-making through the ages. The fusion of castes may be taken for certain purposes as but an aspect of the mingling of races. In other respects also inter-caste marital alliances constituted the basic factors in the social organization. And last but not least, the alleged "lower" races or castes and the alleged "outsiders," i.e. non-Aryans, non-Hindus and what not were getting access to the "upper ten thousands" in blood, ritual, wealth and political power. In the *Sāstras* on law, politics and social *mores* one will have to read the influence of all these aspects of "sociations," "social interactions," "social processes," "social relations," or *Beziehungen* as discussed in contemporary sociology.[54]

(d) *The Paretian Doctrine of the Circulation of Élites Modified*

Here the facts of Hindu culture and politics find themselves in general agreement with the doctrines of the Italian

54 F. Tönnies: *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (Leipzig 1887), G. Tarde: *Les Lois de l'Imitation* (Paris 1890), *L'Opposition Universelle* (Paris 1898), *Les Lois Sociales* (Paris 1898), E. Durkheim: *De la Division du Travail Social* (Paris 1893), E. A. Ross: *Principles of Sociology* (New York 1923); E. S. Bogardus: *Fundamentals of Social Psychology* (New York 1924); J. J. von Schmid: "Les Rapports entre la Collectivité et l'Individu dans l'Evolution de la Pensée sociologique" (*Revue de l'Institut de Sociologie*, Brussels, 1936, no. 2).

sosiologist, Pareto, in *Les Systèmes Socialistes* (1902) and *Trattato di Sociologia Generale* (1916). No society has ever existed without dominant classes, the "*élites*," says he. The distinction between the upper and the lower socio-economic orders furnishes the fundamental basis of all societal organizations. But the *élites*, says Pareto, have a tendency to degenerate, decay and disappear. The dissolution of the upper classes is not only moral but physical as well. They are ultimately replaced by new dominant classes such as emerge out of the people. Sociologically, Pareto never detects the government of societies in a democratic manner. The course is from aristocracy to aristocracy. Only, the aristocracies rise, have their day, cease to be, and give place to new aristocracies. In his doctrine of the "circulation of the *élites*" there is much that Indian history as the history of other countries can offer as corroborative data.

We need not however be hundred per cent Paretians and admit that the *élites* of one generation or culture-stage are *entirely* replaced by those of the next. The emergence of new elements from the lower orders is a reality. For one thing, the army, as we have indicated above, has been one of the greatest "social ladders." These new elements have, because of military, political, economic, sexual and other circumstances, many chances of getting admitted into and fused or mixed up with the already existing dominant classes. It is these fusions and inter-mixtures that enable the transition from generation to generation of *élites* to appear not as an abrupt breach with the past or a total replacement of old by new, but as a generally steady although often revolutionary process of societal transformation. Thus considered, the

historical movements, the social mobilities, the dynamic processes, the *charaiveti* ("move on") activities ought really to be described as the continuous democratizations of world-culture through the rise of the lower and their absorption into the *élites* rather than as marches from aristocracy to aristocracy.[55]

(e) *The Race-Pessimism of Today Unjustifiable*

In recent years the name of thinkers who preach the doctrine of mankind's decline is legion. From Spengler, the German author's *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* people have got the formula that the West is now in for decay. Romain Rolland has popularized the notion that Western civilization is doomed. In the Italian demographist Gini's analysis of "the parabola of evolution" the European races are all exhibiting senescence with the solitary exception, perhaps, of the Italians. Even American sociologists have been attacked by this decline-cult, and many of them like Hankins are anxiously discussing the question as to the decline in the natural fertility of the Eur-American population.

All through the ages there has been a type of mentality that is interested in viewing the things of the world from what may be described in general terms as

55 *cf.* the section on "Social Forces in Mediaeval Indian Poetry," *Infra.* See the present author's *Les Races, les Classes et les Forces Transformatrices au point de vue du Metabolisme Social* (International Congress of Sociology, Brussels, August 1933), as well as some of the data in N. K. Bose: "Caste as a Social Phenomenon," "Caste through the Ages," and "The Contact of Culture" (*Calcutta Review*, August and September 1934, January-March 1935).

a pessimistic angle of vision. And the pessimism of Jeremiads appeals more or less to every man and woman. The reasons are obvious. First, there is no possibility of denying the fact that there is a certain amount or kind of misery and suffering always present, no matter how well-placed the individual or the group. And in the second place, every honest intellectual can find in the sceptical attitudes and warnings or rather the "divine discontent" of the pessimists undoubtedly some very powerful aids to self-criticism and societal regeneration. Indeed, it is to pessimism that the world owes many of the energistic adventures in the "transvaluation of values" and upward trends in civilization. The value of pessimism as a constructive force cannot by any means be ignored.

In these discussions as in all others bearing on social life there is generally no difficulty about agreeing as to the fact of "social metabolism" or transformation going on around us. But it is, as a rule, while appraising the value of the transformation that the diversity of schools arises, each with its own shibboleth based naturally on personal equations. One thinker is convinced in his own way that the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were more "creative" than the nineteenth and the twentieth; and another ignores the beneficial influence of social assurance and other modern legislation on the standard of living and welfare of the masses.

But even those who admit that economic and cultural progress has been advancing from group to group and class to class fail very often to realize that a great deal of the transformations generally known as "class" or social revolutions are at bottom expressions of "racial"

ups and downs. It is these replacements or absorptions of certain races by others that constitute the anatomical back-ground of world-culture. The eternal story of mankind is to be found in a nut-shell in the stone implements of the Palæolithic Ages, when the Mousterians had to give way to the Aurignacians and these latter were in their turn replaced by the Magdalenians and others. Migrations and race-contacts have always furnished the framework of organized societal existence.

In historic times the subversion of the Roman Empires in Europe and that of the Hindu and other Empires in Asia have spelt likewise the ascendancy of certain racial elements at the cost of certain others. So far as modern Eur-Asia is concerned, the same process of race-mixture, race-submergence and race-uplift has been going on until we find that anthropologically the modern Indian's affinities with the ancients of his land are perhaps as problematic as those of the modern European with the ancients of his continent.

(f) *Contemporary Vertical Mobilities*

The world-process in group "metabolism" is visible under our very eyes in Bengal.[56] In the social economy of Bengal there are some thirty tribes known as aboriginals, constituting a diversified group of a million and a quarter, and representing some 3 per cent of the total population. The big three of these primitives, namely, the Santals, the Oraons, and the Mundas, are responsible for nearly two-thirds of this number. But while the big

56 *Census of India* 1931, Vol. V. *Bengal and Sikkim* Part I. (1933) pp. 441, 444, 454, 480-484, 490, 492, 497-499, 502-503.

three "higher" castes, the Kāyasthas, Brāhmaṇas and Vaidyas, numbering something over three millions, have during the last forty years grown 37 per cent the aboriginals have grown 219 per cent. The rate of growth is phenomenal, pointing, as it does, to extraordinary "differential fertility."

This numerical growth, important in itself as it is, acquires a fresh significance when one observes that the aboriginals are today more Hindu than "tribal" in religion. Nearly sixty-six per cent of the big three primitives is Hindu. As a transformation, the Hinduization of the aboriginals is further interesting in another regard. The Hinduized aboriginals form a part, nearly 12 per cent, of what are generally called the "depressed classes,"—say, the *Harijans* (God's children)—of the Hindu society. We understand, then, that the aboriginals of yesterday constitute the depressed classes of today. In other words, the societal transformation known as Hinduization hides the fact of, or prepares the way to, racial expansion, race-fusion and race-assimilation.

Nor does the process stop here. Among the big three "higher" castes, the Kāyasthas were during the last four decades just below the Brāhmaṇas in number. But they were rising until today they have outnumbered the latter. In forty years while the Brāhmaṇa has grown 24 per cent, the Kāyastha has grown 58 per cent. What is this growth of Kāyasthas due to? Not all to fecundity or "natural increment", i.e., the surplus of births over deaths. A great deal is to be accounted for by invasions from other castes whose upward trends have been manifest for some long time. The non-Kāyastha, perhaps, one of the depressed of yesterday, has grown into the Kāyastha,

a higher caste of today. And in this, again, we have to register not only a social but a racial transformation as well. From the aboriginal to the high-caste Hindu the gap may be great, but the bridges are sure although slow, and quite solid. Social "stratification" is not rigid, as Ammon propagates in *Die Gesellschaftsordnung und ihre natürliche Grundlagen* (Social Order and its Natural Foundations), 1893.

Altogether, the Bengali people is expanding although it is undergoing a radical change in class character and racial make-up.[57] The transformations that have been going on in Eur-America today on account of the pressure of the Slavs upon the other races should appear to belong almost to the same category as those in India. As for the "quality" of hybrids or their capacity for carrying forward the torch of civilization, eugencis is still discreetly silent or indefinite in its conclusion unless the exponent happens to have a conservative reform scheme on the anvil. But positive history announces that, notwithstanding the doctrine of Lapouge in *Les Sélections Sociales,* races may come and races may go but that civilization goes on for ever.

The Diversity of the Nītiśāstras

To come back to the state-systems, these larger and more celebrated kingdoms and empires of the Hindus

57 See the discussions on the "Aboriginals of West Bengal" led by Haridas Palit at the *"Āntarjātik Banga" Parishat* ("International Bengal" Institute), Calcutta (*Amrita Bazar Patrika,* Calcutta, 3 May 1934). Compare in this connection the facts of miscegenation in René Martial's *La Race Française et la nouvelle Conception du Mot Race,* a paper for the International Congress of Population, Berlin 1935 (see *Bevölkerungsfragen* ed. by Harmsen and Lohse, Munich 1936, pp. 486-493).

have flourished through over several thousand years of recorded history and in conditions of physical environment as varied as possible in a country like India, the 'epitome of the world'. The types of political organization, therefore, that Indian history presents must be more or less diversified in character to meet the requirements of peoples living under diverse geographical and topographical influences. And one naturally expects a diversity of political philosophies or codes, *Nītiśāstras*, and manuals of governmental rules. In spite of the oneness and basic uniformity of Hindu life throughout India, the text-book of political life evolved in the extreme north, say Kāśmīr, is not likely to be that exactly adjusted to the needs of the Dravidians of the extreme south. Or, again, the rules and regulations which the Marathas framed for themselves in the South-west of India as champions of Hindu freedom against the Mussalmans could not be copied *in toto* from a chapter of the *Nītiśāstra* that was taught, say, to the Pāla or Sena Kings of Bengal in pre-Mussalman times. Politics like everything else of human life are the results of adaptation to the circumstances of time and place; and the history of a people has ever been powerfully influenced, although not in a monistic manner, as indicated above, by the geography and sociography of its habitat.

An analysis of the geographical facts and phenomena occurring in the Hindu *Nītiṣāstras* or treatises on morals (social, economic and political) is therefore likely to be an important factor in assigning each text to the proper sets of physical and social conditions,—the "ecological complex",—under which it was composed.

CHAPTER IV.

MOHENJO DARO MONUMENTS VIS-À-VIS VEDIC TEXTS (C. 3500-2500 B.C.)

The Homeric antiquity of Greece lost its prestige about half a century ago on account of the discoveries in Crete. Homer was then found to be not so much the first of a new series as the last of an old. The same "misfortune" has befallen Vedic India today owing to the "inconvenient" discoveries of the Mohenjo Daro-Harappa culture. In the perspective of the "Hindus" who were responsible for the technocracy and spiritual life of that civilization the Vedic *Ṛiṣis* are found to be much too "flat, jejune, modern." Once more has Vedic civilization grown into a regular "problem" of world-culture. This question has bearings not only on the old issues relating to the so-called Indo-Aryan complex but on the new ones also relating to the origins of civilization itself. And the problems are as much anthropologico-geographical as chronologico-historical.

The relations, both statical and dynamic, as well as formal and contentual, between the Vedas and the "Indus Valley" happen for the time being to be quite mysterious. One reason for this mystery is perhaps to be found in the data themselves. The monuments of Mohenjo Daro complex are as yet non-literary. They speak to us only through "stocks and stones," so to say. On the other hand, the language of the Vedas is almost exclusively literary. The "stocks and stones"

should appear to be almost unknown to the Vedic *milieu*. On the face of it there is hardly any intellectual nexus between the two complexes. The mind operating behind or through the one set of human creations does not seem to have any affinity with that behind the other.

One thing, however, is clear. The "stocks and stones" created by the men and women of Mohenjo Daro have their bearings on the life-systems to the East of the Indus, i.e., to India Proper no less than on those to the West, i.e., to Persia, Asia Minor, Egypt and so forth. Janus-like they are double-faced in their forms and contents. Archæology will perhaps have to wait for quite a few decades before the exact orientations of these finds to the East and the West are deciphered.

But in the meantime it may not be entirely out of the question for the students of social science to attempt reading some meaning into the diverse art-forms—architectural, sculptural, etc.,—such as have been unearthed in plenty. The language of art,—the "geometry" of forms,—is universal. The "stocks and stones" also can be eloquent especially because they have their cognates and agnates. Some of the "stocks and stones" to which the "Hindus" of modern India are used,—no matter how diverse their cranial types and howsoever removed from the Indus Valley they may happen to be,—are the family likenesses of just those antique specimens which have rendered the creations of Vedic *Ṛiṣis* but the phenomena of yesterday. A psychological affinity between those Indians of 3500 B.C. and the Indians of today as registered in the *élan vital* or creative urge behind many of the art-forms may be considered to be fairly plausible. This is one side of the story.

From another standpoint, we may have to believe in no distant future that the Vedic *Ṛiṣis* were not without culture-contacts with the *Ṛiṣis* of Mohenjo Daro. May be, some of the items of the Mohenjo Daro complex are actually to be found in certain Vedic strands. Perhaps it may be established somewhat that during certain periods of this culture-contact the Mohenjo Daro monuments and the Vedic texts supplemented each other. In other words, the archæology of the Mohenjo Daro finds may have a part of its literary background in the Vedas, while the archæological monuments corresponding to Vedic literature may have in part to be detected in the finds of Mohenjo Daro, Harappa and allied regions. The antiquity of Vedic life and thought may altogether have to be pushed farther back towards the third or fourth millennium B.C.

All this guess-work is to be treated for the present as nothing but conjecture, pure and undefiled. But that the history of the achievements of Hindu culture finds itself today in the most complicated melting-point there is no doubt. The beginnings of a new indology are already in sight.[1]

1 W. Wuest: "Ueber die neuesten Ausgrabungen im nordwestlichen Indien" (*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* Vol. LXXXI.

R. Chanda: "Survival of the Prehistoric Civilisation of the Indus Valley" (*Memoirs of the Archæological Survey of India*, Calcutta 1929).

B. Svarup: "Harappa Seals and the Antiquity of Writing in India" (*Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, Patna, Vol. IX.)

S. V. Venkatesvara: "Vedic Iconography" (*Rupam*, Calcutta April-October, 1930).

L. Renou: *Bibliographie Védique* (Paris, 1931).

CHAPTER V.

VEDIC IDEOLOGY (C. 2500-600 B.C.)

For the time being, it is out of the question to discuss the literature, political or otherwise, created by the Mohenjo Daro culture. Our oldest documents for some long time to come must be the Vedic. And as we are interested exclusively in *Nīti* or politics, i.e., political institutions and theories, in our present study it is worth while to define the kind of topics covered by this comprehensive category.

For the purposes of the present author's *Political Philosophies Since 1905* (Madras 1928) politics has been taken to comprise five different topics: (1) constitution and law, i.e., public and private law, (2) economic policy, (3) international and inter-racial relations, (4) societal organization and (5) mental and moral philosophy. Our problem consists in discovering in the field of Hindu literature all those texts which bear on one or other of these five different aspects of group life.

The Categories and Chronology of Vedic Literature

Important literary documents of Vedic ideology are four-fold: the *Rig*, the *Sāma*, the *Yajus* and the *Atharva Samhitās* or collections. The question cannot be taken to have been finally closed as to whether these four Vedic *Samhitās* represent any chronological sequence or only four different principles of classification or indexing. One should be justified in holding that the *Sāma*

Veda which =*Rig Veda* for the purposes of chanting cannot be taken to belong to a later period of time than the *Rig Veda*. The recital of hymns and the chanting of the hymns must have constituted one institutional complex and therefore belonged to the same age. Similarly there is no sense in believing that the ritualistic material of the *Yajurveda* which is nothing but formulæ for the priests in connection with the hymns and chants of the sacrifice could have originated separately from or later than either the recital or the principles of chanting. The materials of the three Vedas constitute one organic whole, being but three aspects of one and the same socio-cultural *Gestalt* or form-complex. The synchronism of the three collections or *Samhitās* may be taken therefore to be an ideological, nay, a factual necessity.

The hymns of the *Sāma Veda* are not however to be taken as direct reproductions from those of the *Rig Veda*. The *Sāma Veda* has strung each one of its hymns together by taking verses out of the *Rig Veda* from here and there and everywhere. The *Sāma Veda*, besides, does not cover the entire ground of the *Rig Veda*.

As for the *Atharva Veda* it seems to be a specialized collection of certain items and incidents in the "folk lore" of the age of which the "culture lore" was collected in the three other *Samhitās*. One can easily understand that the *Rik Samhitā* wanted to bring together the *Riks* (hymns) exclusively. This is why the charms, incantations, medical recipes, the manners and customs of the people etc., did not happen to find a place there. It is in these aspects of Vedic life that the *Atharva Samhitā* specialized. But simply because one specialization led to the collection of the *Riks* and the other to that of spells and in-

cantations etc. we cannot be automatically forced to believe that the world of *Riks* had nothing to do with the other items of life. Normally speaking, we should hold that the material of the *Atharva Veda* is as old as that of the *Rig Veda*. Oldest Vedic life comprised the experiences embodied in both these collections.

Nay, one may take the *Rig Veda*, as does the French indologist, Barth, to be younger than the *Atharva Veda*.[1] Only a part of the faiths of the period is opened up by the *Rig Veda*. The authors of the *Riks* or rather their compilers have over-looked or ignored many of the institutions such as are to be found, for instance, in the *Atharva Veda*.

There is another problem to attack. Each of these four collections or *Samhitās* is incomplete as literature without certain appendages. These appendages are known as *Brāhmaṇas*. The *Brāhmaṇas*, again, are incomplete without the *Āraṇyaks*, and these last again are incomplete without the *Upaniṣads*. Logically, therefore, we should expect the four items, the *Samhitā* of a *Veda*, the *Brāhmaṇa* of the *Samhitā*, the *Āraṇyaka* of the *Brāhmaṇa*, and the *Upaniṣad* of the *Āraṇyaka* to go together, and constitute one complex. Naturally, therefore, the *Upaniṣad* may be taken to be as old as the *Veda*. It is almost senseless to believe that during certain periods people took interest only in the *Samhitā*, that afterwards they began to take interest in the *Brāhmaṇas*, that later they cultivated the *Āraṇyaks*, and that several hundred years after the compilation of the *Samhitā*

1 De la Vallée Poussin: *Indo-Européens et Indo-iraniens* (Paris 1924), p. 252.

people composed or compiled the *Upaniṣads*. From the standpoint of social experience a process of successive emergence of new classes of literature within the orbit of the same *Samhitā* would have hardly any meaning. Sociologically, we should rather be prepared for the circumstance that the *Upaniṣads* were being composed or compiled while the *Samhitās* were being brought together. The process was perhaps that of *pari passu* collection rather than of chronological sequence.

The chief documents of Vedic literature may now be indicated as follows :

Samhitās	*Brāhmaṇas*	*Āraṇyakas*	*Upaniṣads*
I. Rig Veda	*1. Aitareya*	*Aitareya*	*Aitareya*
	2. Kausitakī, or Sāmkhyāyana	*Kausitakī*	*Kausitakī*
II. Sāma Veda	*1. Panchavimśa*	*X*	*Chhāndogya*
=Rig Veda for chanting purposes	*2. Jaiminīya*	*Jaiminīya*	*Kena*
III. Yajur Veda			
(a) Black			
1. Taittirīya	*Taittirīya*	*Taittirīya*	*Taittirīya*
2. Kaṭhaka			
3. Maitrāyaṇī			
4. Kapiṣṭhala			
(b) White :			
Vājsaneyī	*Śatapatha*	*X*	*Brihad-āraṇyaka*
IV. Atharva Veda	*Gopatha*	*X*	*X*

But the problems of chronology cannot be dismissed or dealt with in a naïve manner simply because of logical or sociological necessity. The fact remains that we are dealing with long periods and extensive regions.

To a certain extent the problems of Hellenic culture from the earliest pre-Homeric and Homeric times down to Lycurgus of Sparta (c 650 B.C.) and Solon of Athens (c 550 B.C.) may be taken as parallel to those of Vedic and pre-Vedic culture down to Bimbisāra, Mahāvīra and Sākyasimha (c 550 B.C.). The subsequent periods in Greece and India for about two centuries were likewise more or less similar both in form and content. The Socratic, post-Socratic, and Sophistic speculations down to Aristotle and Alexander (c 300 B.C.) might be easily treated as synchronous with the Upaniṣadic and post-Sākyan or "Buddhist" and other speculations of the Hindus down to Kauṭalya and Chandragupta Maurya (c 300 B.C.).

The regional and racial factors of the Vedic culture-complex are essentially similar, although on a much larger scale, to those of the Homeric. The theatre of the Homeric culture-complex is furnished by such heterogeneous elements as Asia Minor, the islands and the mainland of Greece. And in the problems of chronology also Vedic India does not present a special case. These considerations might suggest relatively modest conjectures as to the antiquity of the most ancient strata of the Vedic texts. We have to fix our attention on the fact that Hesiod is generally assigned the ninth century B. C. and that Homer is not placed anywhere previous to the middle of the eleventh century B.C.

Until the researches in the Mohenjo Daro fields compel the archæologists to push back the epochs of Vedic India in point of time it may not be reasonable, therefore, to think of the oldest Vedic texts as older than 1200-1000 B.C.

Vedic literature may be conveniently although somewhat arbitrarily taken to be a literature of nearly a thousand years from, say, 1500-1200 B.C. i.e. the epoch of the Bharatas, the Tritsus and the Yadus etc., to the beginnings of Jainism and Buddhism, say, *c.* 600 B.C.[2] i.e. to the powerful kingdoms of Kāśī, Kośala, Magadha, and so forth. This is an extensive period and the literature indicates the rise and fall of myriads of races or tribes as well as the gradual submission of virtually the whole of Northern India to Vedic institutions and ideas.

In regard to the region and epoch of origin, each and every hymn, *sūkta,* rite, ruling, ceremony, incantation, magic and what not will have to be treated on its own merits. A generically Vedic culture can hardly be a sociologically scientific category. It presents a sub-continental *Gestalt* of multi-racial morphology and diverse socio-regional ecologies.

Although the question is anything but clear, Vedic chronology can for certain purposes be tentatively taken to be as follows[3] :

1.	*Rig Veda Samhitā*	:	*c* 1200 B.C.—1000
2.	Other *Samhitās*	:	1000 B.C.—800

2 *Supra,* pp. 62-65; N. C. Bandyopadhyaya : *Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories* Part I. (Calcutta 1927), pp. 66-73, 129-152.

3 *The Cambridge History of India* Vol. I. (1922), pp. 112-113, 147-149. Although the dates are being adapted from Keith's two papers in this *History* the interpretation of the Vedic complex as presented here is fundamentally different from his (cf. pp. 114-116).

3. *Brāhmaṇas*	:	800—600 B.C.
4. *Upaniṣads*	:	600—400 B.C.
5. *Sūtras* (i. *Srauta*, ii. *Grihya*, iii. *Dharma*)	:	400—200 B.C.

While it is extremely difficult to avoid using the term Vedic in a generic manner as covering practically everything from the *Samhitā* to the *Upaniṣad* and the *Sūtra* it should be proper always to mark out the precise text and let it speak for itself. One word, "Vedic", must not be permitted to cover the most varied transformations or revolutions, racial and social, institutional as well as ideological, that took place in Northern India during nearly one thousand years from Sudāsa to Bimbisāra.

Vedic Positivism

The ideals of the Riṣis of the Vedic culture-complex are not very metaphysical or other-worldly, the atmosphere of sacrifices, hymns, prayers and gods notwithstanding. The literature is preoccupied with the annihilation of the enemy, the seizure of enemy properties, the distribution of the booty, the expansion of one's territory, and the attainment of the highest position in the society of men. It describes jealousies, ambitions, hatreds, wars, elections, harangues, and rivalries for accession to the throne.[4]

The regime of *stena* (thieves) is feared in the *Rig Veda* (II. 23, 16). The *Atharva Veda* (XIX, 17) writes

4 Zimmer: *Altindisches Leben* (Berlin 1879), pp. 162-165

of the fears and dangers of the night, such as thieves, wolves and snakes. Criminology is in evidence.

The *Rig Veda* (X, 173) furnishes us with a hymn sung on the occasion of installing an elected king. It speaks of the steadfastness of the rock, Indra, the heaven, the earth, and the mountain, and it calls upon the king to be true or loyal to the *viṣ* (folk).

The *Atharva Veda* describes the ceremonies associated with the election of kings. In I, 9, prayer is being offered to Agni to the effect that he should advance the person that is being elected as king to the *śreṣṭhya* i.e. the first place among the *sajāta* or kith and kin.

The blessings to be showered on the elected king are likewise the stuff of some of the hymns of the *Atharva Veda*. In III, 4 one of the greetings to the king from the people is described as life up to the 100th year. Indra is prayed to in IV, 22 in order that the king may rise to the highest of human kings and become the only ruler of the world.

The poets of the *Atharva Veda* likewise are not often carried away by extra doses of idealistic imagination. In IV, 11 we read certain things such as might inspire a Marxist to discover the "economic interpretation of history." The draft-ox is there described as "sustaining the earth and sky." He "sustains the wide atmosphere." He "sustains the six directions." He has "entered into all existence." "With his feet treading down debility, with his thighs extracting refreshing milk, with weariness go the draft-ox and the ploughman unto sweet drink."

At another place (VI, 142) the barley is being asked to rise up and become "abundant with its own greatness,"

to be "unexhausted like the ocean." The "increase of barley" as furnishing the material foundation of life and prosperity has further evoked from Viśvāmitra the following verse:[5] "Unexhausted be thine attendants, unexhausted thy heaps, thy bestowers be unexhausted, thy eaters be unexhausted," says he. From food resources to population the entire gamut is embodied in this prayer of a Vedic *Ṛiṣi*.

It is not necessary to be monistic enough to describe the *Atharva Veda* as nothing but a document of economic ideas and institutions. But such verses, and their name is legion, should compel indologists to banish from their mentality the ultra-Hegelian and romantic conception of Vedic literature as being nothing but religious, metaphysical or mystical. It is only necessary to be adequately oriented to Vedic positivism at the threshold of investigations into the literature and life of the thousand years previous to the rise of powerful kingdoms in the age of Bimbisāra, Mahāvīra, and Sākya the Buddha.

The Perspectives of Vedic Political Thought

The right place of Vedic thought in the history of socio-political speculations requires yet to be appropriately grasped by indologists as well as students of sociology and comparative culture-history. Neither the polity nor the political thoughts of the Vedic *Ṛiṣis* (sages), should there be any, can be adequately explained if one approaches the subject from the angle of mythology and

5 Whitney and Lanman: *Atharva Veda* (Harvard Oriental Series 1905), First Half, pp. 163-166, 387. For the homage to the cow (X, 10) see pp. 605-609.

religion or from that of the life-history of the sacrificial priest like Vaśiṣṭha or Viśvāmitra, nay, of the tribal chief like, say, Sudāsa. This is why, generally speaking, indologists are misled into one-sided views and fail to visualize the genuine problems of the "fire-sages." One does not require to be a tremendous Vedic philologist in order to understand the most elementary fact that the problems of those *Riks* on fire were oriented essentially to *Rassenkampf* or race-struggle. The conflicts were both inter-group and intra-group. The fire-sagas were harnessed to colonising and expansion on the one hand and to inter-tribal war and peace on the other. Altogether, we encounter the atmosphere of jealousy and rage, for instance, like that of Viśvāmitra (*Rig Veda* III, 33, 53, 9-11) and the evocation and development of the aggressive personality of the *viṣ* (race, tribe or folk) group.

An important, perhaps the most important item in the Vedic complex is the *viṣ* itself. It is not enough to know only the chief or the priest, oriented to warfare as each is. We cannot afford to ignore the real centre of political as well as social and economic interest in the Vedic *milieu*, namely, the *viṣ* (people).

A paramount element in the public life of Vedic India is furnished by the wars of the colonising i.e. Aryan *viṣ*-groups with the Dasyus (original inhabitants). Wars among the colonising i.e. Aryan *viṣ* groups themselves, e.g., the five *kriṣṭayah, kṣitayah* or *jātāh*, namely, Yadu, Anu, Druhyu, Turvasa and Puru constitute a second factor of importance. External or foreign politics, to use modern categories, form the foundations of *viṣ* activities. It is the *viṣ* nucleus that is abroad "conquering and to conquer," and it is the "world-conquests" of

these *viṣ*-groups that the fire-*riṣis* or sages are promoting in and through their *Riks* (X, 84, 3).[6]

Vedic polity cannot be identified with the polity of the chieftain and the priest. It is essentially the polity of the *viṣ*, the demos, the mass. It is the harangues in the "crowd" and addressed to the crowd, no matter whether in the form of hymns, prayers or incantations, that constitute the ideological ecology of the Vedic complex. It is the movements, the mobilizations *en masse*, the *charaiveti*[7] (move on) of the folk that furnish the *élan vital* of Vedic men and women.

The *Yajurveda Taittirīya Samhitā* (I. viii, 12) is well up in harangues. The following hymn tells its own tale:[8]

"Notified is Agni, lord of the house; notified is Indra, of ancient fame; notified is Puṣan, all-knower, notified are Mitra and Varuṇa, increasing holy order; notified are sky and earth of sure vows; notified is the goddess Aditi, of all forms; notified is he, N.N. descendant of N.N. in this folk, this kingdom, for great lordship, for great overlordship, for great rule over the people.

"This is your king, O Bhāratas; Soma is the king
of us Brāhmaṇas.
"Thou art the bolt of Indra slaying foes;
with thee may he slay his foe.
"Ye are overcomers of foes.

6 See the chapter on "Völker und Stämme" in Zimmer: *Altindisches Leben* (Berlin 1879) pp. 103-104, 118-122, 127-128, 162-163: and A. B. Keith's chapter on "The Age of the *Rig Veda*" in the *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I. (1922), pp. 81-86.

7 *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VII, 15.

8 Keith: *The Veda of Black Yajus School*, Part I. (1919) pp. 123-124.

"Protect me in front, protect me at the side, protect me from behind, from the quarters protect me: from all deadly things protect me."

One of these harangues is worded as follows in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VIII, 12-15):[9] "Do ye proclaim him, O Indra, as overlord and overlordship, as paramount ruler and father of paramount rulers, as self-ruler and self-rule, as sovereign and sovereignty, as king and father of kings, as supreme lord and supreme authority." The manifesto goes on in the same strain. The *viṣ* is being told that "the lordly power has been born, the eater of the folk hath been born, the breaker of citadels hath been born, the slayer of *asuras* hath been born, the guardian of the holy power hath been born, the guardian of law hath been born."

Another harangue may be quoted from the *Atharva Veda* (III, 3), which refers to the restoration of a king who has been deposed.

"For the waters let king Varuṇa call thee"; says the hymn, "let Soma call thee for the mountains; let Indra call thee for these subjects (*viṣ*); becoming a falcon, fly unto these subjects.

"Let the falcon lead hither from far the one to be called, living exiled in others' territory; let the two Aśvins make the road for thee easy to go; settle together about this man, Ye his fellows.

"Let thine opponents call thee; thy friends have chosen thee against them. Indra and Agni, all the gods have maintained for thee security in the people.

9 Keith: *Rigveda Brāhmaṇas* (Aitareya and Kausitaki), Cambridge, Mass., 1920, pp. 329-330.

"Whatever fellow disputes thy call and whatever outsider,—making him go away, O Indra, then do thou reinstate this man here."[10]

Such political harangues, in tune as they are with the democratic atmosphere of the *viṣ*, form a signal feature of Vedic literature.

The Pluralistic Make-up of the Vedic Culture-Complex

For certain purposes we may go so far as to say that there are virtually not more than two *Veda Samhitās*, the *Rig* and the *Atharva*. To the *Rig* belong as a matter of course the *Sāma* and the *Yajus*. This Rigvedic complex may be taken to be the embodiment, as suggested above, of the "culture-lore" in contrast with the *Atharva Samhitā* which embodies, say, the "folk-lore." Some of the popular, mass, democratic, and secular, worldly or materialistic elements of Vedic life and thought are by all means to be found in the Rigvedic complex. But it is in the *Atharva Samhitā* that we are to look for them in specialized or concentrated forms, although of course the presence of "culture-lore" in this *Samhitā* is not entirely to be denied. To one dealing with Hindu positivism of the Vedic period the *Atharva* is therefore bound to loom large.

The complexity and pluralistic make-up of the Vedic literature are suggested from other angles too. It does not require too much of creative imagination to believe that the 1017 hymns collected in the *Rig Veda Samhitā*

10 Whitney and Lanman: *Atharva Veda Samhita* (Cambridge, Mass. 1905), First Half, pp. 87-88.

do not constitute all that the people of the period produced in that line. Nobody can be charged with being too suspicious if it is believed that the entire *corpus* of beliefs of the Vedic tribes is perhaps not to be found in that compilation. The *viṣ* (people) may be taken to have cherished other faiths and created other hymns through other *Riṣis*. Some of those other beliefs are but incidentally referred to in the collection that we possess today.

The later manuals of domestic rites speak of certain customs and beliefs that are at least as old as the *Rig Veda* and may be even older. The concept of *rita* (cosmic order, right etc.), corresponding to the Chinese *Tao*,[11] indicates an ideology which is opposed to the animistic theory that dominates the extant *Rig Veda Samhitā*. Another non-animistic concept is to be found in the doctrine of *tapas* (self-mortification). This is a practice which produces its results even without prayers to the gods. The concept of the Vedic sacrifices betrays likewise a strand of thought which is somewhat independent of the gods. Indeed, the gods themselves are subject to the power of sacrifices and hymns. This sort of mysticism is independent of the gods and will have to be treated as representative of some other forces without which the Vedic complex is not complete. The incidental and almost ignorable references to such beliefs[12] in the *Rig Veda* point but to the other worlds of

11 B. K. Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916), pp. 13-15, 26.

12 T. W. Rhys Davids: "The Chakkavatti" in the R. G. Bhandarkar *Commemoration Volume* (Poona 1917) pp. 125-131; Przyluski: "The Three Factors of Vedic Culture" (*Indian Culture*, January 1935).

life and thought, whose *Beziehungen* or relations to the society described in the Vedas, as Simmel or von Wiese would say, cannot be overlooked in a comprehensive treatment of Vedic institutions.

The diverse regional values of the Vedic texts must not be overlooked. The territory is divided into four regions, North, South, East and West, in the *Atharva Veda Samhitā* (III, 27, XII, 3), the *Yajurveda Samhitā* (*Taittirīya* IV, 4, 12, 2) and the *Vājasaneyī Samhitā* (XV, 10-14). According to the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VIII, 14) of the *Rig Veda Samhitā* the "midland" (*madhyadeśa*) knows only of *rājyas* (lesser political organisms) whereas the East is used to *sāmrājyas* (larger statal entities, e.g., "empires"). The rulers in Eastern India are accordingly known as *Samrāṭs*. In these Eastern *Samrāṭs* of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* one may easily see the counterparts of Janaka of Mithilā (North Bihar) who is known as *Samrāṭ* in the *Brihadāraṇyaka Upaniṣat* (IV, 1) of the *Yajurveda*. Jarāsandha of Rājagriha (South Bihar) whom the *Mahābhārata* (III, 14, 9-10) describes as the "great sovereign and master" can be regarded as another exemplar for the *Aitareya* authors.[13]

The *Brahmachārin* of the *Atharva Veda* (XI, 5, 6) is described as a person wandering to the Eastern Ocean. The *Pūrva Samudra* (Eastern Ocean) is known to the *Rig Veda* (X, 136) too. The *nāvah samudriyāh* (*Rig*, I, 25, 7) or sea-going vessels need not be taken as referring to the Western Ocean alone but to the Eastern as well.

13 H. Chakladar: "Contribution of Bihar to Vedic Culture" in the *Proceedings and Transactions of the Sixth All-India Oriental Conference* (Patna, December 1930) Patna 1933 pp. 507-508.

Altogether, the Eastern origins of some of the earliest strands of Vedic literature seem very plausible. It cannot be reasonable to look upon North-western India and the midland as the original home of the entire Vedic institutions and ideas. Eastern India, especially Magadha and Videha, i.e. Bihar (North and South) will have to be accorded a due place in the making of the Vedic culture-complex.

While acknowledging the debts of Aryan or Vedic culture to India it should at the same time be reasonable to suspect that the Aryanization of Magadha (Northern Bihar) and Videha (South Bihar) was skin-deep.[14] The Aryans of the *Madhyadeśa* (Kuru-Pānchāla) region could not but look upon the inhabitants of the *Prāchyadeśa,* the region to the East of the *Sadānīrā*[15] (Gaṇḍakī) River as wanting in sanctity and unsuitable for the performance of sacrifices.

The category, "Aryan", is being used in the linguistic, philological or cultural sense. The "racial," ethnological or blood pluralism of the Vedic ecology is an independent consideration and must not be taken to be identical with the heterogeneity implied in the *charaiveti* or expansion of a dominant culture in the sphere of alien cultures, as discussed in the present context. It is necessary to take note of the unscientific manner in which the category "Aryan" is very commonly taken in the ethnological or racial sense.

14 N. Dutt: *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism* (Calcutta 1925) pp. 36-38, 81-84; H. C. Chakladar: "Eastern India and Aryavarta" in the *IHQ.*, for March 1928.

15 Macdonell and Keith: *Vedic Index* Vol. II, (London 1912) pp. 421-422.

In much later works like the *Manu Samhitā* (X, 5) Māgadha and Vaideha are to be found among the "mixed castes," and described as owing their origin to *apasāda* or low birth, e.g., the union of a higher caste woman with a relatively lower caste man. Now Māgadha literally denotes an inhabitant of Magadha and Vaideha an inhabitant of Videha. One can easily suspect, therefore, that in the tradition represented by Manu these regions of Eastern India are treated with contempt as being extra-Vedic or extra-Brāhmaṇic, perhaps semi-Vedic and semi-Brāhmaṇic. In Manu's ethnology, again, the Lichchhavis of Vesāli and the Mallas of Kusinārā are Kṣatriya-Vrātyas. Now Kṣatriya-Vrātyas are Kṣatriyas who became Vrātyas, i.e., lost the genuine Kṣatriyahood on account of neglecting to perform the initiation (*upanayana*) ceremony. In this instance, also, the suspicion is strong that these "republican" races of Eastern India, well-known in the Jātaka stories relating to Sākya the Buddha's contemporaries, are treated in the hundred-percent Vedic tradition as somewhat inferior in social status.[16]

The Puruṣa-sūkta No Index to Caste Origins or Social Order

Among the indologists there is often a tendency to read into the Vedic literature some very modern *mores* and institutions. The *Puruṣa-sūkta* (*Rig Veda*, X, 90), composed by the poet or philosopher, Nārāyaṇa, has

16 R. Fick: *Die Sociale Gliederung im nordöstilichen Indien zu Buddhas Zeit* (Kiel 1897), Ch. I.

been the subject of much modernistic interpretation.[17] The castes and caste morals of recent times are alleged to be already in evidence in the Vedic formula as incorporated in those verses. But strictly speaking, neither the origins of classes or castes nor the facts of social superiority or inferiority can be discovered in the atmosphere of this *Sūkta*.

At one place the *Sūkta* says that the Puruṣa's mouth became the Brāhmaṇa and at another we read that Indra and Agni sprang from the mouth. In the one case the mouth is mentioned first, but in the other instance the mouth is mentioned third, the first place being given to the mind and the second to the eye.

According to this latter arrangement, then, the Moon that springs from the mind is perhaps superior to the Sun that springs from the item that is mentioned next, namely, the eye. And, therefore, Indra and Agni are to be taken as inferior respectively to the Moon and Sun.

Further, the *Sūkta* mentions the mouth twice but in two different positions. Similarly the feet are mentioned twice and this, again, in two different ways. In the first instance, the feet occupy the fourth place, and the Śūdra is supposed to have sprung from them. In the second instance, the feet occupy the fourth place, and the Śūdra arose the earth. In the first instance, the feet are the last to be mentioned, but in the second instance the feet

17 B. Barua's *History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy* (Calcutta 1921, p. 33) says, for instance, that it is clearly implied in the expressions of Nārāyaṇa that "his views are absolutely in favour of the existing caste system or class distinctions." But the author has not tried to explain where and how the "caste system" has been "defended" or justified by Nārāyaṇa.

have precedence before the ear which is the eighth in order.

In the *Sūkta*, again, at one point the breath of the Puruṣa gives rise to the god of wind. But at another point the air arose from the navel. In other words, the gods of wind and air are two different categories with two independent origins, and these are as different as the breath and the navel.

On the face of it, the enumeration should be treated as indiscriminate. If the authors of the *Puruṣa-sūkta* are to be credited with a certain amount of coherent thinking, logical order or sense of system we shall have to understand them as having propounded a dogma of precedence or pre-eminence in which the navel (and correspondingly the air) is superior to the head (and correspondingly, the sky), the head (sky) as superior to the feet (earth), and feet (earth) as superior to the ear (four quarters). And, again, as already indicated above, the mind (Moon) should be superior to the eye (Sun), the eye (Sun) superior to the mouth (Indra and Agni), and the mouth (Indra and Agni) superior to the breath (god of wind).

Unless the navel be conceded to be superior to the head, and the feet superior to the ear,—simply because the authors have cared to mention these items in that order,—the Brāhmaṇa cannot be superior to the Rājanya and the Vaiśya to the Śūdra. One is not at liberty to have two or three different logics in one and the same *sūkta*. We find that the items have been mentioned in a very haphazard manner. The string of names that we come across here does not constitute a system in any sense. Neither the students of astronomy nor of

physics would be inclined to fight over the "value" or the significance to be attached to the place assigned to the natural agencies, the air, the sky, the earth and the four quarters in the *Sūkta*-schedule. No value ought, therefore, to be reasonably attached to the order in which the Brāhmaṇa, the Rājanya etc. have been mentioned in this "award" of the poet Nārāyaṇa as recorded in the *Rig Veda*. The question of the precedence or superiority of some in relation to the others cannot be said to arise in the enumeration, illogical and incoherent as it is.[18]

The chief value of the *Puruṣa Sūkta* consists in the fact that the social category, Śūdra, is already known. But it does not say anything about his relations *vis-à-vis* the other social categories. Nor do we know anything about the relations of the other categories *vis-à-vis* one another.

Other "Vedic" texts, e.g., the *Samhitās* and *Brāhmaṇas* may perhaps be cited for approaches to the conditions as understood by the caste system. But the *Puruṣa Sūkta* cannot be interpreted to yield anything like that.

The social condition of the castes described in the Buddhist *Jātakas* and *Vinaya* or in the *Dharmaśāstras* is not to be projected into the *milieu* of the *Puruṣa-sūkta*.

The *Puruṣa-sūkta* makes it clear, incidentally, that the *Śūdra* is not a non-Aryan in the cultural and social sense. Or even if he be a non-Aryan the Aryan has already accepted him as a member of his own societal organization.

18 Contrast B. Prasad: *The Theory of Government in Ancient India* (Allahabad 1927) pp. 12-13.

The Vaiśya in the Taittirīya "Social Award"

Certain phrases are often quoted from the Vedic encyclopædia to seemingly fortify the dogma of the alleged social inequalities or of superiority and inferiority among the four orders.[19] The *Taittirīya Samhitā* (VII, 1, i) furnishes an illustration of the "social award" as embodied in the caste system. But there we are told simply that one (the Brāhmaṇa) is the "chief" and another (the Kṣatriya) is "strong" and so forth. It is not possible to wring out of that passage the idea that one is superior to or enjoys precedence over the other. The only social philosophy that can be discovered here is that each one is somebody in his own field.

We need not forget that the Vaiśya who is described there as "fit to be eaten" is likewise somebody in his own field. Nay, the Śūdra, who is "dependent on others," is "not created after any gods" and is "not fit for the sacrifice", is also important enough to be regarded as somebody. His position in the social economy is at least equal to that of the horse, as we are told. Thus the question of inferiority in the cases of the Vaiśya and the Śūdra cannot come in automatically. We are to understand from the *Taittirīya Samhitā* "award" simply that each serves a distinct function in the social complex.

But perhaps the *Taittirīya Samhitā* already relegates the Śūdra to a relatively subordinate position. The Śūdra has been declared in this "award" to be "not fit for the sacrifice." In the cases of the other three, especially of the Kṣatriya and the Vaiśya no such discriminat-

19 Keith: *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittirīya Samhitā* Part 2 (Cambridge, Mass. 1914) p. 558.

ing award has been made. The social inferiority of the Śūdra as unprivileged may therefore be taken to be an item in the Vedic thought of the period in question.

But so far as the Vaiśya is concerned, we find that he does not have to *kowtow* to the others. He is of course superior to the Śūdra and is on a par with the Kṣatriya and the Brāhmaṇa. Indeed, in so far as he is fit for the sacrifices he becomes "divine", as a matter of course, like the members of the other two orders (*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* III, 2, 1, 39-40). The dogma of social precedence is robbed of all substantial significance by this doctrine of the Vaiśya's equality with the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya.[20]

Nay, the *Taittirīya* is quite aware of the Vaiśya's special rôle in the social economy. We are told that the Vaiśyas were "more numerous than the others, for they were created after the most numerous of the gods." It is implied that the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas who are not superior to the Vaiśyas have however in point of numbers to yield the palm to the latter. And as the Vaiśya represents the factor "to be eaten" like the cow, another item created along with him, the importance of the economic element appears to have been seized by the authors of the *Taittirīya* school or period.

Non-Aryans, "Lower Classes" and Śūdras in Vedic Polity

The *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* (III, 4, 2, 13) describes the artists, craftsmen and other professional groups, many of whom belonged to the "lower classes" and perhaps

20 B. K. Sarkar: "On Some Methods and Conclusions in Hindu Politics" in the *IHQ.*, December 1926, pp. 859-861.

not only culturally but also racially non-Aryan communities. The professional classification of the *viṣ* is to be seen in the *Puruṣamedha*. In II, 4 hypnotising and mesmerising is described as the profession of the Nāgas, the Rākṣasas are known to be skilled in the art of harlequins, and unfair war methods described as the characteristics of Piśāchas. Among the "five newly created Vedas" mentioned in the *Gopatha* Brāhmaṇa (I, 10) of the *Atharva Veda* are to be found the following names: *Sarpa (Nāga)-veda, Asura-veda, Piśācha-veda, Itihāsa* and *Purāṇa*.[21] Vedic literature in some of its branches is thus the literature dealing not only with the Aryans but with the non-Aryans as well and indicates at the same time different states of cultural *rapprochement* between the two. In this context the categories, Aryan and non-Aryan, are to be understood in both linguistic and racial senses, in case it is at all permissible to speak of non-Aryan "races" as ethnological groups.

The folk-elements and along with them the secular and socio-economic elements of the Vedic age are represented not only by the so-called *Dāsas* (non-Aryans) and *Śūdras* but also by the *Niṣādas*, who are known to be the fifth of the *panchajanāh* (i.e. five classes of men) of the *Rig Veda*. The *Brihaddevatā* (VII, 69) knows this fifth class. The *Yajurveda*[22] also in its *Rudrādhyāya* chapter enumerates them along with *Vrātas* (nomads ?), *Takṣaṇs* (carpenters), *Rathakāras* (chariot makers), *Kulālas*

21 S. V. Venkateswara: *Indian Culture Through the Ages* Vol. I. (London 1928) 62-63.

22 This material has been used in R. P. Chanda: *The Indo-Aryan Races* (Rajshahi 1919) pp. 4-6 in another context.

(potters), *Karmāras* (blacksmiths), *Punjiṣṭhas* (fowlers), *Svanins* (dog keepers) and *Mrigayas* (hunters). It is to be noticed that certain economic groups are mentioned along with a tribal group, the *Niṣāda*. The Vedic Aryans did not leave this tribal group in splendid isolation. The performer of the *Viśvajit* (world-conquest) sacrifice was required in the *Panchavimśa Brāhmaṇa* (XVI, 6, 7), for instance, to live for three days among the *Niṣādaṣ*. Chiefs also could be made out of *Niṣādas* by Brāhmaṇa priests by offering certain sacrifices (Kātyāyana: *Srauta Sūtra*, I, 12, and Jaimini: *Mīmāmsā Sūtra*, VI, 1, 51-52). Vedic society was not so one-sided in economic or social morphology or philosophico-religious outlook as is made out by many indologists.

This interpretation, based as it is on Yāska's *Nirukta*, Aupamanyava and Sāyana (*Rig*. I, 7, 9) is evidently wrong, says Zimmer in *Altindisches Leben* (Berlin 1879, pp. 119-120). The five *janāsah, jātāh, kritayah, kriṣṭayah, mānuṣāh* etc. of the *Rig Veda* refer, according to Zimmer, to the five leading Aryan races, Yadu, Anu, Druhyu, Turvaśa and Puru. But the reference to the complex of four castes *plus* Niṣāda is not without significance, for it indicates the orientations of scholars during the period of Yāska's *Nirukta* (c 500 B.C.).

The position of the *Vrātyas* and their assimilation to the socio-cultural institutions of the Aryans are notable instances of liberal tendencies in Vedic ideology.

Vedic polity, Vedic thought, or Vedic culture is not the work of a generation or two but covers at least a millennium. The terms of language and categories of thought as well as the contents of categories, i.e., the

meanings of terms were getting transformed from generation to generation along with the military exploits of the *viṣ* (folk) groups as well as the territorial and socio-economic expansion of the diverse races or tribes. An aspect of all these expansions was to be seen in the fusion between the colonizers (Aryans) and aboriginals (Dasyus) in the earliest period of the *Rig Veda*. Even during the epochs when *pancha janāh* referred to "five tribes or races" and not to the complex of four castes *plus* Niṣāda the friendly relations[23] are known to have been established with the Non-Aryans (both cultural and racial), among other things, through inter-marriage perhaps for military reasons.

We can watch the operation of Durkheim's principle of the "division of labour" in the processes leading to the expansion of the Vedic *viṣ* (folk). The contest between the aborigines and the Aryan immigrants had to become very intimate on account of economic necessity. The Aryans were not known anywhere in ancient times to display any great taste for manual professions.[24] These were relegated by the Greeks and Romans to the slaves. In India also the Aryans, established in villages as they were and practising the pastoral industry as they did, were not much moved to adopt the manual professions. These had to remain in general in the hands of the aborigines or of those classes of the population whose hybrid or questionable origin placed them in the same category. It is the

23 *The Cambridge History of India* Vol. I. (1922), p. 86 (The Age of the Rig Veda by A. B. Keith). For the different strands in Vedic literature see pp. 112-113, 148-149.

24 Sénart: *Les Castes dans l'Inde* (Paris 1927) p. 226.

arts and crafts that may be said to have contributed to a great extent to the assimilation of the new comers and the old inhabitants of the soil and therefore to have led to the impact of the materialistic, folk and democratic tendencies on the general culture.

The propaganda of the Vedic *Ṛiṣis* was laid on an extensive scale. The "societal planning" of those sacrificers and colonizers comprised conscious attempts to enrich themselves with the original inhabitants. Efforts to meet them half-way are to be seen in many of the institutions and ideas of Vedic literature from epoch to epoch and region to region. Sociologico-anthropologically the entire mass of Vedic literature may be treated as a huge and age-long series of attempts to Aryanize the Śūdra (and the non-Aryan) and Brāhmanize the Vrātya (or non-Brāhmaṇa Aryan). It is wrong to treat the Vedic texts as documents exclusively of Aryan life and thought, whether in culture or in race. The impact of Non-Aryans, "lower-classes," Śūdras and Vrātyas on Aryans, the attempts of the latter to meet the former half-way, the *rapprochements* of the Aryans and non-Aryans, the culture-contacts, race-fusions, professional "interpendence" and so forth,—all these have gone to the making of Vedic literary stuff. To ignore or overlook these non-Aryan and non-higher elements in the structure of Vedic literature is to misinterpret the urges of life operating on the personality of the men and women in question.

Vedic polity is on the one hand the polity of *Rassenkampf*, of interracial and intra-racial conflicts. On the other hand, it is the physiognomy and morphology of race-co-operation and class-solidarity that we see in the

demographic structure of Vedic society. Vedic India was a melting-pot of races and cultures, and its sociography like that of other areas has to be interpreted as by all means a hybrid.[25] Champions of "pure races" and "pure cultures" will be disappointed if they approach this culture with their hypothesis of race-segregation or cultural aloofness such as is generally considered to be unhistorical and sociologically undesirable by Hankins in the *Racial Basis of Civilization* (New York 1924), Gini in *Population* (Chicago 1930), and Martial in "La Race Française et la nouvelle Conception du Mot Race" (*Bevölkerungsfragen*, Munich 1936).

The Vrātya in the Vedic Milieu

It is questionable how far the category, caste, can be used in connection with the diverse periods of Vedic literature. Probably the category, race, is more appropriate when we have to speak of diverse social or professional groups. It should not be reasonable always to take Śūdra = Dasyu, Dāsa and Non-Aryan. To what extent the Śūdra = "lower classes" is also problematic. In any case the Aryan-non-Aryan *rapprochement* or race-fusion, group-mixture and culture-contact is the out-

25 For race-mixture in India see H. Risley: *Census Report of India 1901* (Calcutta) Vol. I., Part III; B. N. Datta: "Ethnological Notes on Some of the Castes of West Bengal" (*Man in India*, Ranchi, July-December 1934 and October-December 1935), "Races of India" (*Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, Vol. XXVI, 1935); B. S. Guha: "The Racial Affinities of the Peoples of India" (*Census of India 1931*, Delhi, Vol. I., Part III, 1935), and lecture in English available in German as "Die rassenmässige Zusammensetzung der Indo-Arier und die Rassenmischung in Indian" (*Mitteilungen* der Detutschen Akademie, Munich, 1935, No. 3).

standing theme of the Vedic texts. In the *Puruṣa Sūkta*, as we have seen, the Śūdra is either not a non-Aryan, or if so, is already assimilated to the Aryan.

Among the many racial or social transformations that the literary documents of the Vedic complex exhibit none is more important than the elevation of the Vrātyas to the Brāhmaṇical fold or the Brāhmaṇization of the Vrātyas. This item is to be treated as distinct from the incorporation of the Non-Aryans into the Aryan community as well as the assimilation of the lower classes by the societal organisation. The impact of the Vrātya on the Vedic institutions represents new liberal tendencies of the Vedic authors.

The *Vrātyaṣṭoma* ceremonies[26] are calculated to introduce such Aryan communities as are however not yet subject to Brāhmaṇistic institutions to the Brāhmaṇic community. The Vrātyas belonged to such communities and could not therefore be described as outcastes.

The *Vrātyas* of the Vedic complex are not to be understood in the sense of later law-books like, for instance, those of Baudhāyana (I, 9, 15), i.e., offsprings of *Varṇa-saṃkara* (caste-fusion).

The *Vrātyatā* or *Vrātya* life consists in observing inappropriate manners (*ācārahīnatā*) and following a life of nomads.[27] The Vrātyas, however, are known to be related to the gods, who because of appropriate sacrifices succeeded in reaching heaven. But in the condition of their *Vrātyatā* they do not prosecute Brāhmaṇical studies, and do not practise agriculture or trade.

26 Hauer: *Der Vrātya* (Stuttgart 1927) pp. 5-6.
27 Hauer, pp. 58, 62, 75, 82-84, 297.

The purification (*śuddhi*) of the Vrātyas and their elevation take place through the *Vrātyaṣṭoma* sacrifice. The Vrātyas purified become full-fledged Brāhmaṇas.

According to Manu (X, 20-23),[28] who preserves the old Vedic tradition, each of the three Brāhmaṇical orders can have *Vrātyas*. So there are (1) Brāhmaṇa-Vrātyas, Kṣatriya-Vrātyas and Vaiśya-Vrātyas.

The following races or castes belong to the Brāhmaṇa-Vrātyas: Bhrijja-Kaṇṭaka, Avantya, Vatodhana, Puṣpa-śaikhara. Among the Kṣatriya-Vrātyas are mentioned Jhalla, Malla, Licchivi, Naṭa, Karaṇa, Khaśa, and Drāviḍa. The Vaiśya-Vrātyas comprise Sudhanvan, Charya, Karuṣa, Vijanman, Maitra and Sattvata.

The *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (II, 22) and the *Tāṇḍya Mahā Brāhmaṇa* (XVII, 1-4), both belonging to the *Sāmaveda Samhitā* admit the *Vrātya* to Brāhmaṇism after the *Vrātyaṣṭoma* sacrifice on condition that he gives up his Vrātya *mores*.[29]

The divine heroes or saints of the Vrātyas were parallel to the *Riṣis* in importance. They were recognized in the *Sāma Veda Brāhmaṇas* but were unknown in the *Brāhmaṇas* of the *Rig* and *Yajur Vedas*. The Vrātya Book of the *Atharva Veda* (XV)[30] was of course their special literature. The other three Vedas did not mention them at all.

The religion and philosophy of the Vrātyas with their *Mahāvrata* (great sacrifice), mysticism and Eka-

28 Hauer, pp. 223-224, 229.

29 Hauer, pp. 55, 60.

30 Whitney and Lanman: *Atharva Veda Samhitā* (1905), Second Half, pp. 769-791; Hauer, p. 334.

vrātya (Rudra-Mahādeva or highest God) constituted the subject-matter of Book XV of the *'Atharva Veda*.[31]

The *'Atharva Veda* may have been originally the *Veda* of the Vrātyas. At any rate Book XV of this *Veda* is the embodiment of Vrātya glorification. The association of the Vrātyas with the *Atharva Veda* raises its importance as a document of the demographic and ethnological structure of the Hindu polity of some of the earliest epochs.

Śākya the Buddha, a Riṣi with a Non-Vedic Upaniṣad.

The ascendancy of Śākyasimha the Buddha (B.C. 563-483) in the sixth century B.C. is an important landmark in the evolution of Vedic culture. It indicates that the assimilation of the Eastern region to the Vedic system was incomplete. East of the Sadānīrā (Gandakī) River the Vedic tradition was not strong enough to withstand a powerful exponent of somewhat non-Vedic or extra-Vedic, nay, anti-Vedic norms. Then, the race or the caste to which Sākya belonged as a native of the Bihar-Nepal frontier was likewise not much subject to the Vedic institutions and ideals.

And, finally, Pali or Prākrit, probably the language of the people in Eastern India, had not been reduced to nothingness under the domination of Sanskrit. Rather it was powerful enough to be used as the vehicle of a new moral and social philosophy.

Altogether, the attempts at *rapprochement* between the *Madhyadeśa* and "the East," between the alleged

31 Hauer, pp. 281-282, 308-310.

"Aryans" and "Non-Aryans" etc. that had been going on through the ages broke down by the sixth century B.C. And among the innumerable sophists, metaphysicians, *sanyāsins*, mystics, philosophers, social reformers, moralists and so forth the *Upaniṣad* which succeeded in conquering the mind of India was not one of those which grew up in the schools associated with the Vedic complex. It was rather the one which in the sayings of Śākya the Buddha was born out of the urge for a new racial, regional and moral solidarity such as the Vedists of the time failed to offer.

Śākya the Buddha may be taken to be a professor of one of the *Upaniṣads*, so to say, and thus to be one of the last of the Vedic *Riṣis*. By harping on the doctrine of *sila* (right conduct) he served virtually to restore the Rigvedic concept of *rita* (right way) and inaugurate a Renaissance in Vedic culture. What the *Vrātyaṣṭoma* of the *Atharva Veda* did in the matter of raising the Vrātyas to a higher status that the Śākyan doctrine of *sila* did in regard to thousands of other kinds of Vrātyas, so to say, inhabiting as they did the Eastern regions. The "Aryanizing," "Brahmanizing" and assimilative work of the older Vedic Riṣis was thus continued by Śākya in a novel guise. From Madhuchchhandā, Brihaspati, Vaśiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra to Śākyasimha we have but one tradition, namely, that of the *"charaiveti"* (march on) of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VII, 15), "conquering and to conquer."[32] In Śākya's tactics we encounter but another item in the pluralistic make-up of the Vedic complex.

32 See the chapter on "The Peers of Sakyasimha" in B. K. Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916) pp. 50-53.

The Brahmanizers of the Vedic complex succeeded in Brahmanizing the Vrātya among many other non-Brahmaṇic elements in Eastern India as elsewhere. But they failed to adapt themselves adequately to the racial and regional features such as ultimately found self-expression in the "eightfold path of the Aryan" as unfolded by Śākya the Buddha (*Digha-Nikāya, Sutta* 22).[33]

The *Ṛiṣis* of the *Yajurveda* Black School *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* (I. viii, 3) had been ideologically quite akin to Śākya the Buddha when they in a mood of self-criticism propagated the penitential formula for the "remaking of man" as embodied in the following verse:[34]

"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."

Incidentally, it should appear perhaps plausible to presume in this "melioristic" *sūtra* that the Śūdra is an antithesis to Aryan and therefore = anti-Aryan. In that case the *Taittirīya* social polity should in this passage at any rate be treated as liberalized enough to comprehend the Śūdra in the Vedic *mores* and thus to furnish but another instance of the racial fusion in culture.

But the word Aryan in the text is not to be taken as equivalent to Ārya. The commentary renders it as equivalent to *svāmi* (master) or Vaiśya. In that case Śūdra cannot be taken as = Non-Aryan. The verse points to the social conditions under which the Vaiśya as well as

33 Warren: *Buddhism in Translations* (Cambridge, Mass, U.S.A. 1906),
34 Keith: *The Veda of the Black Yajus School*, Part I. (Cambridge Mass, 1914) p. 115.

Śūdra are likely to be dscriminated against by the privileged classes. But the reformist tendency of the hymn is evident all the same, and we understand that the privileged classes are making a clean breast of what they may have committed against the unprivileged. In any case, the verse embodies an ideal of societal reconstruction according to somewhat more democratic and humane lines. And that is a strand of Vedic thought to which the Śākyan ideology is the most akin.

Divinity Due to Kingship, Not Kingship Due to Divinity

The terms about gods and kings or rather the contexts in which the gods and kings are brought together in Vedic literature have been the source of much trouble in indology. Very often scholars are led to interpret certain passages from the *Rig Veda, Atharva Veda, Taittirīya Samhitā,* the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* etc. in such a way as to ascribe kingship to divine origin or base the king's authority upon his divinity.[35] Many of these texts should

35 B. Parsad: *The Theory of Government in Ancient India* (Allahabad 1927) takes the conventional view, pp. 14-15. In the second edition of Ghoshal's *History of Hindu Political Theories* (Calcutta 1927) occurs the following passage (p. 22): "Nevertheless it seems to us that we are still far from reaching a true theory of the king's divinity." This position indicates a susbstantial improvement upon that in the first edition (1923, pp. 27-32) where he made too much of the doctrine of the alleged divinity of the king in the Vedic texts. In the second edition he has been "led to abandon," as he says (p. vi), "the tentative reconstruction of the Vedic polity which I sketched in the first edition of my work." In between appeared my observations on his first edition in the papers entitled "Hindu Politics in Italian" and "On Some Methods and Conclusions in Hindu Politics" in the *I.H.Q.* Sept. 1925—April 1926, December 1926—March 1927. Further improvement is required in connection with his data, for instance, at pp. 23-25 (second edition).

mean, in reality, exactly the opposite, namely, that divinity itself comes from kingship.

The import of the story of the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* (II, 2, 10, 1-2)[36] should be properly understood. There Indra is a god and therefore he is naturally made a king by Prajāpati, the chief of gods. But the case of Indra's elevation to kingship by "divine sanction," should such an expression be used, cannot be taken to be normal for the kings of *men* in Vedic literature. Kingship in the Vedic texts is as a rule human and secular. In the case of Indra, again, it is not "divine sanction" but the sanction by the *head of his race* that we find in the story. The main noticeable feature in it is the absence of election by Indra's peers, i.e., the gods.

The texts as a rule tell us in so many words that a person becomes divine through certain actions, ceremonial or otherwise, and that divinity is but a consequence and not the cause or antecedent. We are to understand that Trasadasyu or for that matter anybody becomes a Varuṇa or an Indra as soon as he becomes a king or rather is consecrated. But we are not told that somebody becomes king because he is divine, godlike, descended from the gods or so forth. As soon as a person becomes a king he becomes a god. Quite pharaonic, as it is, a proposition like this is the exact antipodes to the position of those scholars who on the data of Vedic literature want to establish the general thesis that there is such a thing as king's rule by virtue of his divinity.

In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (V. 1, 5, 14) there is an account of the political sacrifice, called the *rājasūya*. In

36 R. L. Mitra: *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* (Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1862), Vol. II. pp. 460-461.

this connection the *rājanya* or king has to practise a ceremonial shooting as he is likewise called upon to do many other ceremonial things.[37] The ceremony requires seventeen shootings. It is by seventeen shootings that the king can win or become Prajāpati who is "seventeenfold" or is the outcome of seventeen drums, whatever all this may mean. In any case, we get the following equation :

King = Prajāpati

(Speech or "lord of creatures").

But in order to get at this equation the Vedic text does not want us to undertake any esoteric or mystical exercise. There is nothing transcendental about it. No external authority, no divine power, raises the king to the level of or makes him identical with, Prajāpati. It is by certain feats of his own,—the seventeen shootings,—that he wins or becomes Prajāpati.

We shall now take a passage from the *Taittirīya Samhitā* (II, 2, 11, 6) where the result of certain offerings by the king is described as follows :

"To him becoming Indra his fellows recognize as superior, he becomes the best of his fellows." The passage is very simple. The king becomes Indra, not Indra becomes king. His becoming Indra in this passage is identical in import with his becoming Prajāpati in the previous context.

In neither case is there anything to suggest that the king's authority is based upon his divinity or that the king rules because of his divinity. From passages like

37 J. Eggeling : *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* Part III (Oxford 1894) p. 25.

these we derive certain categories relating to the king, as follows:

1. The king, *rājanya* or *kṣatriya* is the "best," "rules over many" (*Sat. Br.* V. 1, 5, 14), "is apt to thrive amongst many creatures' (*Sat. Br.* XII, 13, 8).
2. The king acquires his Indrahood and becomes the "most visible form" (*pratyakṣatamān*) of Prajāpati (call it divinity) because of the ceremonial functions. In other words, he is divine because he rules, and not *vice versa*.
3. As incidents in the ceremonies the king has to offer an "additional oblation" (*Sat. Br.* XII, 13, 8) or to shoot. The shooting and the oblation he has to practise because of the ceremonies and not because of his divinity.

And the ceremonies he has to undertake because he is a king, and not because he is a god. As a matter of fact, the fellow does not become a god until and unless he has undertaken the ceremonies and offered the oblation or practised the shooting. Everything is to be traced back to kingship. Indeed, we may look upon these passages as but providing us with a definition of the king.

In this connection it is worth while to call attention to a very important consideration about the concept of divinity in the Vedic *milieu*. Almost everything is often found endowed with alleged divine attributes in the *Vedas*. Everybody who is entitled to the *Srauta* sacrifice becomes divine. The status of divinity is a privilege to which the Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣatriya and the Vaiśya are entitled because of participation in the sacrifice. Only the Śūdra is

to this extent disqualified. That is why one should not treat the king as specifically divine in Vedic thought.

Vedic Origins of Hindu Political Speculation

It is possible to trace back to ancient "gnomic poetry," nay, to the Vedic complex, many of the first principles of the later *Artha* and *Dharma* sciences.[38]

The theories about (1) the origin of kingship, (2) the *mātsya-nyāya* or logic of the fish (Kauṭalya, Manu etc.), (3) the interrelation between taxation and protection (Kauṭalya, Gautama, Baudhāyana, Vaśiṣṭha, Viṣṇu, Manu, Yājnavalkya, Nārada), for instance, thus acquire a parentage as old as anything in India.

As old as the Vedas, again, are (1) the ideas of the *Dharmaśāstra* about the king's duty of fighting and (2) the conception about the attainment of heaven by those who die in battle (Kauṭalya, Gautama, Āpastamba, Baudhāyana, Viṣṇu, Manu, Yājnavalkya).

In other words, whatever be the date of the actual compilation of the treatise as we have it today, a treatise, say, like the *Śukranīti*, has at least some of its roots deep in the philosophical speculations of the Bhāratas and Yadus.

Back to the Vedic complex is likewise to be traced the popular doctrine of the "sea-to-sea empire," world-state, etc. of subsequent political literature.[39]

The Ṣākyan (Buddhist) *chakkavatti* or *chakravartti*, the Kauṭalyan *chāturanta*, the *samrāṭ* of the *Mahā-*

38 M. Winternitz: "Dharmasastra and Arthasastra" in the *Sir Ashutosh Memorial Volume* (Patna 1926-28) pp. 44, 45.

39 R. K. Mookerji: *The Fundamental Unity of India* (London 1914) pp. 87-89. See the chapter on the "Doctrine of Sārvabhauma" in Sarkar: *Political Institutions* etc. (Leipzig 1922) pp. 222-226.

bhārata and the *sārvabhauma* of the *Śukranīti* are as old as the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VIII, 1, 39) and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (XI. 3, 2, 16).

In connection with the *Atharva Veda*[40] it deserves mentioning that in one of its appendices (*Pariśiṣṭas*), namely, the *Charaṇavyūha,* no matter what be its date, the *Arthaśāstra* is described as an *Upaveda.*

Back to the Vedas go not only the politics of the *Artha* and the *Nīti Śāstras* but the morals as well of the Epics, the Śākyan Buddhist *Suttas* and the Jaina *Siddhānta;* nay, the social philosophy of the *Purāṇas* can be traced to its Vedic roots. It is, again, the rites and ceremonies, the sacrifices described in the Vedic *Samhitās, Brāhmaṇas* and *Śūtras* that govern the daily life of men and women among the Hindus of today. For instance, the *Chhāndogya-mantra-bhāṣya*[41] by Guṇaviṣṇu is a medieval work (*c.* 1200). As the title indicates, it is a commentary on the Vedic *mantras.* This treatise is used in present-day Bengal and Bihar for the purposes of domestic ceremonies.

Vedic Ethics Through Western Eyes

It is interesting to observe that according to Sylvain Lévi[42] nothing is more "brutal and materialistic than the theology of the Brāhmaṇas." There is said to be "no

40 M. Winternitz: *Geschichte der indischen Literatur,* Vol. III, (Leipzig 1922) p. 505.

41 Edited by D. Bhattacharya (Calcutta 1930), See also his paper in Bengali on "The Cultivation of Vedic Studies in Bengal from the Earliest Times (c 800 A.C.) to the Seventeenth Century" in *Haraprasād Samvardhanā Lekhamālā* (Bangiya Sahitya Parishat, Calcutta 1933) Vol. II. pp. 203-226.

42 Lévi: *La Doctrine du Sacrifice dans les Brahmanas* (Paris, 1898), pp. 9-10.

morality" in it. The sacrifice which regulates the relations of man with the gods is alleged to be a "mechanical operation." Its efficacy is considered to be due to the "magical action of the priest." The initiation which regenerates is supposed to be a "faithful picture of conception, gestation and child-birth." A religion so crude and coarse, says he, implies a people of semi-savages (*une religion aussi grossière suppose un people de demi-sauvages*). The notions are alleged to be marked by "savage realism."

While Lévi sees nothing but "savage realism" and semi-savage men and women in the *Brāhmaṇas*, Hillebrandt has found legion of parallels and identities between the peoples of India and those of Europe on the strength of the domestic and other ceremonies.

According to Hillebrandt[43] the general opinion among scholars to the effect that the rituals owed their origin to the megalomania and egotistic interests of the priests is wrong. He takes an anthropological viewpoint and observes that this ritual arose out of the customs and rites of the folk. The ceremonies belonged to the people and were developed by them as parts of their life. The priests only systematized them. Their contribution to the tradition by way of new creations is very little.

It is possible to think of morality in Vedic India in other terms than those of "savages". "The laws of the gods are expressed", says Hopkins,[44] "in the regular rotation of seasons and their corresponding sacrifices, for the

43 *Ritualliteratur* in *Grundriss der indoarischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, III. Band, 2. Heft, pp. 2-8.

44 *The Ethics of India* (New Haven 1924) p. 37.

sacrifice is ordered according to days and seasons. Each day illustrates the 'laws divine' incorporate in the sacrifice, and pious men are like gods in 'not diminishing the laws', which give security and peace. Very likely, there was the feeling that the sacrifice even helped preserve the order of the universe, as later it was seriously believed that the sun would not rise unless the morning rite was performed. But what is more important is the recognition that the laws of the gods effect peace and security on earth as in heaven."

According to Albert Schweitzer in *Die Weltanschauung der indischen Denker* or "The World-View of Indian Thinkers" (Munich 1935) morality is alleged to be entirely lacking in the *Samhitās*, *Brāhmaṇas* and *Upaniṣads*. This position is contested by M. Winternitz[45] who refers to the concept of the *rita* ("order") in the *Rig Veda*. The duty of the rich towards the poor is most emphatically insisted upon, says he, in the *Rig Veda* (X, 117). There the man who does not give from his wealth to the poor is described as "eating alone" and "he alone" is known to be "guilty". Incidentally, it is worth while to observe that Hindu positivism is admitted by Winternitz in the statement that Brāhmaṇism has never given its whole-hearted consent to the ascetic ideal of world-contempt and of renouncing all worldly desires and actions.

45 "Ethics in Brahmanical Literature" (*Prabuddha Bharata*, Calcutta, February 1936).

CHAPTER VI

PALI LITERATURE AS A SOURCE OF STUDIES IN ECONOMICS, POLITICS AND SOCIOLOGY (C. B.C. 600-300 A.C.)

The Secular Aspects of Pali Texts

As documents for "Hindu" political, social and economic institutions and theories the importance of the Buddhist texts in Pali (*c.* B.C. 600-100 B.C.) is as great as that of the Vedic. It has been the custom to treat the Buddhist literature as a rule from the viewpoint of religion. Among the exceptions may be singled out the studies by Fick (*Die Sociale Gliederung im Nordöstlichen Indien zu Buddhas Zeit,* Kiel, 1897), as well as by Mrs. C. A. Rhys Davids ("Economic Condition in Ancient India") in the *Economic Journal,* London, September 1901,[1] in which some of the anthropological, economic and political data have been accorded a scientific treatment. But otherwise modern studies like those of, say, the German scholar Dahlke[2] or the American scholar Warren (*Buddhism in Translations,* Harvard Oriental Series, Cambridge, Mass, 1900) coming down to an international symposium like *Buddhistic Studies* (Calcutta 1931) have served but to propagate Buddhist literature as non-secular and unmaterialistic contributions from the Indian mind.

The fate of Buddhist literature has been mainly that of Vedic literature in so far as its value as a source of

1 Incorporated subsequently in T. W. Rhys Davids: *Buddhist India* (London 1903).

2 *Buddhist Essays* transl. from the German by Bhikkhu Silacara (London 1908).

sociological investigation is concerned. Each has in the main been relegated to the fields of religion and superstition. And the category, "sacred books," has served to isolate both the Vedic and the Buddhist texts from contacts with the "profane," i.e., secular, materialistic, economic and political studies. The one-sided approach, or rather the segregation, has hindered the proper evaluation of Buddhist as of Vedic literature as an expression of culture.

The secularization of indology,[3] as embodied in the first edition of the present work (Vol. I., Allahabad 1914) and *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922), has therefore the same problem to solve in regard to the Buddhist texts as to the Vedic. There is of course one important difference between the two.

3 See also the present author's "La Démocratie hindoue" (*Séances et Travaux de l' Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, Paris, 1921), *Die Lebensanschauung des Inders* (Leipzig 1933), "Istituzioni Politiche e Sociali dell'antico Popolo Indiano" (*Annali di Economia*, Milan, 1930), "Die Struktur des Volkes in der sozialwissenschaftlichen Lehre der Schukraniti" (*Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie*, XI, i, Cologne 1931). In regard to the secularization of indology see, further, C. Formichi: *"Pensiero e Azione nell' India Antica"* (*Rivista Italiana di Sociologia*, Rome 1914), B. K. Sarkar: *The Futurism of Young Asia* (Berlin 1922), A. Hillebrandt: *Altindische Politik* (Jena 1923), pp. 131, J. J. Meyer: *Das altindische Buch vom Welt-und Staatsleben: Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra* (Leipzig 1926), A. B. Keith: *History of Sanskrit Literature* (Oxford 1928), pp. 450-451; P. Masson-Oursel: *L'Inde Antique et la Civilisation Indienne* (Paris 1933), pp. xii, 99-101, 128-129; B. Breloer: *Kauṭaliya-Studien* III: *Staatsverwaltung im alten Indien* (Leipzig 1934); H. Lüders: "Indien" (*Der Orient und Wir*, Berlin, 1935, pp. 74, 87, 92); H. von Glasenapp: "Lebensbejahung und Lebensverneinung bei den indischen Denkern" (*Jahrbuch der Schopenhauer-Gesellschaft*, XXII. Band, 1935) *Cf.* P. Sorokin: *Contemporary Sociological Theories* (New York 1928), in which the Hindu theories are discussed along with the non-Hindu in a thoroughly humanistic manner and the similarities between the East and the West brought out, pp. 4, 98, 197, 218-220, 358, 435, 601.

Vedic literature introduces us to the atmosphere of sacrifice and ritual, of gods and hymns. In the Buddhist literature this atmosphere is virtually absent except by way of criticism, folklore, sarcasm, etc. If sacrifices, rituals, gods and hymns constitute religion, Buddhist literature, especially as embodied in the Pali texts, i.e., the pre-*Mahāyānic* strands, is a-religious. On the other hand, the *milieu* of this Buddhist literature is chiefly moral, having bearings on the personality, on man *vis-à-vis* society, on duties, on ideals. Thus considered, Buddhist literature furnishes by all means the most appropriate data for secularized indology. Buddhist texts are nothing but documents *par excellence* of positivism. No other source can be more valuable than these Pali treatises in an investigation into the positive background of Hindu sociology.

Be it observed *en passant* that in the present study as in *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916) the religion of Śākyasimha is not described as Buddhism until Buddha becomes the god of a pantheon. In other words, it is for *Mahāyānism* that "Buddhism" is reserved. *Hīnayāna* is accordingly described throughout as Śākyaism.

And here it is interesting to call attention to the remarks of a Belgian scholar.[4] "We have enough evidence to the effect," says, he, that in spite of the horse sacrifice, the *Upaniṣads*, Buddhism, caste and the Brāhmaṇa India was in many respects a country like all other countries, very living and progressive (*un pays comme tous les autres très vivant et progressif*), charmed with

4 L. de la Vallée Poussin: *Indo-européens et Indo-iraniens: L'Inde jusque vers 300 av. J. C.* (Paris, 1924), p. 251.

arts, festivals, literature, not morose, joking, occasionally Voltairian, easily amused and very entertaining."

It is but just to be oriented to the humanistic elements in the Buddhist *milieu* because as a rule too much has been made of its alleged pessimism.

Buddha-Kauṭalya Complex

A great methodological difficulty in indology has arisen from the fact that the so-called "Hindu" sources are studied apart from the so-called Buddhist sources. The two have for a long time been treated in two water-tight and air-tight chambers. Somehow or other the impacts of the one group of studies upon the other have been few and far between, or, at any rate, not intimate enough. The result is that even among exponents of secularization in indology the obsession with the one source or the other is almost profound.

It is time to recognise that the two sources require to be treated in one and the same atmosphere for parallel studies, comparisons, contrasts, interactions and so forth. The change in the methodology of study suggested here would indeed be just in keeping with the life. Vedic lore *vis-à-vis* Buddhist lore, Buddhism *vis-à-vis* other "isms," ancient, medieval and modern, did not constitute segregation in morals, manners and sentiments. Every bit of life represented some form or "process" of culture-contact, relationship or *Beziehung*, as we see analyzed in the sociological system of Simmel or von Wiese. The "division of labour" in Durkheim's sense or the "imitation," "opposition" and "adaptation" of Tarde's sociology cannot be overlooked in any epoch of Indian culture.

For instance, the whole view of life would have to take Buddha, Kauṭalya and many others as influencing and supplementing one another. Kauṭalya completed Buddha,[5] so to say. It was in the Kauṭalyan *milieu*, taken in the sense of a category of formal logic (for materialism in the generic sense), that Buddha flourished and *vice versa*. In modern studies, therefore, Kauṭalyalogy and Buddhalogy ought to go hand in hand. In other words, the students of the Sanskrit texts or of the Pali texts cannot afford to be ultra-specialists but must have to come together on a common platform for the reconstruction of "Hindu" culture. That culture in every epoch,—Vedic, post-Vedic, Buddhist, Maurya, post-Maurya and what not,—was always what may be described as an expression of the Kauṭalya-Buddha complex or the Buddha-Kauṭalya complex in its diverse dynamic phases.

The Dharma, Artha and Nīti Śāstras of the Buddhists

The Pali texts have to be envisaged in indology as belonging to the same category as the *Dharma-śāstras*, *Artha-śāstras* and *Nīti-śāstras*, so far as the social, political, legal and economic concepts are concerned. And in regard to the disquisitions on the mind, the soul, salvation and so forth and to their relations with the body, matter, elements, etc., the *Piṭakas* are, on the one hand, to be assimilated to the *Upaniṣads*, and, on the other, to the *Darśanas*.

5 See the discussion on "Kauṭalya in Buddhist Perspectives" and "Kauṭalya and His Boswell", *Infra*, Ch. VIII.

Finally, so far as the stories, legends and folk-lore go, the *Jātaḳas* have their natural "cognates" not only in treatises like the *Kathāsaṙitsāgara,* but the *Mahābhārata* itself. Exponents of secularization in indology must, therefore, attack the Buddhist Pali "canon" with the same logic as they have been applying to the so-called Hindu documents.

In the atmosphere of Buddhist (Śākyan) *Dhamma,* righteousness, duty, etc. it is impossible to breathe anything different from the "virtue" and "justice" of Plato. Śākya's logic, again, is but a specimen of the Socratic dialectic, and his dialogues correspond to the dialogues of Plato and the Sophists. In the political speculations of mankind Śākya and his apostles from Ānanda and Upali to Moggaliputta Tissa of the *Kathāvatthu* fame (c. 250 B.C.) and Nāgasena of the *Milinda Pañha* (c. 150 A.C.) deserve the same analysis from modern researchers as those of Socrates and post-Socratic Sophists and other thinkers of ancient Greece.[6]

While in the *milieu* of Śākya's lecture and dialogues, students of Hindu politics might easily be reminded of the ethical atmosphere of Plato's *Republic.* Some of the more important moral categories touched upon in that Greek work may be enumerated below:

Book I. Justice, friends, enemies, good men, bad men, good policy, soul, function, virtue, happiness.

6 Translation in the Sacred Books of the East Series Vols. XXV and XXXVI (1890, 1894) by T. W. Ṛhys Davids under the title of the *Questions of King Milinda.* See B. C. Sen: "Studies in the Buddhist Jatakas" (*Journal of the Department of Letters,* Calcutta University, 1930) and R. N. Mehta: "Crime and Punishment in the Jatakas" (*IHQ.,* September, 1936).

Book II. Worldly success, professions, guardians, education, dignity of gods, myths.

Book III. Future life, forms of stories, music, spirited, philosophic, superior class, possessed of nothing.

Book IV. Three classes, no innovations, Delphian Apollo, wisdom, courage, temperance, justice, absence of meddling, appetite, reason, soul, injustice.

Book V. Functions of women, philosophers, opinion, science.

Book VI. True philosophic disposition, corrupting effect of the contact with the world, politicians of the day, highest studies, good, visible world, intellectual world, four mental states.

Book VII. Purpose of education, from the sensuous to the real, the invisible, the eternal.

Book VIII. Everything that has had a beginning is liable to decay, love of honour, love of wealth.

Book IX. Three qualities of the soul, three species of pleasure, reasonable, "the man, the lion and the serpent in human personality", harmony in social relations, just man, perfect commonwealth in heaven.

Book X. Poetry weakens the mind, hymns in honour of the gods, good man, immortality of the soul, dispensations of Providence, rewards after death.

It is not necessary to establish an equation between Śākya and Plato on all fronts and in all items. But the student of the *Suttas* (*Nikāyas*) will have to feel that Socrates and the post-Socratics or Plato and his precursors have constantly to be remembered in Buddhistic studies. By all means those Greek philosophers are chronologically the contemporaries of Śākya and the Śākyan apostles. What is more important, Śākya and the Śākyans are comrades and colleagues of almost the same school as the Greeks in the profoundest problem of social politics, namely, the remaking of man, such as in recent times has been placed once more in the forefront of moral thought by all "idealists," e.g., Hocking, Redanò, Koellreutter, Lasbax, del Vecchio and others.

Buddhist Institutions and Ideals vis-à-vis Vedic Complex

The Śākyan *milieu* is, in the first place, semi-Vedic or semi-Brāhmaṇic, representing the phases of culture-contacts between the so-called Aryans or Brāhmaṇized Indians and non-Aryans (or non-Brāhmaṇized Indians)[7] as well as, to a certain extent, the continuations

7 J. W. Hauer: *Der Vratya* (Stuttgart 1927), pp. 5-6, 55, 60, 308-310, B. Saletore: *The Wild Tribes in Indian History* (Lahore 1935); De la Vallée Poussin: *Indo-Européens et Indo-Iraniens: L'Inde vers jusque* 300 *av.* J. (Paris 1924), pp. 312-314; E. J. Rapson: "Peoples and Languages" (*Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, 1922, pp. 40-56); A. Hillebrandt: *Ritualliteratur* (*Grundriss der indoarischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, III. Band, 2. Heft).

of perhaps neglected aspects of Vedic culture. In Śākya's life and thought as well as in those of the Śākyan missionaries and householders Vedic ideology cannot therefore be entirely overlooked.

De la Vallée Poussin is, generally speaking, right in his estimate to the effect that Śākyaism arose in a profound Brāhmaṇized region where the influence of Brahmā was preponderant. The religious like of the Śākyan is called *Brahmacharya*. The *Śākyan* saint is the "true *Brāhmaṇa*." *Śākyan* saints are the "*Āryas*." The four Śākyan truths are the "*Ārya* truths."

In the age of the *Upaniṣads* and Śākyaism, says he, the different systems exploited, each in its own manner, a certain common fund which was very rich but of which our knowledge is incomplete.

In the second place, the Śākyan *milieu* is somewhat anti-Vedic or anti-Brāhmaṇic in ideology and institutions too. To this extent the life and thought of Śākya and the Śākyans embody distinctively new aspects of culture and are therefore to be appraised as "supplements" to Vedic ideology and institutions. So far as these aspects are concerned, the Vedic and the anti-Vedic together constitute one Indian culture-complex. The place of Śākyan institutions and theories in a comprehensive study of Hindu politics, economics and sociology is therefore profound. The Buddhist (Śākyan) texts in Pali consequently have to be placed alongside of the Brāhmaṇical texts for an adequate survey of "Hindu" socio-political literature.

Thirdly, for later periods, say, from Aśvaghoṣa downwards the Buddhist *milieu* and the Brāhmaṇic-Hindu *milieu* almost approach each other in many details.

Still later, the common ground of *Mahāyāna-cum-Tantrism* and Purāṇic-Hinduism is quite extensive. These aspects of Buddhism may be called semi-"Hindu," as has been done in my *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* and *Folk-Element in Hindu Culture* (London 1917). Altogether, no study of "Hindu" culture in any of its phases of evolution can pretend to be fair which does not devote simultaneous attention to Buddhist and non-Buddhist sources.

Śākyan Positivism

Interest in the immediate present as contrasted with the past and the future is a dominant element in Śākya the Buddha's positivism. This finds expression in such *Suttas* as the *Bhaddekaratta,* the *Ānanda-Bhaddekaratta,* the *Mahākaccana-Bhaddekaratta,* the *Lomasakangiya-Bhaddekaratta,* etc. of the *Majjhima Nikāya* of the *Sutta Piṭaka.*

The following is to be found in the *Bhaddekaratta-Sutta*:[8]

Atītaṃ nānvāgameyya, nappaṭikaṅkhe anāgataṃ;
Yad atītam pahinan taṃ, appattañca anāgataṃ.
Paccuppannañ ca yo dhammaṃ tattha tattha vipassati,
Asamhīraṃ asaṃkuppaṃ taṃ vidvā manubrūhaye.

Ajj' eva kiccam ātappaṃ; ko jaññā maraṇaṃ suve?
Na hi no saṃgaran tena mahāsenena maccunā
Evaṃ vihārim ātāpiṃ ahorattam atanditaṃ
Taṃ ve bhaddekaratto ti santo ācikkhate muniti.

8 *Majjhima Nikaya* ed. by R. Chalmers, Vol. III (London 1899), p. 187 (No. 131).

Don't pursue the past
Long not for the future,
The past is dead,
Not yet realized is the future.

Whoever examines the present conditions
exactly as they really are
Should ascertain the invincible and unshakable
strive after it.

Exertions are then to be made today;
Who knows death may come to-morrow?
Not possible any pact with Death and his army.

Who exerts thus night and day ceaselessly,
He is called *bhaddekaratta* (devoted to the good)
He is the real saint.

The woman with her joys and woes forms the subject-mater of the *Mātugāma-Saṃyutta* of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*. The definition of *Nibbāna*[9] as the destruction of lust, hatred and illusion and its attainment by the eightfold path are described in the *Jambukhadaka Saṃyutta*, the *Samandaka Saṃyutta* and the *Asankhata Saṃyutta*. The eightfold path as consisting in right view, right aim, right

9 On the latest controversies in the interpretation of *Nibbana* (*Nirvana*) see Suzuki: *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism;* Yamakami: *Systems of Buddhistic Thought* (Calcutta 1912); De la Vallée Poussin: *Nirvana* (Paris 1925); H. von Glasenapp: *Brahma und Buddha* (Berlin 1926); T. Stcherbatsky: *The Central Conception of Buddhism* (London 1923); *The Conception of Buddhist Nirvana* (Leningrad 1927); Keith: *The Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon* (Oxford 1923); N. Dutt: *Aspects of Mahayana Buddhism in its Relation to Hinayana* (London 1930); J. Przyluski: *Le Bouddhisme* (Paris 1932); P. Masson-Oursel: *L'Inde Antique et la Civilisation Indienne* (Paris 1933).

speech, right action, right living, right exertion, right mindfulness and right concentration is the special topic of the *Magga-Saṃyutta*. The four truths, namely, suffering, its origin, its destruction, and the path leading to its destruction have been described in the *Sacca Saṃyutta*.

The *Dhammapada*[10] and the *Suttanipāta*, two of the twenty treatises in verse belonging to the *Khuddaka Nikāya* of the *Sutta Piṭaka* introduce us further to the essentially activistic atmosphere (*appamāda*) of Śākya's fundamental tenets. Every verse in these two noble collections is an admonition to the human spirit to "energize" and to "behave." Most of the teachings are suited to monks and householders alike.

The books are two of the world's profoundest treatises on meliorism or humanism in morals with reference to the remaking of personality and the reconstruction of society. And the shortest catechism of Śākyan ethics is to be found in the *Khuddakapāṭha* of the same *Nikāya*.[11]

Śākya as Remaker of Man

In every system of political and social philosophy, idealistic or realistic, and ancient, medieval or modern, the problems of personality cannot but occupy a prominent place.[12] It may not be clear, except to the idealists like

10 Translation of *Dhammapada* in the Sacred Books of the East (Oxford) Vol. X.

11 B. C. Law: *A History of Pali Literature*, Vol. I (Calcutta 1933), pp. 153, 177-179, 222, 232.

12 Re the place of Buddhist thought in Hindu political institutions and theories see the present author's *"On some Methods and Conclusions in Hindu Politics"* in the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta, March 1927). *Cf.* also his *Political Philosophies Since* 1905 (Madras 1926). See W. E.

Jellinek who believe in the "autolimitation" of the state, as to whether ethics is to be treated as a part of politics or politics as a part of ethics. To such "monists" the problem does not exist. But even to realists the close relations between the two, functional, causal, psychological or otherwise, pragmatic as they are, bring before our eyes an extensive common ground of activities and norms. Naturally, therefore, every individual who deals with "values" and is therefore a "futurist," every moralist who is trying to transform Nature and the world by the "creative urges" of the spirit, every educational scheme that is looking forward to the "remaking" of man or societal reconstruction, and every propaganda that is furnished with an ethical bias, social message or "spiritual" content belong, as a matter of course, to the domain of political speculation. Politics can then annex virtually the whole of Śākyan categories in a generic manner to itself.

From Pythagoras to Socrates, from the Sophists to Seneca, from Jesus to Luther, from Calvin to Kant, and

Hocking: *Man and the State* (New Haven 1926), pp. 190-191, and *Types of Philosophy* (New York 1929), pp. 441-442; U. Redanò: *Lo Stato Etico* (Florence 1927), pp. 266-278; O. Koellreutter: *Allgemeine Staatslehre* (Tübingen, 1933), pp. 6-10; G. del Vecchio: *Etica, Diritto e Stato* (Rome 1934), pp. 7, 24, and *La Crisi dello Stato* (Rome 1934), pp. 37-40 for different idealistic standpoints of modern thought in regard to the relations between morality and politics. See also Hubert: "Le Problème Moral" (*Revue Philosophique*, Paris, November-December 1934, pp. 339-342, March-April, 1935, pp. 228-229), Tazerout: "La Pensée Politique de Moeller van den Bruck" (*Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, January-February, 1936, pp. 71-76), *La Philosophie Tchéchoslovaque Contemporaine* (Prague, 1935), chs. on Masaryk, pp. 19-49, R. R. Ergang: *Herder and the Foundations of German Nationalism* (New York 1931), Moeller van den Bruck: *Das dritte Reich* (Hamburg 1931), Capek: *Masaryk Tells His Story* (London 1934); H. E. Barnes: *History of Western Civilization* (New York), Vol. II (1935) pp. 1067-1068.

from Renouvier, Fichte, Carlyle and Mazzini to Dewey, Hobhouse, Masaryk and Moeller van den Bruck,—each one is occupied with *le problème moral* in its comprehensive sense as analysed by Huber. It is the *drame de l'Esprit*, the drama of the spirit, in which each one is interested. This is the drama which is "the more serious because it is the more subtle, which although less apparent in a material form affects nevertheless the entire human organism from within." The moralizings of Śākyasimha (B.C. 623-543) and the Śākyan missionaries as lectures to the human spirit possess the same significance for political thought as those of their European contemporaries, Socrates, the Sophists and others down to Plato (B.C. 430-347) and his successors of ancient Europe.

The foundations of political action are to be found in these talks of Śākya and speculations of the Śākyans, directed, as they are, to the evocation of the *seelische Kraft* (strength of the soul) and energizing of the "will" or transformation of the "latent energies" into the kinetic, of which Haushofer speaks in *Jenseits der Grossmächte*.

Śākya's lectures to the Vajjis on the "seven conditions of welfare," like many of his other sayings to individuals and groups, may in a general manner be somewhat compared to Fichte's *Reden an die Deutsche Nation* (Addresses to the German People, 1808), although intended for other races and regions and for the nineteenth century. As contributions to political thought, broadly considered, they deserve a proper recognition in a study of *Niti* or *Artha*, i.e., political morals.

Historically, Śākya's moralizings or addresses to the people of Magadha can be taken to a certain extent as

continuations of the "harangues" of the Vedic[13] poets to their *viṣ* and represent the same mentality as embodied in the *dicta* of the *Dharmaśāstras* or the stories of the *Mahābhārata* and later literature.

Law and Constitution in the Vinaya

The *Mahāvagga* and the *Chullavagga* are first class documents of institutional literature in the field of public life and social polity.[14] Political science can derive much data from these *Vinaya* texts both from the viewpoint of institutions as well as from that of theories. The theories of the Śākyan monks in regard to the problems of authority, justice, liberty, individuality, democracy and so forth may be gleaned by a careful student of political philosophy out of many passages in this literature. As documents of *droit constitutionnel* bearing on the ecclesiastical organization of the Śākyans these treatises in Pali furnish, besides, ample evidences to the legal acumen and logical sense of Śākya the Buddha or rather of the Śākyan stalwarts. The *Suttavibhaṃga's* discussions about theft, murder etc., are fine contributions to criminology.

The Social Institutions and Theories of the Nikāyas

The doctrine adumbrated in the different *Nikāyas* of the *Sutta Piṭaka* must not be considered to be all psycholo-

13 H. Zimmer: *Altindisches Leben* (Berlin 1879), pp. 103-104, 118-122, 127-128, Whitney and Lanman: *Atharva Veda Saṃhita* (Cambridge, Mass., 1905), First Half, pp. 87-88, A. B. Keith: *Rig Veda Brahmaṇas* (Cambridge, Mass., 1920), pp. 329-330.

14 The present author's "Ecclesiastical Polity of Old Asia" in the *Vedic Magazine* (Hardwar, July 1920), *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922), p. 158. See the English translations of the *Vinaya Texts* in the Sacred Books of the East Series (Oxford).

gical, metaphysical, theological, theocratic, eschatological or the like. A good deal of these dialogues of the *Digha Nikāya*[15] division, for instance, deals with socio-economic and socio-political questions. Among other topics, *Khattavijjā* (the science of Kṣatriya), polity, treaties, wars, etc., are discussed in the *Brahmajāla-sutta*, which, as a work on the *silas* or moral precepts, thus approaches in the miscellaneous character of its contents almost a *Śukranīti* or a *Yuktikalpataru* of "Hindu" (Brāhmaṇic) literature, or, say, any of the *Dharmaśāstras*. Caste problems, the position of the Brāhmaṇa, as well as sacrifices both in their orthodox, Brāhmaṇic (Vedic) presentations as well as in the "rational" interpretations of Śākya the Buddha constitute, among other things, the subject matter of the *Ambaṭṭha*, the *Sonadaṇḍa*, the *Kuṭadaṇḍa* and the *Tevijja Suttas*. In many of these rationalizings Śākya continues, be it remarked *en passant*, but the corresponding strands of old Vedic and contemporary Upaniṣadic thought (*e.g.*, the *Chhāndogya Upaniṣad*).

From the schedule of topics on which, according to the *Paṭṭhapāda Sutta*[16], the *Paribbājakas* or *Wanderlehrer* and "sophists", so to say, used to hold discourses, one is introduced to the intellectual *milieu* that held political science in solution. The celebrated "seven conditions of

15 See the translations of the *Digha Nikaya Suttas* in the Sacred Books of the Buddhists (London) under the title of *Dialogues of the Buddha* (tr by T. W. Rhys Davids, subsequently with the collaboration of Mrs. C. A. Rhys Davids); N. N. Law: "Early Buddhism and the Laity" in *Indian History and Culture* (London 1925).

16 Chapter on "Teachers of Political Morals" in B. M. Barua: *A History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy* (Calcutta 1921), pp. 347-353; Chapter on "Wandering Teachers" in B. C. Law: *Historical Gleanings* (Calcutta 1922), pp. 13-15.

welfare" for a community as well as the duties of householders etc., are proclaimed and discussed in the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttānta*. The majesty of the "greatest king", his glorious capital and his palace are described in the *Mahāsudassana Suttānta*, which can bear comparison for certain purposes with any of the *Utopias* of world thought in the domain of spirituality, "righteousness," etc. The "seven treasures" conceived in this *milieu* of Śākyan righteousness have been traced by Sénart in *La Legende du Bouddha* to the Vedic hymns. The "ideal Brāhmaṇa", the "assembly hall" of the gods, etc., are among the topics discussed in the *Mahāgovinda Suttānta*, in which, besides, the geography of India is described according to the ideas of the time. The "ideal world-monarch" is the subject of the *Chakkavatti Sihanāda Suttānta*, which, further deals with the problems of life, prosperity and longevity. Universal education is dealt with in the *Lohicheha Sutta*, and birth, old age and death in the *Mahānidāna Suttānta*. Within the general frame-work of righteousness the *Agganna Suttānta* may be described as a general treatise of sociology, dealing as it does with the evolution of the world, man and society as well as the problems of the four castes. The thirty-two marks of the "Superman" are discussed in the *Lakkhana Suṭtānta*. The entire gamut of *Beziehungen* of man in society is the subject matter of the *Singalovada Suttānta*, which may be described as a comprehensive treatise on *gihivinaya* (householder's duties) or domestic and social ethics.

The crimes such as burglary, robbery, adultery etc., as well as punishments like flogging, bastinado, bludgeoning, mutilation of hands and feet, tortures of the saucepan, boiling oil, etc., come in for treatment in the *Mahāduk-*

ḳhakḳhandha Sutta of the *Majjhima Nikāya*. The pretentions of the Brāhmaṇas to social superiority and other caste questions are discussed in the *Assalāyana Sutta*, the *Chanḳi Sutta*, the *Esukari Sutta* and the *Vaseṭṭha Sutta* of the same *Nikāya*. The teachings on unity and concord are to be found in the *Samāgama Sutta*.[17]

Methods of punishment and criminal justice are described in the *Dukanipāta* of the *Anguttara Nikāya*.

Asoka's Political Philosophy

In a survey of Hindu political literature Asoka's Edicts cannot but have an important place. As a rule, they are ransacked by indologists for references to political history. Recently these have been attacked also for the study of administrative institutions. Nay, the problems of Kauṭalyalogy have compelled scholarship to attempt discovering the points of terminological contact between the *Arthaśāstra* and the Edicts.[18]

But it is necessary to remember that Asoka like Marcus Aurelius was a philosopher also. It is not necessary to be positive about the exact nature of the relations of Asoka's *Dhamma* to the *Dharma* or Hindu *Dharmaśāstras*, on the one hand, and the *sila* taught by Śākya and his apostles on the other.[19] The edicts do not betray any reference to *Nirvāṇa* or *Sunyatā*, *Anātma* or *Dukkha*. But there cannot be any doubt about the fact that as promul-

17 See the translations of the *Majjhima Nikaya Sutta* in the Sacred Books of the Buddhist Series (London), Vol. II (1927), pp. 84-102, 139-144.

18 R. K. Mookerji: "Parallelism between Aśoka's Edicts and Kauṭalya Arthaśāstra" in the *Proceedings of the Fifth Oriental Conference*, Lahore, 1928, pp. 329-347.

19 N. Dutt: *Aspects of Hinayana Buddhism in its Relation to Mahayana* (London 1930) pp. 19-21.

gator of the Edicts Asoka was holding forth as a "re-maker" of man in the same manner as Socrates and Śākya, bent upon generating a new "social metabolism" such as might give rise to a new *Gestalt* (form-complex) in human relationships.

Like the copperplate inscriptions these Edicts are, first and foremost, specimens of literature. And although mainly institutional in origin or nature, this literature can be made to yield theories. Much of ordinary ethical propaganda it undoubtedly contains. But as an Empire-builder Asoka tried to impress upon his people the conception of administrative uniformity. He was, besides, an exponent of the conception of the "welfare-state", something like *lo stato educatore* of Redanò. It is through the Edicts that such political categories of the Hindus have found fair expression.

The Dynamics of Buddhist Thought

Like the *Saṃhitās* of Vedic texts the *Piṭakas* (Baskets) of Pali texts represent principles of classification, *i.e.*, grouping according to common subjects. In each group or *Piṭaka*, therefore, as we have to-day, are to be found works composed during diverse periods. In the present form the three "Baskets" are taken to have been finally closed in the last quarter of the first century B.C., when they were committed to writing in Ceylon during the reign of Vattagamani. And since some of the sermons and dialogues are supposed to contain the exact words of Śākya himself, the oldest portions of the Buddhist texts can be traced back to his life time (B.C. 563-483), say, *ca* 500 B.C. The entire literature then covers nearly half a

millennium. The problem of dating the texts is therefore not a simple one.

The canon in its entirety is being exhibited below:

I. *Vinaya Piṭaka*[20] (Basket containing manuscripts of *Vinaya* or discipline and administration), rules alleged to have been declared by Śākya the Buddha himself and presented occasionally through the medium of legends, folklore etc.
   1. *Sutta Vibhaṃga* i.e. explanations of the Rules: 227 rules of the *Pātimokkha* (440 B.C.)
      i. *Pārājika*: Offences for which the punishment is expulsion from the order.
      ii. *Pacittiya*: Offences for which the punishment is some expiation.
   2. *Khandakas* i.e. Treatises in Set Fragments (250 B.C.).
      i. *Mahāvagga*: "larger division."
      ii. *Chullavagga*: "smaller division."
   3. *Parivāra patta*: a digest of the other parts of the *Vinaya*.
   4. *Pātimokkha*.

II. *Sutta Piṭaka* (Basket of discourses concerning the Doctrine), mainly in the form of speeches or dialogues of Buddha.
   1. *Digha Nikāya*[21] ("long discourses"): 34.
      i. *Silakkhandha*
      ii. *Mahāvagga*
      iii. *Patheya* or *Pātikavagga*

20 Translations in the Sacred Books of the East Series (Oxford).

21 Translation by T. W. and C. A. Rhys Davids in the Sacred Books of the Buddhists Series (London).

2. *Majjhima Nikāya*[22] ("medium discourses": 152.
3. *Samyutta Nikāya* ("kindred sayings): 56.
   - i. *Sagathavagga*
   - ii. *Nidānavagga*
   - iii. *Khandhavagga*
   - iv. *Salayatana vagga*
   - v. *Mahāvagga*
4. *Anguttara* or *Ekuttara Nikāya*[23]: *Nipātas*
   - i. *Eka nipāta*
   - ii. *Duka nipāta*
   - iii. *Tika nipāta*
   - iv. *Chatukka nipāta*
   - v. *Panchaka nipāta*
   - vi. *Chhakka nipāta*
   - vii. *Sattaka nipāta*
   - viii. *Aṭṭhaka nipāta*
   - ix. *Navaka nipāta*
   - x. *Dasaka nipāta*
   - xi. *Ekādasaka nipāta*
5. *Khuddaka Nikāya* (mostly in verse): 20
   - i. *Khuddakapāṭha*
   - ii. *Dhammapada* (250 B.C.)
   - iii. *Udāna*
   - iv. *Itivuttaka*
   - v. *Sutta nipāta*
   - vi. *Vimāna vatthu*
   - vii. *Peta vatthu*
   - viii. *Thera gāthā*
   - ix. *Therigāthā*
   - x. *Jātakas* (c 250 B.C.)
   - xi. *Mahāniddesa*
   - xii. *Chulla niddesa*
   - xiii. *Patisambhida magga*
   - xiv. *Apadāna*
   - xv. *Buddhavamśa*
   - xvi. *Chariyāpiṭaka*
   - xvii. *Milindapañha* (150 A.C.)
   - xviii. *Suttasamgha*
   - xix. *Petakopadesa*
   - xx. *Nettipakaraṇa.*

22 Translations by Lord Chalmers in the Sacred Books of the Buddhists Series (London).

23 Translation of the first three sections by E. R. Gooneratna (1913). The fourth section has been translated by A. D. Jayasunder under the title of *The Book of the Numerical Sayings* (Anguttara Nikaya) or "Suttas According to Number," Madras 1925.

III. *Abhidhamma Piṭaka* (Basket of Transcendental Doctrine) chiefly in the form of questions and answers, dealing with the topics of the *Suttapiṭaka*.

i	*Dhammasaṃgani* (350 B.C.).	iv	*Puggala pannati.*
		v	*Dhātukathā.*
ii	*Vibhaṃga.*	vi	*Yamaka.*
iii	*Kathāvatthu.*	vii	*Patthana.*

During these four or five centuries six Buddhist Councils (three in India and three in Ceylon) were held. At each Council the texts were being settled. This fact ought to place the chronology of the Śākyan texts on a secure footing. But the reports of the Councils themselves are anything but uniform and fail to assure any precision, especially in regard to the Śākyan texts. The result is the emergence of a question in regard to each and every document of the Śākyan (Buddhist) Canon in Pali.[24] Like the authenticity of Plato's dialogues in the West the authenticity of Sākya's dialogues and sermons has long been the subject of controversy in indology.

The relative chronology of the above texts between *c.* 500 B.C. and *c.* 100 A.C. can be made out from the following scheme:

1. The simple statements of Śākya the Buddha's doctrine now found are identical words in paragraphs or verses recurring in all the books (c. B.C. 500).

24 B. C. Law: *A History of Pali Literature* (Calcutta 1933), Chapters on "Chronology of the Pali Canon" and "Canonical Pali Literature," pp. 11-15, 40-42, 46, 88, 274-275, 305, 326. See R. C. Majumdar: "Buddhist Councils" in *Buddhistic Studies*, Calcutta, 1931. For the evolution of the schools of Buddhism see the chart in N. Dutt: *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and the Buddhist Schools* (London 1925) pp. 224-225.

2. Episodes found in identical words in two or more of the existing books.
3. The *Silas*, the *Parayana* groups of sixteen poems without the prologue, the *Aṭṭhaka* group of four or sixteen poems, the *Sikkhāpadas*.
4. The *Digha*, Vol. I., the *Majjhima*, the *Samyutta*, the *Anguttara*, and the earlier *Pātimokkha* code of 152 rules.
5. The *Digha*, Vols. II and III., the *Thera-Theri-gāthā*, the collection of 500 *Jātakas*, the *Suttavibhaṃga*, the *Patisambhidamagga*, the *Puggalapannati* and the *Vibhaṃga* (c. 400 B.C.).
6. The *Mahāvagga* and the *Chullavagga*, the *Pātimokkha* code now complete in 227 rules, the *Vimānavatthu* and the *Petavatthu*, the *Dhammapada*, and the *Kathāvatthu* (c. 250 B.C.).
7. The *Chullaniddesa*, the *Mahāniddesa*, the *Udāna*, the *Itivuttaka*, the *Sutta Nipāta*, the *Dhātukathā*, the *Yamaka* and the *Patthana*.
8. The [illegible]*dhavaṃsa*, the *Cariyāpiṭaka* and the *Ava[illegible]*
9. The P[illegible]*ārapāṭha*.
10. The *Khuddakapāṭha*.

Evidently the question of chronology, relative although, is open in regard to many treatises as well as parts of treatises.[25]

25 T. W. Rhys Davids: *Buddhist India* (London 1911) Appendix to Ch. X. Chronological Table of Buddhist Literature from the Buddha's Time to the Time of Aśoka, p. 188. This has been modified in B. C. Law: *History of Pali Literature* (Calcutta 1933) Vol. I. p. 42, which is followed in the present work.

Śākyaism was all the time moving from region to region and race to race. In the process of these mobilizations it gradually lost sight of the very language in which Śākya and the Śākyan apostles had taught, namely, Pali. The Pan-Indian language of culture, Sanskrit, was accepted by the Śākyans and Buddhists of the new epochs on account of the exigencies of their propaganda and annexed to their conquests. And so Buddhist philosophy, moral, social or political, came to have a vast literature in Sanskrit. Nothing demonstrates the vitality and strenuousness of the Buddhistic ideologies more than this Sanskritization of Śākyaism and the utilization of the "Hindu" (Brāhmaṇical) paraphernalia in order to maintain its usefulness under altered conditions.

The diverse strands of Buddhism may be followed easily in the following, rather wide and elastic chronological scheme:[26]

1. Early or Pure *Hīnayāna* Buddhism (*c.* B.C. 450-350). This Buddhism has for its records the *Vinaya* and the *Nikāyas* (*Sūtras*) in Pali.
2. Mixed *Hīnayāna* Buddhism (*c.* [illegible] to *c.* 350-100). This is the Buddhism held in solution among the diverse leaders or cholars such as arose about a century after Śākya the Buddha's death. This pluralistic development of Buddhism took place during the epoch of the Mauryas. It is during this period that the third *Piṭaka* of the orthodox Buddhists, the *Abhidhamma,* was mainly compiled. This is the epoch *par excellence* of the *Jātakas* and

26 N. Dutt: *Aspects of Mahayana Buddhism in its Relation to Hinayana* (London 1930), ch. I. pp. 6, 11, 16, 36, 43, 45.

Avadānas, brought into existence, as they were, for the purpose of democratizing and popularizing the teachings of Śākya.

These two strands constitute not so much Buddhism as Śākyaism in the present author's terminology.

3. Early *Mahāyāna* Buddhism (*c.* B.C. 100-300 A.C.). This is the Buddhism of the ideals associated with the *Bodhisattva* and the *Pāramitā* which had been initiated in the *Avadānas.* The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajnāpāramitā* is taken to have been compiled some time in the first century B.C. The *Kulturkampf* or the conflict of cultures between the old and the new is the chief feature of this period. Nāgārjuna, Aśvaghoṣa and Asaṃga are some of the leading exponents of the new as against the old in the evolution of "social metabolism."

In this the third strand we have Buddhism proper; and the texts of this Buddhism are to be found not in Pali but in Sanskrit.

The sociological data in the Buddhist, like those in the other "Hindu," documents introduce us therefore to the wealth of categories in the subversion of "social determinism," closed systems or absolutism of monists as prevalent, for instance, in modern times from Hegel to Durkheim. It is essentially the atmosphere of "social mobility" and the "perpetual increment of life upon itself," such as is engendered by the "initiatives of the will," the creative urges of the individuals and *le volontà individuali,* in which we move about in the midst of Pali (as well as Sanskrit-Buddhist) texts. The fundamental

Non-Śākyan and Anti-Śākyan Forces

It is in this "pluralistic universe" of culture that the teachings of Śākya and the Śākyan stalwarts, the stories of the *Jātaḳas* and the messages of the Pali texts are to be read. India was larger than all these combined. In other words, there were men, institutions and movements in India such as may have cared to ignore altogether the entire Śākyan (Buddhist) encyclopaedia.

According to the Śākyan (Buddhist) scheme of life and thought, indeed, certain "well known" "heads of orders" and "teachers of schools" were described as heretical. They are enumerated as follows in the *Samānaphala Sutta* of the *Digha Niḳāya*:[1]

1. Purāṇa Kassapa
2. Makkhali Gosāla
3. Ajita Kesakambali
4. Pakudha Kachchāyana
5. Sanjaya Belatthiputta
6. Niganṭha Nāthaputta.

At least two of the above six are today well established in Indian thought as having had a powerful influence in the formation of the culture of the so-called Buddhist India. One is Nāthaputta and the other Gosāla.

Jaina Teachings

Mahāvīra is known as *Nāthaputta* (the son of the Nāthas or Jnātris of Kundanagara near Vaisāli) in the Śākyan *Majjhima Niḳāya*.[2]

1 B. C. Law: "Six Heretical Teachers" in *Buddhistic Studies* (Calcutta 1931) p. 73.

2 K. P. Jain: "Mahāvīra and Buddha" in *Buddhistic Studies* (1931) pp. 126-127.

The Jaina tradition represents Gosāla as a disciple of Mahāvīra. But a modern view[3] seeks to show that Gosāla was one of the teachers of Mahāvīra. It is also believed that among the precursors or contemporaries of Mahāvīra and Śākya the Buddha some of the formative forces of Jainism and Buddhism are to be found not only in the philosophy of Gosāla but also in the scepticism of Sanjaya. Non-Śākyan thought was then a powerful factor of the times.

Śākya the Buddha is even alleged to have lived the life of a Jaina *muṇi* (ascetic) at a preparatory stage of his spiritual career. Nay, there is a tradition that Śākya was actually ordained as Muṇi Buddhakīrti by the Jaina saint Pihitaśrava.[4]

The relations between the two, although separate from and independent of each other, were very close.[5]

The title *Tathāgata* was accorded to Śākya the Buddha as well as to Mahāvīra.

The coincidences and affinities are so great that Weber used to consider the Jainas to be merely one of the oldest sects of Buddhism. In *Indische Alterthums-*

3 B. M. Barua : *History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy* (Calcutta 1921), pp. 381-382, 402.

The history of Gosāla as given in the *Bhagavati*, *Saya* XV, *Udesa* I. can be seen in Engl. transl. (by A.F.R. Hoernle) in The *Uvasagadasao* or the Religious Profession of an Uvasaga (Bibliotheca Indica Series, Calcutta 1888).

4 Jacobi : *Gaina Sutras* Pt. I. pp. 39-41 (S.B.E.), K. P. Jain : "Mahāvīra and Buddha" in *Buddhistic Studies* (1931) pp. 118, 125, 130.

5 P. V. Bapat : "A comparative study of a few Jain Ardhamāgadhī texts with the texts of the Buddhist Pali Canon" in the *Sir Ashutosh Memorial Volume* (Patna 1926-28).

kunde Lassen observed that the Jainas had but branched off from the Buddhists.[6]

The similarity between the Jaina and the Brāhmaṇic disciplines was most profound. And Jaina tradition was not less lengthy than the Buddhist.

The first *chakravarttī* or world-ruler of the world according to the Jainas is Bharata[7] and he was the son of Riṣabha the promulgator or first *Tīrthaṃkara* of Jainism. There were 23 *Tīrthaṃkaras* previous to Mahāvīra, whose immediate predecessor was Pārśva, the twenty-third after Riṣabha.

Pārśva is said to have flourished 250 years before Mahāvīra, the "reformer" of Jainism and the last *Tīrthaṃkara.*[8]

Sambhūtavijaya, one of the priests of the Jaina organization, is said to have died in the year of Chandragupta Maurya's accession to the throne. And his contemporary was the priest Bhadravāhu, the author of the first biography of Mahāvīra. Sambhūtavijaya and Bhadravāhu were thus living in the age which saw the compilation of certain parts of the Śākyan *Piṭaka.*

It was about the same time that the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras of the Jaina system may have been separated (300 B.C.).

6 *Weber's Sacred Literature of the Jains* transl. by H. W. Smith for the *Indian Antiquary* (Bombay) October 1888, p. 290; H. Jacobi: *Gaina Sutras* in the Sacred Books of the East Series, Part I. The *Akaranga Sutra* and The *Kalpa Sutra* (Oxford 1884), pp. xviii, xix.

7 J. Charpentier: "The History of the Jains" in the *Cambridge History of India* Vol. I. (1922), pp. 153, 165, 169 Jacobi: *The Jaina Sutras* in the *Sacred Books of the East Series,* Vol. XXI, p. xxii.

8 For the lives of Mahāvīra, Pārśva and Riṣabha as given in the *Kalpasūtra* see Jacobi's transl. in the Sacred Books of the East Series Vol. XXII. *Gaina Sūtras* Part I. (Oxford 1884).

From the standpoint of Mahāvīra also the extent of the "pluralistic universe" around him was quite vast.

In the first place, Mahāvīra (*c.* B.C. 540-468) had two powerful rivals, Śākya the Buddha (*c.* B.C. 560-480), and the not so well known Gosāla (*c.* B.C. 484).[9]

Secondly, eight classes of "pure metaphysicians" (*akriyāvādins* or non-actionists) are mentioned in the *Sthānaṃga*(IV, 4) of Mahāvīra, as follows[10]:

1. *Ekkavādins* (monists, theists, monotheists)
2. *Anikkavādins* (pluralists)
3. *Mitavādins* (extensionists)
4. *Nimittavādins* (cosmogonists)
5. *Sayavādins* (sensualists)
6. *Samuchchhedavādins* (annihilationists)
7. *Niyavādins* (eternalists)
8. *Na-santiparalokavādins* (materialists)

These were all opposed to Mahāvīra's *kriyāvāda* or doctrine of action.

The diverse doctrines of the times constitute, among other things, the topics of the Jaina *Sūtra Kritāṃga* Book I. i. II, i.[11]

The oldest parts of the Jaina texts were composed somewhere between the Pali texts (e.g. the *Dhammapada*) and the Sanskrit Buddhist text *Lalitavistara*.[12]

9 See the discussion of dates in the *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I. (1922), pp. 156, 163, Jacobi: *Kalpasūtra* in *Gaina Sūtras* Part I, pp. 8-10 (S.B.E.).

10 Schrader: *Uber den Stand der indischen Philosophie zur zeit Mahāvīras und Buddhas* (Strassburg 1902, pp. 545-7) in Barua: *History of Pre-Buddhist Indian Philosophy* (Calcutta 1921), p. 197.

11 For English transl. by Jacobi see the Sacred Books of the East Vol. XLV, *Gaina Sūtras* Part II. (Oxford 1895), pp. 235-248, 339-347.

12 Jacobi: *Gaina Sutras* (S.B.E.) Part I. pp. x, lii, xliii.

The origin of the Jaina literature may be placed somewhere about 300 B.C.

Some of the more important *Sūtras* are mentioned below:[13]

1. *Ākārāṃga Sūtra,*
2. *Kalpa Sūtra,*
3. *Uttarādhyayana,*
4. *Sūtra Kritāṃga.*

All these were written down in book form under the editorship of Devardhi about 454 A.C.

The systems which are described as heretical in both Śākyan and Jaina texts had considerable influence in shaping the thoughts and activities of Śākya and Mahāvīra.[14]

While Sanjaya, Gosāla,[15] Mahāvīra and Śākya were representing Indian culture from four conflicting and somewhat anti-traditional, say, anti-Vedic or anti-Brāhmaṇa standpoints the Vedic or Brāhmaṇic tradition was being maintained as much by the professors of the *Upaniṣads* as by the upholders of the *trivarga* (three desirables).

As a category, the doctrine of *trivarga*[16] or three desirables, i.e. the complex of *dharma* (duty), *artha* (interest and utility) and *kāma* (enjoyment of pleasure)

13 Jacobi: *Gaina Sūtras* (S.B.E.) Part I. (1884) p. xxxviii, Part II. (1895) p. xl.

14 Jacobi: *Gaina Sūtras* Part II. in the S.B.E. Vol. XLV. (Oxford 1895), p. xxvii.

15 For the position of Gośāla in the intellectual *milieu* of Śākya and Mahāvīra see the *Sūtra-Kritānga* Book I. Lecture 1, ch. 3, and Book II, Lecture 6 in the S.B.E. Vol. XLV. (1895). See also Jacobi's introduction pp. xxix-xxxii.

16 Winternitz, *Geschichte III* (1921), p. 505; Keith: *History of Sanskrit Literature* (1928) p. 450.

is at least as old as the *Grihyasūtra* (II, 19, 6) of Hiraṇyakeśin, and Patanjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (Pāṇini 2, 2, 34 *Vārttika* 9, c. B.C. 200). It is to be found of course in the *Mahābhārata* (I. 2. 38) which describes itself as an *Arthaśāstra, Dharmaśāstra* and a *Kāmaśāstra* in one.

The Dharma Sūtras

At the outset it is proper to introduce a formal distinction[17] between the *Dharma Sūtras* and the *Dharma Śāstras* (also called *Smritis*). The *Sūtras* are in prose (or in mixed prose and verse), the latter in verse. The topics are not arranged in an orderly manner in the *Sūtras* while the *Śāstras* (*Smritis*) are particular in observing the threefold grouping of topics, namely, *āchāra,* (customs), *vyavahāra* (law) and *prāyaśchitta* (penance). The *Sūtras* are older than the *Śāstras.*

The authors of *Dharmasūtra* or *Dharmaśāstra* may be named below:[18]

Gautama	(*c* 550 B.C.)
Hārīta	(*c* 500 B.C.)
Baudhāyana	(*c* 450 B.C.)
Āpastamba	(*c* 400 B.C.)
Hiraṇyakeśi, whose work is almost identical with Apastamba's.	
Vaśiṣṭha	(*c* 150 B.C.)
Manu (*Smriti*)	(*c* 150 A.C.)

The chronology is of course open to question.

17 P. V. Kane: *History of Dharmaśāstras* Vol. I. (Poona 1930) pp. 12, 131.

18 *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 30, 45, 46, 59, 71, 148.

M. Winternitz: *Geschichte* (Leipzic 1921) Vol. III. pp. 480, 482.

Jolly: *Recht und Sitte* (Strassburg 1897) available in Engl. transl. (by B. Ghosh) as *Hindu Law and Custom* (Calcutta 1928).

All the treatises mentioned above belong to the *Dharmasūtra* class with the exception of the *Manu Samhitā* which is a *Dharmaśāstra* or a *Smriti*. It may be observed that Max Müller and Bühler (*Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXV) have suspected the existence of a *Sūtra* by Manu which may have been later developed into the metrical *Śāstra*.

The writers of other *Dharma Sūtras*[19] may be enumerated here without reference to the chronological order: Atri, Uśanas, Kanva and Kānva, Kāśyapa and Kaśyapa, Gārgya, Chyavana, Jātu-Karaṇya, Devala, Paiṭhīnasi, Budha, Brihaspati, Bharadvāja and Bhāradvāja, Śatātapa, Sumantu.

Manu, Atri, Viṣṇu, Hārīta, Yājnavalkya, Uśanas, Āngiras, Yama, Āpastamba, Samvarta, Kātyāyana, Brihaspati, Parāśara, Vyāsa, Śaṃkha, Likhita, Dakṣa, Gautama, Śatātapa and Vaśiṣṭha are the promulgators of *Dharma Śāstras* according to *Yājnavalkya Smriti* (I, ch. i, Introduction 4-5).[20]

The *Mitākṣarā* commentary on the above is as follows:

"The *Dharma Śāstra* propounded by Yājnavalkya should also be studied. Such is the implied meaning of the above passage.

"This is not an exhaustive enumeration (*parisaṃkhyā*) but is merely illustrative. Therefore, the *Dharma Śāstras* of Baudhāyana and others are not excluded.

19 P. V. Kane: *History of Dharmaśāstras* Vol. I. (Poona 1930) pp. 107-131.

20 S. C. Vasu: *Yājnavalkya-Smriti* in the *Sacred Books of the Hindus Series*, Panini Office, Allahabad.

"As each of these *Smritis* possesses authority, so the points not mentioned by one may be supplied from others.

"But if one set of Institutes contradicts the other, then there is an option (to follow any one of them) according to Manu, II, 14.

"Bālambhaṭṭa's gloss on the above furnishes much interesting information on the subject."

Devala gives the following list of the *Dharma Śāstras*: 1. Manu, 2. Yama, 3. Vaśiṣṭha, 4. Atri, 5. Dakṣa, 6. Viṣṇu, 7. Āngiras, 8. Uśanas, 9. Vākpati, 10 Vyāsa, 11. Āpastamba, 12. Gautama, 13. Kātyāyana, 14. Nārada, 15. Yājnavalkya, 16. Parāśara, 17. Samvarta, 18. Śaṃkha, 19. Hārīta, 20. Likhita.

In this list Nārada is an addition, while in Yājnavalkya's list we have Śatātapa instead.

The *Saṃkha* gives the following list:—1. Atri, 2. Brihaspati, 3. Uśanas, 4. Āpastamba, 5. Vaśiṣṭha, 6. Kātyāyana, 7. Parāśara, 8. Vyāsa, 9. Śaṃkha, 10. Likhita, 11. Samvarta, 12. Gautama, 13. Śatātapa, 14. Hārīta, 15. Yājnavalkya, 16. Prachetas and the rest. By the phrase "and the rest" is meant, according to the *Mitākṣarā* cited above, 17. Budha, 18. Devala, 19. Sumantu, 20. Jāmadgni, 21. Viśvāmitra, 22. Prajāpati, 23. Paiṭhīnasi, 24. Pitāmaha, 25. Baudhāyana, 26 .Chhāgaleya, 27. Jābāla, 28. Chyavana, 29. Marīchi, 30. Kāśyapa.

In the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*[21] we find the following addressed by Īśvara to Guha: "Having pondered over the texts of the eighteen *Purāṇas*, O Child, and over the

21 For the entire discussion about the number and the authority of the *Smritis* see Vasu as in the previous footnote.

texts of the *Smritis*, beginning with Manu and which are thirty-six in number, I now tell thee."

This shows that the *Smritis* are 36 in number. The *Smritis* like the 1. Vriddha-Śatātapa, 2. Yogi-Yājnavalkya, 3. Vriddha-Vaśiṣṭha, 4. Vriddha-Manu, 5. Laghu-Hārīta, &c. should be included in the well-known thirty-six under their original authors. For example, Manu includes the ordinary and the Vriddha Manu, and so on. The list becomes more lengthy in the account furnished by Ratnākara, who says, "We find in the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* itself the enumeration of other *Smritis* like Gobhila, Riṣyaśriṃga, etc., which are over and above the thirty-six; so we conclude that thirty-six does not exhaust the number of *Smritis*, but is only an enumeration made by the *śiṣṭas*." Those which are found as *Grihya Sūtras* and their *Pariśiṣṭas*, &c., belong to a different category: like the *Purāṇas*. We are told by the *Bhaviṣya* that *Maitrāyaṇīya*, the *Chhāndogya*, the *Kaṭha*, the *Āpastamba*, the *Bhavrichas*, their *Pariśiṣṭas* and those called *Khilas* are also *Smritis*.

The *Viṣṇu-Dharma*, the *Śiva-Dharma*, the *Mahābhārata*, and the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the rest are also to be included among *Smritis*. As says the *Bhaviṣya*:— "The eighteen *Purāṇas*, the history of Rāma (*Rāmāyaṇa*), the *Viṣṇu-Dharma-Śāstra*, &c., the *Śiva-Dharma*, the fifth Veda called the *Mahābhārata* composed by Kriṣṇa Dvaipāyana, the *Sauradharma*, the *Mānavokta Dharma*, are also taken as such by the wise" (IV. v. 87-88).

The words "as such" in the above mean that they are also followed by the great men, and are authorita-

tive. Because they are not decried or dispraised by any and are followed by great men, so they are to be taken also as *Smritis*. The opinion that the *Smritis* are thirty-six only in number, or twenty-four only in number, is held only by some and is contradicted by others, and is not authoritative.

That the *Smritis* are *Dharma-Śāstras* (Institutes of Sacred Law) we learn from Manu II. 10, where it is said "The *Vedas* should be known as *Śruti;* and the *Dharmaśāstras* as *Smriti.*"

According to Āngiras the wise say that the following are *Upa-Smritis* :—Jābāli, Nachiketa, Chhandas, Laugākṣi, Kaśyapa, Vyāsa, Sanatkumāra, Śatadru, Janaka, Vyāghra, Kātyāyana, Jātukarṇya, Kapinjala, Baudhāyana, Kanāda, and Viśvāmitra."

In Hemādri's *Dāna-Khaṇḍa* the following more are enumerated: "Vatsa, Pāraskara, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Riṣyaśringa, Ātreya, Babhru, Vyāghra, Satyavrata, Bharadvāja, Gārgya, Kārṣṇājini, Laugākṣi, and Brahma-Sambhava."

The *Smritis* of Prajāpati, Yama, Budha, and Devala which are enumerated in the *Kalpataru* are quoted by Hemādri as authority in connection with other authorities.

The *Kalpataru* holds that the four sciences mentioned in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (III. 6, 26), as they relate to positive physical sciences, should be taken as authority and *Dharma* in matters worldly. Those sciences are "the *Āyurveda* (medicine), the *Dhanurveda* (archery), the *Gandharvaveda* (music), and the *Arthaśāstra* (the science of wealth). The sciences are altogether eighteen according to the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa.*"

So also in the *Śiva Purāṇa*, the *Vāyavīya Samhitā*, it is said: "O Romaharṣaṇa! O all-knowing! thou hast obtained through good luck a complete knowledge of all the *Purāṇas* from Vyāsa. The four *Vedas*, the six *Aṃgas*, the *Mīmāṃsā*, the *Nyāya*, the *Purāṇa* and the *Dharma Śāstra* are fourteen *Vidyās*. The *Āyurveda* (medicine), the *Dhanurveda* (archery), the *Gandharvaveda* (music) and the *Arthaśāstra* (the science of wealth) are the additional four, making the *Vidyās* eighteen. Of all these eighteen *Vidyās*, treating of different topics, the original author and direct prophet is the Trident-handed Śiva: such is the saying." (*Śiva Purāṇa*, I. 23).

Though all these are sources of law, yet each one of them does not deal with all matters; and sometimes they contradict one another. Therefore, the commentator says that though each of them is an authority, yet the lacunae of one should be supplied from the other, where one is incomplete; and where they differ there is option. Manu (II, 14) has also taught this option in regard to the *Smritis*. But when two *Śrutis* are conflicting, both are held to be law, says he; for both are pronounced by the wise to be valid."

The Chronology of Dharma Literature according to Meyer

The *Smriti* literature does not offer, according to Meyer in *Ueber das Wesen der altindischen Rechtsschriften* (Leipzig 1927, pp. vi., 86-88), anything like the development of secular law but rather the progressive incorporation into Brāhmaṇical *Dharma* works of this law which originated and was developed in other *milieux*

(*anderwarts entstandenen und ausgebildeten Rechts*). This attitude in regard to the origin of *des weltlichen Rechtes* is perhaps unorthodox from the standpoint of Hindu socio-religious tradition and certainly from that of traditional modern scholarship in indology.

But no student of legal institutions bearing on ancient or modern regions or of primitive and well-developed races can oppose the idea that a code in so far as it is a compilation, say, the *Digest* of Justinian, the *Sachsenspiegel* of medieval Germany, or the *Code Napoleon*, is bound to be a hotchpotch of materials coming from the most diverse sources. In the evolution of "Hindu" *mores*, customs and usages the most ancient Vedic or even pre-Vedic culture-complex can hardly be understood except as the result of fusion between Aryan and non-Aryan, Brāhmaṇic and non-Brāhmaṇic, nay, very often Indian and non-Indian elements. Even the oldest "Hindu" laws relating to the arts and crafts, the farming, cattle-breeding and commercial profession and so forth are the expressions of life lived by the *viṣ*, the folk, the *Dāsas*, the *Dasyus*, the *Vrātyas*, the *Niṣādas*, the "wild tribes"[22] and what not of the times. Sociologically speaking, this is an important thesis such as may be accepted by every student of positivism.

Another proposition of Meyer's runs to the effect that *diese sind ihrem ursprünglichen und irhem eigentlichen Wesen nach Zauberliteratur* (the Smriti works constitute by their origin and essential nature the literature

22 B. A. Saletore: *The Wild Tribes in Indian History* (Lahore 1935) may be consulted for a brief bird's eye view, although the work does not deal with the topic dealt with here.

of magic). Unfortunately, the category "magic" carries with it in orthodox Hindu judgment as well as in nineteenth century philosophy something derogatory. But should we once get used to it as just a technical term of modern social science which tries to interpret some of the phenomena of human life bearing on the unseens, the imperceptibles, and their bearings on man's prosperity and conduct even the Hindu will find very little to fight shy of it. Recent anthropology is making it more and more clear that the "elementary forms" of life, the origins of morals, the beginnings of gods, the first manifestations of propriety, decency, good conduct etc. are intimately associated with that vague and elastic word "magic"—and this both in the East and the West. "No magic, no ritual"—can be regarded as the *Sūtra* of modern sociology for the ancient Greeks and Romans as for the ancient Teutons, or the Iroquois and the Hopis of America as for the "Hindus" of all denominations and races in India. "Magic" is just an "X" which like "totem" is improvised to explain almost anything and everything from animism and ancestor worship to the *swastika* and the crucifixion, Hindu *śrāddha* and Roman Catholic "mass." The place of magic in the beginnings of culture is the theme of Coulange's *La Cité Antique*, Frazer's *Psyche's Task* (Discourse concerning the Influence of Superstition on the Growth of Institutions) and Hauer's *Das religiöse Erlebnis auf den unterem Stufen*. As regards even the Chinese people which is conventionally known to be the least magic-ridden and religious, Legge's *Religions of China*, Hirth's *Ancient History of China* and Groot's *Religion in China* are some of the publications in which a sociologist of Durkheim's school

will find plentiful references to the presence of magic, superstitions, "initiation," ritualistic *hocus pocus* and what not, such as may be said to promote the society-forming forces.[23]

But Meyer's position is eminently questionable when he objects to the usual description of the *Smriti* works as *Gesetzbücher oder Rechtswerke* i.e. law books (p. 1). He thinks that law has absolutely nothing to do with the essential or only object of these *Sūtras* and *Śāstras* on *dharma*. Their chief object rather is, says he, the teaching of *āchāra*. And, "what is *āchāra*?" he askes. "It is the conduct that brings health and welfare (*heilbringende Verhalten*) from the religious and moral standpoint," he answers. Even supposing that the treatises on *dharma* deal with nothing but *āchāra* and *sadāchāra*, good conduct, conduct of the good or conduct of the good regions etc. such as can be learnt by a pupil from his *āchārya*, a preceptor, as Meyer explains (pp. 2-3), there is no need for depriving these treatises of their character as books on law. After all, one must admit as a matter of course that not all law is "positive," such as can be enforced by the sanction of the state, or secular and worldly. But as cementing bonds of community no rules or regulations are more appropriately to be termed laws than those of Confucian "propriety" or the Hindu *āchāra* and Buddhist *sila*. And since Meyer has no difficulty in believing that *die Urliteratur aller Völker die Zauberliteratur ist* (the original or primitive literature of all peoples is the literature of charms and magic) he has only

23 E. Durkheim: *Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse* (Paris 1912); L. Lévy-Bruhl: "Remarques sur l'initiation des medicine-men" in *Die Kulturelle Bedeutung der Komplexen Psychologie* (Berlin 1935).

to go another step and encounter the fundamental reality that primitive law (whether private, i.e., relating to family and property, or public, i.e., relating to the king or the state) is also intimately mixed up with magic, incantations, charms and allied phenomena. In other words, in so far as *dharma* literature is the literature of magic it can at the same time and because of this fact be the literature of law.

Whilst these anthropologico-sociological discussions of Meyer may not disturb as a rule the ordinary indologists he has, however, thrown a bomb-shell into their atmosphere of placid *status quo* by entering the domain of chronology (p. vi). In his analysis (1) Viṣṇu's treatise is not an old *Dharmasūtra,* dependent as it is greatly on Manu and Yājnavalkya, (2) Yājnavalkya is a very "unoriginal writer," who borrows from every nook and corner, especially form Nārada and Kauṭalya, (3) Gautama does not belong to the head but rather to the tail of the *Smriti* series, (4) Kauṭalya does not utilize Manu, Yājnavalkya, Viṣṇu etc. and not even Baudhāyana, (5) commencing with Manu, at any rate, the works are not those of schools but individuals, compilers who make collections from books, and (6) Nārada is older than Manu.

In order to establish the relative chronology of the *Dharma* treatises Meyer has adopted the following method (p. 41). First, he examines the intellectual contents and character of the works. Secondly, he discusses the linguistic and metristic features of each treatise. Thirdly, he pursues the traces of indebtedness of the one to the others. And finally, he analyses those items of law and society about which the dates are known from other sources.

The methodology of Meyer is, on the whole, the same as that by which the relative and absolute chronology of the "law books" has been settled by Bühler and Jolly in the *Sacred Books of the East Series* as well as by the latter in *Recht und Sitte*. That there is nothing unacceptable in this methodology is perfectly clear. But that its application is unsatisfying is apparent to many students of indology who are asked by Bühler and Jolly at every step to accept this hypothesis or that in regard to what is alleged to be plausible and what is not. Meyer's bombshell is therefore to be welcome as an item calculated to re-open the question which was for all practical purposes supposed to be closed on account of sheer inertia or perhaps because indologists wanted to have some sort of a working hypothesis in regard to the chronological scaffolding.

In the application of the methodology Meyer like his predecessors wants us to make certain assumptions. And these are almost of the same character as those of his predecessors. They deserve therefore the same recognition as the former. But the fundamental question remains yet to be solved. Let us go back to the Vedic question. The material contained in the *Rik Samhitā* may have belonged to the same age and society as that in the *Yajur* and the *Atharva*. Then, again, the material of the *Brāhmaṇas* and that in the *Samhitā* are likely to have been coeval, sociologically considered. If we go into the problem from the standpoint of substance or social experience and ritualistic facts there are hardly any arguments on the strength of which the alleged oldest Gautama is older than the alleged youngest Nārada. As long as it is a fact that the *Chhāndogya-mantras* compiled by

Guṇaviṣṇu in the twelfth century are ruling Hindu life in Bengal and parts of Bihar even today, in other words, the latest compilation of modern times is in point of social data identical with what is to be found in the oldest *Ritualliteratur* such as forms the subject matter of Hillebrandt's study, any dogmatism about relative chronology is eminently out of place. That Gautama and Nārada may, therefore, have come out of the same anvil there is nothing to dispute logically. That the *Manu Samhitā*, as we have it, is an encyclopaedic hotchpotch like the *Śukranīti* is also apparent to every student of these treatises. One can, therefore, find arguments in favour of Meyer's attempt to reopen the question of the chronology of the *Dharmaśāstras*. We should, at any rate, attach some distinct value to Meyer's standpoint that one treatise does not necessarily imply a later period or stage of development simply because the data furnished by it happen to look like being relatively more developed. The difference between treatise and treatise may just be the one between author and author. One may be a specialist, the other a dilettante and so on (pp. 86-88).

This is an eminently acceptable attitude of Meyer's. The most questionable practice in regard to the Vedic chronology as to the *Dharmaśāstra* chronology as well as the *Dharma-Artha-Kāma-śāstra* complex consists, as it has appeared to me always, in attaching a time-value to every instance of difference or discrepancy between author and author or rather text and text. Simply because certain social, legal or economic incidents are not mentioned by one authority but they happen to be dealt with by another it has become the convention among indologists to believe that there must be an interval of time lying between

the two. Humanly speaking, it should be reasonable to believe also that both might have arisen in the same epoch but that not every authority as book-maker, writer or compiler cared to or was capable of giving everything that was prevalent in his days. The diversity of regions or homes and surroundings of the authors also may explain the discrepancy between text and text although composed at the same time and dealing with the same topic.

While calling attention to the need for a reshuffling of the *Dharma* box in regard to dates and appreciating in the main the general lines of attack as formulated by Meyer it is not possible in the present work to deal with the entire *corpus* in a specialised manner. The conventional chronology, relative and absolute, as established by Bühler and Jolly, is therefore being provisionally left undisturbed, so far as the series from Gautama to Nārada and Brihaspati is concerned. In regard to the subsequent treatises, wherever there is a conflict between Winternitz's *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur* Vol. III (1921) and Kane's *History of the Dharmaśastras* Vol. I. (1930), a *via media* is being decided upon. On the chronology of every text Kane has bestowed considerable attention.

The Arthaśāstras

The topics of *Dharma sūtras* (*śāstras*) as discussed above enable us to realize that these books are in the main treatises of "private" law (i.e. the law relating to family or marriage, property, contract and so forth). In contrast with them the *Arthaśāstras* may be regarded as treatises on "public law" (*droit public*), the law of

the constitution, the polity, the *saptāṃga* or seven-limbed organism, the state.

Among the precursors of Kauṭalya in *Artha* speculations the following "schools" are noted by himself:[24]

1. The Mānavas.
2. The Bārhaspatyas.
3. The Auśanasas.
4. Ghoṭakamukha.
5. The Āmbhiyas.

The Kauṭalyan text cites the following individuals as professors of *Arthaśāstra* who preceded the author:

1. Kātyāyana.
2. Kinjalka.
3. Kaunapadanta (Bhīṣma).
4. Ghoṭakamukha.
5. Dīrghachārāyaṇa.
6. Parāśara.
7. Pisuna (Nārada).
8. Pisunaputra.
9. Bāhudantīputra.
10. Bhāradvāja (Droṇāchārya).
11. Vātavyādhi (Uddhava).
12. Viśālākṣa (Śiva).
13. Kaninko Bhāradvāja.

24 K. V. R. Aiyangar: *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity* (Madras 1935) p. 50.

N. C. Bandyopadhyaya: *Kauṭilya* (Calcutta 1927) pp. 19-21. M. Winternitz: *Geschichte der indischen Literatur* (Leipzig 1921) Vol. III. pp. 507-509.

Jacobi: "Über die Echtheit" etc. in the *S.K.P.A.W.* (Berlin 1912) pp. 837-838.

The Kāmaśāstras

In the speculations on *Kāma* (pleasure, joy, enjoyment) the precursors of Vātsyāyana or rather the founders of this science were as follows :[25]

1. Śvetaketu, son of Uddālaka (of the *Chhāndogya Upaniṣad, Brihadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* and *Jātaka* fame).
2. Bābhravya of Pānchāla.
3. Dattaka.
4. Chārāyaṇa (named in the *Arthaśāstra*).
5. Suvarṇanābha.
6. Ghoṭakamukha (perhaps a contemporary of the Śākyan-Buddhist (Udena) named in the *Arthaśāstra*.
7. Gonardiya (named in Patanjali's *Mahābhāṣya* as grammarian).
8. Goṇikaputra (named in Patanjali's *Mahābhāṣya* as grammarian).
9. Kusumāra

Vātsyāyana has been placed in the third century A.C. by Haran Chandra Chakladar but in the first century A.C. by Hara Prasad Sastri.[26]

The Culture-Complex and "Old Masters"

It is only when the indologist is adequately oriented to the pluralistic culture-complex of India as of other re-

25 Winternitz : *Geschichte* Vol. III, (Leipzig 1921) pp. 538-539. For the date of the *Kāmasūtra* see also H. Chakladar : *Vātsyāyana* (Calcutta 1921), and *Social Life in Ancient India : Studies in Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra*, (Calcutta 1929) pp. 19, 24, 33.

26 Lecture IV. in H. P. Sastri : *Magadhan Literature* (Calcutta 1923) p. 87.

gions that it will be possible to see at once how unhistorical and unfounded is the presentation of Indian thought-data in the works that are generally published about Indian philosophy, viewpoint and outlook on life etc.

One of the latest publications on India which is as weak in objective sense as in the anthropological basis of comparative culture-history is Betty Heimann's *Studien zur Eigenart Indischen Denkens* (Tübingen 1930). The *"Eigenart"* (pecularity) of Indian thought, as discussed by her, should really appear to be but common to the most diverse races, regions, religions and climates, should a researcher care to go into the institutions of positive sociology in a scientific manner.

The author makes statements like the following :[27]

"Not only in economico-religious but also in socio-psychological aspects the sense of the individual disappears among Indians in the community feeling. In stead of individuals creating the society, in India the individual is merged in a community."

The *Studien* contains such generalizations from beginning to end. That even in 1930 a student of culture can proceed to work in this manner indicates how powerfully the traditional *orientalisme* has misled the scholarship of Indianists in the directions of subjective, one-sided and monistic prejudices bearing on the East and the West. Another piece of "conventional" indology, weak as it is in positive historical data and cultural perspectives, is Albert Schweitzer's *Die Weltanschauung der indischen Denker* or "The World-View of Indian Thinkers"

27 B. Heimann : *Studien zur Eigenart Indischen Denkens* (Tübingen 1930) pp. 238-239.

(Munich 1935). He finds in Indian thought nothing but the negation of the world and life.

The anthropologico-sociological analysis of the foundations of domestic and social ceremonies, as examined by Hillebrandt in *Ritualliteratur* (pp. 3-8), was well calculated to cry halt to such "*Eigenart*"-philosophies. And of course the data of "new indology" as exhibited during the last generation from diverse fields are eminently adapted to counteract these unobjective tendencies. Some of the interpretations of Hindu culture by Heinrich Lüders and Helmuth von Glasenapp bear testimony to new orientations.[28]

For the period of three hundred years (c. B.C. 600-300) from Bimbisāra to Chandragupta Maurya Indian literature possesses hardly any dated texts in Sanskrit, Pali, and Prakrit, if it has them at all for any period. One does not know for certain the dates of the texts in the form in which they are available today. It is interesting to observe that almost every one of these texts is known in so many words to be a "compilation" and has made it a point to mention the "old masters," the *pūrvāchāryas*, previous authors or compilers. Whatever, then, be the dates of the last redaction, compilation or abridgment one can presume quite a high antiquity for the substantial portion of the material contained therein. That the *milieu* of Śākya and the Śākyans as well as of Mahāvīra and the Jainas was pluralistic in cultural institutions and movements acquires, therefore, special significance in the complicated questions of literary chronology. We understand

28 *Supra*, pp. 40-45. For the recognition of Hindu positivism by M. Winternitz see his "Ethics in Brahmanical Literature" (*Prabuddha Bharata*, February 1936), *Supra*, ch. V., note 46.

that many of the "old masters" of the professors of *dharma, artha* and *kāma śāstras* were the contemporaries, colleagues, critics and rivals of Śākya and Mahāvīra. The synchronism and parallel growth of the *trivarga* literary complex with the earliest Śākyan-Jaina propaganda and Upaniṣadic (Vedic) atmosphere may be presumed as a matter of course. In so far as the Śākya-Mahāvīra activities are known to belong to the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. the critical student of comparative literary history will not be off the mark, should he attempt to place some of the earlier strands, chapters, and verses of the available texts on *Dharmaśāstra, Arthaśāstra* and *Kāmaśāstra* in the sixth century B.C. i.e., the very age when Śākya and Mahāvīra were living. In every instance when it is necessary to indicate a somewhat later date for any such undated texts whether in Sanskrit, Pali or Prakrit it will be necessary to adduce incontestable and positive evidences. Each and every text will have to be appraised for chronological purposes on its own merits. Altogether, Indian literary tradition enables us to feel that the Hindu mind was not dominated by any particular "ism". The prevalence of conflicting tendencies served to endow social life and thought with a diversified pluralism as well as freedom of movement.

CHAPTER VIII

THE KAUTALYA QUESTION

Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra

The first edition of the present work was prepared and published (1910-14) when the Kauṭalya question appeared to be rather simple. But today in 1936, i.e., over thirty years since the first notice of the *Arthaśāstra* in 1905 the question is not yet closed. As the subject is likely to be no less important in the present century than were, say, the Plato question and the *Mahābhārata* question in the last the principal problems and viewpoints bearing on the subject are being dealt with chronologically in the following sections. A certain amount of repetition is unfortunately inevitable. My own position is being indicated not only sometimes in connection with those of others but also separately as the occasions arise.[1]

1 Text and Commentaries :—

1. The text was edited and published for the first time by R. Shamasastry in 1909 (Mysore). The second edition of the text appeared in 1919.
2. Sorabji Taraporewalla's *Some Notes on the Adhyakṣa Prachāra Book II. of the Kauṭilīyam-Arthaśāstram* prepared under Jolly at Würzburg (Germany) was published at Allahabad in 1914.
3. Jolly and Schmidt's edition was published in two volumes during 1923-24 (Lahore). The Sanskrit commentary *Nyāya-chandrikā* belongs to Vol. II. The Vol. I. published in 1923 contains Jolly's introduction in English on the Kauṭalya question.
4. The edition of Ganapati Sastri was published in 1924-25 (Trivandrum). This edition contains a Sanskrit commentary written by the editor himself.

The Kauṭalya question or the problem of the authenticity of the *Arthaśāstra* involves two main problems:

1. The question of the date or the age. The Indian tradition says that the *Arthaśāstra* is a Maurya work. The problem consists in examining this tradition about the alleged Maurya *milieu* of the *Arthaśāstra* materials or contents.
2. The question of the authorship. The Indian tradition says that Kauṭalya, the minister of Chandragupta Maurya, is the author of the *Arthaśāstra*. The problem consists in examining
   i. whether it is the work of a single individual or several combined in a school or otherwise,
   ii. whether the person who wrote the book is identical with the minister of Chandragupta Maurya.

On both these questions the opinions are as varied as possible. The evolution of indology in Kauṭalya scholarship from 1905 until today is being briefly surveyed in the following pages.

5. Kashi Prasad Jayaswal and A. Banerji-Sastri's edition of Bhattasvamin's Commentary on Book II. chs. VIII-XXXVI of the *Arthaśāstra* was published in the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* (Patna) Vols. XI and XII (1927) Bhattasvamin's Commentary on the *Arthaśāstra* is incomplete. It deals only with book II, and with chapters from viii to xxxvi only.

Shamasastry, 1905

It is with the publication of R. Shamasastry's paper on "Chāṇakya's Land and Revenue Policy (fourth century B.C.)" in the *Indian Antiquary* (Bombay) of January 1905 (pp. 5-6) that modern scholarship began to take interest in the politics, economics and sociology of Kauṭalya. In the introduction to that paper Shamasastry described the *Arthaśāstra* as the "science of economics" and pointed out that the author was "known by the name Kauṭalya." And he observed as follows:

"That Kauṭalya and Viṣṇugupta are other names by which Chāṇakya is known is a fact with which Oriental scholars are too familiar to doubt, and that Chāṇakya was the historical personage who put an end to the power of Nanda is a fact which is mentioned in a number of Sanskrit works." The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (Wilson, Book IV. ch. xxiv, p. 186), Hemachandra's *Sthavirapallīcharita* or "Lives of Jaina Patriarchs", and the *Nandisūtra*, a Jaina religious work in the Prakritic language were cited by him in evidence, and these he considered to be documents of the period between the first and the second centuries A.C. And he considered these works to be "fairly reliable data for assuming that Chāṇakya lived as minister of Chandragupta in the fourth century B.C.."

So much for the date. In regard to the authenticity of the *Arthaśāstra* Shamasastry referred to the subsequently oft-quoted passage in Dandin's *Daśakumāracharita* (II. viii) as well as Kāmandaka's glorification of Viṣṇugupta at the commencement of his *Nītiśāra*. He considered the *Kāmandakīnīti* to be "earlier than the fourth century A.C." In addition he drew attention to

the *Panchatantra* (ch, I) and Somadeva's *Nītivākyāmrita* as alluding to the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra.*

The paper was published in three numbers, January, March and May. It was mainly in the form of translation[1] of passages bearing on the following topics:

I. Land: (1) political divisions, (2) distribution of land, (3) concessions to cultivators, (4) remissions of taxes on land, (5) village rules, (6) land sales.

II. Revenue: (1) sources of revenue, (2) collection of revenue, (3) rates of toll, (4) weights and measures, (5) municipalities, (6) jails, (7) currency, (8) price of grain, (9) premia on exchange, (10) passports, (11) excise, (12) slaughter house, (13) oil, (14) butter, (15) salt, (16) goldsmiths, (17) commerce, (18) taxes on the sale of commodities, (19) sale of imported commodities, (20) courtesans, (21) gambling, (22) buildings, (23) artists, (24) religious institutions, (25) gate-dues, (26) special tax on Bāhirikas, (27) country revenue, (28) produce from crown lands, (29) merchants in country places, (30) superintendent of ferries, (31) rates of boat hire, (32) mines, (33) gardens, (34) forests, (35) cattle, (36) special taxes, (37) principle of revenue collection.

The contents of the *Arthaśāstra* were given as follows:

Book I. Training, Discipline and Personal Safety of Kings and their Ministers.
,, II. Departments of State.
III. & IV. Administration of Civil and Criminal Law.

1 These preliminary translations were later revised before publication in book form.

Book. V. Duties of Government servants towards the King and *vice versa*.
,, VI. The Rise and Progress of States.
,, VII. The Six-fold Diplomacy or Policy of Kings.
,, VIII. The Vices to which kings are liable.
IX-XIII. Military Matters.
,, XIV. Measures calculated to secure Peace and Plenty of States.
,, XV. The Plan of the *Arthaśāstra*.

It was pointed out by Shamasastry that "the *Arthaśāstra* was, in its author's own words, divided into fifteen books containing on the whole 150 chapters, which in 6,000 *granthas* (32 syllables = 1 *grantha*) deal with 180 themes."

Smith, 1908

The *Arthaśāstra* was naturally unknown in the first edition (1904) of Vincent Smith's *Early History of India* (Oxford). The Maurya institutions in this work were described chiefly or rather exclusively on the strength of the *Indika* of Megasthenes. In the second edition (1908, pp. 134-136) Smith preserved the material of the first but added three or four footnotes inviting attention to Shamasastry's paper in the *Indian Antiquary* (1905) as well as translation appearing in the *Mysore Review* since 1907. Besides, he felt that the Greek descriptions had remained "practically uncorroborated when the first edition was published." So he made it a point to supplement his old account of 1904 with passages from the *Arthaśāstra* in order to throw "much additional light on the matters briefly treated by Megasthenes and his fellow authors."

At this point Smith's attitude to Kauṭalya may be seen from the following extract. "Whoever its author may have been," says he, "that curious work undoubtedly is proved by both external and internal evidence to be of early date. The substance of the precepts and regulations has an extremely archaic aspect, and in my judgment, the polity described is mainly that of the Maurya age. The treatise in fact may be read as a commentary on, and exposition of the notes recorded by the Greek observers." He used it really as something by which the Greek accounts could be corroborated. He was not touched by the Megasthenes *vs.* Kauṭalya problem.

The *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* was described by Smith as "Chāṇakya's Art of Government." It was also treated as a work on the "principles and methods of government in ancient India." He considered many of the rules to be puerile or merely theoretical." "On the whole," the document was appraised as "evidently" a "presentation of the facts of actual practice made in the peculiar literary form affected by the Hindu writers of text-books."

According to Smith, the suggestions of Kauṭalya concerning the "methods by which a necessitous monarch might extort money were of Machiavellian wickedness."

The third edition was published in 1914. But for the present it is necessary to observe that it was the second edition that influenced indology not only in India but also in Germany.

Hillebrandt, 1908

In 1908 (July 16) lecturing at the Orientalisch-Sprachwissenschaftliche Section of the Sächsische

Gesellschaft für Vaterländische Culture (Breslau) on the subject entitled *"Ueber das Kauṭilīyaśastra und Verwandtes"*[1] (On the Kauṭilīyaśastra and Allied Topics) Alfred Hillebrandt began as follows: "At the head of Indian politics stands Chāṇakya also called Viṣṇugupta with the patronymic title Kauṭilya or Kauṭalya, a descendant of Kauṭala."

It is interesting to observe *en passant* that the name Kauṭalya was known in Germany already in 1908 (cf. Shamasastry 1905). According to Hillebrandt, Kauṭalya's name was first used by Wilson in 1883 in connection with a citation from the *Daśakumāracharita* where it is said that Kauṭilya composed a *Daṇḍanīti* in 600 *śloḳas* for the Mauryas. The annihilation of the Nanda Dynasty and the elevation of Chandragupta to the throne were remembered as Chāṇakya's achievements for a long time in the Indian tradition. *Panchatantra* (III. v. 138, V, v, 47), *Hitopadeśa* (III, 58), *Kāmandaḳī Nīti* (I. i, 4), *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* (IV. 24), *Kathāsaritsāgara* (V. 108) and Hemachandra's *Pariśiṣṭa parvan* (VIII. 193) were cited by Hillebrandt as evidences of the Kauṭalyan tradition in Hindu thought.

"The entire Indian tradition left no room for doubt as to the existence of a textbook by Kauṭilya," said Hillebrandt; "A *darśana* of politics is mentioned in the *Kāmandaḳī* (I. 7) and the commentary calls it *Kauṭalya-bhāṣya*. In *Kādambarī* also (ed. Peterson, p. 109, 4) the expression *Kauṭilyasāstra* is found."

In modern times the existence of a "work at least partly in prose on a now lost *Śāstra*" about *Rājanīti*

1 The lecture is to be found in the 86th *Jahresbericht* (Annual Report) of the Gesellschaft.

(politics) was first suspected by Zachariae in 1883 in his *Beiträge zur Indischen Lexikographie* (p. 43), said *Hillebrandt*. Quotations from Kauṭilya (Chāṇakya) had been collected by Aufrecht, Zachariae, and himself.

He said further: "The existence of a 'book' *Kauṭilyaśāstram* was also considered by Weber to be very probable. Then came the English translation of a part of the text by Shamasastry in the *Indian Antiquary* of Bombay (1905). The second edition of Smith's *Early History of India* (1908) referred to Shamasastry's English translation in the *Mysore Review* (1907)." But at the time of the lecture the English translation was, as he reported, not known to Hillebrandt.

Hillebrandt was about this time editing the *Mudrārākṣasa* and interesting himself in Hindu *nītiśāstra* with a view to writing the introduction. Julius Jolly referred him to the two of his own manuscripts of the *Kauṭalya* or *Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra* preserved in the State Library of Munich. With the examination of these two manuscripts may be said to commence Kauṭalyalogy or the study of the authenticity of Kauṭalya and the entire Kauṭalya-complex.

In the same lecture at Breslau Hillebrandt described his method as follows: "If we wish to test whether this work corresponds to the text which is described as Kauṭilīya in our citations, it appears to me necessary," said he, "that we should examine as to whether those passages are to be found in these manuscripts or not." The testing was done by him with regard to 50 passages (18 from Aufrecht, 7 from Zachariae, 23 from the commentary on the *Kāmandakī*, 2 from Mallinātha's commentary on the *Raghuvaṁśa*).

Hillebrandt's conclusion was thus worded; "Of these 50 passages 40 can be found in the manuscript, almost entirely word for word, in part with variants. I cannot say whether the remaining ten have been overlooked by me or perhaps may be found in other texts or, may be, were wrongly ascribed to Kauṭilya. But this large number is enough, I believe, for the demonstration, and it might accordingly be accepted that our manuscripts actually contain the lost textbook of Kauṭilya. With this work, then, the study of Indian *Niti* is placed on a strong foundation. Zachariae is right in his guess about the existence of such a work."

The "authenticity" of the *Arthaśāstra* was thereby established. Hillebrandt discussed also its age. He quoted the opinion of Hertel to the effect that the *Urpanchatantra* (original *Panchatantra*) was probably composed in Chāṇakya's life time, that "wooden temples" were built in those days, that Chāṇakya was described with the honorific title of *Mahat* (high souled or great) even before the gods. In *Mudrārāḳṣasa* also Chāṇakya's reputation was equally if not more held in honour.

The *Kāmandaḳīnīti* devoted five verses to the glorification of Kauṭalya, the *guru* of the author. "In any case the age of the *Panchatantra* determines," said Hillebrandt, "a correspondingly higher age for the *Arthaśāstra.*" He suggested that as soon as the text were available in print a comparison with the data of Megasthenes would not be uninteresting. Finally, be it observed that Hillebrandt was even then convinced that the work was the product of Kauṭalya's school (*entstammt nur seiner Schule*) and that Kauṭalya was not the author

throughout. But he did not make a definite pronouncement about the date or the age.

Hillebrandt's position should appear to be strong and reasonable so far as the plural authorship of the *Arthaśāstra* is concerned.

Hillebrandt invited attention to certain peculiar features of the text.

The references to Kauṭalya are sometimes in the form of posing his views as against those of other named professors of *nīti*. Once in a while direct quotations from Kauṭalya are introduced. On other occasions the *āchāryas* are named in a general manner in order to bring into relief Kauṭalya's opinions quoted as such.

These features would arouse suspicion in anybody's mind against the Kauṭalyan authorship of the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra*. The suspicion of Hillebrandt cannot be explained away especially as to whether it was a Maurya work.

It appeared to him, besides, that the manuscript was not complete.

The lecture was published separately also as a brochure and contained two more papers: (1) "*Nīti und Mudrārākṣasa*" and (2) "*Viśākhadatta.*" The brochure contains valuable material such as can be used for a history of Hindu political literature. We have given a somewhat extensive summary of Hillebrandt's lecture in almost his own words[2] because the Kauṭalya tradition from the earliest times on has been presented by him in a clear manner.

2 In the foregoing summary even when quotation marks have been used a literal translation has not been attempted.

Hertel, 1910-14

Like the *Mudrārākṣasa*, the *Panchatantra* also had been popular with German indologists in connection with *Niti* philosophy. The bearings of the *Panchatantra* on the Kauṭalya question were considered to be very substantial and even decisive. A leading authority on the *Panchatantra*, Hertel, was therefore naturally interested in the *Arthaśāstra*. His "Literarisches aus dem Kauṭilīya-śāstra" (Literary Data from the Kauṭilya) was published in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. XXIV of Vienna in 1910.

The *Tantrākhyāyika* uses the *Arthaśāstra* very often. According to Hertel the latter must be older than 200 B.C., the date assigned by him to the former. It should be observed, however, that, as usual in regard to other works, the suggested date for the *Tantrākhyāyika* is open to question.

His subsequent publication, *Das Panchatantra, seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung (The Panchatantra, Its History and Propagation)*, published in 1914, threw some fresh lights on the problems of the *Arthaśāstra*. Incidentally it may be observed that Zachariae whose guess in 1883 about the possible existence of a "book" (partly in prose) on the *Arthaśāstra* was verified by the discovery in 1905 published "Die Weisheitssprüche des Sanaq bei al-Tortusi" (The Wise Sayings of Sanaq to Al-Tortusi) in the *W.Z.K.M.* of Vienna in 1914 and dealt likewise with the Kauṭalya question. Here Sanaq = Chāṇakya.

In his translation of *Tantrākhyāyika* Hertel agreed with Hillebrandt that the *Arthaśāstra* was worked upon and expanded in subsequent times. But all the same,

he believed that the text as well as the commentary certainly came from Chāṇakya."

Mookerji-Law-Jayaswal-Sarkar, 1910-14

It was in connection with the work at the National Council of Education, Bengal, established during 1905-06 as an expression and embodiment of the national awakening known as the *Swadeshī Movement* that the present author's studies in Hindu culture as well as English translation of the *Śukranīti* were undertaken in 1907. Parts of this translation as well as the *Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* (first edition) were being prepared and published off and on in the journals of Calcutta, Allahabad, Madras and Dacca during 1911-13.

These studies, intimately associated as they were with the work of Baman Das Basu of the Panini Office (Allahabad), editor of *The Sacred Books of the Hindus Series* and part-author of *Indian Medicinal Plants*, were carried on in the main in an atmosphere of co-operative research at Calcutta.[1] To this research-complex belonged also Radhakumud Mookerji's studies in Hindu shipping and the geographical unity of India under the inspira-

1 The dates of the first publication in *book-form* are given below :

1. R. K. Mookerji : *History of Indian Shipping and Maritime Activity* (London 1911).
2. N. N. Law : *Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity based on the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya* with an Introduction by Mookerji on the Authenticity of Kauṭilya (London 1914).
3. B. K. Sarkar : : *Śukranīti* (Allahabad 1914), with Index by N. N. Law.
4. B. K. Sarkar : : *The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* Vol. I. (Non-Political, Allahabad 1914).
5. R. K. Mookerji : *The Fundamental Unity of India* (London 1914).
6. K. P. Jayaswal : *Hindu Polity* (Calcutta 1924). By the time of its publication the "book" had widely moved away from the author's ideas of the 1910-14 period.

tion of Satis Chandra Mukerjee of the Dawn Society (1903-06) and the National Council of Education, as well as Narendra Nath Law's investigations into the *Arthaśāstra* and Kashi Prasad Jayaswal's papers on Hindu coronation rituals and other aspects of Hindu polity (1911-13). That was the atmosphere of what may be described as an almost homogeneous and undifferentiated, although entirely informal, "school" of Hindu culture and social sciences at Calcutta. So far as the Kauṭalya question was concerned, that "school", like Shamasastry, considered the Indian tradition as but verified by the discovery of the *Arthaśāstra*.

And this tendency of that pre-war Calcutta School was fortified by Smith's treatment of the problem because in the second edition of his *Early History of India* (Oxford 1908, pp. 134-136) he actually supplemented his description of the Maurya institutions based on Megasthenes's *Indika* with data from the *Arthaśāstra*.

During this period Shamasastry's work on the *Arthaśāstra* was being followed with keen interest at the "Calcutta School." In addition to his first paper in the *Indian Antiquary* (1905) and translation of Books I-IV. in the *Mysore Review* (1906-08) the following parts (in English) furnished the material for investigation:

1. *Chāṇakya's Arthaśāstra or Science of Politics*, Books I and II. (Mysore 1908?), a brochure.
2. *The Arthaśāstra of Chāṇakya or Science of* Politics, Books III and IV. (Mysore 1908?), a brochure.

These two were available at the same time as articles in the *Mysore Review*, also, as indicated above.

3. *The Arthaśāstra of Chāṇakya*, Books V-VII in the *Indian Antiquary* (1909-10).

The entire text, edited by Shamasastry, was also available in 1909 (Mysore).

The personal contact with Hermann Jacobi, the German champion of the Indian tradition, at Calcutta during 1911-12 had likewise some influence on the "School."

The complications of the Kauṭalya question remained, therefore, untouched in the first edition of the present work. The following paragraphs are being reproduced from that edition:

"There is no difficulty about the *Arthaśāstra* of Chāṇakya, or Kauṭilya, the Minister of Chandragupta Maurya, who for the first time in Indian history conceived and executed the plan of a vast Empire, the limits of which it has not been possible for any Indian monarch to reach or exceed.

'Like Abul Fazl's *Ayeen Akbari*, the *Arthaśāstra* may be looked upon as the *Imperial Gazetteer of India* in one of the most remarkable periods of Indian culture-history. The chapters of this monumental document are devoted exclusively to a description of the multifarious incidents of political life under Chandragupta's government as well as economic and financial topics, e.g. the working of the mines, the opening of irrigation works, the establishment of factories; the maintenance of preserves and grazing grounds, of high ways of commerce, waterways, land-routes, and other facilities for communication; the establishment of markets and stores, the construction of embankments, dams and bridges, the planting of fruit and flower trees, of medicinal plants

and herbs (i.e. the establishment of Āyurvedic and pharmaceutical gardens); protection of the disabled, the helpless and the infirm, and also of beasts &c; famines, census, central and municipal government; livestock; and many other social, juristic and economic institutions."

"In the Introduction to Law's *Hindu Polity* Mookerji has summarised the arguments which may be advanced in support of the traditional and widely current view that the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya is the work of Chāṇakya the minister of Chandragupta and therefore belongs to the 4th century B.C. The writer has proved from both external and internal evidences—

1. That the political connection of Kauṭilya with Chandragupta as his Finance Minister is a fact and not a myth.
2. That the *Arthaśāstra* attributed to Kauṭilya is a genuine work of antiquity and not a traditionally handed down fable.
3. That the work is the production of an individual author and not of a school, as is frequently the case with Indian treatises."

Jacobi, 1911-12

In order to vindicate the Indian tradition that the *Arthaśāstra* is the work of Kauṭalya, the "famous minister of Chandragupta," Hermann Jacobi read a paper entitled *Ueber die Echtheit des Kauṭilīya* at the Königliche Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften (K.P.A.W.), Berlin, in 1912 (July 18).[1]

1 See the *Sitzungsberichte* of this Academy 1912, pp. 833-834, 836, 848-849. This is available in English transl. (by V. S. Sukthankar) in the *Indian Antiquary* (Bombay) for June-July 1918.

The very first item in Jacobi's paper deals with the expressions *iti Kautilyah* and *neti Kauṭilyah*. He speaks of the 72 cases[2] of such reference to Kauṭilya himself in the third person in the body of the *Arthaśāstra*. In 1908 Hillebrandt had raised the suspicion against the unitary authorship attributed to Kauṭalya. That position is challenged by Jacobi.

First, he quotes the view expressed in Shamasastry's introduction to the text (1909) as to the alleged usual practice of ancient Indian authors.

Jacobi's own argument is as follows: The *Arthaśāstra* mentions authorities 114 times. It is unthinkable, says he, that the opponents of Kauṭalya should have been called *āchāryas* by the school to whom Kauṭalya was the only *āchārya*. On the other hand, the very fact that disagreements are so often referred to is alleged to indicate the authorship by an individual of extremely critical tendency. It is clear, however, that Jacobi did not present a front attack to the problem involved in *iti Kauṭilyah*.

Hillebrandt's position that the *Arthaśāstra* was the work of Kauṭalya's school and not of Kauṭalya himself was challenged by Jacobi. According to Jacobi it is hardly thinkable that Kauṭalya should have been the "founder of an "academic school" (*Gründer einer Gelehrtenschule*). He is prepared to believe that the Imperial Chancellor Kauṭalya "made a school," as one may say about Bismarck, "among the statesmen and diplomats" of his time. But it is difficult to believe that Kauṭalya should have established a "school for scholars."

2 *S.K.P.A.W.* pp. 832, 837.

Jacobi cannot conceive the "Indian Bismarck" to have functioned like an "ordinary Paṇḍit" as a teacher of *Arthaśāstra* to the pupils around him. On the contrary, it fits in well with the character of a "great statesman" and a ruler of the state, says Jacobi, that just as Frederick the Great did, Kauṭalya should have dealt with his life's profession or a part of it in a theoretical manner. If, then, there were a school it could have come into existence not from Kauṭalya the person but from his book. In Jacobi's analysis it is the school that owed its existence to the book and not the book to the school. In this instance the "school", said he, is to be understood in two senses: (1) as a series of teachers and pupils and (2) the entire body of adherents to the Kauṭalyan doctrines.

Jacobi was also convinced that the book as the work of an individual did not suffer from interpolation to which as a rule works of a school are subject. And since the number of chapters along with the topics discussed was indicated by the author himself the text could not be considerably expanded by subsequent copyists. As to whether curtailments were effected would have to be ascertained by a critical examination of the text, said he.

On the Kauṭalya-complex Jacobi had another, previous paper. His lecture in 1911 at the K.P.A.W. (Berlin)[3] was entitled *Kultur—Sprach—und Literarhistorisches aus dem Kauṭilīya* and dealt with the cultural, linguistic and literary-historical data of the *Arthaśāstra*. There, among other things, he pointed out the discrepancies between the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Kāmandakī*. It is

3 *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin) 1911, p. 642. This is available in English transl. (by N. P. Utgikar) in the *Indian Antiquary* (Bombay 1924).

clear according to him that although Kauṭalya has been honoured as the *guru* by the author of the *Kāmandakī* (II. 6), the latter derived his materials from other authorities as well. The *Kāmandakī nīti* is based not on Kauṭalya alone but on *rājavidyā-vidām matam*, i.e., the doctrines of those versed in the science of kings. Thus considered, the existence of a special school alleged to have been established by Kauṭalya is considered by Jacobi to be very questionable.

To this position of Jacobi's a reply was presented by Hillebrandt in "Zu Kauṭilya" published in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Leipzig 1915) where the latter sought to maintain his original thesis.

Jolly, 1911-16

In 1911 Julius Jolly reported on the contents of the *Arthaśāstra* at the first session of the Internationale Vereinigung für Vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft (International Union for Comparative Jurisprudence) which was held at Heidelberg. The paper was published at Berlin in 1912 in the *Proceedings* of this Session, under the title "Ein altindisches Lehrbuch der Politik" (An Old Indian Textbook of Politics). His "Lexikalisches aus dem Kauṭilya" (Dictionary material from the K.) appeared in the *Indo-Germanische Forschungen* vol. xxxi of 1912. During this period Jolly entertained no doubts about the authenticity and antiquity.

As author of *Recht und Sitte* (Strasburg 1896), Jolly was specially interested in the laws and morals as well as manners and customs, in one word, the *mores*, as embodied in the *Arthaśāstra*. In the *Zeitschrift der*

Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft (Leipzig) for 1913 he had a paper entitled *Arthaśāstra und Dharmaśāstra*. In 1914 his pupil Sorabji Taraporewalla's edition of Book II. of the *Arthaśāstra* with notes was published at Allahabad. Jolly's collection of parallel passages from the two sides was being published in the *Z.D.M.G.* during 1914-15 under the title of "Kollektaneen zum Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra." In one of these papers Jolly referred to the following passage in the *Daśakumāracharita* (chapter VIII): *Iyam (Daṇḍanītih) idānīm āchārya Viṣṇuguptena Mauryārthe ṣaḍbhih ślokasahasraih samkṣiptā*, This science of politics was "*idānīm*" (recently?) abridged by Prof. Viṣṇugupta into 6000 *ślokas* for the use of the Maurya or Mauryas. On the strength of the word *idānīm* Jolly considered the *Arthaśāstra* to be not much older than the *Daśakumāracharita* (seventh century A.C.). The position was challenged by Jacobi in the same journal for 1914 in the paper "Ist das Daśakumāracharita gleichzeitig mit dem Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra? (Is the D. of the same age as the A ?). Jolly's "Textkritische Bemerkungen zum Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra" was published in the *Z.D.M.G.* during 1916-17.

In 1916 the chapters of the *Arthaśāstra* dealing incidentally with technological (chemical, medicinal and toxicological) matters were examined by Jolly in the paper on "Zur Datierungsfrage" (the Question of Dating) published in the *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zur Göttingen*. Jolly's previous work on Hindu medicine also throws light on the question. The results of these researches were later made use of by Otto Stein in *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya* (Vienna 1922. pp. 61-63), by Hillebrandt in *Altindische Politik* (Jena 1923

p. 4), by Winternitz in his paper on "Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra" in the *Calcutta Review* (April 1924) and by Keith in *A History of Sanskrit Literature* (Oxford 1928, p. 460). These ideas were likewise summarized by Jolly in the introduction to his and Schmidt's edition of the text, vol. I. (Lahore 1923).

We need not quote here the relevant passages from Kauṭalya and Magasthenes.[1] A few observations are being made on the methodology of Jolly. According to him the metallurgical knowledge displayed in the *Arthaśāstra* is said to be much too advanced for the Maurya times. As for evidences he has to depend on nothing more than what he considers to be the extant chemico-metallurgical literature of the Hindus. A more reasonable proposition should perhaps consist in questioning the finality of the as yet established antiquity of Hindu chemistry itself. It is time to discuss whether the *Arthaśāstra* references (II, XII, XIII, XIV) do not bespeak fragments of chemical texts or of medico-chemical experience older than has yet been studied (e.g. by Prafulla Chandra Ray). Instead of bringing the *Arthaśastra* down to post-Maurya times it should be within the limits of scientific truth-investigation to push the older epochs of Hindu metallurgy or chemistry further up to the Mauryas. At the present state of our knowledge it is not possible to dogmatize either way. The question should be regarded as an open one.

A curious argument is presented by Jolly in the course of his studies bearing on *Dharma vis-à-vis Artha*.

1 The details are to be found in the chapter on the "Data of Ancient Indian Mineralogy."

Should the *Arthaśāstra* comprising the legal portion (*Dharmasthiyam*), says he, be taken for a composition of the fourth century B.C. then the entire chronology, up till now accepted as valid for the schools of Hindu law, falls like a house of cards. It appears, if we are to follow this kind of logic, that all new discoveries and inventions must be forbidden and penalized in order that the *status quo* of a tradition—albiet scholastic—may not be altered.

It is strange that Jolly, the author of *Recht und Sitte*, should have considered the *Arthaśāstra* to be a branch of the *Dharmaśāstra*. In Hindu *mores* there is no room for any one category (*kāma, artha* or *dharma*) claiming priority to or precedence over another. This indeed is the first postulate about personality and societal organization in Hindu thought. The secular, worldly, economic, political and social interests (*artha* and *kāma*) of mankind can be traced back to the *Atharva Veda* atmosphere in the Vedic complex. The discussions about them, the solicitude for them, the magical and perhaps Tāntric hocus-pocus in their regard are really as old as anything in Indian culture and intellectual discipline. Some of the oldest folk-elements, the secular interests of diverse economic groups, and non-Aryan or pre-Aryan, nay, depressed and un-Brāhmaṇ classes or races are to be found in the *milieu* of the *Vrātya*.[2] As long as the *Atharva* tradition is there one does not have to look for the origins of *Arthaśāstra* in some *Vidyā* bearing on non-*Artha*.

From a careful study of what Jolly has said in connection with the age of the *Arthaśāstra* it seems that he

2 For *Vrātya*, see *Supra*, pp. 145-148.

wants the world to believe that the oldest possible documents of law, morals, arts, industries, sciences etc. bearing on India have already been discovered and that the chronology of Hindu literary documents has been ascertained and fixed for ever. And since the *Arthaśāstra* happened to be discovered long after the *Dharmaśāstras* and other branches of Hindu literature had been discovered and studied, the *Arthaśāstra* must therefore by all means be later than and even derived from those sources. This is a very regrettable attitude in the world of science.

Formichi, 1914

At the University of Rome a lecture was delivered by Carlo Formichi in 1914. It was published in the *Rivista Italiana di Sociologia* for March-April of the same year under the title "Pensiero e azione nell' India antica" (Thought and Action in Ancient India). The prejudice among Western nations against the Hindu character as being devoid of force and vitality was due to a hasty generalization, said he. But he believed that by the discovery of *Arthaśāstra* the prejudice was demolished. He believed that this discovery would lead in Italy to a revival of studies in Machiavelli. As a student of *nīti-śāstra* Formichi had taken a humanist and cosmopolitan view in his *Salus Populi* or "Welfare of the People" (Turin 1908). There he sought to establish the identities in the political ideas of Machiavelli, Hobbes and Kāmandaka. On certain aspects of the Kauṭalya question Formichi took a very conventional view, however. For instance, writing subsequently in 1924 on the *Arthaśāstra* he observed that the treatise failed to furnish ideas of a great national state. Nothing more than a picture of *piccoli*

stati was to be seen in Kauṭalya's book. The *Arthaśāstra* was alleged to mirror forth the political condition of India before and after the glorious parenthesis of the Maurya Empire. But still he believed that Kauṭalya was a man whose whole life and talent were devoted to moulding *le base d'un impero in India* i.e. the foundations of an Empire in India.

Bottazzi, 1914

The Italian scholar G. B. Bottazzi's *Precursori di Niccolo Machiavelli in India ed in Grecia Kauṭilya e Tucidide* was published at Pisa in 1914. The book described two precursors of Machiavelli, namely, Kauṭalya in India and Thucydides in Greece. In his judgment Kauṭalya was taken to have lived like the Greek historian Thucydides *secoli e secoli prima di Cristo,* i.e. centuries and centuries before Christ. In other words, he accepted the Indian tradition about Kauṭalya's *Arthaśāstra* as being a Maurya work. He believed likewise that Kauṭalya was the minister of Chandragupta. For he says that Kauṭalya was more fortunate in practical life than Machiavelli. The Florentine Secretary had a grand dream to which he, a little bit too enthusiastic, fell a victim, as says Villari. But Kauṭalya, on the other hand, was alleged to be more positive and more political and to have lived to see his ideas fulfilled. Bottazzi assumed that it was to Kauṭalya that Chandragupta Maurya owed his accession to the throne.[1]

1 For Formichi and other Italian writers see the present author's "Hindu Politics in Italian" (*I.H.Q.*, 1925-26), in which Bottazzi's work has been analyzed in detail. The analysis may be seen in the *Pos. Back. Hind. Soc.* Vol. II. Part II. (1927).

Smith, 1914-19

The third edition of Smith's *Early History of India* was published in 1914 after the publication by Shamasastry of the text of the *Arthaśāstra* (1909) as well as the entire English translation in the *Mysore Review* (1907-10). In this edition also his material of the first edition, "derived solely from Greek authorities", as it was, remained unchanged. Only, one or two footnotes were added from the *Arthaśāstra* to those derived in the second edition from the same source. But nearly eight pages based on the *Arthaśāstra* material were added in the place of two of the second edition. The treatment of the new data in the third edition was somewhat different from that in the previous. Besides, an appendix was added, namely, "The *Arthaśāstra* or *Kauṭilīyaśāstra.*"

In the third edition (pp. 137-138) Smith's attitude to the *Arthaśāstra* had already changed in some vital points. "It is not desirable," says he, "to amalgamate the rules laid down in the *Arthaśāstra* with the descriptions recorded by the Greeks, because the latter present to us the impression made upon foreign observers of institutions actually existing at a particular date, 300 B.C. in round numbers, after the foundation of the Maurya Empire, whereas the former express the arrangements favoured by Brāhmaṇ ministers as suitable for any independent kingdom at any time."

In Smith's judgment (1914) the *Arthaśāstra,* then, was "a pre-Maurya work, an authoritative account of political and social conditions in the Gangetic plain in the age of Alexander the Great" (325 B.C.). The book was, moreover, regarded as a treatise such as had no reference

to the "Dravidian kingdoms of the South, which were organized in other fashions".

In the third edition it was possible for Smith to utilize also the lecture of Hillebrandt at Breslau (1908) as well as the lecture of Jolly at Heidelberg (1911). Jolly's paper on "Arthaśāstra und Dharmaśāstra" in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (1913) was also acknowledged. It is interesting that Smith mentions Hillebrandt and Jolly who doubted the Maurya antiquity of the *Arthaśāstra* but ignores Jacobi whose paper (1912) was emphatically and aggressively in favour of the Indian tradition.

But still it is curious that Smith should have made the following statement. "The researches of German scholars", said he, "have clearly established that the *Arthaśāstra* is a genuine and ancient work (*echt und alt*) of the Maurya age, and presumably attributed rightly to Chāṇakya or Kauṭilya." (Third Edition, p. 153).

This interpretation by Smith is entirely wrong. It is the exact opposite of the views maintained by Hillebrandt and Jolly. Neither of them was convinced of the Mauryanism of the *Arthaśāstra*. Hillebrandt did not dogmatize and venture on any date; but Jolly, although favourable at the outset (1911), was positively against the Maurya origin. The words "*echt*" (genuine or authentic) and "*alt*" (old) used by them did not mean anything more than that it was not a work of any period, say, after the seventh or eighth century A.C. It is regrettable that in English-speaking countries, and especially in India, a misleading notion about the attitude of German indology in regard to the Kauṭalya question should have been propagated by Smith's work at a time when the Hille-

brandt-Jacobi controversy and the Jolly-Jacobi controversy were the most characteristic features of this branch of studies in Germany relating to Hindu culture.

However, Smith reiterated his position to the effect that the contents of the *Arthaśāstra* described the "state of things as existing immediately before the establishment of the Maurya Empire." But he believed in the "possibility or probability that the existing text may contain minor interpolations of later date." He was convinced, however, that the "bulk of the book certainly dated from the Maurya period."[1]

Smith's general orientations to the *Arthaśāstra* were likewise somewhat new in the third edition. In his judgment in 1914 (as in 1908) many of the rules in Chāṇakya's treatise were "puerile" and "some merely theoretical." But on the whole the book was intended, said he, to be "a practical manual of statecraft and administration"[2] Then he made a comparison between the *Smriti* books and the *Arthaśāstra*. According to Smith "books like the so-called *Laws of Manu* and *Dharmaśāstra* set forth the Brahman ideal" whereas on the contrary the treatise of Chandragupta's minister was alleged to "openly discard ideals." The *Arthaśāstra* was alleged likewise to present "a plain unvarnished statement of the immoral practice of kings and Brāhmaṇ ministers in the fourth century before Christ, prior to the realization of the novel idea of a great empire extending over nearly all India."

1 Smith's views as adumbrated in the third edition (1914) appeared in print a few months after the publications of the pre-war "Calcutta School" (1913-14). They began to influence Indian thought during the Great War.

2 Third Edition (1914) p. 144.

There are many statements in these few lines. Attention will be called to only one point. The words, "theoretical", "ideals" etc. are not clear enough and are eminently misleading.

In the first place, should the *Arthaśāstra* be, to a certain extent, a work of "principles and methods" and "merely theoretical" (1908 ed. p. 136), adequate attention ought to be bestowed on these aspects. It would be doing injustice to Kauṭalya's work to treat it virtually as a "practical manual" and a "presentation of the facts of actual practice." Indeed, it is impossible to ignore or overlook the "theoretical" side or "principles" of the *Arthaśāstra*. The "rise and progress of states" dealt with in Book VI. is certainly "theoretical" or philosophical. Book VII. describes the sixfold diplomacy or policy of kings. Naturally, this classification points also to a logical analysis of statal facts and, although perhaps based on "facts of actual practice" or experience, is to be treated as a contribution to the theory or philosophy of the state. Then, again, the vices to which kings are liable are analyzed and groupified as usual in Hindu and Śākyan (Buddhist) logic, ethics, or psychology. By no means can the chapter be regarded as on the whole a "practical manual of statecraft and administration." All these portions as well as many chapters, sections, or subsections of the other Books which deal with such problems of the mind, personality, group, society, human relations, society, bureaucracy and so forth can by no means be regarded as purely descriptive reports of the pre-Maurya, Maurya or post-Maurya times.

The fallacy to which indology has been liable for a long time is due to the fact that the *Arthaśāstra's* scope

or character as *Kauṭalyadarśanam* or Kauṭalyan philosophy has been ignored, overlooked or minimized. Whether that philosophy be agreeable or disagreeable, humane or wicked, Machiavellian or Saturnian is an altogether different question. The first and foremost fact about the *Arthaśāstra* is that it is a contribution to thought, the philosophy of the state and society, and of individuals *vis-à-vis* the state and society.

And therefore we come to another point. Even should the *Arthaśāstra* have to be assessed as a document of "immoral practices" of kings and ministers, it cannot be regarded as having discarded ideals. The proper course in such a state of things is to admit that the *Arthaśāstra* does not deal less with "ideals" than the *Dhammapada*, the *New Testament* or the *Gītā* but that its "ideals" are perhaps as the poles asunder from those of the latter documents. To promulgate alleged unholy, immoral or wicked ideals is not to discard ideals altogether.

Two considerations should therefore be attended to at once. First, the *Arthaśāstra* is a "philosophical" work, a contribution to "theory", whatever else it may be at the same time. Secondly, the *Arthaśāstra* is a book of "ideals", "norms", "duties" etc. no matter whether we consider those ideals to be desirable or pernicious to mankind.

Once we admit the philosophical or theoretical nature of some of the discussions in the *Arthaśāstra*, Smith's idea that it "applies only to a small kingdom"[3]

3 Third Edition (1914) p. 138. See the present author's "Hindu Theory of International Relations" in the *American Political Science Review* (August 1919), *Hindu Rāṣṭrer Gaḍan* (Calcutta 1926), "Hindu Politics in Italian" (*I.H.Q.*, 1925-26), and "The German Translation of the Kauṭalyan Arthaśāstra" (*I.H.Q.*, June 1928).

becomes meaningless and untenable. To say that Kauṭalya meant that his principles were to be "applied in the government of a small kingdom surrounded by other small kingdoms, all either actually or potentially hostile" is to misunderstand the philosophical or theoretical value of the doctrine of *maṇḍala* ("geopolitical" sphere) in the world's political speculation. And this fallacy has been committed by Smith, Jolly, Formichi, Winternitz, Keith and others because they have somehow ignored the speculative aspects of the *Arthaśāstra* or failed to do them adequate justice.

On the other hand, those scholars who are prepared to admit that in the doctrine of *maṇḍala* ("geopolitical" sphere) only a philosophical idea of states *vis-à-vis* one another is being adumbrated and that no value should be attached to any region or epoch will also have to be prepared to accept the idea that the *Arthaśāstra* is the work of a theorist, a scholar, a Paṇḍit.

It is only when we are mentally prepared for the acceptance of the *Arthaśāstra* as a contribution to philosophy by a prefessional scholar that we can fully appreciate the fact that in the entire range of mankind's political speculation there is nothing to compare with the logical analysis of political or rather international psychology as embodied in the doctrine of *maṇḍala*. And from the Indian side this is the greatest single contribution of the Hindu brain to the world's political philosophy.

Smith's *Oxford History of India* was published in 1919. In this book, he devoted seventeen pages (pp. 76-93) to Maurya institutions, much more indeed in the number of words than in his *Early History* (1914). Here

the *Arthaśāstra* loomed large, the *Indika* being rather pushed to the background. Or, perhaps one might say that both were being used at random to supplement or illustrate each other. The name of Megasthenes was however used less frequently than that of Kauṭalya or rather his book.

Smith's idea about the pre-Maurya character or atmosphere of the *Arthaśāstra* was maintained in the *Oxford History*. "The reader should understand," says he, "that the Nanda Kingdom of Magadha was strong, rich, extensive, protected by a numerous army, and no doubt administered on the system described in the *Arthaśāstra*."

It is interesting to observe that in all these publications Smith never cared to go into a discussion of the Kauṭalya question. He accepted the Indian tradition as a matter of course and was not at all interested in giving the reasons for his accepting the tradition.

Vallauri, 1915

Book I. of the *Arthaśāstra* was translated into Italian by Mario Vallauri in 1915 (Rome) as *Il I Adhikaraṇa dell' Arthaśāstra di Kauṭilya*. The work was prepared under the guidance of Jolly at Würzburg.

Shamasastry, 1915

The English translation by Shamasastry was first published in the *Mysore Review* and the *Indian Antiquary* during 1906-1910 in the most inconvenient manner. In book form the first edition of this English translation was available in 1915.

In the introduction to this translation he pointed out (1) some of the phrases common to the *Arthaśāstra* and

the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, (2) some of the passages cited by Mallinātha for his commentaries on Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa* and *Kumārasambhava* and (3) the quotation from the *Arthaśāstra* by Kālidāsa himself in his *Śakuntalā* for the efficacy of hunting as a royal sport.

An important question raised by him had bearings on the problem as to the priority of the *Arthaśāstra vis-à-vis Yājnavalkyasmriti*. In his judgment Yājnavalkya must have borrowed from Kauṭalya. Shamasastry pointed out that in Yājnavalkya's time the technical sense of the Kauṭalyan *yukta* (government official) had been forgotten.

Shamasastry considered the Kauṭalyan society to be in the main pre-Buddhistic (pre-Śākyan) and the societies reflected in the *Manu Samhitā* and the *Yājnavalkya Smriti* as portraying conditions of revived Hinduism and decadent Buddhism.

Finally, he singled out a few words which were alleged to violate the grammatical rules of Pāṇini. Presumably, "Kauṭalya was unaware of Pāṇini."

It is not out of place to observe that Shamasastry made it a point to refer to the two editions of Smith's *Early History of India* (second edition, 1908, third edition 1914), in which the civil and constitutional laws of the *Arthaśāstra* were treated as strikingly similar to those recorded by Megasthenes and other Greek writers.

Fleet, 1915

In the introduction to Shamasastry's English translation J. F. Fleet observed that the "archaic style" of the *Arthaśāstra* was "well in agreement with the claim" that it belonged to the period 321-296 B.C. To him as to Smith the problem was thus very simple. In his judg-

ment it is but a "common practice of Indian writers" that the "name Kauṭilya figures constantly through the book, especially in places where the author lays down his own views as differing from others which he cites."

In the present author's judgment, however, it is rather strange that a writer should constantly name himself in his own book while he has to offer views contrary to those of others. A practice like this would be unthinkable in any country. So far as India is concerned, it is questionable if the practice existed at all. Certainly it was not a "common" practice. It is because of this "mannerism" that confidence in the Kauṭalyan authorship of the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* receives a rude shock. The passages in question will have to be ascribed to somebody other than Kauṭalya.

Fleet refers to "competent judges," without naming any, according to whom "the existing text is perhaps not absolutely word for word that which was written by Kauṭilya." But he has no doubt that here we have essentially a work which was composed by Kauṭalya "in the period stated above."

Keith, 1916

The Hillebrandt-Jacobi controversy was the subject of a paper by A. B. Keith entitled "The Authenticity of the Kauṭilīya" published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) for January 1916. Jacobi has not been able to prove his case, said Keith, who concluded as follows:—"It is, however, perfectly possible that the *Arthaśāstra* is an early work and that it may be assigned to the first century B.C. while its matter very probably is older by a good deal than that."

An important point raised by Keith in this discussion bears on the relations between the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Kāmasūtra*. Keith referred to the agreements in form between these two works, as pointed out by Jacobi in his paper of 1911, and said, "It is very probable that the latter borrows from the former. But the similarity of the quotation of the same rare authorities Chārāyaṇa and Ghaṭa(ka)-mukha renders it very surprising that the authors should be separated by a period of six centuries as held by Jacobi who ascribes Vātsyāyana to the third century A.D."

Jacobi's paper of 1911 pointed out the 300 *śloḳas* that are to be found in the *Arthaśāstra*. Their metre is far more classical in type than that even of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Some of the stanzas are *triṣṭubh* in regular metre. Keith argued therefore about the "comparatively recent date" of the *Arthaśāstra*. "No such verses," said he, "are to be found in a work of the fourth century B.C." of which we have a probable date, the *Brihaddevatā*."

Altogether, Keith came considerably under the influence of Jolly's "arguments for a late date and fictitious authorship" as given in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. LXVIII. By 1926-1928 his views were to undergo a radical transformation, as we shall see later.

K. V. R. Aiyangar, 1916-35

The reference to Kauṭalya's part in the revolution which overturned the Nanda dynasty of Magadha and placed Chandragupta Maurya on the throne is an important item in the information furnished by the *Purāṇas* about the dynasties of the Kali age. And as according

to Pargiter the Puranic lists of dynasties attained their present form about 250 A.C., K. V. R. Aiyangar[1] suggests that "Chāṇakya must have lived at some earlier period pretty far removed from the middle of the third century A.C."

On the relations between the *Sūtras* on *Dharma* and *Artha* he may be said to believe in their synchronism, generally speaking. Certain differences in regard to *clientele* have however to be observed.

For instance, the *Dharmasūtras* as manuals of duties varied according to the Vedic *charaṇas* or schools, says he, but the *Arthaśāstras* were common to followers of all Vedic schools. This fact ought to have rendered the latter more popular or universal than the former. But there is another consideration. The rules of *Dharmasūtra* are of equal interest to all classes of men. But it is none but princes and officials that can take interest in the rules of the *Arthaśāstra*. Thus each of these kinds of *Sūtras* became confined to certain special classes, the *Dharma* to the *charaṇas* and the *Artha* to the princes and officials (pp. 10-11).

Altogether, a certain amount of common stuff is observable as pervading the entire *Dharma* and *Artha* literature. In regard to Kauṭalya, for instance, Jolly's paper in the *Z. D. M. G.* (1913) gives 80 parallels from Yājnavalkya and 50 each from Manu and Nārada.

1 *Ancient Indian Polity* (Madras 1916), pp. 7-10, F. E. Pargiter: *Dynasties of the Kali Age* (London 1913), pp. 69-70. The second edition, published in 1935, is virtually a reprint of the first. The chapter on Bibliography is additional. It may be pointed out (p. 186) that the writer of the paper on Chāṇakyasūtrāṇi in the *IHQ.*, 1927 is Jacobi (and not Jolly). Further, Jacobi's paper on the 'authenticity' of Kauṭalya (1912) was published not in the Z.D.M.G. but in the S.K. P.A.W.

K. V. R. Aiyangar analyzes the resemblances and discrepancies between Kauṭalya and Manu and concludes that the latter follows the former and precedes the author of *Śukranīti*. In his judgment Yājnavalkya also is later than Kauṭalya (pp. 17-18, 109-111).

As for the date or age of the *Arthaśāstra* he examines six kinds of evidence,—(1) religious, (2) political, (3) historical, (4) literary, (5) philological and (6) astronomical. In his judgment Kauṭalya's work was composed during a period in which Pāṇini's work was either unknown or had not attained wide celebrity and influence. The *Arthaśāstra* is therefore according to him pre-Pāṇinian, i.e. previous to 350 B.C. Besides, the *Arthaśāstra* is said to follow the *Jyotiṣa-vedānga*, the astronomical treatise, which according to Burgess (*J.R.A.S.* 1893, p. 752) "preserves the main features of Indian astronomical knowledge before it was modified or affected by that of the Greeks" (pp. 27, 120-127).

Altogether, the Indian tradition about Kauṭalya's personality and the authenticity of the *Arthaśāstra* in every sense is accepted by him as vindicated (pp. 9-10, 27).

Thomas, 1916-22

In the introduction to his edition of *A Brihaspati Sûtra*[1] F. W. Thomas referred to Jacobi's "two very valuable papers" in 1911-12 (already cited above). In these papers Jacobi is described by Thomas as having "discussed the bearings of the *Arthaśāstra* upon the Indian literary and linguistic history and argued forcibly for its authenticity." We do not understand, however, whether Thomas believed that Jacobi is right. But his

1 Published in *Le Museon* 1916, p. 383.

sentiments seem to lie that way. One is perhaps entitled to guess like this from the following statement. "As Prof. Jacobi has mentioned," says Thomas, "Chāṇakya frequently quotes his predecessors, both schools and individuals, the style often assuming almost the form of a discussion; and it is clear that in (say) the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. the subject of royal policy was a recognized topic."

It should appear that Thomas most probably does not object to the Indian tradition about the Maurya *milieu* of the *Arthaśāstra*.[2]

In the chapter on "Chandragupta, the Founder of the Maurya Empire" in the *Cambridge History of India*,[3] the date of the *Arthaśāstra* is placed by Thomas "within or near the Maurya period." The political and social organization of the Maurya Empire" is described by him in a separate chapter on the strength, first, of Greek writers, and secondly, of the *Arthaśāstra*.

The "means of describing the complete polity existing at the time, its land system, its fiscal system, its administrative system, its law, its social system with some view of literature and religion" is described by him as being furnished by the *Arthaśāstra*.[4]

2 Thomas refers to the "notable paper" of 1908 by Hillebrandt "which drew attention to a number of quotations from a prose work ascribed to Chāṇakya," and observes that "Prof. Hillebrandt was unaware at the time that this original treatise had already been discovered in South India." This evidently is wrong because, as we have seen, Hillebrandt expressly mentioned that he saw the translation of a part published by Shamasastry in the *Indian Antiquary* (1905). And he gave a short account also of Shamasastry's paper.

3 Vol. I. 1922, pp. 467, 474.

4 See also Thomas's paper in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London 1914),

Sarkar 1918-1922

Between 1914 and 1918 my ideas about Kauṭalya were undergoing transformation. It was not considered necessary to doubt the tradition about the Maurya origin of the *Arthaśāstra*. But in regard to the contents of the work itself it was not felt reasonable to maintain that it could be treated *in its entirety* as an or the Imperial Gazetteer of Maurya India. Certain parts might indeed be regarded as descriptive-historical or objective-factual. But in the main it appeared to be a work of theory, a philosophical treatise or *vidyā* on politics just like the other *vidyās* or *śāstras* of Hindu literature. The position thus obtained was substantially different from that embodied in the first edition of Vol. I. of the present work.

The changed position was, manifest in the following papers which were published from 1918 to 1922 in America and Europe :

1. "Democratic Ideals and Republican Institutions in Ancient India" (*American Political Science Review*, November 1918).
2. "Hindu Political Philosophy (*Political Science Quarterly*, New York, December 1918).
3. "Hindu Theory of International Relations" (*American Political Science Review*, August 1919).
4. "Gilde di Mestier e Gilde Mercantili nell' India Antica" (*Giornale degli Economisti e Rivista di Statistica*, Rome, April 1920).
5. The Theory of Property, Law and Social Order" (*International Journal of Ethics*, Chicago, April, 1920).

6. "La Teorie de la Constitution dans la philosophie politique hindoue" (*Revue de Synthèse Historique,* Paris, August and December 1920).
7. "The Hindu Theory of the State" (*Political Science Quarterly,* New York, March 1921).
8. "La Démocratie hindoue" (*Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques,* Paris, July-August 1921).
9. "The Public Finance of Hindu Empires" (*Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Philadelphia, September 1921).
10. "Politische Strömungen in der indischen Kultur" (*Deutsche Rundschau,* Berlin, March 1922).

In all these papers Kauṭalya was cited as a mirror for the Maurya times. But a sharp distinction was made, in the first place, between institutions and theories. In the second place, care was taken to stress the discrepancy between *Realpolitik* and "pious wishes." In other words, Kauṭalya could not always be quoted as a reporter on institutions or laws actually enforced in a particular locality. Vol. II. Part I. of the *Positive Background* (Allahabad 1921-22), in so far as it had to do with the *Arthaśāstra,* differed thus essentially from Vol. I in ideology. This conception about the double or complex character of the *Arthaśāstra* was the fundamental feature of my *Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922) also.

In that work occurs the following passage about the "literary" evidences, i.e., the Sanskrit, Pāli and Prākrit

treatises on politics and law: "The evidential value of these latter sources (as contrasted with the inscriptions) of information in a portrayal of *Realpolitik*, excepting perhaps that of certain sections of the *Arthaśāstra*, is as a rule very questionable. This circumstance is not adequately realized by writers on Hindu law (public or private) but will have to be grappled with from now on as a problem in indology" (p. vii).

Considerable portions of Kauṭalya's book were then treated as but of the same rank as most of the *Dharmaśāstras* and *Nītiśāstras*, i.e., speculative or normative compositions without any necessary connection with the region or the epoch. The following passage from the *Political Institutions* (p. 163) describes the general character of all these Hindu *śāstras* or *vidyās*: "Neither merely pedagogic-ethical nor purely descriptive-anthropological are these political *vidyās* of Sanskrit literature. As manuals of *rājadharma* or duties for princes the *nītiśāstras* have natural analogues in Elyot's *Boke Named the Governour* (1531) and in the works of John of Salisbury (twelfth century), Aquinas (thirteenth century), Occleve (fourteenth century), Patrizi (fifteenth century) and the like. For certain purposes, again, they may be slightly compared to treatises of the type of Fortescue's *Governance of England* (1476). Moreover, like the Arab encyclopaedist Al Farabi's *Al-Madinat-al-Fadila*, i.e., *Model City* (tenth century), based as it was on Plato, and like the *Prince* and the *Utopia* the writings of Kauṭalya, Kāmandaka, Śukra and Bhoja are contributions to political 'ideals' as well."

It may be remarked *en passant* that for the purposes of the above publications the quantitative statements in

regard to the finances were taken *tentatively* as the data for Maurya India.

In so far as the *Arthaśāstra* is the work of a scholar, theorist, philosopher, *Gelehrter* or *Paṇḍit* its statements cannot be depended upon automatically as descriptions of things *as they were* in Maurya times. On the other hand, one should not be justified in calling it un-Maurya or post-Maurya simply because certain things known to be Maurya from other sources are not to be found in this book. The question of age thereby acquired a new character. Logically, therefore, the *Arthaśāstra* could not be shorn of its Mauryanism simply because of its eventual discrepancy, say, with the inscriptions of Aśoka or the *Indiķa* of Megasthenes.

The troubles have arisen in looking upon the *Arthaśāstra* as a "Gazetteer," as was done in the first edition of Vol. I of the *Pos. Back.*, i.e., as a document of statutes relating to the constitution and law of a particular region in a certain period of history. That the *Arthaśāstra* in its entirety is not. It is in the main a logic or grammar of politics. In the manner of the Śākyan (Buddhist) *Niķāyas*, it furnishes us, among other things, with the psychological analysis of virtues and vices, crimes and punishments, nay, of the human personality itself. We find in it the logical classification of the *casus belli*, the formula by which to understand friends and foes, and altogether the mental apparatus involved in the mastering of the diverse problems of group-life. The *Arthaśāstra* is a philosophical treatise conceived in the traditional Indian way and with its varied schemes, plans, formulae, classifications etc. addresses itself not to this *narendra* (king) or that, this *amātya* (minister) or that, this

adhyakṣa (superintendent or director) or that but to all and sundry who care to read this treatise and make use of its suggestions.

It is this change in the orientation to the *Arthaśāstra* as mainly *Kauṭalya-darśanam* or the (social) philosophy of Kauṭalya that has determined my attitude in regard to subsequent researches, whether Indian or Eur-American. This position was systematically maintained in the papers contributed to the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta) during 1925-28.[1]

In *Hindu Politics in Italian* are to be found the following passages: "The critics are very prone to ignore the fact that the *Arthaśāstra* is not history as Guizot's *History of Representative Institutions in Europe* is, nor does it attempt to set forth the constitution of a particular state, like, say, Joseph-Barthélemy's *Gouvernement de la France* (1920).—It is *Kauṭalya-darśanam*, a philosophical treatise established, as openly admitted in the text, on the researches and investigations of *pūrvāchāryas*, i.e., previous speculators and theorists. In general features it belongs to the type of works like Bodin's *Les Six Livres de la République* (1578) or Adam Müller's *Die Elemente der Staatskunst* (1809). Political philosophy is, as in Spann's *Der wahre Staat* (1921), to mention a modern work, essentially a structure of ideals and pious wishes. It may not overlook analyzing the existing

1 See the papers:

1. "Hindu Politics in Italian," September and December 1925 (p. 751) January and June 1926 (p. 356).
2. "On Some Methods and Conclusions in Hindu Politics," December 1926, (pp. 851-853), January 1927, (pp. 198-202).
3. "The German Translation of the Kauṭilyan Arthaśastra," June 1928, (p. 378).

institutions, practices and *mores*, but its fundamental *raison d'être* consists in the criticism of the *status quo* and suggestions as to the duties that lie ahead."

As a corollary to the above standpoint the question of the so-called *piccoli stati* (small states) as alleged to be furnishing the atmosphere of the *Arthaśāstra* was discussed in the following manner. "How, then, are critics justified," it was asked, "in attaching a realistic, objective and historical value to the Kauṭalyan doctrines in an off-hand way?" The answer was given as follows: "The doctrine of *maṇḍala* ("geopolitical" sphere), for instance, will have to be taken as a philosophical category pure and simple, just like the doctrine of *saptāṃga* itself. It constitutes a logical framework, a formula, so to say, of formal logic."[2]

In the paper on "Some Methods and Conclusions in Hindu Politics" it was pointed out that the scope, i.e. the scientific nature, character or object of the Kauṭalyan treatise was as a rule misunderstood by indologists because of its institutional references and practical associations. "It is the tendency to ignore the fact that the *Arthaśāstra* is *Kauṭalya-darśanam* (Kauṭalya philosophy). It is, in other words, a theoretical, speculative treatise, and not a historical work designed to portray the actual constitution of a particular state or states." The *Arthaśāstra* deals, it was observed, both with "the art of government" and the "theory of the state" but with each in the *darśana* or philosophical manner. It could not be overlooked that the "art of government" itself had a "theoretical, speculative, philosophical", i.e., *darśana*, aspect."

2 For *saptāṃga* and *maṇḍala* see B. K. Sarkar: *Pol. Institutions etc.* (Leipzig 1922), pp. 167-192, 214-226.

In the same paper it was also clearly brought out that from the standpoint of scope and methodology no distinction could be made between the main body of the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Dharma* or *Smriti* treatises. "In regard to these evidences (Gautama, Baudhāyana, Āpastamba, etc.), it was observed, "my judgment is to the effect that their institutional value is questionable. For, as is well known, these *Smriti* books merely say that the king *should* do such and such things, the priest *should* do such and such things, and so on. Collections of these and allied "shoulds" may indicate the trends of thought, speculation, theory or philosophy in the social fields but not *necessarily* the actual histories of positive realities such as may point to what is or was being *done* by the men and women of flesh and blood."

The occasion was utilized to repeat once more that the subtle distinction between "pious wishes" and *Realpolitik* had invariably escaped the workers in indology. The suggestion was, therefore, made to the following effect: "Workers in ancient Indian lore must have the courage to face the situation and ransack the available literary data from the standpoint of positive science wherever possible. The time has come to attempt rendering unto history the truths that are history's and to philosophy the truths that are philosophy's."

R. G. Bhandarkar, 1919

R. G. Bhandarkar is perhaps the first Indian indologist to argue against the Indian tradition.[1] The date of the *Arthaśāstra* was considered by him, in the course of

1 *Proceedings and Transactions of the First Oriental Congress* (Poona 1920), Vol. I. pp. 24-25.

his Presidential Address at the Oriental Congress held at Poona in 1919, to depend on that of the *Kāmasūtra*, whose author Vātsyāyana is the earliest author to notice the *Arthaśāstra*. The *Kāmasūtra* was considered to be a work of the first or second century A.C. This is the earliest date therefore to which in R. G. Bhandarkar's judgment the *Arthaśāstra* could be referred.

According to R. G. Bhandarkar, Vātsyāyana is said to have lived "about a hundred years" after Kuntal Sātakarṇi Sātavāhana who "must have flourished in the middle of the first century B.C."

But the data of Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* are not considered to be as old as the first or second century A.C. On the strength of latest researches, e.g., those of H. Chakladar[2] Jolly places the *Kāmasūtra* somewhere in the fourth century A.C. R. G. Bhandarkar's method would then compel us, as it does Jolly, to assign the *Arthaśāstra* to, say, the third century A.C. The *Kāmaśāstra-Arthaśāstra* question has been later discussed by others. To argue about the probable interval of time on the strength of coincidences and resemblances is evidently very questionable.

It is interesting to observe that R. G. Bhandarkar goes not only against Jacobi (1912) who believed that the author of the *Arthaśāstra* is none other than the minister who helped Chandragupta Maurya but also against Hillebrandt (1908) who, without committing himself to any age or date, attributes the authorship to a member of the Chāṇakya school and not to Chāṇakya himself. He is thus radical in his position as regards the Indian tradition.

2 *Vātsyāyana, the Author of Kāmasūtra*(Calcutta 1921); Jolly's Introduction to his and Schmidt's *Arthaśāstra* (Lahore) Vol. I. (1923), pp. 26, 28-29.

Another point was raised by R. G. Bhandarkar. He was of opinion that the "occurrence of the name of Kauṭilya should not be taken as indicating his authorship of the whole statement."

This is an important standpoint and cannot be easily explained away. There is no way but accept the proposition that the writer of the passages in which Kauṭalya has been quoted cannot be Kauṭalya himself. Even without going into the doctrine of *apadeśa* (i.e. statement of the views of others) one should accept the proposition on common-sense logic. (See Hillebrandt, 1908, Jacobi, 1912).

Sastri, 1920-23

In his course of six lectures delivered at Patna University (1920-21) Haraprasad Sastri[1] asks the question, "But was the author the prime minister of Chandragupta in the fourth century B.C.?" He answers in the affirmative on the strength of the verse at the end of the last chapter which is too well known.

Sastri believes that Kāmandaka was Kauṭalya's "direct disciple." In the *Kāmandakīnīti* the salutation to Viṣṇugupta has the following lines:

darśanat tasya sudriśo
vidyānām pāradriśvanah
yatkinchid upadekṣāmah
rājavidyāvidām matam.

Here the adjective, *sudriśo* (handsome), refers to Viṣṇugupta. According to Sastri, Kāmandaka does not seem therefore to be far distant in time from his great master.

1 *Magadhan Literature* (Calcutta 1923), pp. 51, 55-56.

Winternitz, 1921-24

In the third volume of his *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1921), M. Winternitz devoted a lengthy discussion to the Kauṭalya question (pp. 504-524). In Jolly's case we know that he at first (1912) believed in the authenticity but began to doubt it in 1914. But in Winternitz's case there was no question of a change. His very first impression which appears to be recorded in this chapter of his *Geschichte* was against the Indian tradition in every way. In his judgment the work was not the work of an individual and of course not of the minister of Chandragupta. Besides, it was not much older than the *Tantrākhyāyikā* which was considered to belong to the fourth century after Christ (p. 523).

In April 1924 he wrote a paper in English on "Kauṭilya *Arthaśāstra*" for the *Calcutta Review*. This was virtually a translation of the German chapter in the *Geschichte*. In that chapter (p. 519) he had simply referred to Stein's article on "Megasthenes und Kauṭilya" in the *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Vienna, 1921). But in the meantime Stein's book came out (1922) and so in Winternitz's article for the *Calcutta Review* Stein could loom large.

Winternitz's position in the *Calcutta Review* as in the *Geschichte* is as follows: "It would be a precious work," said he, "even if it were not older than the seventh century A.D. when we find it actually quoted by Dandin. But it would be perfectly invaluable if it really were, as it pretends to be, the work of the minister of Maurya Chandragupta and would thus belong to the fourth century B.C."

It is worth while to recall that Jolly's ideas against the Mauryan antiquity of the *Arthaśāstra* were rendered available in a final form in English in the introduction to his and Schmidt's edition of the text (Lahore, Vol. I. 1923).

As in the case of Jolly, the special feature consisted in the incorporation by Winternitz in his paper of all that his pupil Stein in his *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya* (1922) had unearthed presumably against the synchronism of the *Indika* and the *Arthaśāstra*. With this paper of Winternitz's as well as Jolly's introduction to the Lahore edition (1923), then, the controversy over the Kauṭalya question acquired a fresh lease of life.

In my way of looking at things, as has been often pointed out, there should not be any difficulty in agreeing with Winternitz that in the *Arthaśāstra* we find "exactly the same predilection for endless and pedantic classifications and definitions as in other scientific works composed by Puṇḍits." No body can overlook the "quibblings" and hair-splitting discussions that mark the book as in the Śākyan (Buddhist) treatises on the *Nikāyas*, for instance.

But Winternitz is not right when he maintains that this method of classifying "certainly looks more like the work of Puṇḍits than of a statesman." First, there is no earthly reason why a writer on economics, politics, or international law who is very objective, realistic, endowed with common sense and is interested in the quantitative and statistical aspects of the social sciences should not care to follow the methodology of scientific analysis and literary compositions as prevalent in the academies and universities of his fatherland. It is a standing joke, for

example, in French academic and Anglo-American literary circles that German authors, no matter what their profession or subject of research, must inevitably bring in the terms, "subjective" and "objective," etc. into their discussions.

Secondly, there is a subtle assumption in Winternitz's statements to the effect that a Paṇḍit cannot be a statesman or that a statesman cannot be a Paṇḍit. Now this is utterly untenable as an item of human personality, in the East or the West, in classical antiquity or in modern conditions.

From the inscriptions of the Pāla Dynasty of Bengal we are aware that Darbhapāṇi was a Paṇḍit as well as a Premier. One can perhaps cite instances from every royal dynasty in India.

The *pièce de resistance* in Winternitz's paper as in Jolly's recent arguments is furnished by Stein's conclusions in *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya*. They have already been discussed at the proper place. But one item calls for a special notice. "It is of great importance," says Winternitz, "that Kauṭilya among the different kinds of gold mentions artificial gold made from other metals by chemical process in which mercury is used." And "even P. C. Ray in his excellent history of Indian Chemistry who believes that alchemy is indigenous in India cannot trace it (the use of mercury) any further back than the earliest Tantric text in the fifth or sixth century A.C. In the medical works mercury is mentioned only once in Charaka's treatise, once in the Bower manuscript (fourth century A.D.), and twice in the *Suśruta*. It is entirely unknown in earlier literature." Winternitz concludes, therefore, as follows:—"I am

inclined to think that this chapter on minerals is a strong proof of the later origin of the *Arthaśāstra.*"

Perhaps, another scholar would be equally entitled to conclude in the opposite manner, namely, "I am inclined to think that this chapter on minerals represents an older landmark for Hindu chemistry than what is yet known."

Incidentally, it is very curious that Ray, whose literary sources, i.e., references to the Ayurvedic, Tantric and other passages are but borrowings from what indologists have said, should be conveniently quoted by Winternitz, author of the standard German history of Indian Literature, as an authority on dates of Sanskrit texts.

Should the use of mercury be actually known to the *Arthaśāstra,* this treatise ought to be regarded as a new document in the history of Hindu chemistry. But unless strong proof be forthcoming, nobody can be compelled to regard this new discovery as not older than the oldest known documents.

Winternitz concedes to Jacobi that Kauṭalya perhaps had officials of different departments as collaborators. But it must be observed, that this ought to be conceded only when one accepted that the author of the *Arthaśāstra* was Chāṇakya the minister. Be this as it may, in regard to Kauṭalya's dependence on others for specialized branches of knowledge one need not quarrel with Winternitz when he believes in the existence of special treatises on architecture, metallurgy, military science etc. in Kauṭalya's time and in the incorporation by him of some of that material in the *Arthaśāstra.*

But it is very important to observe that Winternitz has not been able to argue logically in favour of his thesis that "it is at least not very probable that such a highly developed technical literature existed in or before the fourth century B.C." Winternitz's argument here, should there be any, is of the same kind as Jolly's as remarked on in a previous context. Both seem to say, "well, I have been dealing with all this literary stuff of ancient India for more than a generation. Up till now the oldest Hindu texts were not older than the seventh, sixth, fifth, or fourth century A.C. Is it probable that this upstart creature, Kauṭalya, should compel us all at once to revise our conceptions of Indian literary chronology by being declared to be a man of the fourth century B.C.?" Neither Jolly nor Winternitz has been able to produce a single argument to prove why a newly discovered document cannot be older than what they have all along known to be the oldest. Neither has yet been able to demonstrate that what are now discovered to be rather highly advanced, complicated or developed conditions could not by any means be placed within Indian boundaries in centuries before the Christian era.

Finally, it is reasonable to agree with Winternitz about the Machiavellian elements in the *Arthaśāstra*. On this point Indian scholars are as a rule very touchy. The subject has been dealt with at length in the other contexts.[1]

Winternitz's paper on "*Dharmaśāstra* and *Arthaśāstra*" (1926-28)[2] seeks to give some tentative conclusion

1 B. K. Sarkar: *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig, 1922); "Hindu Politics in Italian" (IHQ., 1925-26), "On some Methods and Conclusions in Hindu Politics" (*IHQ.*, 1926-27).

2 *Sir Ashutosh Memorial Volume* (Patna) pp. 47-48.

about the relations between the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Dharmaśāstra* on the result of a comparative analysis of important contents. In certain topics both these classes of literature can be traced back to the Vedic sources. But in certain topics which belong as a matter of course to the domain of *Dharmaśāstra* Kauṭalya has borrowed from the oldest *Dharma* books. On the other hand, in those topics which belong to the *Arthaśāstra* Kauṭalya is the authority and has been drawn upon by later *Dharma* books (e.g. Viṣṇu, Manu and Yājnavalkya). This is a substantial study and may throw light on the Kauṭalya question.

Hopkins, 1922

Describing the growth of law and legal institutions in ancient India the American indologist E. W. Hopkins says in the *Cambridge History of India*[1] that the *Arthaśāstra* "may date from about 300 B.C." He is not sure, however, as to whether "it is indisputable that this work belonged to the third or fourth century B.C." For the present, he considers it advisable to deal with the *Arthaśāstra* as with the *Jātakas*. That is, it is not advisable to accept *all* its rules as belonging to the time assigned to the work as a whole i.e. to *c* 400 B.C. Hopkins's footnote indicates that he was influenced by Jacobi's two papers. A cross reference indicates that about the date Hopkins (or perhaps the general editor, E. J. Rapson) is in agreement with Thomas who contributes the chapter on the Maurya institutions.

1 Vol. I. (1922), pp. 294-295.

Hopkins therefore accepted the Indian tradition. And this acceptance leads him also to make the statement that the *Kauṭilīya* is "a manual of rules imposed by a practical statesman." In his judgment it is "impossible to suppose that the conditions it depicts are imaginary."

According to Hopkins Manu represents a "state conceived as a smaller kingdom" whereas Kauṭalya's purview is "not only more exhaustive but wider."

Pargiter, 1922

Without much discussion Pargiter[1] takes Kauṭalya for the fourth century B.C.

Charpentier, 1922

Writing on the history of the Jains in the *Cambridge History of India* Vol. I. (1922, pp. 151, 164) the Swedish scholar Jarl Charpentier takes the traditional view. He speaks of the *Arthaśāstra* or Manual of Politics which may possibly be the real work of Chāṇakya or Kauṭilya and therefore written about 300 B.C." Chāṇakya is described by him as the "great statesman" with whose "aid" the last of the Nandas was dethroned by Chandragupta the founder of the Maurya dynasty.

Stein, 1922

In Megasthenes und Kauṭilya (Vienna 1922) Otto Stein came to the following conclusion (p. 302):

"On the strength of an intensive comparison between the *Indika* of Megasthenes and the *Arthaśāstra* it is not

1 *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* (London, 1922), p. 54.

possible to discover an agreement as some investigators have asserted. The snychronism of the two sources becomes therefore improbable and the authorship of Chandragupta's minister for the *Arthaśāstra* doubtful."

The Reliability of Megasthenes Questionable

But whether Megasthenes's *Indika* is a reliable document for the actual facts of Chandragupta's India may well be doubted. About the *Glaubwürdigkeit* (reliability) of the Hellenist ambassador Stein himself is eminently sceptical. His remarks on this point are interesting.

"Absolute reliance cannot be placed in Megasthenes," says he (pp. 297-298). According to Stein the *Indika* is marked by idealizings. Exaggerations are noticeable as well as incorrect generalizations. Then there are misunderstandings also which may in part be ascribed to the subsequent copyists. Those who have made use of the *Indika* have also introduced changes in the text. Megasthenes, we are told, was probably influenced by literary or historical surveys and interpretations. Or rather, the institutions of foreign countries (e.g. Persia, Egypt, Greece)[1] were ascribed to India by Megasthenes and those who borrowed of him. In certain instances the sources of his information seem to be limited. He may not have fully understood the deeper motives of Indian life. His report may be charged also with being a work not so objective as planned according to some definite scheme. The tendency to mention institutions with five members is an instance in point.

1 Pp. 18, 21, 129, 192, 252.

These defects of Megasthenes notwithstanding, Stein has, curiously enough, proceeded to examine the Mauryanism of the *Arthaśāstra* by the touchstone of the *Indika*.

The Fortification of Pāṭaliputra

Among the descrepancies between Megasthenes and Kauṭalya as discovered by Stein one relates to the kind of building material used for forts. Megasthenes is alleged to have mentioned wood. But in the *Arthaśāstra* the use of wood is said to be forbidden and that of stone to be recommended. A stone-wall is also noticeable in it. But on the other hand recent excavations have come across remains or fragments of wood work of the Maurya epoch.

In regard to the ditch around the fort Megasthenes and Kauṭalya are said not to agree. It is possible, according to Stein, to demonstrate the existence of stone work in the *Arthaśāstra* but not wood work on a large scale.[2]

It is interesting to observe, however, that Stein is not in a position to say that stone, i.e., something other than wood, was not used in the wall. Indeed, he quotes passages to indicate that a "long brick wall" ran from north-east to south-east. He is also aware that remnants of a stone wall as well as four high walls of stone and earth have been found in the course of archæological explorations and excavations (p. 40). In other words, wood work is not the only material that has been discovered at Pāṭaliputra in recent years.

2 Pp. 34, 38, 45, 299.

Further, following Stein we can get the following equations :[3]

(1) The *prākāra* of Kauṭalya = the wall of Fragment No. 26.

(2) The *indrakoṣa* of Kauṭalya = the loophole arrangement in the palisade of Fragment No. 25.

(3) The house drains of Kauṭalya lead to the ditch outside the city which in Fragment 25 serves a double purpose : (i) defence and (ii) sewage.

As regards the building materials in the *Arthaśāstra* Stein is not blind to the fact that wood is used in considerable quantities (pp. 43-45). He is quite aware that as regards the numerous "public buildings" the materials used may be either wood or stone. As for the internal structure of houses most of the materials is wood. He is not definite about the material of the walls of the houses.

Altogether, one should believe that in regard to the fortification Stein has offered relatively more points of agreement between Megasthenes and Kauṭalya than discrepancy. It is curious, therefore, that in his general conclusion he should be so convinced about the discrepancy.

As for the chronological value of stone *vs.* wood in regard to the priority or otherwise of Kauṭalya, Stein should not have much worry, because he himself has cited Rhys Davids's reference to the stone walls of the fort or city of Giribraja in the sixth century B.C. (p. 40). Even with stone walls, then, there is nothing in the *Arthaśāstra* to prevent it from being at least as old as Megasthenes.

3 Pp. 36, 37, 39.

In regard to the item of fortification one should let the question drop here. But because Stein has laboriously cared to maintain a thesis which virtually leads him to inconsistency let us dwell at length on the details as well as his general methods of discussion.

Building Materials in Maurya India

Stein quotes Fragment No. 25 as well as Fragment No. 26. But it is necessary to call attention at the very outset to the fact that the two Fragments, as explained by Stein, although agreeing in the figures about the length and breadth of the city, differ in certain respects, as follows (pp. 29, 32):

Fragment	First Defence	Second Defence
No. 25 (Strabo)	Wooden Palisade	Ditch
No. 26 (Arrian)	Ditch	Wall

In No. 25 the wooden palisade is the first defence round the city and then comes the ditch. But in No. 26 the ditch is the first defence immediately round the city and is followed by the wall. In this second report the wall is not described as wooden. It appears, therefore, that nobody can be sure of what Megasthenes actually saw at Pāṭaliputra.

The statements in No. 26 are somewhat more elaborate than those in No. 25 which indeed is much too short. "The number of Indian cities is so large that it is not possible to report about them correctly," says Fragment No. 26. It is clear that Pāṭaliputra is not the only city this Fragment has in view. No. 25 does not have any statement like this. About the architecture of towns No. 26 has in part the following: "Those which lie on a river or on the sea-coast were built of wood." Another

statement runs thus: "Those which are situated in high and dry regions were built with brick and mud." Then comes the description of the greatest city of the Indians, Palimbothra. The report from Megasthenes is added at the end where the wall is mentioned but not as a wooden structure.

From Fragment No. 26 one should believe that one is getting a general idea of the cities in India. The idea is derived from more than one report. The cities are not uniform in the matter of building materials. The proper conclusion from the two Fragments should be as follows:

(1) Both wood and brick were in use in India as building materials.

(2) About Pāṭaliputra nothing definite is known: (i) The position of the wall in relation to the moat is an open question, and (ii) that wood was a material used at all for the wall is problematic. Further, there is no guarantee that wood was the only material used.

On the strength of the two Fragments, then, we should be well advised to refrain from feeling that we have a positive knowledge of Pāṭaliputra's external structure. Megasthenes cannot, therefore, be taken as the touch-stone of all subsequent reports about the external features of Pāṭaliputra.

Pāṭaliputra Not Mentioned in the Arthaśāstra

But let us see what use Stein makes of the data and how. We have the following passage:

"Two Fragments of Megasthenes (No. 25 and No. 26) deal with the city Pali(m) bothra and its fortification" (pp. 28-29).

And his next sentence reads as follows: "From the *Arthaśāstra*, however, nothing can be derived about Pāṭaliputra (*nichts über Pāṭaliputra entnehmen*)."

Such being the actual position of the data on both sides, the reasonable procedure should be not to attempt institute a comparison between the two at all. As long as Kauṭalya has nothing to say about Pāṭaliputra it is entirely irrevalent to talk of his agreement with or discrepancy from Megasthenes.

But Stein has considered it worth while to go at length into this question, because Kauṭalya deals in detail with the "installations of a fort" (*Einrichtungen einer Festung*). It is evident that according to Stein no particular fort of any specified locality has been discussed by Kauṭalya. Just the general considerations about a fort are all that can be derived from the *Arthaśāstra*. In the interest of logic one should, therefore, leave Kauṭalya alone because his evidence cannot possibly have any bearings on Pāṭaliputra. A simple illustration will make the situation clear. Suppose a particular individual has been stabbed with a dagger. A gentleman A has reported the fact to the Police. The Police summons, say, to the witness box a gentleman B. The magistrate asks B if he has seen the stabbing. B replies that he knows what is a dagger, how daggers can be manufactured, what kind of craftsmen are skilled in making daggers, and so on. About the stabbing itself he is silent. In regard to Pāṭaliputra and its fortification Kauṭalya's evidence is no more valuable than B's in regard to stabbing.

Kauṭalya on Forts Objective but Theoretical

Yet Stein proceeds as follows:—"It is probable (*wahrscheinlich*) that Kauṭalya either derived his requirements for a fortified city from the existing arrangements in Pāṭaliputra and reproduced them or that he wanted to carry out his ideas of a fort in Pāṭaliputra." It is interesting that on the strength of his data as given above, Stein is not sure of his position, as indeed nobody can possibly be sure under such circumstances. He speaks therefore of "probability." He thinks of two probabilities. But regrettably enough, neither can be assumed as a matter of course. Suppose a British architect writes a book on town planning and gets it published in London. Shall we be justified in taking it for granted (1) that the author must have got his ideas of a town from London and London alone or (2) that he wants the city fathers of London to adopt his plan? A treatise on town planning, although published by a British firm in London and although the author is a Briton, may have nothing to do with London itself and the work may not be addressed to the Londoners at all. Stein's probabilities about Kauṭalya *vis-à-vis* Pāṭaliputra in the matter of the sections on fortification (*Durgāvidhāna* and *Durganiveśa*) in the *Arthaśāstra* are therefore hardly of any worth. We cannot be forced to imagine that Kauṭalya's writings on fortification were based on what he may have seen at Pāṭaliputra or that he wanted his ideas to be accepted for the city. The reasonable way of looking at things would be to treat Kauṭalya just as an author and to believe that his sources as well as objects might be as wide as the world at large.

But Stein proceeds with his "probabilities" further. In any case, says he, Kauṭalya's description of a fort "might be based on a reality (*Wirklichkeit*) and not be a theoretical one." The logic here is rather complicated and open to question. In the first place, supposing that Kauṭalya's ideas of forts and fortifications were based on a reality we are not justified in assuming that the only *Wirklichkeit* in India for an author on town planning or fortification was Pāṭaliputra. There were many other towns, forts and fortified towns which might equally furnish a Hindu author with *Wirklichkeit* as the basis for his writings. In the second place, Stein assumes that an author who bases his ideas on *Wirklichkeit* cannot at the same time be theoretical. This is an entirely untenable assumption. Indeed, there are very few theoretical treatises which are not based on *Wirklichkeit*. In other words, the sections on *Durgāvidhāna* and *Durganiveśa* might be based on actual forts and towns and yet at the same time serve the purpose of a theory. We are to understand that Kauṭalya may have been an author of practical common sense endowed with interest in the "objective" or "realistic" method of investigations and yet attempting nothing more than giving to his countrymen a scientific treatise on the theory of forts and cities.

It is by systematically ignoring or overlooking the normal and common sense view of the matter that Stein comes to the following proposition: "Consequently (*Darum*) it may not appear to be unjustified (*unberechtigt*) to institute parallels between the data of Megasthenes and the requirements of Kauṭalya.' Unfortunately, we have noticed that the previous steps do not entitle him to

use the word "*Darum*" and that the attempt to institute comparison between Megasthenes and Kauṭalya in regard to Pāṭaliputra is entirely *unberechtigt*, arbitrary and unscientific except as an interesting piece of intellectual gymnastics.

In any case the analytical investigation and the intensive analysis of data should be appraised as almost exemplary.

The present work is not a treatise on the *Arthaśāstra*. There is no room in it for an item by item examination of the data, results and methodology in Stein's study.[4] But certain general considerations must not be overlooked.

In the first place, Kauṭalya's work is a book of *śāstra*, a philosophical or theoretical treatise, a work on some *vidyā*. It is not a report on actual conditions which may or may not influence the thought of an author. At any rate, an author is free to utilize these conditions in his own way as data.

In the second place, Megasthenes's *Indika* is a report and is therefore entirely different from the *Arthaśāstra* in scope. Now, as reporter, Megasthenes may have been a monumental misinterpreter even with the best of intentions. One ought to treat this report as liable to fallacies of "mal-observation" and "non-observation." Besides, as an Hellenist Megasthenes was perhaps much too obsessed with his Platonisms and Egyptian and perhaps also Persian stories. Altogether, he is not implicitly to be trusted as an *objective historian*.

4 Stein's ideas have been referred to and examined in B. K. Sarkar: "Hindu Politics in Italian" in the *IHQ.*, Calcutta, September 1925-April, 1926, and *Hindu Rāṣṭrer Gaḍan* or The Morphology of the Hindu State in Bengali (Calcutta, 1927).

In the third place, one need not be too liberal in the matter of according the benefit of doubt when a story by Megasthenes is in question. He did not enjoy an enviable reputation among the classical writers. Megasthenes and Ktesias were almost twins as notorious liars in the estimation of the ancient historians.[5]

Fourthly, therefore, the *Indika*, does not furnish the reliable touchstone for Mauryanism or the Maurya *milieu*. We need a third and more reliable source on the strength of which both Kauṭalya and Megasthenes can be "sized up" or appraised as to the Maurya or non-Maurya elements reflected in each.

Finally, the discrepancies between Kauṭalya and Megasthenes do not dissipate, at the present state of knowledge, the Maurya atmosphere traditionally associated with the *Arthaśāstra*. Each may have referred to certain aspects or parts of the Maurya conditions and, therefore, although conflicting with the other, may have been objectively true to those conditions.

Stein begins his chapter on officials with the following postulate: "*Die erstere bietet die Beschreibung des Gesehenen, die letztere die systematische Darstellung des Bestehenden*[6] (The former, i.e., Megasthenes offers the description of the seen, the latter the systematic survey of the existing).

Evidently this postulate ought not to be accepted without question. Megasthenes (Fragment XXXIV) could not possibly have *seen* all these officials or their function-

5 Mc Crindle: *Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian* (Calcutta 1926) pp. 17-20.

6 P. 232; *cf.* Mc Crindle: *Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian* (Calcutta 1926) pp. 86-88.

ings. A German student of the French constitution who writes a thesis on his subject may live perhaps a few years in France, spending most of the time at Paris and perhaps living occasionally in Bordeaux, Marseilles, Nancy, etc. But his book is in the main based on the reports of public administration published by the French Government as well as on treatises on *Droit Public Français* written by French and other scholars. And his thesis is judged, among other things, on the quality, quantity and variety of reliable authorities. Now about the *Indika*, the world knows nothing as to its composition, its sources, etc. Whether it deals with any particular region or regions in India cannot be attested. What kind of people gave him information about the functioning of the public administration is unknown. Nor can one be positive about the books, Indian or foreign, from which he drew the data. It is certain at any rate that the *Indika* cannot be entirely a record of the *Gesehenen*.

About the *Arthaśāstra* also Stein's statement is eminently open to question. The chapters, sections or paragraphs on *Adhyakṣaprachāra* (officials), *Durganiveśa* (forts and cities), *Janapadaniveśa* (country) etc., are written mainly with the grammatical *vidhiling* form, which indicates, as a rule, that the functions *are to be* carried out, that one *should* do certain things, etc. A *Darstellung des Bestehenden* is expected in another literary form. The *Arthaśāstra* could claim to be a survey of the things that exist or have been existing if it had used the present or past tense in its statements. But as a rule that form of expression is lacking. Its style is mostly identical with that of the *Dharma-Smriti* and *Nitiśāstras*. It is more normative than descriptive-historical. Kauṭalya

has never said that such and such an institution *besteht*, i.e., has been functioning in this region or that.

In the three sections on *Landbeamten* (provincial officials) and *Militärbeamten* Stein is asking us to compare the eminently questionable *Indika* with the predominantly normative *Arthaśāstra*. A comparative analysis is interesting by all means, in so far as each is a literary production. But under the present conditions neither can be taken as the touchstone for Maurya India, if we apply the strictest canons of historical criticism. The problem of agreement or discrepancy is therefore irrelevant for the purpose in question, namely, the ascertainment of Maurya public law, economy and social organization.

In so far as the *Indika* is alleged to be a work about Maurya India and in so far as the *Arthaśāstra* also is by tradition known to come from Maurya times there is no harm, therefore, in accepting both as documents for the same period although composed in two different styles. One can therefore embark upon reconstructing the administrative, financial and socio-economic history of Maurya India by drawing indifferently upon both. But of course one will have to avoid the most palpable inconsistencies and always take care to render unto philosophy or fable the things that are philosophy's or fable's and unto *Realpolitik* the things that can be confidently guessed as belonging to *Realpolitik*.

Hillebrandt, 1923

In *Altindische Politik* (Jena 1923) Hillebrandt stated his position as follows:

"The identity of the author of the *Arthaśāstra*, as discovered today, with Kauṭalya or Chāṇakya, the

minister of Chandragupta (B.C. 322-298?) is doubtful. The present text does not appear to have Kauṭalya himself as the author throughout (*nicht durchweg Kauṭilya selbst zum Verfasser habe*). It may be taken to have been the product of his school which collected the opinions of other teachers and in the style of *Sūtra* literature placed them *vis-à-vis* those of Kauṭalya. In the *Arthaśāstra* there are instances of citation from Kauṭalya himself (*iti Kauṭalyah*). Authors of the fourth century B.C. like the grammarian Patanjali are not used to self-quotation. The practice of the *Arthaśāstra* is rather too peculiar and should appear to be later than the old age ascribed to it. Altogether, then, only those words are to be taken as Kauṭalya's which are definitely attested (*beglaubigt*) as such. The rest of the book should be taken as a work of his pupils (*Jünger*) who preserved his opinions and expressions and brought them out in bold relief by posing them against the other doctrines. Or the work may have been prepared by his pupils on the basis of an old text by himself."[1]

This is Hillebrandt's last word on the subject. In this interpretation the hand of Kauṭalya the minister of the fourth century B.C. is to be seen in two items: (1) in regard to certain actual words and phrases quoted by his *Schule* or *Jünger*, and (2) in regard to the first text which was perhaps the basis of the work that we see today. Thus considered, the original handiwork of the fourth century B.C. (*c* 320 B.C.) should appear to be very close to the document at present available.

1 Pp. 3-5. In the above quotation one should not suspect a literal translation from Hillebrandt.

The distance from B.C. 320 will depend on what we understand by the *Schule*, the school of Kauṭalya, or by his *Jünger*, pupils or disciples. In case we take both these categories as implying Kauṭalya's immediate scholars the book becomes practically a work of c 300 B.C. But in case we are to understand simply followers or adherents the date of the work will depend on what we choose to take as the duration of the Kauṭalyan tradition among the leading institutions of the third or second century B.C. We are left with a good deal of vagueness in this regard.

Hillebrandt does not, however, intend to leave us in the dark. He refers to the doubts about the antiquity of the *Arthaśāstra* engendered on account of Jolly's parallels with the medical and legal texts (1911-16) as well as of Stein's researches (1922) bearing on Megasthenes *vis-à-vis* Kauṭalya. But still he remembers that the *Arthaśāstra* is cited by the author of the *Tantrākhyāyikā* (fourth century A.C.) and Dandin, the novelist of the eighth century. Besides, the *Kāmandakīnīti*, the best known of the literary successors of the *Arthaśāstra*, is believed to be a work of the eighth, sixth or even fourth century. That is, some time before the fourth century A.C. the *Arthaśāstra* may have been composed. This is what Hillebrandt means when in spite of all endeavours he makes the vague conclusion that the book can be traced back to high antiquity (*geht das Kauṭilyaśāstra auf hohes Alter zurück*).

While dealing with Hillebrandt's ideas a word may be said about his attitude in regard to Hindu politics. He is to be regarded as an exponent of what should perhaps be described as the "new indology". He is pre-

pared to admit, what should have been accepted as a postulate long ago, that the Hindu mind and creative genius have functioned in positive and materialistic fields. In his *Altindische Politik* he has made it quite clear that the qualities of manhood, energism, civic sense, rationalism etc., are not the monopoly of the Western races and climates. The texts of European statesmanship have often been cited by him as parallels to Indian concepts and categories. The errors of German "romanticists"[2] are at last being made good by the Germans themselves to a certain extent. Eur-American scientists and philosophers may now perhaps be expected to attempt a change of front in regard to *orientalisme*.[3]

Jolly, 1923-25

In 1923 Jolly had a chance to write extensively in English on the Kauṭalya question in connection with the Lahore text. So he summarized all his previous ideas in the most effective manner. His writings in the German Journals (1911-16) may be recalled. To these has to be added another German paper, namely, the one entitled "Eine neue indische Rechtsquelle" (A New Source of Hindu Law) which was published in 1921 in the *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft,* Berlin (Journal of Comparative Jurisprudence) Vol. XXXVII which was dedicated to the jurist-anthropologist-sociolo-

2 B. K. Sarkar : *Die Lebensanchauung des Inders* (Leipzig 1923).

3 The first edition of the present work, The *Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* (Allahabad 1914) or rather the chapters that were published as magazine articles in Calcutta, Madras, Allahabad, Dacca etc. during 1911-13 raised perhaps the first cry in favour of a reform in indology both as regards Hindu materialism as well as parallelism with the Western culture-systems.

gist Kohler. In this paper Jolly remarked that the *Arthaśāstra* might be traced to the fifth or fourth century after Christ. And he believed that the work had perhaps as little to do with the half-historical Chāṇakya as the Sayings of Solomon with the famous King Solomon. His views, as expressed in English, would not then appear new to those who are familiar with his previous writings.

According to Jolly in the Introduction to the Lahore text (Vol. I, 1923) Kauṭalya must have been acquainted with the whole body of *Dharmaśāstra* literature such as we now have from the earliest *Dharmasūtras* down to the most recent metrical *Smritis* and *Smriti* fragments.

Again, Manu, we are told, knows of two kinds of peace only while Kauṭalya describes ten kinds with characteristic names. The polity in Kauṭalya is more advanced and is alleged therefore to be later than that in Manu.[1]

Jolly's arguments from the more developed character of the Kauṭalyan jurisprudence and polity really prove nothing. The book containing more developed accounts does not necessarily have to be the later in point of time. The *Arthaśāstra*, for instance, is more developed than *Śukranīti* in many respects. In that case the *Śukranīti* should have to be described as being older than the *Arthaśāstra*. Neither Yājnavalkya nor Manu had before himself the mission of writing encyclopædic and intensive treatises just on those items in which Kauṭalya was furnishing specialized treatment. This is also a way of interpreting the difference between Kauṭalya and the

1 Introduction, Vol. I. (Lahore 1923) pp. 17-20.

others. Again, in the matter of two authors having certain things in common nobody can on the strength of this fact only judge as to who is the original and who the borrower. As long as it is not possible to prove on other grounds that Yājnavalkya is older than Kauṭalya the agreement in certain rules cannot be made to yield much. The entire argument of Jolly in regard to the treatment of the common materials in the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Dharmaśāstra* is subject to this fallacy.

It is impossible for a student of law and sociology, again, to admit with Jolly (p. 20) that, "generally speaking, the *Dharmaśāstra* or science of duty and religion has far better claims to a high antiquity than the *Arthaśāstra* or science of gain, which in its turn is older than the *Kamaśāstra* or science of love." He wants the modern mind, nurtured on anthropology as it is, to believe that the three sciences based on *Trivarga* (duty, gain and love) followed in the order mentioned in point of time as well as in rank and value. There is neither logic nor psychology in the concept that for several centuries men and women only did their duties, then after several centuries they learnt how to eat and drink, and then again after several centuries they began to taste the fruit of the forbidden tree. And yet this scheme of life's interests Jolly should like the students of human development to accept while they enter the domain of indology.

Jolly (p. 21) believes that Vedic lore and literature were marked by high-flown idealism and one-sided religious character.' This is a fallacious belief and is evidently due to his singling out the idealistic passages from the Vedas and ignoring the materialistic, militaristic, secular, and other contents. The one-sidedness con-

sists not in the subject of study itself but in his own method of study. Through Hegelian eyes one may discover nothing but idealism in the Vedas, a Karl Marx, on the other hand, would detect in the same stuff nothing but hunger's urge, a Gumplowicz nothing but race-conflicts and a Freud nothing but sex-impulse. But modern anthropology and history are not prepared to look upon such monistic interpretations except as curios. A rational interpretation of history would trace the *Arthaśāstra* elements as far back as the Vedic complex, not only the *Atharva Veda*, the document of "folk-elements" in Hindu culture, but to the *Rig Veda* as well.

The parallelisms and identities traced by Jolly between the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Kāmasūtra*, again, cannot by themselves settle the priority of the one in relation to the other. In his judgment the *Kāmasūtra* is alleged to have borrowed of the *Arthaśāstra* and he concluded as follows: "If we may take as probable", says he, that the "*Kāmasūtra* was composed not long after the *Arthaśāstra*" one is asked to say that the date of the latter depends on that of the former (pp. 26-28).

Jolly takes Kālidāsa in his *Śakuntalā* to have borrowed of the *Kāmasūtra* and therefore assumes the latter to be not more than a century ahead of the former. And, again, because the *Kāmasūtra* borrows of the *Arthaśāstra*, therefore, the latter is said to be not more than a century ahead of the former. According to him no borrower can be more than a century later than the original. And since Kālidāsa is generally referred to the fifth century *Arthaśāstra* cannot be older than the third century. A.C. In the whole series of arguments the fallacy consists in the assumption of not more than a century constituting the

interval between the original and the borrower. Such fallacies can be due sheerly to a desperate determination to prove the post-Maurya origin of the *Arthaśāstra*.

Other arguments of Jolly are based in the main on Stein's *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya* which has been examined at the proper place.

In regard to the age of the *Arthaśāstra*, Jolly considers, as usual, the acceptance of c. B.C. 300 as very uncertain or problematic (*sehr unsicher*). His last word on the subject has already been referred to, namely, the Introduction to his and Schmidt's edition of the *Arthaśāstra* (Lahore 1923-24). There it is described as having been composed in the third century after Christ. Perhaps it is still later, says he, because of the references to alchemy and the making of gold. The influence of Stein's *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya* (1922) is to be seen in Jolly's ideas of the time.

According to Jolly (p. 34) the *Arthaśāstra's* use of the term *surunga* or *surangya* is suspicious. But the situation should not appear to be damaging. As the Indian word is probably derived from Greek *syrinx* the Kauṭalyan work may be said to betray its Indo-Hellenistic *milieu* by internal evidence. This, however, does not compel it to be a post-Maurya work by any means. The use of *surunga* (mine or tunnel) in military tactics may have been regarded as a novelty among the Hindus *vis-à-vis* Alexander, and it is not improbable that they learnt of it from the Hellenists in the course of the anti-Alexandrine wars of self-defence. The thing as well as the term may thus have attracted the attention of Indian soldiers, statesmen, and scholars even before the days of the Mauryas.

The *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft* for 1925 (Vol. XLI) published Jolly's extensive paper entitled "Ueber die alte politische Literatur Indiens und ihre Bearbeiter" (On the ancient politicial Literature of India and its Researchers). The paper dealt exclusively with the researches of Indian scholars. While presenting a survey of the Indian publications from 1913 to 1924 he quotes Hillebrandt's *Altindische Politik* (1923) to indicate that the so-called Hindu republics, the *gaṇas* and the *samghas* were nothing more than aristocratic families of the Kingdoms or Empires.

Jolly's conclusion in regard to the researches into Hindu politics by Indian scholars is as follows: "As a common tendency of all the preceding works are to be noticed the bringing into prominence of the political life of the Hindus in the place of their philosophy and religion which have been up till now presented in an one-sided manner as well as the demonstration of the democratic and republican polities and the rights of corporations in ancient India."

He says further, "One cannot fail to see a connection of these *nur scheinbar rein wissenschaftlichen Tendenzen* (only apparently pure scientific tendencies) with the modern movements for freedom and autonomy. It lies in the interest of Swarajists to be able to refer to similar tendencies in the old literature of their fatherland. That is why most of the authors reviewed here do not wish to renounce the belief in the authenticity and early origin of the *Arthaśāstra*, although the evidences for it are inadequate. However much one may sympathise with the freedom movements of these Indian researchers, their historical viewpoints and conclusions are to be accepted

with caution (*Vorsicht*) and one cannot entirely exonerate the authors named here from the reproach (*Vorwurf*) that they have not kept politics and history separate from each other."

Perhaps in these remarks of Jolly's we should read less a *Vorwurf*, i.e., reproach levelled against Indian scholars than its opposite, namely, the recognition of their services in the great work of national awakening or reconstruction. There is no country on the surface of the earth including Jolly's where researchers and historians have not dedicated themselves to such a noble cause. Had the Indian scholars of the generation referred to above failed to apply themselves in and through their own fields to the noble mission of the remaking of India in co-operation with her poets, philosophers, pedagogues and publicists of the day perhaps Jolly would have been one of the first to condemn the intellectuals of Young India as a worthless and undutiful set.

Be this as it may, it is very questionable whether the scholarship and investigations of Young India in their entirety or in part really deserve the *Vorwurf* of not keeping politics and history separate from each other.

The significant fact at the present moment (1935) remains that the German scholars, Jacobi, Meyer and Breloer, and the Italian scholars, Formichi and Bottazzi, are neither Indians nor Swarajists. Nor do the contributors to the chapters on ancient Indian law and polity in the *Cambridge History of India* Vol. I. (1922) such as Hopkins of Yale (U.S.A.) and Thomas of London as well as the British members of the Indian Civil Service like Monahan, author of the *Early History of Bengal* (Oxford 1925), Fleet and, last but not least, Smith, all of whom

have ventured on using the *Arthaśāstra* as an important authority on the legal, economic and political institutions of the Mauryas, happen to be known as champions of *Swaraj* for India. It is not the race but the brains of the researchers, not their politics but their logic that have determined in the main their predilections for the one or the other side in regard to the Kauṭalya question.

When all this has been admitted it remains to add that Jolly's Introduction to the Lahore text embodies the utmost that can be said against the Indian tradition. And as Jolly's arguments which go back to 1911 constitute the original material upon which subsequent writers against the Indian tradition have mainly drawn, the Introduction deserves the greatest attention from all students of Kauṭalyalogy. It is, besides, the most comprehensive and intensive attack levelled against the tradition and is conceived in a thoroughly scientific spirit and as such cannot but command respect from all those who have to differ from him in the general logic of social science or in the special researches of indology.

Ganapati Sastri, 1924-25

The Trivandrum text of the *Arthaśāstra* was published by Ganapati Sastri during 1924-25. He added to it a commentary of his own in Sanskrit. In the English introduction he maintains that Kauṭalya was posterior to Yājnavalkya. His position was thus the reverse to that of Shamasastry.

Jayaswal, 1924

The appendix of Kashi Prasad Jayaswal's *Hindu Polity* Part I. (Calcutta 1924, pp. 203-214) examines

Jolly's arguments as advanced in the latter's introduction to the Lahore edition (1923), item by item.

One or two points may be singled out. Patanjali (second century B.C.), it is true, as Jolly points out, does not mention Kauṭalya. But asks Joyaswal, "if Patanjali does not mention Bindusāra, Asoka, Rādhāgupta or the Gupta, is that a reason to hold that they did not live?."

Jayaswal agrees with Jolly to the effect that the *Yājnavalkya Smriti* and the *Arthaśāstra* have certain laws in common. But instead of saying with Jolly that the *A.* made *sūtra* out of Y's verses Jayaswal would believe like Shamasastry that the Y. made verses out of the *A's sūtras*. And since the *Y.* did not fully understand the *A's* technical terms the latter must be several centuries older than the third century A.C. (Yājnavalkya's date).

Jayaswal does not agree with Jolly in the idea that the *Rājadharma* (political) ideas of the *Mahābhārata* are in an embryonic condition compared to the politics of the *Arthaśāstra*. From the standpoint of development in thought, therefore, the *Arthaśāstra* must be older than the *Rājadharma* section.

The reference to divination cannot point to the late origin of the *Arthaśāstra*, according to Jayaswal. He points out rightly that divination is as old as the *Atharva Veda*.

The use of the word *surunga* in the *Arthaśāstra* points to the acquaintance of the Indians with something derived from the Greek *syrinx*. But according to Jayaswal, this fact should not be an evidence against the Mauryan origin of the *Arthaśāstra*. Some Greeks had been living on the Indian frontier, says he, earlier

than Alexander's time and under the Persians in the Punjab.

Jayaswal refers to the cast iron finds in the Maurya *stratum* of Pāṭaliputra in order to prove that metallurgy in Maurya India was highly developed.

As against those critics who point to the reference to China as an evidence of the post-Maurya origin of the *Arthaśāstra*, Jayaswal maintains that Chīnas were not the people of China but Himalayan peoples speaking a Sanskritic language as well as skilled in the making of silk.

Law, 1924

The entire paper of Winternitz's was subjected to a detailed examination by Narendra Nath Law in the *Calcutta Review* (September-December 1924).[1]

According to Law the duties of Maurya officials mentioned by Megasthenes (Fragment XXXIV) are almost identical with those in the *Kauṭalya*. For instance, the following identities in functions can be made out, among others, on the basis of Law's data:

I. Outside the City.

Indika	*Arthaśāstra*
1. Superintending the Rivers.	1. *Nadīpāla* (II. 6) who looks after rivers
2. Measurement of Land.	2. *Samāhartā*'s department of cadastral survey.

1 The paper can be seen conveniently in N. N. Law: *Studies in Indian History and Culture* (Calcutta 1925); *cf.* pp. 238-243. For certain details see N. C. Bandyopadhyaya: *Kauṭilya* (Calcutta 1927), pp. 114-121, 132-135, 198.

3.	Control over huntsmen.	3. *Vivitādhyakṣa* (II. 34) who controls the *lubdhakas* with their hounds.
4.	Superintendence of wood-cutters, carpenters, blacksmiths and miners.	4. *Ākarādhyakṣa, Lohādhyakṣa, Kupyādhyakṣa, Sitādhyakṣa* etc. (II, 12, 17, etc.)

II. Inside the City

1.	Supervision of manufactured articles and their sale by public notice keeping separate the old and the new articles.	1. *Saṃsthādhyakṣa* (II, 6, 15, 17, 23, 24, IV. 2).
2.	Supervision of trade and commerce, weights and measures etc.	2. *Paṇyādhyakṣa* (II, 16), *Pautavādhyakṣa* (II, 19).
3.	Collection of the tenths of prices.	3. *Śulkādhyakṣa* (II, 22)
4.	Recording births and deaths.	4. II, 36,
5.	Repair of buildings	5. I, 4, II, 4,
6.	Regulation of prices	6. *Paṇyādhyakṣa* (IV, 2
7.	Care of markets	7. II, 16, 19, IV, 2
8.	Care of harbours	8. *Pattanādhyakṣa* (II, 28)
9.	Care of Temples	9. *Devatādhyakṣa* (II, 6)

10. Admiral of the Fleet.	10. *Nāvadhyakṣa* (II. 28)	who is not only the naval head but, as described by both Kauṭalya and Megasthenes, the head of customs and commerce of the marine department.

The question of identities between the Maurya officials of the *Indika* and the *adhyakṣas* etc. of the *Arthaśāstra* has been examined later at some length in Dikshitar's *Mauryan Polity* (Madras 1932, pp. 364-366).

Monahan, 1925

In F. J. Monahan's *Early History of Bengal* (Oxford 1925, pp. 30-31) the *Arthaśāstra* has been taken as the basis for Maurya institutions. He has thus followed Smith. The existence of the persistent Indian tradition is with him an important factor. He is not sure as to "whether the whole treatise or any part of it be the work of Chāṇakya." On the other hand, in his judgment Megasthenes's account is "obviously superficial and inaccurate."

"For the purposes of history the best means of arriving at an idea of the social conditions in Bihar and Bengal, during the Maurya period," says he, is to be found in the analysis of the *Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra*. He is, however, careful enough to point out that the "description attributed to Megasthenes" is to be compared with it. The edicts of Asoka are also named by him in the

same context for the purpose of comparison with the *Arthaśāstra*. But all the same, Monahan does not expect to find in the Kauṭalyan administration "agreement in all details with that which may have been observed by Megasthenes at Pāṭaliputra, when the Magadha State had grown into an Empire." Here, then, is to be found another champion of the *pre-Imperial* Maurya *milieu* of the *Arthaśāstra*.

Monahan's attitude in regard to the *Arthaśāstra* is apparent from the fact that more than fifty per cent of his book (pp. 28-139) is given over to the summary of that treatise. Evidently, he assumes that Maurya Bengal was governed for civil and criminal matters as well as in regard to finances and economic policy according to the ideas of Kauṭalya.

But he attaches some theoretical value also to the work. For, "the polity contemplated in this treatise is," according to him, "evidently that of a small state, ruled by an ordinary *rājā*, and this is consistent with the probability that the empire comprised a number of vassal kingdoms" (p. 136). It is on this conception that Monahan builds up his theory of the *Arthaśāstra* as describing conditions such as "in the course of a quarter of a century or thereabouts" grew into those described in the *Indika* of Megasthenes.

Stein has stressed the point that in the *Arthaśāstra* there is no mention of a wooden wall, such as is mentioned in the *Indika*. But Monahan does not consider this point to be very important.[1]

1 P. 175. See also *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya* pp. 34, 299.

Stein believes that Megasthenes did not report correctly when he said that cultivators were not molested during war, because the *Arthaśāstra* can be cited in evidence of plundering in times of war. But Monahan doubts if the plundering referred to in the *Arthaśāstra* has bearing on cultivators (p. 153).

Monahan believes that there are certain discrepancies between the *Indika* and the *Arthaśāstra* which it is "difficult to explain" (p. 31). But in spite of that he is convinced that the political institutions and theories of the Maurya age are embodied in Kauṭalya's work.

Meyer, 1926-27

Johann Meyer's German translation of the *Arthaśāstra* was published in 1926 (Leipzig) as *Das altindische Buch vom Welt-und Staatsleben* (The Ancient Indian Book of Worldly and Political Life).[1] The next year was published his voluminous work entitled *Ueber das Wesen der altindischen Rechtsschriften und ihr Verhältniss zu einander und zu Kauṭilya* (On the Nature of Ancient Indian Law books and their Relation with one another and with Kauṭilya). The German translation contains in the introduction a lengthy discussion bearing on the Kauṭalya question.

As author of studies on *Daśakumāracharita* (1903) and Indian womanhood (cf. *Das Weib im altindischen Epic*, The Woman in Ancient Indian Epic Poetry, 1915),

1 See B. K. Sarkar: "The German Translation of the Kauṭilyan *Arthaśāstra*" in the *IHQ.*, (Calcutta) June 1928.

Meyer is interested in indology more as a humanist than as a philologist. So in his introduction to the translation of the *Arthaśāstra* as well as notes one finds his interest in the personality of Kauṭalya from the standpoint of the vital urges of life. He examines also the contents of the *Kauṭalya-darśanam* with a view to the requirements of the social organism. We encounter here once more the humanist's grasp of the fundamental realities of flesh and blood and of the universal springs of action in private morals and public life. He is not a mere, conventional Kauṭalyalogist. One feels in his attempts at psychological analysis and literary style that he commands the key to the very soul of Kauṭalya.

In regard to the Kauṭalya question, i.e., the date and personality of the author of the *Arthaśāstra,* Meyer devotes 36 pages of the introduction in order to vindicate the Indian tradition. He tries to prove that Kauṭalya of the Chandragupta Maurya fame, the ambitious and diplomatic Brāhmaṇa minister, the revolutionary philosopher and scholar, is the one single author, compiler and reformer of the political science as embodied in the *Arthaśāstra* associated with his name. The tradition remains unshaken, says he, in spite of modern attempts to assail it, and appears even to be "supported by very high probability." Doubts, of course, are not dissipated. But we must be very modest in our scepticism, at any rate, for the present. The benefit of doubt is in Meyer's judgment on the side of the tradition.

To begin with, neither Megasthenes not Patanjali of course mentions Kauṭalya. But that the tradition cannot be negatived by *argumentum ex silentio* is quite handy although not the only reply.

Arthaśāstra the Work of one Person

Hillebrandt all along held the view and has stated it in his *Altindische Politik* (Ancient Indian Politics, Jena, 1923), that the portions marked *iti Kauṭilyah* constitute the statements of Kauṭilya himself, but collected together by some of his followers who are responsible for the compilation of the whole book. Against this view of the school or collective origin of the *Arthaśāstra* Meyer offers his own which runs to the effect that *iti Kauṭalyah* may be written by Kauṭalya himself just as *iti Baudhāyanah* by Baudhāyana in the *Baudhāyanasūtra*. One does not have to make any distinction between the different portions of the work as regards authorship. With the exception of Book II which may be derived from or rather based on various sources but is by no means independent of the author's personal equation, the entire work appears to be the product of one fount, the creation of a single man; and that man is no other than the person who is self-conscious enough not to be ashamed of describing himself in his own book in the third person as *iti Kauṭalyah*.

The New Indology

Meyer differs from Hillebrandt in regard to the date and some other items. But it need be noted *en passant* that both are exponents of what may be described as the "new indology". Each one is prepared to admit the secular energism and materialistic achievements of the Hindus.

Kauṭilya, a Title of Honour

Winternitz holds that the name or title Kauṭalya is too derogatory for a man of the Chancellor's position.

But Hillebrandt in his very first paper on the *Kauṭalya-śāstra* (1908) pointed out the existence of another name, namely, Kauṭalya. Besides, argues Meyer, the title *Kuṭila* (crooked, clever, etc.) as used in the *Mudrārākṣasa* is really appreciative or laudatory and not at all dishonourable. Cleverness consisting in the ability to deceive others is a virtue among all races. Thus, for instance, Israel, the patriarch of the Israelities was known as Jacobi, i.e., the cheater or swindler. Every Tom, Dick and Harry "can be named a Viṣṇugupta, but Kautilya is the *Kronenorden* (Order of the Crown) granted out of the hands of Nature and science."

Statesmanship vs. Scholarship in Kauṭalya

According to Winternitz, the author of the *Artha-śāstra* is not a practical statesman but a mere Paṇḍit (*ein pedantischer Gelehrter*) and deals not with a powerful empire but with *Kleinstaaterei*, the condition of small states. Meyer considers this argument to have been deprived of all strength, in anticipation of all future scepticism, by the text itself. For, it says that both the science of politics and the political world were saved and reconstructed by the author.

Kauṭilya is by all means a "Paṇḍit," a scholar addicted to his technique of classification and so forth, as Winternitz remarks. The Indian tradition says so. Why should not this tradition possess a greater validity, asks Meyer, than the demands of the moderns who expect or believe that a "Paṇḍit" could not be a "statesman?" How do we know that this famous Chancellor of Chandragupta was or must have been something different?

According to Meyer, Kauṭalya is not a Bismarck in the sense of a professional and trained publicist. But he may have risen to the position of the Chancellor on account of his helping Chandragupta up. It is doubtful, however, if he contributed much to the actual administration of the new empire, says Meyer. He may have been dismissed by his pupil, the Emperor, after a short time. The book, we are asked to suppose, may have been composed by the "exiled" king-maker, perhaps in his native land somewhere in South India.

Compilation and Originality in the Arthaśāstra

The author of the *Arthaśāstra* is certainly a "compiler", says Meyer, but an "extraordinary" and "peculiar" compiler. Jolly's criticism at p. 33 of his English introduction to the Lahore text is entirely unjust according to Meyer. The phrase *iti Kauṭilyah*, used so often in the text, not only exhibits, we are to understand, the compiler-author's own contribution but is a standing monument of his proud individuality, self-consciousness and strong personality, just the characteristics attributed to him by tradition. Instead of saying with Jolly that the *Arthaśāstra* is much indebted to the *Mahābhārata*, Meyer would consider the reverse process to be more natural.

Kleinstaaterei

The precursors of Kauṭalya, says Meyer, were dealers in small states, and their philosophies corresponded to these conditions. If Kauṭalya had wished to function as a "mere" compiler or copyist, i.e., introduce nothing new, his philosophy would have run in the same old grooves. But his work, according to Meyer, indi-

cates at several points that it is not adapted to the ancient Indian small states-system but only to a powerful empire. After all, one must remember, argues Meyer, that even Chandragupta's empire was not much different, at any rate, in quite a number of items, from an ancient Indian "small state inflated to colossal proportions." One should not be surprised, therefore, it is to be understood, if one finds the touches of small states here and there in the book. The *Arthaśāstra* can still be the product of an Imperial epoch although one does not find in it exactly what you and I expect to find in an empire.

A word may be added in this connection. In the discussions bearing on the Kauṭalya question in my *Hindu Politics in Italian* (*IHQ.*, 1925-26) it has been pointed out that the *Arthaśāstra* is essentially a "philosophical" work (*Kauṭalya-darśanam*). The doctrine of *maṇḍala* (sphere) which involves automatically the plurality of states and hence perhaps might to a certain extent suggest *Kleinstaaterei* is therefore to be taken more as a "logical category", a stock-in-trade of philosophical academies, in regard to international relations, than as a realistic description of the actual foreign politics of a particular epoch or epochs. The professors who are lecturing on the *mores* of the *vijigīṣu* do not necessarily have before them, as explained in that paper, a bunch of pigmies as audience.

Fourth Century B.C.

Meyer has no objection to believing in the existence of a long tradition of political and technical literature in India previous to the *Arthaśāstra*. But according to him this does not necessarily lead to Winternitz's conclusion

that the "fourth century before Christ is at least not probable." Rather, says Meyer, "it cannot be proved and even sounds very unbelievable that in that period the Indians did not possess a very extensive political and economic science."

Arthaśāstra not younger than Dharmaśāstra

In order to prove that the *Arthaśāstra* as a branch of literature is a comparatively late production, Jolly considers it to have been preceded by the *Dharmaśāstra*, and to have arisen as a branch of the latter. This attitude is wrong, says Meyer, who believes that *Dharmaśāstra* is of late growth. In Meyer's judgment the origin of ancient Indian law is not all to be traced to the Brāhmaṇas. The origins even of the religious or "priestly laws" are not to be found in the *Dharmaśāstra* literature. Their "later development" alone can be seen in it. And as for the worldly or secular laws, they arose entirely among other (than Brāhmaṇa) classes of the people and first cultivated by them.

The two categories of law are fundamentally opposed to each other, but the secular laws have been later incorporated in and assimilated with the Brāhmaṇic-religious or shamanic-magical laws. The Brāhmaṇizing proceeded very energetically. Even the *Arthaśāstra* was in danger of losing its independent existence and being swallowed up in the *Smritiśāstra*. But the attempts of the Brāhmaṇas have been crowned only with partial success. Meyer's thesis is fully developed in the book, *Ueber das Wesen der altindischen Rechtsschriften und ihr Verhältniss zu einander und zu Kauṭilya* (On the nature of ancient Indian law books and their relations

with one another and with Kauṭilya), a work of some 450 pages. That book should really be described as the main introduction to this translation.

Meyer comes to the conclusion that the "secular laws" of ancient India had a secular origin. The "more secular" *Arthaśāstra*, i.e., politics as science, however, came to have a "priestly" origin. The authors of this class of literature were mainly Brāhmaṇas.

This, however, is not tantamount to saying that the *Arthaśāstra* was originally a branch of *Dharmaśāstra*. Exactly opposite is the relation between the two branches of literature. According to Meyer *Arthaśāstra* was at first a science by itself. The later Brāhmaṇical *Dharmaśāstras* have attempted to annex it to themselves, of course, in the eclectic manner of dilettantes. Such dilettantes are Viṣṇu, Gautama, and especially Manu and Yājnavalkya, who attempted encyclopaedic treatises on the entire magical, religious and civil laws as well as moral welfare. And of course they could not afford to neglect the *rājadharma*.

Arthaśāstra not condemned by the Ṛsis

Jolly believes that the topics of the *Arthaśāstra* were held as "wicked" by the Brāhmaṇical Ṛsis. Meyer holds the contrary view. One or two persons may have indulged in such sensitiveness. But for a genuine ancient Indian, i.e., an Indian used to the philosophy of the famous *trivarga*, "it would not have been possible even to dream of condemning the *Arthaśāstra*." With all its ferocities and crookednesses this *śāstra* was in Indian sentiment as important and even as holy as the "sacred" *Dharmaśāstra*. The civic laws arose as a rule out of the folk-consciousness, the consciousness of the masses. The laws and

the customs of the local groups, castes, industrial and religious communities, families and tribes are declared by the *Dharmaśāstras* to constitute the foundations of these laws. Naturally, these must have been collected and put together, although not of course in their entirety, long before the *Dharmaśāstras*.

Mahābhārata Politics later than Arthaśāstra

According to Jolly political science is to be found in an embryonic or primitive condition in the *Mahābhārata* and therefore its relevant portions must be older than the *Arthaśāstra*. This position is challenged by Meyer. The relation between the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Mahābhārata* is according to him identical with that between Nārada on the one side and Manu, Yājnavalkya, Viṣṇu and Gautama on the other. Nārada is a scientifically trained scholar, and a person with a juridical frame of mind whereas Manu, Yājnavalkya and the rest are eclecticists, popularizers, dilettantes. The same dilettantism, eclectic and unscientific character, the *Smriti*-attitude is to be found in the writers of politics in the *Mahābhārata*. In fact, there the *rājadharma* is but a part of *Dharmaśāstra*.

These dilettantes of the *Mahābhārata* betray in their writings that they know an *Arthaśāstra* which is not of the alleged "embryonic stage" but even more developed than the Kauṭalyan work. The grouping of facts and phenomena by mathematical figures is an instance of post-Kauṭalyan progress in political thought. The enumerations like 14 *rājadoṣas*, 8 *buddhis*, 36 *guṇas*, 8 *varṇas*, 20 *vargas*, 10 *vyasanas* derived from *kāma*, 8 *varṇas*, due to *krodha*, all point to investigations unknown to and

later than Kauṭalya. Had the subject-matter of *vyasanas* acquired such a complexity in Kauṭalya's time, he, as a specialist and not a mere dilettante in politics, would have cared to insert it in his book.

Chemical and Metallurgical Knowledge in the Arthaśāstra

According to Jolly the Indians of the *Arthaśāstra* are much too developed for the fourth century before Christ. Meyer retorts that "Jolly cannot prove that the India of those days did not possess all the sciences, arts, dexterities and institutions such as are described by Kauṭalya." In his judgment the whole line of this so popular argument is unfounded. Our positive knowledge on these subjects is so small that we ought to be very modest in our statements.

In a paper contributed to the *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, Vol. XLI., Jolly has asserted that the *Arthaśāstra* is "a work of the third century after Christ, perhaps still later, because of the references to alchemy and gold-making." There is nothing in the world, says Meyer, to prevent us from believing that these arts may have been known in India in earlier ages although perhaps in another and more primitive form.

Meyer has not been able to discover mercury in the *Arthaśāstra*. Hence a technological argument as to the lateness of the book is disposed of. Professor Lippmann has contributed a paper on "*Technologisches und kulturgeschichtliches aus dem Arthaśāstra des Kauṭilya*" in the *Chemikerzeitung* 1925 Nos. 134-135. He translates *trapu* by zinc and thinks that this reference betrays the origin of the passage as being not earlier than the eleventh

century after Christ. But, says Meyer, *trapu* is tin and not zinc. Then there is a reference to *śarkarā* (sugar) which cannot be older than the fourth century after Christ, says Lippmann, or sugarcandy which is reported as an import from Egypt about 1300 A.C. But according to Meyer *Kauṭalya* knows five different kinds of sugar, and "it is unthinkable that the solid forms of sugar were not known in India before the fourth century after Christ."

The Megasthenes Question

In connection with these technological questions Meyer remarks that we do not possess as yet adequately dependable information regarding the arts and industries of ancient India. "How can we, for example," he wonders, "summon the ancient Greeks, with a Megasthenes at their head, as witnesses for the Crown although we have known for a long time how misleading their reports are?"

Kauṭalya and Vātsyāyana

Jolly has traced parallelisms and identities between Vātsyāyana and Kauṭalya and on that strength considers the author of the *Arthaśāstra* to be at the most a century older than the author of the *Kāmasūtra*. According to Meyer this sort of arguing *steht rein in der Luft* (exists purely in the air), i.e., has no solid foundation whatever. In regard to Vātsyāyana, Meyer agrees with Jacobi whose contributions to Kauṭalyalogy he appreciates as on the whole still valuable (*Ueber die Echtheit des Kauṭilya*, 1912).

Keith, 1928

A great transformation took place in Keith's ideas. By 1928 in his judgment the name Kauṭalya "has no value being obviously a correction." The *Arthaśāstra* is considered by him to convey "absolutely general and very pedantic utterances" and is therefore not to be compared with Bismarck's *Gedanken and Erinnerungen,* or "Thoughts and Memories" (Stuttgart 1898) which is full of practical details. The maxims of the *Arthaśāstra* are suited to the requirements of a moderate-sized state and "ignore entirely the issue of the government of an empire." Smith's claim that the *Arthaśāstra* had been composed before Chandragupta established the Empire is regarded as "absurd". The effort to establish resemblances between the *Arthaśāstra* and Megasthenes's *Indika* has according to Keith been a "complete failure". Yājnavalkya was known to the *Arthaśāstra* which may have used some of the other *Smritis* like Manu and Nārada. By the fifth century A.C. the *Kauṭalya* and Chāṇakya were known to the Jaina canons like *Nandisūtra* and *Anuyogadvārasūtra.* The work was prior to the *Kāmasūtra* and *Panchatantra* of the fourth century. It may have been written about 300 A.C. by a court official somewhere in South India. Keith has in the main reproduced Jolly's last words as given in the Introduction to the Lahore edition (Vol. I. 1923).

Keith asks "why the author knows nothing of an empire or Pāṭaliputra" (p. 461). The answer is to be found in a statement to the effect, say, that a Briton writing on political science may have no occasion to refer to London or to the British Empire.

Depending on Stein's general conclusion Keith[1] asserts that the "*Arthaśāstra* knows nothing of the wooden fortification of Pāṭaliputra but provides for stone work." This statement should appear to be out of the mark because the *Arthaśāstra* says nothing about Pāṭaliputra. And as for stone work recent excavations have discovered remnants of walls built with this material. Should the *Arthaśāstra* be alleged to know of nothing but stone as building material, even then it can be well accepted as a document describing the Maurya conditions.[2] One should not inadvertently rest assured that wood work is the only stuff that has been discovered in the course of excavations and explorations.

Another paper of Keith's was published in 1928.[3] It is like Jolly's Introduction (1923) and Winternitz's paper in the *Calcutta Review* (1924) a substantial contribution against the Indian tradition. For all practical purposes the three arguments are more or less identical. They are based fundamentally on Jolly's German papers (1911-16) and fortified by Stein's *Megasthenes und Kauṭalya* (1922).

In this paper Keith has adumbrated certain questionable views of a general character. His statement that the intellectual power of Machiavelli is wholly lacking in the author of the *Arthaśāstra* is unsupported by facts of comparative politics.

It is strange that Keith is prepared to discover in Machiavelli the "ideal of a national king ruling over a

1 *History of Sanskrit Literature* (Oxford 1928), pp. 458-461.
2 Stein: *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya* (Vienna 1922), pp. 28, 33-34 40. See the discussion about Stein, *supra*, pp. 260-272.
3 "The Authenticity of Kauṭilya" in the *Sir Asutosh Memorial Volume* (Patna).

centralized realm in lieu of a chaos of contending states" but fails to find the same ideal or anything like it in Kauṭalya. Machiavelli has been presented as standing for the "ideal of the Renaissance", an ideal of "universal peace", which of course remains yet to be realized, as it should appear to Keith as to others. Should it be possible, however, for twentieth century scholarship to credit Machiavelli with such extraordinary political futurism, one wonders why it should not be equally reasonable to trace some of the latest ideas or ideals of today in the *sūtras* and *bhāṣyas* of Kauṭalya. In this context we must remember all the time, as one can believe with Keith, that the "search for such a state organization as shall secure universal peace" has not led to any tangible results. He has not cited any relevant passages from Machiavelli nor tried to discover phrases from Kauṭalya such as might correspond to what he means by Machiavelli's Renaissance political ideals or philosophy. But when he makes the categorical statement that the conception of "unversal peace" is "wholly alien to the *Arthaśāstra*" one wonders whether justice has been done to the conception of the *chāturanta* or *sārvabhauma* state which furnishes the fundamental basis of Kauṭalyan as of other Hindu politics. Furnished as Keith is with such postulates, it is easy for him to declare that "of political philosophy the *Arthaśāstra* has little conception" and that "it expresses no new theory of the purpose of the state and has no ideals." He has, however, not made it clear as to what he understands by "political philosophy," "theory of the state," and ideals.

In my analysis the most important fact against the Indian tradition is to be found in the quotations from

Kauṭalya himself by name in the third person. The standpoint of Hillebrandt, Jolly, and Winternitz has been presented by Keith with great force in this paper. "The citation of views under the form *iti Kauṭilyah* is *prima facie* wholly against this view (Kauṭalya's authorship)," says he. One ought to agree with him in the remark that "no effective reply has been adduced to meet this obvious objection." My views on this question have been expressed on different occasions in the course of this investigation.

S. K. Aiyangar, 1929

According to S. K. Aiyangar "nobody could ordinarily be a minister who was not a Paṇḍit"[1] Govinda Dikshita of the seventeenth century was such a minister-paṇḍit. In Aiyangar's judgment the fact that Kauṭalya lays down the rules "by which a state placed in the middle of a number of states round about it of equal strength can make conquests of its neighbours and become an imperial state is just what gives the indication that Chāṇakya helped to evolve from out of a powerful single state an empire, far flung and reaching to the frontiers which British statesmen even of the twentieth century have sighed for in vain at least on one side of India."

Aiyangar says that we may take with Meyer that Kauṭalya was the minister of that name who assisted Chandragupta in the establishment of, and in laying down the lines of the administration for, the Maurya Empire. His position is thus indeed that of Smith and

1 Introduction to V. R. R. Dikshitar's *Hindu Administrative Institutions* (Madras 1929) pp. xiii-xiv.

Monahan who consider the *Arthaśāstra* to be a pre-Imperial Maurya work.

D. R. Bhandarkar, 1929

In regard to Megasthenes's statements that Indians never took to wine except at sacrifices and that theft was of rare occurrence Jolly is sceptical and has used Kauṭalya as the touchstone. This methodology is open to question, as has ben pointed out by D. R. Bhandarkar.

"If this work is much posterior in date to Megasthenes, as Prof. Jolly contends, where is the necessity, asks D. R. Bhandarkar, "of bringing in its contents to disprove the statement of the Greek ambassador?"[1]

D. R. Bhandarkar agrees with Shamsastry that some of the manners and customs depicted in the *Arthaśāstra* are pre-Maurya (p. 46). This may indeed be almost taken for granted because many of the *mores* even of today can be traced back to the Vedas.[2]

Arguing against Winternitz in connection with Kauṭalya's love of endless and pedantic classification and definition, D. R. Bhandarkar observes (p. 43) that "this list of excellences is a *sine qua non* in the treatment of *maṇḍala* ("geopolitical" sphere), whose main object is to gauge the strength of one state against the neighbouring ones as every ruler is expected to do." But one will have to retort that although the object is quite understandable the fact remains that Kauṭalya had to have recourse to this sort of fatiguing categories. One can establish a thesis even without creating such an atmosphere of round-

1 *Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity* (Benares 1929) p. 45.

2 See D. Bhattacharya: *Guṇaviṣṇu's Chhāndogya Mantra Bhāṣya* (Calcutta 1930); also Hillebrandt: *Ritual-literatur* (Grundriss der indoarischen Philologie).

about and hair-splitting definitions of definitions. It is not possible to get out of these super-logicalisms of Kauṭalya as of Śākya the Buddha and Mahāvīra. But even then one is not forced to hold, as does Winternitz, that Kauṭalya cannot be a practical, hard-headed and shrewd statesman.

D. R. Bhandarkar's position that the *Arthaśāstra* "combines the minimum of speculation with the maximum of practical wisdom" (pp. 50-51) is entirely misleading. He makes an antithesis between speculation and practical wisdom which is unwarrantable. Besides, it is to be observed that the *Arthaśāstra* is from top to bottom nothing but speculation. It is *Kauṭalya-darśana*, it is a *śāstra*, albeit "very often combined with practical wisdom," and what is more, always supported by command over the psychology of superiors and subordinates, friends and foes, in one word, ever backed by the knowledge of the realities of flesh and blood. In order to demonstrate that Kauṭalya has practical wisdom one does not have to argue like D. R. Bhandarkar in such a way as to rob Kauṭalya of his intrinsic merit as speculator *par excellence*, as philosopher, aye, one of the greatest philosophers of all ages.

At one point (pp. 51-52) D. R. Bhandarkar seems to concede to Jolly the point that the *Arthaśāstra* "cannot be much anterior to the *Kāmasūtra*." And his arguments are threefold:

(1) the chapter of each ends with the verses of the other,

(2) the quotations in each are invariably indicated by a prefatory remark to the effect, and

(3) each commences with a detailed table of contents.

One cannot understand how this correspondence between two authors in the purely formal side of book-making can compel anybody to believe that they "could not have been separated from each other by any long interval." Quite another explanation might appear to be more reasonable. Let us admit for the present (1) that the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Kāmasūtra* were not written or compiled by one and the same individual or school, and (2) that the *Arthaśāstra* was the original upon which the *Kāmasūtra* drew for certain items. We may then believe that in the art of book-making Kauṭalya initiated a new style. This new style appeared to be attractive to those scholars who took interest in topics which were nearest to those of the *Arthaśāstra*. It is quite reasonable to surmise that the Kauṭalyan style remained unimitated for quite a long time until some genius got inspired to make a name for himself as the pioneer of a new science by at last utilizing the Kauṭalyan method. No arbitrary period can be set up for this interval between the originator and a great imitator.

In D. R. Bhandarkar's final argument (pp. 56, 61) the *Arthaśāstra* in the main (excluding the first and the last chapters) is composed in *Dharmasūtra* style and may therefore belong to the period from the seventh to the second century B.C. He furnishes instances of Vaśiṣṭha's *Dharmaśāstra* as well as a Jātaka quoting from the *Arthaśāstra*. And these instances point to the pre-Asokan origin of the treatise. The first and last chapters may have been added "shortly before the time" of *Kāmandakī*, says he, and there may have been a few interpolations in that process of "imparting a finishing touch to the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya."

It may not be difficult to believe that the first and last chapters did not come from the same hands as the main *corpus* of the text. But there is no earthly reason for the assumption that the Kauṭalyan school came into existence "shortly before the time" of Kāmandaka, when it was alleged to be felt necessary to add the first and the last chapters by way of finishing touch.

According to D. R. Bhandarkar the "use of one's name in the third person is more modest and is common to both the Sanskrit and vernacular literatures" (pp. 50-51).

This is unacceptable. By no means can a self-quotation or rather a reference to one's name in the third person be described as a case of modesty on the part of the author in the East or the West, in ancient or in modern times. This is normally speaking anything but modesty. It may be conceded that perhaps once in a while an author is likely to use the third person about himself when he happens to be in an exceptionally devout and humble attitude. Medieval poets, preachers and singers of the religious turn or *Bhakti* school in India, for instance, are used to this kind of modesty. But as a rule to mention oneself by name is not a mark of modesty. In modern Eur-American scholarship it is the practice of authors while writing the report on or even history of researches in certain sciences say, from anthropology to zoology, to name themselves along with other contributors to the fields in question. This is excusable on grounds of objectivity. In any case it does not bespeak modesty, however.

But on occasions of controversy when the views of several authors are being discussed and criticised almost

as in an assembly it cannot by any means be taken as modesty in the East or the West to name oneself in the third person as the exponent or opponent of certain views. Not even the question of objectivity can furnish a justification here. In controversies conducted through journals or carried on in learned societies nobody would dare mention oneself in the third person in any country.

As for ancient and medieval Indian practice D. R. Bhandarkar's two references (Medhātithi's commentary on *Manu I*, 4 and Viśvarūpāchārya's commentary on *Yājnavalkya* I, 2) point simply to general rules of etiquette in the literary profession. The authors are said not to use the first person in order that *svapraśamsā* or *ātmastūti*, i.e. self-praise may be avoided. It is on considerations of objectivity that the avoidance of the first person is practised by literary men, say the Hindu commentators. These are "general" rules. But the commentaries do not say anything about the special situations covered by problems of controversy. Neither Viśvarūpāchārya nor Medhātithi says that the third person is used by authors about themselves when they are combating the views of others.

In the *Arthaśāstra* we have instances of Kauṭalya being quoted no less than seventytwo times not under the ordinary circumstances but under conditions of controversy. Humanly speaking, this is unpardonable. That is why men of ordinary common sense cannot be blamed if they are not prepared to take those passages in which Kauṭalya is quoted as written by Kauṭalya himself. The hand of somebody other than Kauṭalya in the composition of the work can be very reasonably suspected. And this

is bound to tell very effectively against the authenticity of the Indian tradition as generally understood.

Johnston, 1929

So far as literary evidences are concerned, it is *vis-à-vis* (1) *Pāṇini*, (2) *Patanjali*, (3) the *Kāmasūtra*, (4) the *Tantrākhyāyikā*, (5) the *Panchatantra*, (6) the *Yājnavalkya Smriti*, (7) the *Manu Samhitā*, (8) the *Raghuvamśa*, (9) the *Śakuntalā*, (10) the *Daśakumāracharita*, (11) the *Purāṇas*, (12) the *Kāmandakīnīti*, (13) the *Brihat Samhitā*, (14) the *Charaka Samhitā*, (15) the *Mudrārākṣasa*, etc., that the orientations of the *Arthaśāstra* were investigated up till now. Enumerated without reference to chronological order, as they are, these are all Sanskritic and "Hindu" sources. A few Jaina sources were also studied, namely, (1) the *Nītivākyāmrita*, (2) the *Nandīsutta* and (3) the *Anuyogadvāra*.[1]

The Buddhist and Pali sources had been neglected. Hopkins's reference to the *Jātakas* was very slight. New lights, therefore, have been thrown on the Kauṭalya question by the publication of H. E. Johnston's paper on "Two Studies in the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya" in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) for January 1929 because here the perspectives are derived from Buddhist sources, namely, (1) the works of Aśvaghoṣa (second century A.C.?) (2) *Āryaśūra's Jātakamālā* (fourth century A.C.?) and (3) the *Lankāvatārasūtra* (fourth century A.C.?).

It is to be understood however, that the dates of these Buddhist texts are in any case as questionable as

1 Jolly's Introduction to the Lahore edition (1923), pp. 10-12.

those of the "Hindu" and Jaina texts mentioned above. Altogether, we encounter once more the eternal problem of Indian chronology,—namely, the ascertainment of an unknown with reference to another unknown or questionable.

Let us begin with Johnston's general orientations.

On the one hand, he would not care to read into the *Arthaśāstra* the "ideas of a great statesman or a deep political thinker." On the other hand, he believes that "half its value is missed by treating it as the pedantic theories of a Paṇḍit." In his judgment it is "in essence the work of a practical administrator" whose interest in political theories does not go beyond the considerations of the "king's advantage." The *Arthaśāstra* is besides alleged to be "unfettered by moral or religious prejudices except in so far as their existence in others affects the execution of policy."

In his *Saundarananda* Aśvaghoṣa uses the concept of the "conquest of the earth", says Johnston. But the doctrine of *vijigīṣu* or world-conqueror in the chauvinistic sense was not used with the alleged "relentless logic" in Aśvaghoṣa's days as in the days of Kauṭalya. In Johnston's logic Aśvaghoṣa must therefore be earlier than Kauṭalya.

But this interpretation is questionable. One might perhaps argue, on the contrary, that although the Kauṭalyan category was already there Asvaghoṣa's personal message happened to be different from, nay, the opposite of Kauṭalya's. Hence to the one it was very subsidiary while to the other it was a prominent item in thought. May be, even the same category of world-conquest was used in a humane manner by Aśvaghoṣa while

in Kauṭalya's mentality it was perhaps nothing but a creed of alleged self-aggrandisement of the most materialistic dye.

From the analysis of philosophical doctrines it is never safe to argue about their chronological relations. Let us take an historical fact. It was during the epoch of "pacifistic" propaganda by Śākya the Buddha's followers that Chandragupta Maurya knew how to organize his legions and consummate his *digvijaya*. Śākya's teachings may have been unknown or unnoteworthy to the officials of the Maurya "general staff." This does not prove that the Buddha or his followers were later in time than Chandragupta Maurya or mere non-entities on any count.

Johnston does not likewise seem to be taking a commonsense view when he believes that in his *Buddhacharita* Aśvaghoṣa might have seized the opportunity to condemn the *Realpolitik*, so to say, of the Kauṭalyan *Arthaśāstra*, had the latter treatise been known to be a "standard work" by this time.

As suggested above, the situation might be entirely otherwise. In other words, the alleged Kauṭalyan chauvinism and cult of self-aggrandisement may have been quite dominant in the philosophical *milieu* of Hindustan for a number of centuries. But not everybody cared to take interest in or to have the inspiration to condemn it,—not, at any rate, the professors of the Śākyan cult of humanitarianism, Asokan *Dhamma* and so forth. The world was pluralistic enough for both the Aśvaghoṣan and the Kauṭalyan strands of life and thought. From the indifference of Aśvaghoṣa in regard to Kauṭalya we can infer nothing as to the chronological relations between the

two. We understand simply that neither in *Saundarananda* nor in *Buddhacharita* are we to find the characteristic messages of the *Arthaśāstra*. Today, for instance, every power in Eur-America and Asia is keeping its gun powder dry although a dominant political and moral philosophy of the hour is to be seen in the cult of world-peace, disarmament and what not. The philosophers of militaristic energism are plying their trade merrily although anti-militaristic preachings over the radio are frequent.

In Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* Johnston detects certain tenets which seem to be like those of Kauṭalya. The phrase *nītikauṭilyaprasamgeṣu* used by Āryaśūra has been supposed to contain Kauṭalya's name. According to Johnston, therefore, "it is quite certain that *Āryaśūra* knew the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya and that in his day it was regarded as the standard work."

Unfortunately the passages cited indicate nothing more than a moralist's "shortest way" with politics. And as it is the object of the writer to condemn just those aspects of *Khattavijja* or *Kṣatriyavidyā*, the Kṣatriya science or politics which deal with diplomatic manœuvres, double dealings, intrigues etc. the common noun *Nītikauṭilya* has been used. No person need be understood here as a matter of course and there is no question of the *Arthaśāstra* being a standard book or even a book in the time of Āryaśūra.

Nītikauṭilya = crookedness of policy. It is not identical with *Kauṭilyanīti* (politics or political science or statecraft). There is no presumption to think that either a book or an author is meant here. Even if *Kauṭilyanīti* had been used by Āryaśūra one might suspect perhaps that we had here a sly hit at the book or the author or both. But in *nīti-*

kauṭilya no suggestion along those lines can be automatically entertained.

However, Johnston's interpretations bring the *Arthaśāstra* between Aśvaghoṣa of the second century A.C. and Āryaśūra of the fourth century A.C. The lower limit of its composition can hardly be later than 250 A.C., says he.

The *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* has an appendix of 884 *ślokas* which belongs to the fifth century A.C. In the prophecy about future *ṛiṣis* that are to arise the appendix mentions them in the following order: (1) Pāṇini, (2) Kātyāyana (3) Yājnavalkya, (4) Vālmīki, (5) Masurākṣa, (6) Kauṭilya, (7) Āśvalāyana and (8) the scion of the Śākiyas.

The mention of Kauṭilya in this fifth century list of *ṛiṣis* without reference to the Mauryas leads Johnston to the following conclusion: Viṣṇugupta Kauṭilya, the author of *Arthaśāstra,* was a different person from the minister of Chandragupta Maurya, whose name perhaps was Chāṇakya.

This line of reasoning is not long followed by Johnston. One finds that it is arbitrary. In any case he hastens to conclude that the lower limit of the composition of the *Arthaśāstra* is certainly not later than about 250 A.C., and that the upper limit is perhaps the beginning of the Christian era.

Incidentally, it is to be observed that Masurākṣa is known as the author of *Nītiśāstra* in the Tibetan *Tanjur.*[2] This work, be it noted further, is placed in that list "just after a slightly longer work called both *Chāṇakya-nīti-śāstra* and *Chāṇakya-rājanītiśāstra.*"

2 *J.R.A.S.*, (London) January 1929, p. 87.

Johnston has approached the *Arthaśāstra* not only from the perspective of Buddhist ideology but also from that of administrative experience. He believes that "Kauṭalya's attitude comes naturally in fact to all who have been engaged in administrative work." And on the strength of such experience he has attempted explanations of certain passages on land tenure and agriculture which need not be discussed in this context. But it is worth while to observe that he finds himself unable to accept the theories set out in Breloer's *Kauṭalīya-Studien* I. *Das Grundeigentum in Indien* (Bonn 1927). His disagreement with Breloer on certain issues is radical.

Pran Nath, 1929-31

About the *Arthaśāstra* Pran Nath in his *Study in the Economic Condition of Ancient India* (London 1929) states in a footnote (p. 103) that the "general view appears to be that it was compiled during the Gupta period." So he considers it "desirable to adopt the general view." But in regard to this alleged "general view" he mentions only two authorities, first, Thomas, who assigns the date as prior to the Christian era, and secondly, Jolly, who "holds the opinion that it was compiled much more recently." It is not clear as to what he means by the "general view." He has made considerable use of the *Arthaśāstra* for the purposes of this study but has nowhere discussed the date. In the introduction he assigns an "early date, perhaps not later than the times of the early Gupta sovereigns" (p. 8). Students of the Kauṭalya question are aware, however, that by 1929 one would hardly be justified in considering the Gupta period for the age of the *Arthaśāstra* as based on the "general view."

The date of the compilation of Kauṭalya's *Arthaśāstra* was the subject of an independent paper by him in the *Indian Antiquary* for June and July 1931. Here he brought the date further down, namely, to the later Guptas, somewhere between 484 and 510 A.C.

In this paper Pran Nath takes *janapada* in two senses, first, as an administrative division (p. 109), and secondly, as the entire state (p. 110). Hence there is a verbal confusion in his arguments bearing on where the author of the *Arthaśāstra* is alleged to have lived.

At one point we are told that the *janapada* referred to in the *Arthaśāstra* is a small territory of the area of a modern *tahsil*. It is not clear as to whether Pran Nath believes that the state of the *Arthaśāstra* does not possess an area more extensive than that of a modern *tahsil*. But if so, one does not see why the *Arthaśāstra* should have regulations about forts, roads, rivers, ships etc. If, on the other hand, he believes, as indeed he does, that the *janapada* is only an administrative division but that the Kauṭalyan state is extensive, the references to sea ports, fisheries, pirate vessels, etc. cannot by themselves prove that the "author of the *Arthaśāstra* lived somewhere near the sea-coast."

In one context the *Arthaśāstra* mentions certain regions which may be identified as follows: Konkana, Kaccha, Surāṣṭra, Sindh (*Aparānta*), some parts of Rajputana (*Jāngala*), Malwa with the capital at Ujjain (*Avanti*), the tracts along the banks of the Narmadā and Tāptī (*Anūpadeśa*) and Mahārāṣṭra. Pran Nath takes all these regions together and believes that they "would form a political unit." And then he considers this political unit to be the state furnishing the geographical *milieu* as

well as the date of the *Arthaśāstra*. This unit he treats as identical with the Malwa Empire (Western Saka Satrapy) from A.C. 126 to 510. And, therefore, "Kauṭalya's *Arthaśāstra* must fall within this period." (pp. 111-112).

But the geographical names in the *Arthaśāstra* are not all exhausted in the few indicated by Pran Nath. Naturally on the strength of the other names one might conceive of a much more extensive and in any case a *much different* political unit than that suspected by him.

The *Arthaśāstra* has a law relating to the punishment of those whom Pran Nath calls the Eastern Huṇa (*Prāg-Hūṇaka*) regions or races. As is well known, the Huṇs were very powerful on account of their capture of the North-western Punjab in 465 A.C. By 510 when Mihirakula succeeded Toramana the Huṇ dominion was extensive and comprised Malwa. Pran Nath argues, therefore, that the kings of Malwa and perhaps other Hindu rulers did not like to "give any chance of complaint to the Huṇa chieftains." Hence the law of racial abuse referred to above. In that case the "*Arthaśāstra* was compiled between 484 and 510 or 528," as he says (p. 121).

Unluckily there are two readings here, Prājjunaka and Prag-Hūṇaka, as Pran Nath admits. A third variant is also admissible. The Munich text has *Prāṇaka*.[1] It is not difficult, therefore, to dissipate the Huṇ *milieu* of the *Arthaśāstra*.

It should be observed, moreover, that the law of abuse refers to other two regions or races besides these. One is not compelled therefore to accept an interpretation

1 K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar: *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity* (Madras 1935), p. 164.

which says that a law like this indicates the relativity of the passage in question to the ferocity of Huṇ legions, conquerors or overlords. The entire discussion bearing on the Malwa Empire and the Huṇ conquests should therefore appear to be irrelevant.

In any case, Pran Nath seems to believe that the *Arthaśāstra* must in its entirety be a work of the fifth or early sixth century simply because one or two geographical or racial names appear to point to the Malwa Empire. But such conclusions about the entire *corpus* of literary work have generally been avoided in indology by admitting that these stray words or phrases might have been interpolated in texts of long standing.

In order perhaps to prove that the capital of the state implied in the *Arthaśāstra* was not *Pāṭaliputra* and that the state was not the Maurya Empire Pran Nath refers to the sea coasts and observes that "boats employed on pearl fishing did not sail from Patna." This logic is not more convincing than to say that the vessels of the British India Steam Navigation Co. do not sail from Delhi or Simla in order to prove that the British Empire of India must be located somewhere near the Bay of Bengal or the Arabian Sea. As long as certain parts of India are sea-washed there is no reason why the author of a *śāstra*, although having domicile in the mountains, forests or deserts, could not mention ports, ships and customs duties.

With reference to the *pravālakam alakandakam*, i.e. coral from Alakanda (Alexandria) Pran Nath observes that Alexander came to India during Chandragupta's time and asks "If Kauṭalya was his minister, is it possible that he would have recognized a name which Greeks gave to a part so recently and have associated it with a particular

kind of coral found there?" (p. 123). One should reply in the affirmative. It is just a "novelty" associated with a great adventurer like Alexander that was well calculated to become popular in the very first years of post-Alexandrine Hellenism in western Asia. The same chronological bearing on the *Arthaśāstra* is to be seen in *surunga* or Hellenistic *syrinx*. That is, Kauṭalya can be a contemporary of Chandragupta Maurya not only in spite of but just because of his use of the terms "Alakandaka" (Alexandria) and *syrinx*.

In view of the fact that Alexander's name is hardly referred to in Indian literature we have here an interesting evidence to the effect that his Hindu contemporaries remembered him in the name of the city founded by him as well as in the military tactics employed by him.

Pran Nath observes that not a single coin of Chandragupta or Aśoka has been discovered as yet. But this does not necessarily render the Kauṭalyan ideas of coining un-Maurya or post-Maurya.

He finds "non-Indian ideals and culture" advocated in the *Arthaśāstra*. This should be regarded as quite in keeping with the evolution of Indian history. There is no period of Indian "ideals and culture" when something "non-Indian," "non-Aryan," "non-Brāhmaṇic" or the like is not to be detected. We are therefore not justified in concluding, as Pran Nath does, that "this may be due to the fact that the Malwa Empire for a long time remained under the influence of Greeks, Sakas and Huṇas." Further, the "Persian" custom referred to can by all means be pre-Maurya. Besides, fish and meat-eating as well as divorce and separation are not dangerously "non-Indian."

Kane, 1930

Kauṭalya mentions neither the four stages of a lawsuit,—namely, plaint, reply, proof and judgment,—nor the three kinds of evidence,—documents, witnesses and prescription.[1] These two groups of items are fully developed by Yājnavalkya. The widow or the mother is not the heir to a sonless son according to Kauṭalya who thus differs entirely from Yājnavalkya. The *strīdhana* (the woman's special property) of a woman dying during her husband's life time is divided in the *Arthaśāstra* among her sons and daughters. But in Yājnavalkya's system the daughters get a preference. Yājnavalkya is considered by Kane to represent a much more advanced stage and therefore to be "later by several centuries" than Kauṭalya.

In comparison with Manu also Kauṭalya is considered to be "primitive." The *Arthaśāstra* permits the Brāhmaṇa to marry even a Śūdra woman. But the *Manu Samhitā* allows such unions although on second thought it condemns them. In the *Manu Samhitā* widow remarriage is forbidden while it is permitted in the *Arthaśāstra*. A wife is permitted by Kauṭalya even to desert her husband if he is of bad character, endangers her life and so forth. From the standpoint of juridical development Manu represents a much developed strand and hence a relatively recent age compared to Kauṭalya.

The existence of correct *triṣṭubh* metres in the *Arthaśāstra* argues for a late date corresponding to that of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and much later than that of the *Brihaddevatā*.

1 P. V. Kane: *History of Dharmasutras* (Poona, 1930) pp. 95-97, 101, 104.

According to Kane the *Rāmāyaṇa* may be a work even of the fifth century B.C. and the date of the *Brihaddevatā* is still debatable. He is convinced therefore that all circumstances agree with the traditional date of 300 B.C.

De La Vallée Poussin, 1930

In *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas* etc. De la Vallée Poussin considers Jacobi's interpretation of the *Arthaśāstra* to be "extravagant" and Meyer's introduction to his German translation to be "deceptive". Evidently he accepts the arguments of Stein regarding the alleged discrepancies between Megasthenes and Kauṭalya. In his judgment the best study is that of Keith who "has destroyed the thesis of Jacobi".

The only French contribution[1] has bearing on the name China as used in the *Arthaśāstra*. Pelliot's paper entitled "Origine du nom de China" in *Toung-Pao*, called attention to the well known fact that not before Tsin Shi-hwangti became Emperor of a United China, could China as the name of the whole country be known abroad as such.

Pelliot's remark is, however, irrelevant because Chīna, as mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra*, refers to a Himalayan region and not to any extra-Indian territory.[2]

De la Vallée Poussin's own position is described below.

"The attitude of F. W. Thomas as one belonging to the adverse camp is perhaps a little too favourable for

1 French indology has hardly anything to offer in regard to the Kauṭalya question. But in Kalidas Nag's *Les Theories Diplomaliques de l'Inde Ancienne* (Paris 1923 pp. 116-118) we are presented with a summary of Jolly's views as against those of Jacobi and a reference to Stein.

2 Jayaswal : *Hindu Polity* (Calcutta 1924) Part I, p. 212.

the authenticity or the quasi-authenticity of the *Arthaśāstra*", says he (pp. 71-72). "The comparison between Magasthenes and the *Arthaśāstra* forbids the placing of the latter under the first Maurya. Besides, the *Arthaśāstra* envisages a regime of small states, very small states, and should appear to have reference to an India fragmented and not to the Imperial India of the Mauryas."

We shall do well to consider, says he, that this book like many Indian things does not have a date and that it contains interpolations and idealistic interpretations. But still he believes that it is based on ancient data (*il repose sur des données anciennes*). Altogether, he would give the historian the right to make use of it in order to design the picture of Hindu states of all times (*le tableau des états hindous de tous les temps*). He is cautious, however, to say that this right ought to be used by the historian with moderation.

According to *De la Vallée Poussin*, one should take literally neither every thing that is reported by Magasthenes nor all that is said in the *Arthaśāstra*. "Just as the art of love presented in the *Kāmaśāstra*, thank God, is not followed by all the lovers in India," says he, "so also the rulers of India did not practise the childish international Machiavellism prescribed by the *Arthaśāstra*, the permanent intervention of the state officials in the village feasts etc."

Dikshitar, 1932

The Mauryan Polity (Madras 1932) by V. R. R. Dikshitar examines the ideas of Winternitz and Keith in one Appendix and those of Stein in another.

Dikshitar points, as does N. N. Law, to Vidyāraṇya, the minister of Bukkā, the Emperor of Vijayanagara in mediæval Southern India who was both a Paṇḍit and a statesman. Paṇḍit-statesmen or statesmen-Paṇḍits have gloriously adorned many an enviable station in every state, says he. Kauṭalya belonged but to the same category.

Incidentally Dikshitar adduces arguments in favour of the tradition which establishes Kauṭalya's identity with Vātsyāyana, the author of *Kāmaśāstra*.[1]

Concerning the controversy over the Maurya metallurgy he observes as follows (p. 339): "To say that Megasthenes's account betrays an infant stage of India's technical sciences is a contradiction in terms. His mention of "other metals" as well as their different uses show as much an advanced stage as that portrayed in the *Arthaśāstra*. We are not able to find any difference between the two versions except the fact that Magasthenes does not mention much by way of workmanship in metals."

Like all other Indian indologists Dikshitar finds the references (pp. 307-310) in the form of *iti Kauṭalya* as but belonging to the common professional etiquette of Hindu literary men. The problem should not appear to be very simple. The item has been discussed above.

Attention may be further called to the fact that an author who has to oppose certain views does not have to mention himself even in the first person. He has only to state his position. Readers understand that as long as the entire book is written by the author all the views

1 P. 317. See also K. V. R. Aiyangar: *Ancient Indian Polity* (Madras 1916) pp. 90, 152 (Vatsyāyana=Kauṭalya).

presented against the exponents in question are automatically his. Anything else would be unnatural. It is because of six dozen self-quotations or rather references to Kauṭalya himself that the Kauṭalyan authorship of the book was suspected and the question of plural authorship raised by Hillebrandt in the very first paper (1908) which established the authenticity of the *Arthaśāstra*. That question cannot be ignored or belittled.

Attention may be drawn to a paper of Dikshitar's, namely, the one entitled "Is the *Arthaśāstra* secular?" in the *Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference Madras* (1924). He answered the question in the negative, because among other things, as it appears, Kauṭalya has respect for the *Purohita* (the king's family priest) and has cared to recommend Vedic ceremonials to the attention of the ruler. It is perhaps only necessary to observe that the writer of a textbook of mineralogy can have respect for his family priest and also take part in the religious ceremonies of his village. But all this does not render the textbook of mineralogy unsecular. *Artha* is *artha* i.e., something secular according to the very logic of *trivarga*.

In "Kauṭalya and Machiavelli" (*I.H.Q.* March 1927) Dikshitar agrees with me in my remarks that "Kauṭalyaism first, Kauṭalyaism second, Kauṭlyaism always has remained the motto of the Hindus as of the other pillars of the state." He concedes also that "undoubtedly Kauṭalya is 'an inveterate trait of the Hindu genius." But in his analysis Kauṭalya or his work "has nothing to do with Machiavelli or Machiavellism." The subject has been discussed by me at length in other contexts and need not detain us here.

In these two papers Dikshitar had much to say on what he considered to be the "Hindu viewpoint." But this consideration has not been prominent in his later writings, *Hindu Administrative Institutions* (1929) and *The Mauryan Polity* (1932). Here we have perhaps another evidence of the growing secularization in indology.

Breloer, 1934

A work of substantial importance by Bernhard Breloer in several volumes has been attacking the Kauṭalya question from the standpoint of comparative jurisprudence. Some of his methods and conclusions ought to be valuable not only as contributions to the study of the *Arthaśāstra* itself but also in regard to the larger problems of Hindu polity, economy and law.

"Kauṭalya was no man of the crowd but a powerful statesman, a mind, from whose name the children of India even today feel a light palpitation of the heart, an Aryan endowed with intelligence and inflexibility, a figure like the Hagen of the *Nibelungenlied*. Hermann Jacobi who infused into my mind his respect for this extraordinary figure calls Kauṭalya the Bismarck of India because in his person and work he corresponds to what we Germans understand about the unifier of Germany.

"Not only did Kauṭalya raise that person to India's imperial throne who expelled the Macedonian army of occupation but he also extirpated the reigning royal family.

"This work did not appear to Kauṭalya, to follow his own words, more important than the collection of the laws which constitute the stuff of the present treatise. He

considered this to be a political achievement which he himself placed by the side of his external activity, which indeed he frankly regarded as a necessary counterpart."

These are the words with which Breloer opens the Part i. *Finanzverwaltung und Wirtschaftsführung* or "Financial Administration and Economic Planning" (Leipzig 1934, 606 pages) of the Vol. III of his *Staatsverwaltung im alten Indien* or "Administration of the State in Ancient India." The two previous volumes are:

1. *Das Grundeigentum in Indien* or "Landed Property in India" (Bonn 1927, 145 pages) which deals with the modern land laws of India as well as with their history as embodied in Kauṭalya, Megasthenes, Akbar etc. and
2. *Altindisches Privatrecht bei Megasthenes und Kauṭalya* or "Hindu Private Law as described by Megasthenes and Kauṭalya" (Bonn 1928, 200 pages).

Indian Tradition as Starting Point

According to Breloer scepticism about authenticity can be overriden by those who have "some amount of confidence" in the indigenous tradition.

A bad touchstone is selected, says he, if one tries to test the authenticity of Kauṭalya by reference to the *Smriti* literature. The Megasthenes question also like the Kauṭalya question cannot be solved with one stroke. He is not interested in the solution of the authenticity question for the present but is trying to build up a critical standpoint which may prepare the way for that solution. This is what he calls the "higher critical method" and

evidently consists in the analysis of the principal contents (*beherrschende Materie*).[1] This explains why his Kauṭalya researches have carried him to the ancient, medieval and modern, as well as to the East and West (*wie breit eine Untersuchung anzulegen ist*).

Megasthenes in Agreement with Kauṭalya

In regard to Stein's *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya* (1922),[2] Breloer observes that the comparison between Megasthenes and Kauṭalya as regards legal institutions cannot be undertaken on the strength of a dictionary in the hand but of intensive juridical researches. But both in regard to landed property and to debts Megasthenes's reports were rejected flatly as exaggerated and idealized. The only witness that was available until now, namely, Megasthenes did not enjoy much confidence (*sich keines allzu grossen Vertrauens erfreute*) because people felt disappointed or cheated (*getäuscht*) with his reports. It is because of this want of confidence in both Megasthenes and Kauṭalya that comparative jurisprudence has been requisitioned by Breloer. He is interested, therefore, neither in the *Smriti* literature nor in Magasthenes for comparison with Kauṭalya but in the history of other allied laws such as are likely to throw light especially on Megasthenes.[3]

'And here the attention may be called to the paper on the "German Translation of the Kauṭilyan *Arthaśāstra*" in the *I.H.Q.* for June 1928 in which the

2 Vol. I, pp. 4-6.

On the Megasthenes question see B. K. Sarkar: "Hindu Politics in Italian" in the *I.H.Q.*, for September 1925—April 1926.

3 Vol. II. pp. 6, 7.

present author made the following remarks: "We need a third and more reliable source on the strength of which both Kauṭilya and Megasthenes can be appraised as to the Maurya or non-Maurya elements reflected in each." Breloer's methodology may turn out to be fruitful in the long run.

From the standpoint of private law Stein's ideas, according to Breloer, have been proven to be baseless (*grundlos*). The alleged discrepancy between Megasthenes and Kauṭalya in regard to slavery does not exist. The absence of slavery in India as reported by Megasthenes is true in the sense that slavery as understood in Hellenistic Europe was unknown in India and that what was supposed to be slavery in India was really nothing but a relation of service which could be dissolved (*lösbares Dienstverhältnis*).[4] All the 15 kinds of *dāsas* described in the *Nārada Smriti* are interpreted as staying outside the category of slaves, strictly so called.

As for the alleged absence of litigiousness among the Indians also Megasthenes's report is not as rosy as Stein and others believe.[5] Law suits were not unknown in India. Only the methods of civil process as prevalent in Greece were different from those in India. Witnesses likewise were known in Indian law courts according to Megasthenes. He was aware also of the use of seals. In the law of debts in Macedonia six witnesses were required for the validity of contract. India did not know this law. In Greece, again, the suits regarding debts

4 Vol. II. pp. 6, 8, 10, 31-37, 48, 69, 70, 158. See Stein's *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya* (Vienna 1922) pp. 109-115.

5 Vol. II. pp. 70, 72, 75, 88, 126, 158.

constituted a special branch of the law of contract. But in India the general law of contract covered debts as other items. Altogether, according to Breloer, Megasthenes was not idealizing the Indian conditions and his reports in so far as these legal data are concerned agreed with the data of the Indian texts.

Megasthenes really pointed to the special characteristics of Indian legal institutions. One should not therefore make much capital out of the alleged discrepancies between Kauṭalya and Megasthenes (*die Grundgedanken des Griechen auch aus den überlieferten indischen Rechtsquellen klarer hervortreten*). Apart from other topics of Hindu law and polity, the fact of Megasthenes being in substantial agreement with Kauṭalya is well calculated to open up new vistas in comparative sociology.

Kauṭalya as Chancellor of Chandragupta

The *Arthaśāstra* is postulated to have been written towards the end of the fourth century B.C. In this standpoint Breloer, to use his own words, follows his *guru* Jacobi, who recognized the authenticity of the work at the very outset while other well-known investigators are still sceptical. From the aphoristic language of the text no conclusions can be drawn as to the age, says he. "The authoritative grammar of Pāṇini which in point of quality is until today unsurpassed in the world should appear to be not far remote from the *Arthaśāstra* in time (*zeitlich nicht weit vom Arthaśāstra entfernt*)."

The reasons for the scepticism of researchers he finds in their absence of knowledge regarding the facts with which the text deals and in over-cautiousness. It is because of these circumstances that, according to him,

researchers have been led to conclude that a *Stuben-Gelehrter*, a *"tulo Paṇḍit"* (as we say in Bengal) or an academic scholar who knows only his little institution or working room has "compiled this magnificent work out of authentic sources."[6]

Breloer is, on the contrary, convinced that any body who has studied with careful eye only the artistic structure of finance as embodied in this treatise would at once reject such a possibility. In his judgment the content of the work, no matter who be the author, mirrors forth actual life, practice and experience (*reales Leben, Praxis und Erfahrung*).

Kauṭalya has been accepted as *Kanzler* (Chancellor) by Breloer. About the quality of Kauṭalya's treatise Breloer makes the following observation: "It is animated by a powerful mind, such as cannot be misled or confused. The work has thereby been conducted to the highest height of political thought (*auf die höchste Höhe der politischen Gesinnung*).[7]

The fundamental tone of the treatise is one of confidence (*zuversichtliche Grundstimmung*) which draws its strength from the certainty of experience or practical work (*Erfahrung*) and is fully conscious of the contrast with experiment." Breloer means that in the preparation of the *Arthaśāstra* Kauṭalya was guided by the experience of things actually done rather than by what might be done as a result of experiments. The author is thus believed to have been more a practical statesman than otherwise.

6 Vol. III, pp. 91-92, 538.
7 Vol. III, pp. 300-302, 538.

Arthaśāstra as Document of Planned Economy

The postulate which runs through the entire volume and which indeed furnishes the socio-philosophical or economico-political scaffolding for the presentation of the Kauṭalyan data is to be mentioned at the outset. We are told that the objects that Hindu administration seeks to realize are something from which the conceptions of an European appears to be exceedingly different, especially if the latter happens to be entangled in or possessed by the ideas of economic liberalism (*im wirtschaftsliberalen Denken verfangen*).[8] In the expression "*wirtschaftsliberalen Denken*" of Breloer's is to be understood the doctrine of *laissez faire*, economic freedom, etc., as common in the history of economic thought from Adam Smith and Ricardo to Gustav Cassel and the general trends of thinking represented in the *Société d'Economie Politique* of Paris. It is to be taken as the antipodes of what today is being described as the policy of "economic planning", "planned economy" etc., so strongly associated, although in diverse forms, with Soviet Russia's "Gosplan" (state-planning), Fascist economics, the Hitler regime in Germany, and the Rooseveltian "New Deal."[9]

8 Vol. III. pp. 3, 302

9 In regard to these anti-liberal economics see the liberalist Cassel's lecture entitled "From Protectionism through Planned Economy to Dictatorship" at the Dunford House (Cobden Memorial Association), London, June 1934 (*International Conciliation*, New York, October, 1934). For anti-liberalist views of economic and political liberalism as well as of its opposite, see in the same journal for January 1935 Mussolini: "The Political and Social Doctrine of Fascism" and De Ritis: "Aims and Policies of the Fascist Regime in Italy"; cf. Hitler: *Rede vor dem Reichstag*, 30 January 1934 (Ein Jahr Nationalsozialismus in Deutschland) and B. K. Sarkar: "The Hitler-State" in the *Insurance and Finance Review* (Calcutta) October and November, 1933.

"One who is entangled in or committed to liberal thought", says Breloer in regard to the interpreters of Hindu politics, "fishes only for those items and judges the whole only according to those viewpoints which correspond to this kind of thinking. The result is a completely incorrect picture which arises from the wrong mental attitude of the interpreter."[10]

The planned economy, says he, should not at all appear new and unintelligible to the Indian, in so far "as the modern ideas of liberalism do not blind him to the otherwise constituted conditions of the Orient." Among the many theories of the state the Europeans knew hardly anything, so we are told, of the "conservative welfare state (*Fürsorgestaat*) with planned economic control." It is the most recent times that according to him have commenced to fill up the gap and "will assure to Europe also an honorable place in discussions bearing on the question."[11]

These passages make it clear, although he disclaims *propagandistische Tendenz* (p. 362), that Breloer is an admirer of the "most recent" political theories of planned economy etc., that he is expecting an "honourable place" for Europe in this respect in the future. It is evident also, as we have previously noted, that his sentiments against "liberalism" are quite pronounced. Finally, he says in so many words that the Hindu (and Oriental) state has anticipated the "most recent" political institutions and theories, namely, those of welfare-state and economic control etc.

10 Vol. III, p. 2.
11 Vol. III, p. 362.

The economic aspect of administration, the *Planwirtschaft* (planned economy) is carried out in the *Arthaśāstra* with unquestionable thoroughness (*mit nicht zu leugnender Gründlichkeit*) without letting the reader feel that the question here is of a pale theory.[12] On the contrary, every measure is established on the foundation of practice. If in regard to this, says Breloer, a strictness of attitude is observable, it is perhaps to be ascribed to the "famines in Chandragupta's time of which the tradition speaks."

In these passages, written as we understand from the preface in December 1933, towards the end of the first year of the national-socialist (*Nazi*) state in Germany, Breloer seems evidently to have the following equations before his mind's eye:

(1) Economic policy of Kauṭalya = Planned economy of the *Nazi* State.

(2) Famines in Chandragupta's time = Unemployment in Hitler's Germany.

(3) Strictness of economic measures in the *Arthaśāstra* = strictness of the Nationalsocialistic intervention in the private affairs of individuals from marriage to charity.

Such being the case, a successful general like Chandragupta, as he was known to the Romans, may have commissioned his teacher and statesman Kauṭalya with the preparation of a *Corpus juris*. It is also possible that because of the explicable or natural attempt to establish the unified state (*aus dem erklärlichen Streben nach dem Einheitsstaat heraus*) it was in contemplation to

12 Vol. III. pp. 11, 95, 302.

transfer the dominant form and method of administration in Magadha to the whole of the new state, *Kaiserreich* or Empire. In this reference to the *Streben of Chandragupta nach dem Einheitsstaat*[13] Breloer is not uninfluenced by the epochmaking constitutional (and political) achievement of Hitler in 1933, consisting as it did in the abolition of the states and the final unification of Germany beyond the range of Bismarck's dreams. The following Indo-German equations should appear to have been at work in the atmosphere of Breloer's researches :

(1) Magadha (Chandragupta) = Prussia (Hitler).

(2) Unification of India under the auspices of Magadha = Unification of Germany under the auspices of Prussia.

Breloer has not mentioned any contemporaries by name. But his sympathies leave no doubt as to what he means. In the hands of Jacobi we got the equation, Kauṭalya = Bismarck. Jacobi's pupil has carried the equation to the next generation of German statesmanship. At this stage we find that Kauṭalya = some German economist or economists who may be regarded as the guide-philosopher-friends of Hitler during 1933-34. It should be remarked that Gottfred Keller, the inspirer of Hitler in the communistic or socialistic aspects of national-socialism in 1921-22, cannot be regarded as one of them, because the *Nazi* regime in office has gone beyond those theorizings of the years just after the Great War (1914-18).

That Breloer's interpretation of Kauṭalya has been greatly influenced by contemporary events in Germany is apparent from another interesting reference. We have

13 Vol. III, p. 11.

seen that the author has commenced by saluting Kauṭalya as an "Aryan" and as a kinsman of the heroes of the Teutonic *Nibelungenlied*. Evidently the Aryanism and the race-cult of Hitler's sociopolitical philosophy (1933-34) is to be credited with some impact on this ideology of Breloer's.

Kauṭalya = Tribonian

One might suspect that the *Arthaśāstra* was perhaps a primer of lessons on politics to be imparted to a young prince.[14] Breloer is emphatically against this view.

'A' mere pedagogic instruction of an uneducated king must be regarded as out of the question in the face of the circumstances. The work was not compiled for an uneducated man. Otherwise it would not be so difficult for us today to enter its contents.

'Although Kauṭalya himself says that he has presented his material in an easily comprehensible form and, further, that he has prepared his work or certain portions of it for his prince his statements must not be exploited in the interest of a naïve interpretation.

So Breloer comes to the position of Jacobi who represented the standpoint that in the *Arthaśāstra* we are dealing with a "document of administrative law, the outline of a Magna-Charta, if not the legislative work of Kaiser Chandragupta, which would raise the Emperor even above the Roman Kaiser Justinian." Both Chandragupta and Justinian contemplated the expansion of their native law to the whole *Weltreich* (world-empire) and the creation of modern law on the basis of the oldest sources. The

14 Vol. III, pp. 91-92.

old codes were collected, a school of scholars studied the material up into a modern work under the direction of a statesman, here Tribonian and there Kauṭalya. So we get the following equations:

(1) Chandragupta = Justinian.

(2) Kauṭalya = Tribonian.

In so far as the parallels have been pushed back to the "classical" atmosphere, students of political science as well as indology should feel to be placed on more reasonable and solid ground.

Kauṭalya's work is described as *corpus juris universalis*, a collection of norms or rules, about which, however, nobody is sure as to whether it had even the power or sanction of law. But it is to be observed, says Breloer rather too naïvely for the fourth decade of the twentieth century, that in India the law-maker was neither the king nor the state but that the sayings of the old sages were interpreted by law-scholars.[15]

Kauṭalya, we are told, did not himself make the norms or rules. He has pointed it out that he prepared a compilation. According to Breloer this implies in Hindu tradition that except where Kauṭalya introduces conflicting opinions (*apavāda*) and makes some criticism his treatise is to be taken as but the survey of general opinion.

It is possible to doubt if a single individual compiled this work in its present form and with its sub-divisions. "Even if the authorship of the Iron Chancellor should be taken to be an historical fact,—which there is hardly any substantial reason to doubt (*woran zu zweifeln kaum ein stichhaltiger Grund zu sehen ist*),[16] it is only

15 Vol. III, pp. 6-7.

16 Vol. III, p. 10.

with the help of many scholars that like Tribonian he could have brought this compilation of laws together." In spite of that or rather just because of this circumstance, says Breloer, "a single powerful hand, an austere tone and a hard mind cannot be overlooked in this work." Kauṭalya's brain is appraised as follows :—"Both in positive as well as in negative items the unbending opinion becomes manifest which quickly and clearly decides and likewise quickly offers the reasons for the decision almost before they are demanded."

Arthaśāstra as a Comprehensive Document of Hindu Polity for All Ages

According to Breloer Kauṭalya's work is unique in the Indian culture-world. It is characterized by *Vollständigkeit,* completeness or integrity as a system of public law comprising also, as it does, private law. It is also a postulate with Breloer that there is a large number of constant factors running through all the ages of Hindu polity. The question about the author's personality or name is said therefore to possess hardly any importance in the light of these circumstances. Because of this reason it should be more attractive, says he, to treat the *Arthaśāstra* as the starting point of discussion on Hindu administration than fight over the question as to whether the treatise was written by the Bismarck of ancient India, the Iron Chancellor of Kaiser Chandragupta, the unifier of India or by some other named or unnamed Anonymus like nearly all the works of Indian literature.[17]

17 Vol. III, pp. 2-4.

As for the data of inscriptions, they should be brought in later after the groundwork of the study on Hindu administration has been established on the basis of Kauṭalya. It would be putting the cart before the horse should one treat the *Arthaśāstra* as apocryphal and look for miserable crumbs in the wilderness of inscriptions and then triumphantly come back with them to the richly covered table of the *Arthaśāstra,* says Breloer.

One wonders as to why Breloer felt it necessary to fling a joke at the student of inscriptions. All inscriptions of course are not genuine or objective accounts of actual facts. But should one happen to hit upon an inscription that is not only authentic but also contains an unembellished statement of events and promulgations, say, like the Roman Twelve Tables there is hardly any doubt that every document of *Śāstra* literature (*Dharma, Artha* and *Nīti*) would have to be appraised by reference to this touchstone. Under those circumstances the *śāstras* must follow the inscriptions and not the inscriptions the *śāstras* as authority for positive history. In any case each evidence is to be judged on its own merits.

The Problem of Variations in Hindu Polity

Breloer's position in this regard should appear to be anything but scientific. According to him the way through the *Arthaśāstra* leads direct into the actual life of India, and that life is alleged to be evident even today as it was in Buddha's time and earlier. This postulate of unchanging India is modified by him in so far as he admits the existence of changing conditions and concedes that the number of "constant factors" is equal to that of the unknown or changing ones. But in any case, "the vari-

ations", says he, "which the Indian system has undoubtedly experienced fully disappear behind the institutions which have survived the changes of times until today and will survive further in future.[18]

The topic of "constant factors" and "stability" may be left out of consideration for the present. But in so far as "variations" are believed to be in evidence in Indian political institutions and in so far as according to his estimate fifty per cent should appear to be the proportion of these variations one should naturally expect an analysis of the "modifying" conditions, the new circumstances, the forces leading to "social mobility" etc., such as from time to time were responsible for these differentiations. Thus considered, Kauṭalya's date, *locale* and *milieu* are quite important in every scientific study of Hindu politics. It is the "relativity" of Kauṭalya to the region or state and period of culture that possesses very deep significance in a genuine understanding of the Hindu culture-developments. Otherwise one is landed on the absurd proposition that the world of the *Atharva Veda* is identical with that of the *Mahāvagga* as well as with that of the *Mahābhārata*, or perhaps that Hitler's Germany is the same as Bismarck's because to both of them the cult of the Fatherland and the doctrine of *Kulturstaat* are as life-blood, nay, that Mussolini does not differ from Stalin and neither from Hitler because all three are believers in the "totalitarian state" as well as "economic planning." It should appear that Breloer has rather too lightly dealt with the problems of chronology, personality and the surroundings of Kauṭalya—by considering them to be less "*anzie-*

18 Vol. III, pp. 3, 15.

hend" (attractive) and *hinter der Bedeutung dieser Feststellung der Vollständigkeit weit zurück* (far behind the question of the integral or comprehensive character of the work in importance).[19]

The Welfare-State of Kauṭalya

In Breloer's interpretation the Kauṭalyan state follows a store or reserve-economy as its most old and original duty. Further, it receives its business resources in kind. The dimensions of planned economy resulting from this are so considerable for the whole economic structure that the statal economy becomes by itself the determining factor in economic life. All the same, the state seeks to evoke private initiative. This kind of "state-planning" was not due to any ideologies or experiments, says Breloer, but owed its origin to the solution of a gigantic problem. That problem, according to him, "remained unknown to the West until most recent times." It consisted in the provision of guarantee for the barest lives of India's untold millions and the conservation of her space in the interest of food supply.[20]

The monopoly-economy, the centralized bureaucracy and the standing army are described as items that clearly demonstrate the strength and preponderance of the "control" elements in the *Fürsorgestaat*.[21]

The instrument on which the state has to play in order to carry out its functions is said to be no unorganized dumb mass but a living organism which is almost as strong as the state itself. This is the "total society"

19 Vol. III, p. 2.
20 Vol. III, pp. 361-362.
21 Vol. III, pp. 363-364.

corresponding to the well known category of the "total state." And in this "total society" every class discharges its own functions, its *sva-dharma*.

According to Breloer the concentration of preventive measures or precautionary provisions as suggested in the *Arthaśāstra* in the hands of the state is economically simple, sound and effective. Along with this comes into operation the "welfare principle" and the state undertakes the direction or management of the economy.[22] This economic direction or guidance (*Wirtschaftsführung*) is, however, radically different from communalization, says he.

The direction of economic activities by the state embodies itself essentially in "economic superintendence or control" (*Wirtschaftsaufsicht*) which does not shrink from compulsory measures. But it fights shy of direct participation in economic enterprises. The "monopolies" are clear exceptions and they are managed by the state only when it is sure of surplus in all circumstances.[23]

In these statements Breloer should be credited with having rightly grasped the functions of the Hindu state, as the present author has indicated in his *Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922) in the extensive chapter on "National Finance," with parallels from the experience of non-Indian regions.[24]

But Breloer is not content with this objective analysis of data. He goes beyond these facts into philosophical speculations about the alleged fundamental and peculiar causes of this growth in India.

22 Vol. III, pp. 74, 284, 302. 23 Vol. III. p. 95.

24 See also B. K. Sarkar: *Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* (Allahabad) Vol. II. (1921) chapter on "State House-keeping."

Climate As Alleged Determinant in Hindu Polity

Economic centralization or planned economy was engendered in India, says he, because of two reasons.[25] First, it was necessary to maintain the stores or reserves as provision against famine as well as for the standing army and the civil service. And secondly, the question of irrigation was of fundamental importance to the people and the state. An extensive agricultural policy furnished with central control was, it is said, the bed-rock of state-economics.

These conditions Breloer considers to be peculiar to India occasioned by climate and Nature.

This discussion of climate and Nature in their bearings on Indian society, economy and state, has played a considerable rôle in Breloer's work. He believes that the *Eigenarten des Klimas*[26] (the peculiar features of the climate) has as yet been hardly presented in right lights as *"beherrschender Faktor"* (the ruling factor) in India.

A comparative study of economic and technical conditions from the earliest times carried over the most diverse regions of the world would, however, indicate that anthropologically speaking, neither economic centralization (e.g., financial, statistical etc.) nor administrative control in economic enterprises ought to be regarded as a "function", sociologically considered, of climate and Nature. As Breloer's work is based on these fundamental postulates it has served but to repeat in a new form the fallacies of monistic regionalism or "geographical

25 Vol. III, pp. 15-18, 73-76.
26 Vol. III. pp. 14-18, 73, 360-361.

interpretation" of culture from Hegel to Huntington.[27] In reality the kind of planned economy that he has discovered in India can be ascribed to many countries, primitive, ancient and medieval.

From top to bottom and cover to cover he has tried to propagate an untenable economic and sociological thesis. Every item of what Breloer believes to be special to Indian economics and finance can be proven to have flourished under other climates and under other "geopolitical" conditions. The almost universal character of *Wirtschaftsführung, Wirtschaftsaufsicht, Planwirtschaft, Vorkehrungspolitik*, and so forth is the most outstanding feature of ancient and medieval history.

It is strange that Breloer should consider interest in agriculture, irrigation, agricultural statistics and finance etc. on the part of the state and attempts of the state to control the agricultural policy in a systematic and centralized manner as something *ausschliesslich* (p. 77) or exclusive, i.e., special to India's climate and Nature. He believes that extra-Indian parallels are hardly available (p. 16). Nothing could be more unhistorical and untrue to facts of world-economy.

The comprehensive and centralized land, irrigation, water supply, sanitation, roads and agricultural buildings legislation of Italy embodies itself in the *bonifica integrale* movement. Mussolini's *battaglia del grano* (wheat campaign) is but an item in the same complex. His *riscattarre la terra, con la terra gli uomini e con gli uomini la razza* (redeem the land, with the land the men and

27 Climatological fallacies of this type have been examined at length in B. K. Sarkar: *The Futurism of Young Asia* (Berlin 1922) and *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922).

with the men the race) has become the agrar-demographic war-cry of Fascist Italy. The *bonifica* movement is as old as the unification of Italy.

In France the agricultural interests of the state comprise among other items the financial legislation bearing on the *Credit Agricole* and its relations with the *Banque de France*. This *Agrarpolitik* was initiated by Méline in the nineteenth century. The British people which is known to be relatively less agricultural has for two generations been pushing forward the enactment of Small Holdings Acts in diverse forms. The reagrarization movement has got a tremendous fillip in England in post-war years and took definite shape in the Agricultural Tribunal of Investigation.

The all-embracing agricultural legislation, finance and statistics of Germany have become classical. The *Innenkolonisationspolitik* (internal colonisation policy), the *Rentengutsgesetzgebung* (rent-land legislation), the *Anerbenrecht* (law of succession by a "chosen" heir) and so forth constitute a magnificent complex of agricultural economy under state auspices.

Hitler's emphasis on the *Bauernstand* (the farmer class) as the fundamental basis of German *Kultur* and the *Nazi* legislation of 1933 protecting and promoting the cultivator's interests point but to the continuation of the traditional German policy since Stein, nay, since Frederick the Great.

These are examples from modern races and epochs. It is not necessary for the time being to refer to the older instances of the state's solicitude for agriculture under other than Indian climates and geopraphical conditions. In this *extensive Agrarpolitik* (p. 76) of Kauṭalya there is

nothing of *Eigenart* (p. 16), i.e., pecularity, exceptional character or speciality to be seen in India, as suspected by Breloer.

Breloer would perhaps like to furnish new hints to the geographical sociologists who are travelling in the wake of Ratzel, Le Play, Matteuzzi, Barth and others. In recent years there have been scholars who have attempted to out-Buckle Buckle in the "climatological interpretation" of history. But as a result of intensive investigations, e.g., of Durkheim, Brunhes, Thurnwald, Lowie, Vallaux and others it is impossible to demonstrate a regular or substantial "correlation" between climate, nature and geographical conditions, on the one hand, and economic structure, religion, family life, social organization and polity on the other.[28]

Planned Economy Old and New

Breloer is careful to point out that one should not read modern viewpoints into the concept of Hindu *Planwirtschaft* (planned economy). But all the same, he would not like that this special feature of Indian economy should be ignored.[29] It does not escape him that the "ideology of modern socialistic origin in the interpretation of ancient conditions is a disturbing guest." The difficulties of comparison are not ignored. But he does not object to the use of expressions which enables a certain world of ideas that lies near to us in point of time to be brought into the neighbourhood of equalization or

28 See the examination of the geographical monist Huntington's theories in Sorokin: *Contemporary Sociological Theories* (New York 1928) pp. 123, 137-158, 186-193.

29 Vol. III, pp. 73, 360.

similarity. This sort of tentative efforts at establishing what may be called rough equations between the nearest approximations (or approaches to similarity) is certainly the only course open in a scientific investigation of values.

In spite of his formal warning Breloer has given reasons to understand that in connection with the Kauṭalyan polity he is using "planned economy" in the contemporary "anti-liberal" sense and that his sentiments lean towards anti-liberalism. His work is therefore bound to be the butt of much criticism from the standpoint of modern economics. One cannot help feeling that this huge tome of some 600 pages is essentially a study in contemporary planned economy. Indeed, this is apparent in the very title. Only the illustrations have been drawn from Kauṭalya. In other words, Kauṭalya has been presented virtually as an anticipator of economic planning. This is a serious proposition and eminently open to challenge.

Economic planning is indeed in one sense such a simple, elementary and human category that almost every individual even of the most primitive times may be said to be an economic planner in so far as he makes provisions for the future. Similarly every state that makes a yearly budget is also used to planning out the future ahead.

In a more limited sense, economic planning implies the intervention of the state in the private economy of its citizens. This also is almost an eternal as well as a universal fact of history from the earliest times. The regulation of prices, wages and interest, the prescriptions as to the kind of food grains to grow, the control of commerce

by tolls, excise and customs, the redistribution of national wealth and income by taxation and currency manipulations, and of course the promotion of public health, *vidyās*, *kalās*, arts and sciences etc. have been the regular features of state activities in the East and the West.

One can say, therefore, that man as a political animal has been practising planned economy all through history without knowing it or using the word. Thus considered, even the alleged "liberal" states have not been less used to it than the "conservative" states. *Planwirtschaft* cannot by any means be regarded as the exclusive or special achievement of Hindu or Oriental genius. Nor did the West have to wait until the *"neueste Zeit"* (most recent times) to commence the A. B. C. of this *Fürsorgestaat* philosophy. Breloer is extremely out of the mark in this discussion.

It is too well known that the *ager publicus* (public domain) was the mainstay of public finance at Rome even under the Empire. The place of "state-property" and "state monopolies" in French finance was very high, as one learns from Brissaud's *Histoire du Droit Public Français* and Leroy-Beaulieu's *Traité de la Science des Finances*. The system of public granaries (Breloer's *Reservepolitik*, *Magasinpolitik*) was established by Augustus in order to mitigate the evils of a famine. On the occasion of a famine in Marcus Aurelius's time the Roman Empire organized a seven year supply of provisions. The institution was championed by Thomas Mun in *England's Treasure by Forraign Trade* and Jean Bodin in *Les six Livres de la République*. The idea of a war-chest was popular with the Hohenzollerns from Frederick the Great to Wilhelm II.

Students of anthropology and economic history will admit that Europe does not have to get admitted into a Freshman class, as Breloer seems to suggest, for elementary lessons in economic planning as understood in primitive, ancient, medieval or even pre-war modern times. But economic planning is, after all, not an old category. It is a post-war phenomenon and must not be confounded with what looked like it in previous epochs. Historically, it is not older than 1928 when it was set in motion in Soviet Russia under the name of *Gosplan* (state-planning). Since then it has been formally adopted in Italy, Germany and the U. S. A. and to a certain extent in Japan and informally in Great Britain.

Economic planning as thus circumscribed, i.e., in its latest phase, is a socio-financial complex comprising the following items:

1. A definite goal of economic or social welfare.
2. A definite period of time within which the goal is to be realized.
3. A definite portion of the state budget earmarked for the realization of the goal.
4. Intervention of the state in private affairs in order to carry out the programme indicated in the first three points.

These four items taken together should be regarded as the irreducible minimum of planned economy that has become a common place of public life today. It is so extraordinarily new that nowhere has anybody dared introduce it for more than a fixed number of years. And even during the course of these short periods every statesman's position has been shaking.

Besides, state intervention in the ordinary sense of suggestion, advice or general legislation is not the item in question, because this belongs to every state as a matter of course. It is not even public ownership, or state management and control, because all this "socialism" belongs virtually to every state. The novelty of the present situation is to be found in a peculiar "dictatorship" limited for certain defined purposes to fixed periods.

This intervention is an ideological cognate or agnate of the war-communism (1914-18) or dictatorship of the state, of which it is indeed virtually an immediate successor. Some amount of "dictatorship" is by all means associated with this category. But it is not the dictatorship of Imperial despots, "enlightened" as they were, like the Mauryas, the Roman Emperors, the Bourbons, Frederick, Peter and Joseph. In the present instances the dictatorship is that of a party which covers if not the entire nation, at any rate, a very large section of the population, and which happens to have taken possession of the state (e.g., Russia, Italy, and Germany). Or, as in the U.S.A., Japan and England the Parliaments have by constitutional and legal methods virtually conferred dictatorial privileges on the party in power.

The fact that an individual like the *Duce*, the *Führer*, the leader, is always lording it over in some of the "planned economy" -regions does not eclipse the great reality that today we are dealing not with individuals, but with the huge masses of men and women, the folk, who as Party are enjoying the dictatorship.

Economic planning, as defined by Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler and Roosevelt as well as the Seiyukai Party and British National Administration of today was not and

could not be understood by Kauṭalya as it was not and could not be understood by the past masters of centralization, administrative unification as well as promoters of welfare in Roman and Elizabethan times, in the *ancien regime* as well as in the Hohenzollern epoch. It is in the interest of economics, politics and sociology as well as of indology that we should save ourselves from the tendency to use ultra-modern categories in connection with old Hindu institutions and theories.

In his economic and social policies Hitler the national-socialist is not identical with Bismarck the nationalist, and is of course at poles asunder from Frederick the Great. There cannot be any equation between the economic planning of the *Nazi* state and that of the "enlightened despots." Exactly in the same manner is it impossible to establish any equation between the *de facto* "planned economy" measures of the British Cabinet today and the Elizabethan *Fürsorgestaat* or state intervention in private economy. Kauṭalyan economy does not contain anything more than what is to be found in Diocletian, Elizabeth, Colbert and so forth. When all these considerations are taken into account the category *Planwirtschaft* should not be employed in connection with the economic measures of the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra*.

The economic planning of today is a very complicated affair. In spite of the differences in methods and tactics between Bolshevism, Fascism, Nationalsocialism, Anglo-American liberalism and Japanese "paternalism" the capitalists and employers in each and every region have come under the sway of one or other brand of socialism or communism embodied as it is in trade unions and other labour institutions. The world is witnessing every-

where a peculiarly new socio-economic *Gestalt*, configuration, or form-totality in which capitalism happens to be multiplied or modified and moderated by socialism. The systems of today may be described as belonging to neo-capitalism. On the other hand, the technocratic revolutions and rationalizations have served to initiate and promote centralization and administrative unification of the highest order. It is this "neo-capitalistic" centralization that furnishes the fundamental logic of planned economy in the post-war world. To attempt to think of or even insinuate such a technique while in the atmosphere of Kauṭalya would be as unhistorical and unscientific as to do so in the perspective of Diocletian or Louis XIV.

One is at liberty to have own's own views in regard to the methods and problems of contemporary societal remaking. Economic planning happens to be a phase, the most recent phase of applied economics, sociology and politics in Eur-America, nay, in Asia too. One can understand its origins and necessities as one can appreciate also the origins and necessities of *laisser faire*, economic freedom, democracy and "liberalism." The one system is as relative to world-conditions as the other. But in order to justify a measure that one considers to be very necessary for today it should be as utterly unwarrantable to father it upon an ancinet Hindu statesman as upon an ancient European.

Had Breloer only cared to make a passing remark just by way of "suggestive" reference in order to point out what he considers to be an "approximate parallel" the situation would not have been so damaging. But he has seriously set himself to establish a thesis on what may be

called the Kauṭalyan anticipation of planned economy. The effort is regrettable in view of the fact that his intensive analysis of the financial data as available in the *Arthaśāstra* is marked generally by sound judgment and critical scholarship. He uses a commonplace category, "economic planning", without distinguishing its old and new contents and has led the readers to suspect that the latest contents of this category are to be discovered in the ancient Hindu statesman of the Hellenistic period. This attempt should not appear to be more reasonable than that of discovering a modern British Cabinet in the royal councils of the *Rāmāyaṇa* or a modern League of Nations in some of the inter-tribal assemblies of the *Mahābhārata*.

Doses of Economic Freedom in the Arthaśāstra

At one point, while speaking of gilds, Breloer makes the categorical statement that the concept of professional freedom (*Gewerbe-freiheit*) is utterly unknown (*völlig unbekannt*).[30] At another point, however, we are told that the state planning does not function in any way as a disturbing factor because as a result of long experience "private initiative" was afforded the "widest space," scope or chance. Further, says he, it is not the regulations of planned economy but the incorporation of precautionary measures that furnishes the practical item in the Kauṭalyan system of economic control.

He has not made it clear as to how professional freedom could be entirely lacking although economic planning left loopholes for freedom. Had Breloer sought to place the data of the *Arthaśāstra* in the perspective of the

30 Vol III. pp. 363, 367, 548.

European craft-guilds and gild-merchants as well as the economic policies of the Western states during certain periods of ancient and medieval history, he might have discovered something more universal than the alleged Kauṭalyan patent of "economic planning." He might have felt that there was nothing exceptional or extraordinary in the Kauṭalyan policy, but that certain doses of freedom as well as certain doses of restraint, control and guidance were being normally administered at the same time by the state-systems of the East and the West.

Society and State in Hindu Politics

The present writer notes with interest that since he raised the cry against Max Müller's over-emphasis on metaphysics and religion in the survey of Hindu culture scholars at home and abroad have cared to turn to its "positive" and secular aspects. Breloer also observes that in Max Müller's presentation the diversities in the tendencies of the Indians were exceedingly underestimated.[31] This does not however enable Breloer to fully realize the volume and weight of the non-religious and non-philosophical strands of Hindu thought. He cannot get away from the fact that, on the whole, Indian literature was maintained and cultivated almost exclusively by the Brāhmaṇs, and that the entire literature with which he has to deal for his researches is somehow religious.

This attitude of Breloer's does not appear to be reasonable. Even supposing that the state and its seven limbs are described in part or in full in certain texts that

31 Vol. III, p. 60.

are known to be religious it does not imply that the state activities are not worldly and materialistic. The Hindu books were as a rule encyclopaedic and almost every treatise tried to deal with the whole duty of man. Naturally, therefore, *kāma, artha,* and *dharma* came to be discussed along with *mokṣa* in almost every work. The presentation of all the diverse interests of man in one complex does not render *artha* or *kāma* less positive and non-religious.[31]

The Vedas are supposed to be religious works. But the relations between the folk and the ruler that are described or referred to therein are anything but religious. *Atharva Veda* is more secular than many secular treatises. In the *Brāhmaṇas* one comes across more worldly ambitions than other-worldly ones. The *Dharma-sūtras, Dharma-śāstras* and *Smriti-śāstras* are again held as canonical treatises. But the daily duties of the individual, the rites and ceremonies of the family, inheritance and partition of property, the functions of kings, etc. that form the principal contents of these works are nothing but secular. Breloer quotes with approval the historically unfounded and anthropologically fallacious remark of Emil Sénart evidently from the latter's *Les Castes dans l'Inde* to the effect that "the ancient Indians did not at all know any state," because the state was extremely dependent on the society.[32] According to Breloer the "statal organization could hardly be recognised beside the society" and the state was simply the protector of the social order. From this is said to follow the doctrine of *dharma* being above or going before *artha*. The state is alleged to be in

32 Vol. III. pp. 68-70.

no way contained in the society but to stay apart from and opposed to it.

Both Sénart and Breloer have managed to ignore the *daṇḍa*, the punishment, the "sanction," which keeps the castes or the social orders each to its *svadharma* or discharge of one's own duties. And the *daṇḍa* is wielded by the state through its executive, the King. The Hindu theory of state is based on the *dictum*, no *daṇḍa*, no *dharma*, i.e., no king, no society. It is the state that is personified in the king as one of its seven limbs. In other words, the right attitude in regard to Hindu politics would consist in admitting that there is no society, morality, duty etc., possible without state. The state is the "cause" of social order.[33]

In regard to the theories of Hindu politics Breloer has not been able to go beyond the conventional. Be it observed *en passant* that Hillebrandt's *Altindische Politik* (Jena 1923) tried to introduce German indology to some fruitful ideas in the field of Hindu polity and is well calculated to counteract the traditional orientalism in so far as it is manifest in Breloer.

As Breloer has been attempting an analytical and objective excavation into the *Arthaśāstra* and allied works from far and near it should perhaps be deemed reasonable to try to discover the theories of the Hindu state and society on the basis of the new facts that are being unearthed. In the mean time it is not prudent to make uncritical use of the ready-made theories of the last generation of indologists, for they may need to be modified in the light of the new data.

33 See "The Hindu Theory of Property, Law and Social Order" in B. K. Sarkar, The *Political Institutions*, etc. (1922).

Kauṭalya and His Boswell

In regard to the alleged Maurya *milieu* of the *Arthaśāstra* materials or contents the Indian tradition remains unproven after thirty years of strenuous studies in Kauṭalyalogy. On the other hand, the arguments advanced against the Indian tradition from all sides have failed to prove anything. The benefit of doubt is therefore in favour of the Indian tradition to the effect that the *Arthaśāstra* is the work of the Maurya, especially of the Chandraguptan epoch.

In regard to the second question, namely that about the authorship, likewise, nothing conclusive has yet been advanced to prove that Kauṭalya, the minister of Chandragupta Maurya, is the author of the *Arthaśāstra* in the form in which we have it. But, on the other hand, it is possible to argue strongly against its being *entirely* the work of one man and to suspect that somebody who is not Kauṭalya the minister himself has had a hand in its preparation. Although Kauṭalyan and Maurya in the main, the *Arthaśāstra* has therefore to be regarded as a compilation in the making of which a non-Kauṭalyan hand has to be admitted. These non-Kauṭalyan traces are separate from the eventual interpolations of words or phrases that may have crept in subsequently. The non-Kauṭalyan hand is to be seen in the substantial portions or main *corpus* of the work itself. We are speaking of the man who virtually "made" Kauṭalya and started the tradition about him.

The most commonsense and matter of fact view of the last chapter of the *Arthaśāstra* ought to be (1) that the writer of this chapter is not the same man as Kauṭalya, (2) that Kauṭalya is a famous name and is very highly adored by the writer, and (3) that the writer has collected

together the Kauṭalyan ideas for publication under his editorship. As for the relation in which the writer of the last chapter stands to Kauṭalya two alternatives may be suggested. First, the writer is a pupil, colleague or secretary of Kauṭalya. Or perhaps the writer is exploiting Kauṭalya's name in order to palm his own ideas off as Kauṭalyan. Now, it appears that there is nobody to challenge the alleged Kauṭalyan authorship of the main body of the book. It has, therefore, been accepted by the people as emanating from Kauṭalya himself on the assurance or authority of the editor, i.e., the writer of the last chapter. The origin of the Indian tradition about the Kauṭalyan school or system may have to be sought in these circumstances. The tradition may have been started by this editor and it caught the imagination of the folk or the literary public.

The very opening lines of the first chapter say that the work is a summary and compilation from the works of previous authors. This statement may have been written by the writer of the last chapter, i.e., the editor or publisher, who was perhaps himself a compiler or the compiler-in-chief.

All those 72 places in which Kauṭalya has been quoted by name as against other professors of *Nīti* or *Artha* philosophy indicate, likewise, that a person who is different from Kauṭalya has been at work. No normal-minded person can ever believe that Kauṭalya as author was mentioning himself in the third person as arrayed against others in the discussions. The style indicates that diverse views were presented by a student of comparative politics and that in his judgment Kauṭalya loomed large.

All through this work we have to feel the breath of

two persons. The first is the hero, the demigod, the *avatāra*, Kauṭalya himself. The second is the person who is making Kauṭalya the subject of his study, propaganda, glorification and what not. This second man may be regarded as Kauṭalya's editor, publisher, advertiser etc., as the person who places Kauṭalya before the world of letters, who institutes comparisons between Kauṭalya and his precursors, and who narrates to mankind all that this superman is alleged to have accomplished. This man is Kauṭalya's Boswell,—a St. Paul to the Jesus of Nazareth. Whether there was a Viṣṇugupta, Chāṇakya, Kauṭalya or Kauṭilya we do not know, nay, need not know. His Boswell has created such a living personality, such a veritable *avatāra* like Vālmīki his Rāma that the actual historicity of Kauṭalya becomes a question of eighth-rate importance. Thanks to the brilliant propaganda made by this pious Anonym the *Arthaśāstra* passed into the literary tradition of India as an integral part of the folk's political consciousness.

The Boswell and the Johnson, the St. Paul and the Jesus are two different persons by all means. But they are contemporaries, they belong to the same age like Vālmīki and Rāma. In the present instance the *Arthaśāstra* belongs to the Maurya epoch as the Indian tradition has been created by the editor. Thus considered, the situation is quite akin to or rather almost identical with Hillebrandt's hypothesis in 1908 about the school or pupils of Kauṭalya as being responsible for the *Arthaśāstra* as compiled in the form in which we have it today. This school constitutes, however, the immediate *entourage* of the master himself and does not have to be regarded as any the least remote from him in time.

The Indian tradition about the Kauṭalyan authorship is not marred by the recognition of the second person, the Boswell, in the *Arthaśāstra* complex. Nor is the Maurya *milieu* of the work tampered with because of this circumstance. The suggested dichotomy into the editor and Kauṭalya does not lead us to the position of Winternitz about the negation of Kauṭalya and the Maurya origin or to that of D. R. Bhandarkar who suggests that the school may have been established and the finishing touch imparted shortly before the time of Kāmandaka, i.e., several centuries after the age of Chandragupta Maurya. In the scheme suggested in the present edition, the Indian tradition does not have to be discarded or modified in any way, because the tradition may have been created by the Boswellism of the editor. Let us go further.

Even if in the last analysis Kauṭalya should turn out to be a contemporary of Kālidāsa (fourth-fifth century A.C.) and a citizen of the Gupta Empire the Maurya *milieu* of the *Arthaśāstra* cannot be negatived by any means. We ought never to overlook the fact that the author or editor of this treatise commences his work by saying categorically that he prepared it by condensing "almost all" the *Arthaśāstras* that had been composed by "old masters." One does not know how much or how little of originality is to be ascribed to the Kauṭalyan summary or compilation. But it is reasonable to believe that plenty of data bearing on olden times,—Maurya, pre-Maurya and what not,—are to be discovered in this work.

The Indian tradition about the Maurya origin of the *Arthaśāstra* remains unshaken in spite of the desperate

efforts, mostly illogical although learned as they are, of Jolly, Stein, Winternitz, Keith and Johnston.

It is worth while to mention, as has been indicated previously, that the controversy has not taken the form of Indian *vs.* European. Among the Europeans themselves there have been two camps since the very beginning. Pre-war indology in Germany, so far as Kauṭalyalogy is concerned, yielded the following situation :

For Indian Tradition	Against Indian Tradition
Jacobi	Jolly.

In the Jolly-Jacobi controversy Hillebrandt was virtually neutral. He did not commit himself to any definite date. At any rate he did not maintain in so many words that the *Arthaśāstra* was post-Maurya or un-Maurya.

In that controversy the British indologist Smith was on Jacobi's side although he does not appear to have referred to the latter by name. To the same camp belonged two other British indologists, J. F. Fleet and F. W. Thomas.

Subsequent Kauṭalyalogy in Germany yields the following situation :

For Indian Tradition	Against Indian Tradition.
Jacobi (unshaken still)	Jolly (aggressive)
Meyer (aggressive)	Stein (somewhat objective and tentative)
Breloer (aggressive)	Winternitz (aggressive)

In this latter-day controversy the British indologist Keith belongs to the Jolly group and is therefore opposed to his compatriot Smith. Be it noted *enpassant* that Winternitz, although writing in German, is Czechoslovak by nationality.

Among the British indologists the following grouping may be noticed :

For Indian Tradition	Against Indian Tradition
Smith	Keith
Fleet	Johnston.
Thomas	
Pargiter	
Monahan	

Among Italian indologists both Formichi and Bottazzi are on the side of the Indian tradition. In Mario Vallauri's Italian translation of Book I. there is no discussion of the Kauṭalya question. But as the work was done under the guidance of Jolly at Würzburg he may perhaps find himself against the Indian tradition.

It is interesting that in these things European scholarship goes very often along the lines of *gurus* as in ancient India.

Thus we have already the following :

	Guru	Pupil		Tendency
1.	Winternitz	Stein	:	Against Indian Tradition
2.	Jacobi	Breloer	:	For Indian Tradition.

As long as a tradition is there about the Maurya *milieu* of the text and its author it is for the anti-tradition party to adduce internal and external evidences such as may demolish the tradition. Unfortunately, up till now the evidences advanced are poor and mostly in the nature of (1) probabilities, (2) guesses, (3) *argumentum ex silentio*, (4) postulates about the interval between a borrower and his original, (5) comparison with a foreigner who was known in some circles as a liar and whose objectivity is very often questionable, and (6) hypothesis as to the probable degree of technocratic, industrial, political and juridical developments in pre-Christian India. Naturally

the logic behind such arguments cannot appear to be convincing.

Last but not least, the anti-tradition group is not adequately oriented to the implications of its admission that the *Arthaśāstra* is the work of a scholar (Paṇḍit). In so far as it is such a work it cannot and ought not as a matter of course to be called in for evidence for the objective account about social, economic, legal or political conditions. Every attempt on this basis is likely to be *ultra vires*.

As for the Indian Kauṭalyalogists, all of whom virtually belong to the pro-tradition group (with the exception of R. G. Bhandarkar and Pran Nath), it is time for them to accept the proposition referred to above, namely, that the *Arthaśāstra* is a *darśanam*, a *śāstra*, a book of *vidyā* and just like other *śāstras* of Hindu literature written by a Paṇḍit. It contains pious wishes of all sorts, norms, platitudes, ideals, duties, things that ought to be done, and what not, such as belong to every philosophical treatise. Besides, it is impossible to argue out of existence the innumerable hair-splitting groupifications, the hyper-logical discussions *pro* and *contra*, etc., in the manner of the Sākyan (Buddhist) *Nikāyas*, for instance, that mark many of the chapters.

The very last chapter of the *Arthaśāstra* describing the thirty-two *tantra yuktis* is a good illustration of the grammatical mood and ultralogical classifying mentality in which the treatise often appears to us. All these philosophical and logical aspects, be it observed once more, can tally quite well with the profoundly realistic, objective, statistical and statemanlike grasp of the realities of flesh and blood that constitute the seven-limbed (*saptāmga*) organism known as the state.

And finally, this leads to the item to which Indian indologists have likewise need to be adequately oriented, namely, that many of the ideals, *dharma* (duties), norms etc. expounded in the *Arthaśāstra* are frankly and hundred per cent Machiavellian. It is fallacious to believe that "ideals" and "pious wishes" must always be holy, humane, high-souled, or philanthropic as one generally understands them according to one's lights. The Machiavellian ideals are also ideals,—and whatever they may mean,—have never been seriously repudiated in the *Realpolitik* as well as in the political philosophy of the world.[34] As an exponent of Machiavellism Kauṭalya is in excellent company, Eastern and Western, and the *Arthaśāstra* is one of the greatest works of mankind in the realm of political ethics or logic (*Staatsräson*). It is a glory to the Hindu brain that this powerfully conceived philosophical masterpiece on the problems and solutions of group life, of man in society, and of man in state has not been excelled, so far as it goes, in any quarter of the globe and in any epoch of culture-history.

If our Mother India is great and divine because she gave birth to a Śākya the Buddha (Awakened), let us all worship our Mother India as equally great and divine because she produced a Viṣṇugupta-Chāṇakya, the Kauṭalya or the Kauṭilya (Cunning or Crooked). It is in this worship that we do justice to the glorious "positive background" of Hindu sociology as furnishing the folk-elements, the materialistic complex, the worldly group-consciousness and the rationalistic perspectives of India's transcendental and spiritual achievements. Kauṭalya completes Buddha.

34 For the diverse aspects of Machiavellism see B. K. Sarkar: *Hindu Politics in Italian* (Pos. Back. Vol. II. Part II.).

CHAPTER IX

FROM KAUTALYA TO VARĀHAMIHIRA

(*c. B.C. 300-600 A.C.*)

It was a new India, this India of the Guptas—a new stage, new actors, and what is more, a new outlook. Extensive deplomatic relations with foreign powers, military renown of *digvijaya* at home, overthrow of the "barbarians" on the western borderland, international trade, maritime activity, expansion of the motherland, missionising abroad, the blending of races by which the flesh and blood of the population was almost renewed, and social transformation as epoch-making as the first Aryanization itself—all these ushered in the fourth and fifth centuries of the Christian era a thorough rejuvenation and a complete overhauling of the old order of things in Hindustan.

This is one aspect of the age of Kālidāsa as described twenty years ago in another context.[1]

A consideration of equal if not greater significance about Kālidāsa was also noted.

With the establishment of the Guptas at Pāṭaliputra, it was pointed out, we enter modern India. The currency of thought, the conventions and technique of life obtaining in the age of the *Raghuvaṁśa* are almost the same as today, but the Hindus of the age of the *Arthaśāstra* or even of Aśvaghoṣa's *Awakening of Faith in the*

1 Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916) pp. 208, 217-218, 226.

Mahāyāna thought in other terms and lived in other spheres.

And in the message of Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa* we have a synthesis of opposites,—the Machiavellian Kauṭalya shaking hands with the Nirvānist Śākyasimha. Here are secularism and other-worldlyism welded together into one artistic whole, a full harmony of comprehensive life.

A great deal of the Pali texts—the *Piṭakas* and the *Jātakas*—discussed in a previous connection belongs to the period between the Mauryas and the Guptas (c B.C. 325-A.C. 550). The economic, political, juridical and social *data* of this vast literature constitute therefore some solid foundations of Hindu positivism for about eight to nine hundred years.

Two important works in Pali deserve special mention in this connection. They are the Ceylonese chronicles, namely[2]:

1. The *Dīpavamśa* (Chronicle of the Island of Ceylon) in verse (c 300 A.C.).
2. The *Mahāvamśa* (c 500 A.C.) a reconstruction of the *Dīpavamśa*.

Mahāyāna Humanism

The Buddhist *milieu* of this period, extensive as it is, has to be seen also in the tremendous amount of literature produced in Sanskrit. Students of Hindu politics as well as Sanskrit language and literature as a rule have bestowed but a stepmotherly attention on this mass of Sanskrit Buddhist texts.

2 B. C. Law: *History of Pali Literature* Vol. II. (London 1933) pp. 518, 548.

For the purpose of studies in secular life and institutions these texts are exceedingly valuable. They are mostly in the form of biographies, legends or legendary biographies and biographical legends bearing on Śākya who in most of this literature is not a mere man or monk or prophet, but a veritable god, the Buddha. These stories of new or rather the only Buddhism, i.e., the Buddha-cult, strictly so called, are as important in Indian social and moral thought as the *Jātakas*, the stories of Sākyaism, i.e., of old Buddhism (*Hīnayāna*).

Although some of these texts bearing on the new Buddhism (*Mahāyāna*) possess psychological and purely "theological" interest, most of them are ethical addressed to the great problem of the remaking of man.

Some of the more important of the Sanskrit Buddhist texts and their authors are being enumerated below:[3]

1. The *Mahāvastu* (the Book of Great Events), the life of Buddha in "mixed Sanskrit" (*c* B.C. 150—*c* A.C. 300).
2. *Avadānaśataka* (*c* 150 B.C.).
3. *Karmaśataka* (*c* 150 B.C.).
4. *Aśvaghoṣa* (*c* 100 A.C.) a contemporary of Kāṇiṣka, and a founder of *Mahāyāna* Buddhism:
   - i. *Buddhacharita*, a poem
   - ii. *Saundarānanda*, a poem
   - iii. *Sutrālamkāra*, legends in prose and verse based on the *Jātakas* and the *Avadānas*.

3 G. K. Nariman: *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism* (Bombay 1935) pp. 18, 28-36, 41-75, 92-97, 100.

5. Nāgārjuna (c 150 A.C.), another founder of *Mahāyāna*:
   i. *Mādhyamikasūtra*
   ii. *Mādhyamikakārikā*
   iii. *Dharmasamgraha.*
6. The *Divyāvadāna* (c 200 A.C.) which contains *Aśokāvadāna* in chs. XXVI—XXIX.
7. The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (Lotus of the Good Law), in prose and *gāthā* (verse) in "mixed Sanskrit" (c 200 A.C.).
8. The *Karaṇḍavyūha* (c 200 A.C.) of the Bodhisattva, available in two recensions, prose and verse.
9. The *Sukhāvatīvyūha* (The Land of Bliss) c. 200 A.C.
10. Āryadeva (c 250 A.C.), described as a great master of Mahāyāna by Itsing and Yuan Chwang.
    i. *Śataka chatuśataka*
    ii. *Śatakaśāstra.*
11. Vasuvandhu Asanga (c 350 A.C.).
    i. *Abhidharmakoṣa* in *sūtras* and *kārikās.*
    ii. *Gāthāsamgraha*
    iii. *Paramārtha Saptati*
12. Āryasūra (c 350 A.C.): *Jātakamālā* (*Bodhisattva Avadāna-mālā*).
13. The *Lalitavistara* (Life of Buddha) (c 400 A.C.).
14. The *Lamkāvatāra* (c 550 A.C.).
15. Śāntideva (c 650 A.C.).
    i. *Śikṣāsamuchchaya*
    ii. *Sūtrasamuchchaya*
    iii. *Bodhicharyāvatāra.*

As usual, most of the dates are questionable. The relative chronology also is not to be depended upon.

It is this Buddhist Sanskrit literature that furnishes the spiritual inspiration for the peoples of Central Asia, China, Korea, Japan, and Tibet. It is to these texts that the "Greater India" movement of the epoch of the first six or seven centuries of the Christian era owed its *raison d'être*.

In the history of Hindu positivism no documents are more valuable than these Sanskrit Buddhist texts. The *Mahāyāna* mentality is the most profoundly humanist mentality, the *Weltanschauung* of service to mankind and martyrdom in the interest of the oppressed and the suppressed, the lowliest and the miserablest.

On the one hand, we have in these documents the most glorious Bibles of selfless social service. On the other hand, they contain the most optimistic messages of unending hope, of eternal possibilities of perfection (*pāramitā*) and of the diverse pragmatic ways to salvation for the meanest creature on earth. It is in the atmosphere of these humane and humanitarian stories, legends, ideals and fancies that the energism of men and women for whom the *Artha*, *Nīti* and other technically sociopolitical *Śāstras* were composed was nurtured.

In Śāntideva's *Sikṣāsamuchchaya* we have a passage describing the ten things by which a Bodhisattva acquires power. The passage is quoted by the author from a work entitled *Tathāgataguhya-sūtra*.[4] "How, O Great King," it is asked, " a Bodhisattva gives up his body and life,

4 M. Winternitz: "Notes on the *Guhya samaja Tantra* and the Age of the Tantras" in the *I.H.Q.*, March 1933, Haraprasad Memorial.

but he does not give up the Good Religion? He bows before all beings and does not allow his pride to rise. He has patience with the feeble beings and does not put any difficulties in their way. He gives up the best excellent food to the beings who are suffering from hunger. He gives security to those beings who fear. He is full of zeal for the complete healing of the sick. He satisfies the poor with riches. He repairs the shrines of the Tathāgata by lumps of plaster. He brings glad tidings to the beings. He shares his possessions with the poor and the unfortunate. He bears the burden of those who are weary and exhausted."

The Positivism of the Jaina Siddhānta

To the two classes of Buddhist texts, Pali and Sanskrit, have to be added the Prakrit texts of Jainism. The Jaina canon known as the *Siddhānta* was "written down" in present form about 550 A.C. We are to understand, however, that the Jaina social philosophy was a formative force in the intellectual and cultural world of India under the Mauryas, Āndhras, Kuṣaṇas, Vākāṭakas, Bhāraśivas and the Guptas.

The Jaina *Angas* and *Dasāos* are like the Buddhist texts full of anecdotes and stories. The psychological and ethical discussions or commands in this Prakrit literature are brought out in and through extremely realistic and secular descriptions of villages and cities as well as of economic, political and social life. Works like the *Uvāsagadasāo*[5] (The Religious Profession of a Uvāsaga),

5 See A. F. R. Hoernle's translation of the *Uvāsaga dasāo* (Bibliotheca Indica Series, Calcutta 1888); L. D. Barnett's translation of the

the *Antagada-dasāo*, the *Anuttaro vavai-dasāo* and the like are quite rich in the data of secular life and worldly interests, although meant to be treatises for monks and ascetics. For certain purposes these *Dasāos* may be treated like the *Panchatantra*, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* etc. Certainly they deserve recognition by students of the *Dharma-Artha-Kāma* complex as contributions from the angle of Jaina idealists or Utopists.

The positivism of the Jainas is embodied in the doctrine of four gifts (*āhārābhayabhaiṣajyasāstrādāna*).[6] In the remaking of personality the Jaina social philosophy's contribution consists in emphasizing the supreme need of service to others. The first service is the gift of food (*āhāra*), the second that of *abhaya* i.e. courage (non-fear or protection), the third that of *bhaiṣajya* (medicine), and the fourth that of *śāstra* (learning).

The *Siddhānta* comprises 45 texts grouped as follows:[7]

1. *Angas*: 11 or 12 (one missing)
2. *Upāngas*: 12
3. *Painnas*: 10
4. *Chheda sūtras*: 6
5. *Sūtras*: i. *Nandī*
   ii. *Anuyogadvāram*
6. *Mūlasūtras*: 4

Antagadodasāo and *Anuttarovavaiya-dasāo* (Oriental Translation Fund, London 1907).

6 Inscription in Banasamkari temple at Udri in Sorab, Shimoga District, Mysore, cited in R. Shamasastry: *Evolution of Indian Polity* (Calcutta 1920) p. 101.

7 *Weber's Sacred Literature of the Jains* transl. by H. W. Smith for the *Indian Antiquary* (Bombay) October 1888, p. 285.

In the Jaina as in the Buddhist atmosphere the gods do not play a prominent part. Nay, in Vedic and post-Vedic Brāhmaṇism also the rôle of the gods, strictly speaking, is rather subordinate. Positivism is the fundamental feature of all the Indian systems.

In the system of the Vedic Brāhmaṇas it is on account of the efficacy of the sacrifice that the gods are compelled to capitulate (*les dieux se voient obligés de capituler*) and the sacrificer rises to the celestial world and is assured a definite place for the future.[8] Man is made super-human. It is man and his energy that are really adored through the sacrifices. The *milieu* is humanistic and secular.

This philosophy of the sacrifice pervades not only the *Upaniṣads* but Buddhism and Jainism also in spite of the prejudice of the last two systems against sacrifice. The concept of the *Riṣi* who without the help of the gods and often against their will (*sans l'aide des dieux et souvent contre leur gré*) discovers by the sole force of his intelligence the ritual or the formula which assures the success is the immediate precursor of that of the Buddhas and the Jainas who discover the way to salvation by direct intuition and spontaneous enlightenment. It is not by chance that the sacred words of the *Arhat* and the Buddha figure already in the *Brāhmaṇas*. The very dogmas which these words symbolize reside also there in germ and are already in the process of growth. It is the touch of humanism and positivism that makes the diverse Indian systems kin.

8 S. Lévi: *La Doctrine du Sacrifice dans les Brahmanas* (Paris 1898) pp. 9-12.

Dharmaśāstras (Smritis)

The compilers of the leading *Dharma sūtras (śāstras)*[9] during the epoch from Kauṭalya to Varāhamihira were as follows:

1. Viṣṇu (c 250 A.C.)
2. Śankha (c 300 A.C.)
3. Yājnavalkya (c 350 A.C.)
4. Nārada (c 500 A.C.)
5. Brihaspati (c 550 A.C.)
6. Kātyāyana (c 550 A.C.)

The political (*Artha*) tradition was kept up by the *Dharmaśāstras* during this period as before.

It is to be recalled, as observed above (p. 203), that the *Dharma* or *Smriti* treatises are mainly books on "private" law (i.e. the law of family and property) while the *Artha* and *Niti* treatises are books on "public" law (i.e. constitution or polity).

Let us see a bit of the private law as expounded by Nārada, a leading jurist of the Gupta Empire.

Nārada's exposition of private law commanded authority as well as a considerable degree of popularity in mediaeval India. A large part of his doctrines was incorporated sometimes without acknowledgment, in the works of subsequent writers on both civil and criminal law, while commentators ascribed to him all sorts of important texts bearing on legal institutions. Definitely secular and legalistic in his approach, Nārada emphasized

9 P. V. Kane: *History of Dharmasastras* Vol. I. (Poona 1930) pp. 59, 69, 79, 148, 187, 205, 210, 218, Winternitz: *Geschichte* III, 482, 498, 500. See the Chapter on "the concept of law" in A. K. Sen: *Studies in Hindu Political Thought* (Calcutta 1925) pp. 85-134.

the rule of reason as a source of law and maintained that where the sacred precept was at variance with custom, the latter should prevail.

Nārada's code of law deals in the introductory chapter with legal procedure, complaints and courts of justice. Then the law is classified under eighteen titles similar to those of Manu, except the minor differences and the fact that Nārada eschews entirely the social and religious items contained in the former's encyclopaedic treatise. Nārada's classification includes debt, deposits, partnership, breach of labour contracts, boundary disputes, marital relations, inheritance and heinous offences. Like Manu and Yājnavalkya he is liberal and sympathetic in his treatment of the rights of illegitimates, permitting an illegitimate son to inherit his maternal grandfather's property (xiii : 18). But he differs substantially from these authorities in that he holds that even the youngest son, "if able," may govern the family and manage its property (xiii : 5) and allows a father to distribute the property among his sons in whatever proportion he desires (xiii : 4, 15). In his system the widow may inherit part of her husband's property, while unmarried daughters may share in their father's estate (xiii : 3, 12, 13). The right to divorce and remarriage is allowed to women on many grounds (xii : 96-101). Books xii and xiii of the *Nārada-smriti* are the embodiments of modernism in ancient Hindu conceptions of property and marriage. As the exponent of a secular and realistic view of the law Nārada appears to be as prominent a figure in comparative jurisprudence as is Śukra in comparative politics.

The Tamil Classics

A South Indian classic of this period which may be compared to the finest romances of Sanskrit literature and which enables us to feel a bit of the secular interests of Hindu India is the Tamil work, the *Maṇimekḫalāi*. The kind of Buddhism propagated in and through it appears to have no reference to the *Mahāyāna* system associated with Āryadeva or Nāgārjuna. The romance is evidently *Hīnayāna* in general features.

The *Maṇimekḫalāi* may perhaps be placed in the first or second century A.C.[10]

South Indian culture was Brahmanized, *Piṭakized* and Jainized in succession. The Sanskritization of Tamil culture proceeded step by step.

A prosperous epoch of Tamil literature in Southern India may be taken to have been synchronous with the Empire of the Guptas in Northern India, i.e., the age of Kālidāsa, the *Purāṇas* and the *Mahābhārata*. A Tamil classic, the *Kurāl* by Tiruvallu, which in certain sections, reads almost like the *Gītā*, may be referred to this era. This work, recognized as it was by the third Tamil *Sangam*, deserves a careful analysis by students of social philosophy.

People have detected the ideas of the *Angas* and the *Āgamas*, i.e., Jainism in this Tamil classic (300 A.C.). On the other hand, it exhibits indebtedness to the Kauṭalyan *Arthaśāstra*, coincidences with the *Kāmandakīnīti*, *Manu Samhitā* and the *Mahābhārata*

10 S. K. Aiyangar: "The Buddhism of Manimekhalai" in *Buddhistic Studies* (Calcutta 1931) pp. 10, 13, 16.

(*Bhīṣma Parva*).[11] Be this as it may, this book of verses, complete as it is in 1330 aphoristic stanzas, is divided into three parts according to *trivarga*, i.e., *dharma, artha* and *kāma*. We can then establish to a certain extent a psychological affinity between this South Indian moralist and Bhartrihari, the author of three *śatakas* or centuries of verses, namely, *Śringāraśataka* (on love), *Vairāgyaśataka* (on dispassion), and *Nitiśataka* (on morals and propriety). And in any case the student of positivism can find in this eclectic work a clue to some of the solid foundations of Hindu social life in southern India in the early centuries of the Christian era. It is worth while to observe that *porul* which corresponds to *artha* commands greater attention of the author than the other two interests. Indeed, we may take it almost as a *Kāmandakīnīti* in Tamil.

The Joy of Life in Literature

Secularism, *le joie de vivre*, has been the one grand theme of Hindu *belles lettres*. Political incidents and movements were worked upon by all the leading poets and dramatists. Those who study Hindu poetry, drama, fables and stories do not require to read the *Dharma, Artha* or *Nītiśāstras* separately. The social philosophy of Kauṭalya and Manu is to be found in this creative literature in an artistic form.

11 S. K. Aiyangar: *Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture* (Calcutta 1925) pp. 125-29, 401; V. V. Aiyar: *The Kural or the Maxims of Tiruvalluvar* (Eng. transl.), Shermadevi, 1935.

Among the poets and dramatists who dealt with *Nīti* topics are to be enumerated in a somewhat chronological order the following for the period in question:[12]

1. Bhāsa (*c.* 350 A.C.): *Avimāraka.*
2. Śūdraka (*c.* 400 A.C.) *Mrichchhakaṭika.*
3. Kālidāsa (390-460) *Raghuvamśa.*
4. Bhāravī (*c.* 550 A.C.): *Kirātārjunīyam.*
5. Daṇḍin (*c.* 550 A.C.): *Daśakumāracharita.*
6. Viśākhadatta (*c.* 550 A.C. ?): *Mudrārākṣasa.*

To the same category as the Sanskrit Buddhist legends but more oriented to *Nīti* or political and social thought are the story-books of "Hindu India." Some of them are being named below:[13]

1. The *Tantrākhyāyika* (*c.* 350 A.C.)
2. The *Panchatantra* (*c.* 400 A.C.)
3. The *Brihatkathā* (*c.* 450 A.C.)
4. The *Hitopadeśa* (*c.* 500 A.C.)

The Eighteen Purāṇas

Each one the eighteen *Purāṇas* is an *Encyclopaedia Indica.* Economics, politics, law, social philosophy and morals constitute therefore a great part of this literature. A very substantial portion of these texts may be taken to have come into shape by the time of the Guptas.

The *Matsya Purāṇa* brings the dynastic history to the fall of the Āndhras about 236 A.C.[14] In the *Vāyu,*

12 Winternitz: *Geschichte* (1921) Vol. III., pp. 37, 45, 47. Keith: *History of Sanskrit Literature* (1928) pp. 82, 297; Hillebrandt: "Nitti und Mudrārākṣasa" and "Viśākhadatta" in *Jahresbericht der Sächsischen Gesellschaft für Vaterländische Culture* (Breslau, July 1908).

13 Winternitz: *Geschichte,* Vol. III. p. 37.

14 F. E. Pargiter: *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali*

Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu and *Bhāgavat Purāṇas* the narrative is carried down to the exploits of the Guptas previous to the *digvijaya* (world-conquest) of Samudragupta, say, 335 A.C. As the original authority for the *Matsya* and the *Vāyu* is known to be the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, this last is considered to be the foundation of the entire *Purāṇic* tradition. The *Bhaviṣya* must have been in existence by 250 A.C. according to Pargiter.

The *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* is, it is said, the oldest only in so far as the dynastic lists are concerned. But many of the other *Purāṇas* "must be considerably older."

The *Purāṇas* in the form of definite texts existed in the days of Kauṭalya, i.e., the fourth century B.C. as authoritative works.[15]

Some of the *Purāṇas*, traces of which are not to be found today must have been known to Gautama (*c.* 550 B.C.) and Āpastamba (*c.* 450 B.C.), authors or compilers of *Dharmasūtras*.[16]

The more important *Purāṇas* came into their present shape by the beginning of the sixth century A.C. They may have been brought together for the first time a few centuries earlier. And, of course, the traditions contained in the *Purāṇas* could be older by *many* centuries.

The order in which the eighteen *Purāṇas* are almost uniformly mentioned is given below: 1. *Brahma*, 2. *Padma*, 3. *Viṣṇu*, 4. *Vāyu*, 5. *Bhāgavat*, 6. *Nārada*, 7. *Mārkaṇḍeya*, 8. *Agni*, 9. *Bhaviṣya*, 10. *Brahma-*

Age (Oxford 1913), pp. vii, xlii, xliii, xvii; *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* (London 1922) pp. 49-55.

15 Pargiter: *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* (London 1922) p. 55.

16 Winternitz: *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur* Vol. I. (Leipzig 1909) pp. 441, 445, 451-480.

vaivarta, 11. *Linga*, 12. *Varāha*, 13. *Skanda*, 14. *Vāmana*, 15. *Kūrma*, 16. *Matsya* 17. *Garuḍa*, 18. *Brahmāṇḍa*.

The most important single event of Hindu culture under the Gupta Empire or in the age of Kālidāsa is the recasting, reinterpretation and final redaction of most of the great *Purāṇas*. These are the same texts which for over fifteen hundred years have remained virtually the Bibles of the people for social ethics and civic sense. It is to be understood that like the *Dharmaśāstras*, the *Purāṇas* also have been worked upon from generation to generation. It is impossible to establish a single date for an entire *Purāṇa*. Every chapter, sometimes every section will have to be dated on its own internal and external evidences.

The Epics

It is during this period that the two great epics, the *Mahābhārata*[17] and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, were compiled in the final form. Their value in politics, law, economics etc. is immense.[18]

Varāhamihira

The *Brihat Samhitā* of Varāhamihira (c. 505-587) is an *Encyclopaedia Indica* of the time, although of no huge

17 The *Adiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* has been for the first time critically edited by V. S. Sukthankar for the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Poona 1933), with the co-operation of Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, R. D. Karmarkar, A. B. Paranjpye, V. R. Rajavade, N. B. Utgikar, P. L. Vaidya, V. P. Vaidya, M. Winternitz, R. Zimmermann and others.

18 E. W. Hopkins: "The Social and Military Position of Ruling Caste in Ancient India as represented by the Sanskrit Epic" (*Journal of the American Oriental Society* 1889); *The Great Epic of India* (New Haven 1920).

dimensions. It furnishes information as much about climatology and astronomy, architecture and town planning as about the seven-limbed organism, the state. It is a landmark of Hindu scientific thought.

We may indeed describe this period of nine hundred years as that of scientific growth and development from Pāṇini to Varāhamihira.

"Treatises" on applied economics known as *Vārttāśāstras* can perhaps be not yet traced back to the Gupta period. But the literature on farming, cattle breeding, commerce and banking is to be found in the *Purāṇas*, the Epics, as well as in the *Brihat Samhitā*. The same remarks apply to the *Śilpaśāstras* (treatises on arts and crafts). No record of Gupta positivism can be complete without due orientations to the secular and "exact" sciences[19] as many of the *Vārttā* and *Śilpa* books are. The subject deserves more than an incidental notice.

The Vārttāśāstras

Vārttāśāstra is a new category. *Vārttā* is known to the *Kauṭalyan Arthaśāstra* (Book I) as agriculture, animal husbandry and commerce. The same three professions constitute *Vārttā* in Somadeva's *Nītivākyāmrita* (VI, 1) also (c 950 A.C.). In such a late compilation as the *Śukranīti* (I. lines 305-312) it comprises a fourth item, namely, interest or banking. Of course the subject matter comprehended in *Vārttā* is as old as the Vedic culture-complex. But specialized treatises on *Vārttā* or any of its diverse topics can hardly be traced back even to such recent times as the great age of literary reconstructions,

19 B. K. Sarkar: *Hindu Achievements in Exact Science* (New York 1918).

compilations, codifications and redactions, namely, the Gupta Epoch (c A.C. 320-550). The beginnings of *Vārttā* lore as idependent discipline in the thousand and one crafts and industries, occupations and professions, in one word, in the topics of applied economics may however be sought during the period covered by the Vardhanas, Chālukyas, Pālas, Senas, Gurjara-Pratīhāras, Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and Cholas (600-1300). Many of the handbooks on *Vārttā* mentioned among the Sanskrit manuscripts in Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum* as well as some of the printed texts on this branch of socio-economic science were made use of for the present work in the edition of 1911-14. The English translation of *Śukranīti* served to invite the attention of indologists and sociologists to the different branches of Hindu applied economics from town planning to veterinary science.

Indeed, a substantial portion of the Vol. I. of the present work as executed in those days was based on *Vārttā* treatises and constitutes as such a contribution to Hindu *Vārttā* or applied economics. The chapters dealing with the data of Hindu mineralogy, Hindu botany (including *Vrikṣāyurveda*) and Hindu zoology (including *aśvaśāstra* and *gajaśāstra*) and along with them of Hindu medicine (*Āyurveda*) are essentially studies in the *Vārttā* positivism of the Hindus.

As usual, it is not possible to place many of these works in the proper chronological perspective. Perhaps most of them will have to be placed somewhere between 1300 and 1700. But in Indian literary history every document has its "unwritten" or rather unsystematized and uncompiled or unedited beginnings. The economic (*Vārttā*) treatises of the Hindus also, whether described as

vidyā (science) or *kalā* (practical art) may perhaps be traced back to the age of Harṣavardhana (606-647). Varāhamihira's (*c* 506-585) *Brihat Samhitā* leaves no doubt about the existence of *Varttā* materials in the age of the Guptas. It has, besides, to be observed that many of the economic topics dealt with in the treatises of *Vārttāśāstra* are to be found in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* as well as in the *Dharma*-and especially in the *Artha*-and *Nīti śāstras* whether in connection with the discussions on public finance, functions of the state, demographic structure, social classes, or professional groups.[20]

The Śilpaśāstras

While introducing the *Vārttāśāstra* we should perhaps at once enter the domain of *Silpaśāstra*, either as

20 For the topics of *Vārttā* (economics) see the notes in B. K. Sarkar: *Śukranīti* (English translation, Allahabad 1914) to which the present work is a preface, "The Economic Foundations of the State in Śukra's Political Theory" (*Modern Review*, Calcutta, 1920-21) which may be conveniently consulted in *The Positive Background* etc. Vol. II, Pt. i, (Allahabad 1921), "Gilde di Mestier e Gilde Mercantili nell' India Antica" (*Giornale degli Economisti e Rivista di Statistica*, Rome 1920), "The Public Finance of Hindu Empires" (*Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 1921), "Economics of Indian Guilds" (*Journal of the Indian Economic Society*, Bombay 1921), "Economics in Hindu Thought" (*Indian Historical Quarterly*, Calcutta, 1926); Balkrishna: "Economics in Ancient India" (*Indian Journal of Economics* 1918), "Hindu Taxation System" (*I.J.E.*); N. N. Law: "Vārttā or Hindu Economics" (*Indian Antiquary*, 1918), which may be conveniently consulted in *Studies in Indian History and Culture* (Calcutta, 1925), J. N. Samaddar: *The Economic Condition of Ancient India*, (Calcutta 1923), N. C. Bandyopadhyaya: *Economic Progress in Ancient India*, (Calcutta 1925), J. N. C. Ganguly: "Principles of Hindu Taxation" (*I.H.Q.*, December 1925, March 1926); S. K. Das: *Economic History of Ancient India* (Calcutta 1928), Pran Nath: *A Study in the Economic Condition of Ancient India*, (London 1929), U. N. Ghoshal: *Hindu Revenue System* (Calcutta 1929); K. V. R. Aiyangar: *Aspects of Ancient Indian Economic Thought* (Benares 1934).

one of the branches of the former or perhaps as almost its twin in the Indian intellectual system. As a category *Silpaśāstra* possesses by all means an independent status. It deals with the arts and crafts, especially those bearing on architecture, sculpture and painting as well as town-planning. But as belonging to applied economics we may name both *Varttāśāstra* (farming, cattle breeding, trade and banking) and *Śilpaśāstra* (housebuilding and the fine arts) in one and the same breath. It is interesting to observe that in the *Nītiśāstras*, e.g., in our *Śukranīti*[21] the place of *Silpaśāstra* is no less important than that of *Vārttāśāstra*. Apart from the fact that the Agni, Matsya, *Viṣṇudharmottara*, and other *Purāṇas* deal with the topics of *Silpaśāstras* as much as they do with the *Vārttāśāstras*, the independent literature on housebuilding as well as temples, images, paintings, etc. is exceedingly large.

The problem of dating in connection with the *Silpaśāstras* is identical with that in connection with the *Vārttā-*

21 The material of the *Śukranīti* has been extensively utilized in B. B. Dutt: *Town planning in Ancient India* (Calcutta 1925) and P. N. Bose: *Principles of Indian Śilpaśāstras* (Lahore 1926). The English translation of *Śukranīti* has been made use of in the most varied forms by students of all sorts of economic, political and social topics during the last quarter of the present century. One is convinced that while the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* has given rise to researches with special reference to politics, the angles from which the *Śukranīti* have been attacked, thanks to the encyclopædic character of its contents, have been most extensive and diverse. It is possible to assert that in certain fields recent indology has been virtually dominated by Kauṭalya and Śukra. It is worth mentioning and curious at the same time that although *Kāmandakīnīti* was rendered available in English in 1896 it has failed as yet to evoke considerable interest among scholars.

See also the chapter on "The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya and the Nītiśāstra of Śukra" in A. K. Sen: *Studies in Hindu Political Thought* (Calcutta 1926), pp. 135-179.

śāstras. As in the case of the latter, the materials of the *Śilpaśāstra*[22] can be traced in well developed forms at least to the Gupta age, e.g., to the *Brihat Samhitā* (c. 550 A.C.). Nay, in so far as town-planning, the establishment of villages and towns, the erection of buildings, dams etc., and the construction of roads belong to the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra*, the *Śilpaśāstras* like the *Vārttāśāstras* can to this extent be seen even in that *milieu*.

Kāmandakīnīti

A specialized political text of this period is the *Kāmandakīnīti*.

It is necessary to observe that Kāmandaka did not depend exclusively on his alleged *guru* (II, 6) Kauṭalya but drew substantially upon other "old masters" as well. Indeed he offers only *yat kimchit*, i.e., just a bit of the *Arthaśāstra*. The practical items in regard to administration etc.,—the *forte* of Kauṭalya—have been excluded in the *Kāmandakīnīti*.

The *Kāmandakīnīti*[23] excludes the whole of Books II, III, IV and XIV of the *Arthaśāstra* and abridges the others. On the other hand, the doctrine of *maṇḍala* ("geopolitical" sphere) plays an important rôle in this *Nīti* work.

The *Smriti Śāstras* have for their subject-matter a greater amount of socio-religious topics than are usually dealt with in the *Nīti Śāstras*. Their authorship is, be-

22 K. Rangachari: "Town-Planning and House-Building in Ancient India, according to *Silpasastras*" in the *I.H.Q.*, December 1927, March 1928.

23 Jacobi in the *S.K.P.A.W.* 1911, pp. 835-836.

sides, attributed to *Ṛiṣis*, as we have seen in the previous enumeration. The *Ṛiṣi* upon whom *Śukraniti* has been fathered is mentioned in the above list as Uśanas. It is believed that Uśanas or Śukrāchāryya was the latest of the *Ṛiṣis* who meddled in polity, and that since his time the whole science of morals (social, economic and political) called *Niti Śāstra* has been designated after him.

Śukrāchāryya himself records the history of the abridgment of *Niti Śāstras* towards the commencement of his work. "For the good of men", says he, "Brahmā had spoken that treatise on morals which contained 100 *lakh* i.e., 10 million *śloḳas*. By the process of selection the essence of that *Niti Śāstra* which was an extensive argumentative thesis, has been compiled in an abridged form by Vaśiṣṭha and others like myself for the increase of prosperity of rulers of the earth and others whose life is of short span."

The same tradition [24] is otherwise stated by Kāmandaka thus: "Formerly for the protection of creatures Brahmā wrote the science of polity in ten million chapters. Śiva obtained this from Brahmā and epitomised it in ten thousand chapters. His work is called *Vaiśālāḳṣya* from his name (*Viśālāḳṣa*, or large-eyed). Indra made an abridgment of it in five thousand chapters, and Śukra into one thousand. Thus it was gradually abridged by the various sages having in view the shortened life of the people around them."

The *Kāmandaḳī* is divided into *sargas* or cantos and has been described by the commentator Śankarāchāryya as a *mahāḳāvya*. This work is not known to the *Tantrā-*

24 M. N. Dutt: *Kāmaṇḍaḳāya Niti Śāra* (Calcutta 1896).

khyāyika (which quotes the Kauṭalyan treatise), but is quoted by the *Panchatantra* in its later form. Bhavabhūti refers to in the *Mālatīmādhava* and Vāmana (c. 800 A.C.) in the *Kāvyālaṃkāravritti.*

In Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracharita* Kauṭalya is known as well as Śukra and Viśālākṣa as propounder of *Nītiśāstra* but not Kāmandaka. The *Kāmandakīnīti* is placed therefore somewhere between Daṇḍin and Vāmana, say, 700-750 A.C. by a certain school of indologists, e.g. Winternitz and Keith. But Jacobi places it somewhere earlier than the third century A.C.

But some light comes from the Island of Bali in Indonesia or Insulindia. In the introduction to his English translation of the *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra* (Calcutta 1896) M. N. Dutt refers to a report submitted by Frederick to the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences on the *Sanskrita* literature of Bali. "It appears," says Dutt, "that the most popular work in that island on polity is called *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra,* and all the *Sanskrita* books there extant are acknowledged to be counterparts of purely Indian originals." The researches of Stamford Raffles and Crawford show, says he further, that "the predominance of Buddhism in the island of Java obliged the Hindu inhabitants of that place to retire in the fourth century of the Christian era, with their household gods and their sacred scriptures to the island of Bali, where they carefully preserved the authenticity of their literature and their religion."

"It has also been shown by the same authorities", says Dutt, "that since the period of their emigration the Hindu inhabitants of Java and Bali have not had any intercourse with India."

One may, thereofre, take it that the Sanskrit texts now available in Bali or elsewhere in Indonesia must have left India previous to the fourth century A.C. The *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra* is one such work and may therefore be believed to have been well known in India in the third century of the Christian era.

Dutt observes, however, that the contents of the *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra* as found in Bali are unknown. It is "premature", therefore, to argue from the identity of titles the identity of that work with the treatise famous in Indian Sanskrit literature.

As against the possibility of this suspicion there is the reassuring fact from the Balinese side to the effect that all the Sanskrit texts of that island were obtained from India. That is, no work in Sanskrit appears to have been composed in Bali. The *Kāmandakī* found in Bali was therefore not a Balinese but an Indian work, and as argued above, must have left India by the fourth century.

The name of Bali in connection with the *Kāmandakī* has created a fresh complication, however.

A treatise named *Kāmandakīnīti* is found in the "*Kawi*" literature of this land. But the *Blütezeit* or period of spendour for the literature in "*Kawi*" (or mixed i.e. Indonesianized Sanskrit) language cannot be placed before the tenth century.

This circumstance should however appear to be irrelevant in the present case. The *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra* found in Bali was not a "*Kawi*" but a Sanskrit work. The later development of "*Kawi*" does not therefore affect the fate of the treatise in Sanskrit imported from India. As early as 413 A.C., be it observed, Brāhmans

were found in Java by Fa Hien. We may, then, take the *Kāmandakī* as a text of the early Gupta period.[25]

It is worth while to observe that the Italian indologist Carlo Formichi made use of the *Kāmandakīnīti* in his *Gl'Indiani e la loro scienza politica* (Bologna 1899). In his work entitled *Salus Populi* (Welfare of the People, Turin 1908) also the Hindu political thinker of the age of Kālidāsa was placed in the perspectives of the Italian Machiavelli and the British Hobbes. Formichi observed that all the three thinkers came to the same conclusion each in his own way and without knowing one another. Formichi's translation of the *Kāmandakīnīti* was published subsequently as *I Primi Principi della Politica secondo Kāmandakī* (Rome 1925). He believes that the *Kāmandakī* possesses even today more than an historical interest and is not in any case to be brushed aside as a curio of scientific literature.[26]

In *Alcuni Osservazioni sull' epoca del Kāmandakiya Nītisāra* (Bologna 1899), a paper based on the lecture delivered at the Twelfth Congress of Orientalists (Rome) Formichi contested Bühler's idea that the *Kāmandakī* was a pre-Christian work. In his own analysis the treatise was considered to be posterior to the *Nyāyasūtra* (third or fourth century A.C.) and contemporaneous with

25 Winternitz: *Geschichte* Vol. III, (1921), pp. 524-526, R. Friedrich: *Ind. Stud.* II. 133, 145; *J.R.A.S.* 1876, 188); Keith: *History of Sanskrit Literature* (1928) pp. 462-463.

On "*Kawi*" and Indonesian culture see H. B. Sarkar: *Indian Influence on the Literature of Java and Bali* (Calcutta 1934) pp. 18-24, 89-90.

See also E. Kuhn: *Der Einfluss des arischen Indiens auf die Nachbarländer im Süden und Osten* (Munich 1903), p. 19.

26 B. K. Sarkar: Hindu Politics in Italian," *I.H.Q.*, 1925 26, also *Pos. Back* Vol. II, Part II.

the *Brihat Samhitā* (sixth century A.C.), perhaps a little earlier.

Hindu Positivism in Indo-China, Insulindia, Tibet and China

It is during the early centuries[27] of the Christian era that Hindu colonies were firmly established in Burma, Chinese territories like Yunnan, Champa (Annam), and Kamboja (Cambodia) i.e. the entire region comprising Further India, South-west China and Indo-China. Land route for trade can be traced of course as far as the second century B.C. The colonies were the results of military conquest by Indians and promoted the cultural expansion as well of the Hindus.

King Bhadravarman, the Hindu ruler of Champa, who dedicated the temple of Myson to Śiva belonged to the fifth century A.C. (*c.* 413). By the first quarter of the sixth century Vijayavarman (*c.* 520-529) was king. About the time the Gupta Empire of India came to an end the Hindu Cham ruler of Champa was Śambhuvarman (565-620).

An inscription says that Bhadravarman of the fifth century was "versed in the four *Vedas.*" Another inscription says that his son Gangārāja abdicated in order to spend his last days on the banks of the Ganges. A third inscription says that Śambhuvarman is not the ordinary name of the ruler but the name he assumed as *abhiṣekanāma* at the time of the coronation or consecration

27 Pelliot in *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d' Extrême Orient* 1904, p. 142, in R. C. Majumdar : *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East* Vo. I. *Champa* (Lahore 1927) p. xiii, See also pp. 21, 27, 34, 48, 157, 159, 184, 234.

according to Hindu custom. The worship of Śiva as national deity is referred to in the inscriptions about kings Bhadra and Śambhu.

One can, therefore, feel convinced that the influence of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Dharmaśāstras*, the *Purāṇas*, the *Śilpaśāstras*, and the sixty four *Kalās* in the life and thought of the Cham people in Indo-China about which inscriptions of subsequent ages give information was already at work in the period in question, i.e., from Kauṭalya to Kālidāsa, or at any rate, the first six centuries of the Christian era. No study of Hindu positivism and secular arts and sciences can be complete without adequate emphasis on these aspects of Greater India during this early period.

The colonisation of Insulindia has also to be placed in the same period. The chronicles of Java connect this island with Bengal and Madras ports. A Gujarati prince (c 75 A.C.) is believed to have been the first colonizer of Java.[28]

Not later than the first century A. C. is the reference to Java in the *Rāmāyaṇa* in connection with the search of *Sītā*. The Sanskrit name of Java, *Javadvīpa* (Isle of Barley), was used by Ptolemy for his *Geography* in the second century. In the fourth century the *vahusuvarṇaka* sacrifice was performed by Mūlavarman, a king with a Hindu name, of Borneo. Canals with Hindu names, Chandrabhāgā and Gomatī, were constructed in western Java by Pūrṇavarman in the fifth century. In 413 Fa Hien was fellow passenger with two hundred Hindu merchants *en route* to Canton from Java. Ten years later Nandī is

28 R. C. Majumdar: *Champa* (Lahore 1927) p. xii.

described as a Hindu ship-owner in whose boat Guṇavarman, the Buddhist missionary of Kashmir, sailed for China. Down to the end of the period we are discussing, that of the Guptas, the Hindus were always in evidence in Insulindia in diverse capacities.[29]

The island of Sumatra also was under a Hindu dynasty in the fifth century. The dynasty was known as the *Śailendra* and the territory as *Śrīvijaya* (Modern Palembang). Mahāyāna Buddhism was the faith of the rulers.

A Buddhist Sanskrit inscription of the Malay Peninsula (West Coast) can be ascribed to the fourth century. The fifth century inscriptions of king Mūlavarman of Borneo are also in Sanskrit. In Sanskrit, again, are the four rock inscriptions of king Pūrṇavarman in western Java. A Sanskrit inscription of the early sixth century refers to the River Gangā.

It may be inferred that the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* which became so popular in Insulindian[30] literature, folk-play, architecture and sculpture were powerful forces in the morals and manners of the people during the Gupta period. We have already discussed this item in connection with the *Kāmandakīnīti*.

The expansion of Hindu positivism in Tibet is to be seen in the influence of the *Śilpaśāstras* on the architecture,

29 B. R. Chatterji: *India and Java* (Calcutta 1935) Part I. pp. 1-2, 14, Part II. pp. 7, 17, 20, 28, based to some extent on Krom: *De Sumatraansche Periode der Javaansche Geschiedenis* (1919) and *Hindoe Javaansche Geschiedenis* (1926); R. C. Majumdar: "Indo-Javanese Literature" (*Indian Culture*, Calcutta July 1934).

30 H. B. Sarkar: *Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali* (Calcutta 1934) pp. 172-173, 234-235.

sculpture and painting of the Tibetan people. Literary evidences are forthcoming to the effect that the architectural terminology in connection with the construction of *Chaityas* used by the Tibetans was derived almost entirely from Indian masters.

Treatises on iconography are mentioned in the Tibetan translation of Indian texts in the *Tanjur* collection.[31] The more important documents of Hindu influence in Tibet belong to post-Gupta times.

The name of Indian missionaries who carried on their work in China during the first two centuries and a half of the introduction of Buddhism is legion. Down to 300 A.C. all the translators of Buddhist texts into Chinese were non-Chinese scholars. While Fa Hien was studying Buddhist culture at first hand in India (399-413) the great Indian missionary Kumārajīva was working in China (385-417). With Kumārajīva and Fa Hien we enter a new era of Indo-Chinese relationships.

It marks the beginning of an intimate cultural and spiritual union between the two peoples. For the next thousand years the life and activity of human beings from India to Japan were governed by one Asian science, art and philosophy.[32] We must remember that the category

31 G. Tucci: *Indo-Tibetica*, Part I. *Mc'od Rten e Tsa Tsa nel Tibet Indiano e Occidentale* (1932) reviewed by B. K. Sarkar in the *I.H.Q.* for June, 1934, pp. 382-391.

32 See "A Period of So-called Anarchy in China" in B. K. Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916), and Hirth: *The Ancient History of China* (New York, 1908). See also Hackmann: *Buddhism as a Religion* (London 1910); Parker: *Studies in Chiense Religion* (London 1910); Lloyd: *The Creed of Half Japan* (London 1911), Johnston: *Buddhist China* (London 1913).

Buddhism implied in China the entire *corpus* of Indian civilization from algebra to zoology. China, like the other countries of Northern, Eastern and Southern Asia is, then, a vast field for the study of Hindu positivism.

The first authentic Indian missionary in China appears to have been Kāśyapa Mātanga of Central India. It was as a guest of the Han Emperor Mingti that Kāśyapa Mātanga arrived at the Imperial capital, Loyang, the site of the present-day Honan-fu in 67 A.C. We ignore, for the present, the legendary traditions to the effect that the Celestials had knowledge of Śākya's teachings already in Chou times (*c.* B.C. 1122-249). Such legends are at any rate not unplausible in view of the fact that the Indian Asoka (B.C. 273-232) was an ardent embodiment of Śākyan (Buddhist) *appamāda* (energism) on the one hand and of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VII 15) cult of *charaiveti* (march on) on the other, in other words, an active internationalist bent on proselytizing and making converts among all and sundry. It is also a fact of Chinese culture-history that the Han Emperor Wuti (*c.* B.C. 140) was a great explorer of Central and Western Asia. The chances of the earlier Hans to come into contact with the Hindu arts and sciences are therefore quite conceivable. Historically, however, i.e., from the standpoint of datable events it is convenient to mark the official entry of Hindu culture into China with the advent of the Indian missionary Kāśyapa Mātanga, furnished, as he was, with Buddhist images and scriptures.

It is not necessary to go into the vicissitudes of Chinese dynastic history. But for the period in question it is necessary to introduce a dichotomy in Chinese politics, namely,

the politics of the North as distinguished from those of the South.

Down to the middle of the third century the centre of Buddhist missionizing activity in North China was located at Loyang (68-265 A.C.). In 265 it was transferred to Changnan, where the work went on with occasional breaks or rather periods of depression down to 581. New centres of this period were located at Ku-chang, Pao-han, Heng-nan and Ye. In Southern China the centre was always at Kien-ye or Nanking from 222 to 589 A.C.

The conversion of Southern China was consummated to a considerable extent or perhaps almost entirely independently of Northern or Northwestern China. India's contacts with Yunnan in South-western China had been going on by the land-route through Burma since the first century A.C. The sea-route to Southern China is as old as at any rate the second century A.C. Tonkin is to be treated as a part of South China.

It is not yet possible to get the exact Indian equivalents of all the names given in Chinese.[33] A list is being compiled in the following account showing the dates within which Indian Buddhist missionaries were engaged in translation work at diverse centres.

33 The list is based on P. C. Bagchi: *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine* (Paris 1927) which contains more details about the persons, their names and their activities than Nanjio: *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka, the Sacred Canon of the Buddhists in China and Japan* (Oxford 1883). This latter as well as Beal: *Buddhist Literature in China* (London, 1882) were utilized for the present author's *Chinese Religion* (1916). Eighty names are given in that work, pp. 237-240. Some of them are different from the names used in the present work based as they are on Bagchi's renderings.

The names and dates of the Indian scholars who worked at Loyang and Changnan are given below :

I. 68-220 A.C. : 1. Kāśyapa Mātanga,
2. Dharmaratna,
3. Lokakṣema,
4. Buddhadeva.

II. 220-265 A.C. : 1. Dharmakāla,
2. Sanghavarman,
3. Dharmasatya (?)
4. Dharmabhadra (?)

III. 265-316 A.C. : 1. Dharmarakṣa,
2. Kālaruchi,
3. Mokṣala,
4. Nārāyaṇa.

IV. 384-417 A.C. : 1. Dharmayaśas,
2. Puṇyatrātā,
3. Kumārajīva,
4. Buddhayaśas.

In the other centres of North China the propaganda was in the hands of the following Indian missionaries :

I. 302-439 A.C. : 1. Dharmakṣema,
2. Buddhavarman.

II. 387-534 A.C. : 1. Dharmaruchi,
2. Ratnamati,
3. Buddhasānta,
4. Bodhiruchi.

III. 534-550 A.C. : 1. Gautama Prajnāruchi,
2. Upaśūnya,
3. Vimokasena,
4. Dharmabodhi.

IV. 550-557 A.C.: 1. Narendrayaśas.

V. 557-581 A.C.: 1. Jnānabhadra,
2. Jinayaśas,
3. Yaśogupta,
4. Jinagupta.

The South China or Nanking centre was likewise the theatre of literary activity for a large number of Indian scholars some of whom are mentioned below:

I. 222-280 A.C.: 1. Vighna.

II. 317-420 A.C.: 1. Śrīmitra,
2. Dharmaratna,
3. Kālodaka,
4. Gautama Sanghadeva,
5. Vimalākṣa,
6. Dharmapriya,
7. Buddhabhadra,
8. Gītāmitra,
9. Nandi.

III. 428-479 A.C.: 1. Buddhajīva,
2. Īśvara,
3. Guṇavarman,
4. Sanghavarman,
5. Guṇabhadra,
6. Dharmamitra,
7. Kālayaśas,
8. Guṇasatya (?)

IV. 479-502 A.C.: 1. Dharmakritayaśas,
2. Mahāyāna (?)
3. Sanghabhadra,
4. Dharmamati,
5. Guṇavriddhi.

V. 503-589 A.C.: 1. Mandrasena,
2. Sanghabhara,
3. Paramārtha,
4. Upaśūnya,
5. Subhūti.

The names given in the above three lists are not all. Those names which cannot be definitely treated as Indian have been excluded. It is to be observed, further, that anonymous translations from original Sanskrit into Chinese were numerous, and that among the translators of such anonymous works there were evidently many Indians. Incidentally, it is worth mentioning that the bureaus of translation at the diverse Buddhist centres in China comprised not only Indian and Chinese scholars but also "Central Asians" of all races, Parthians, Huns, Afghans, Turks, Sogdians, etc. The inhabitants of Central Asia had become Indianized earlier, of course, than the Chinese and served to help forward the Indianization of China as good Buddhists.

From Epicurus to Gregory the Great

In the Hellenistic world during this period the dominant thought forces came from Epicurus (B.C. 341-270) whose doctrine of the "wise man" (corresponding to the Hindu *Riṣi*, Jaina *Arhat* and the Śākyan *Bhikkhu*) taught mankind the blessing of quietism and indifference to public life.[34] Equality of man in a world-state was preached by Zeno (B.C. 350-260), whose doctrine of "universal reason" might be easily assimilated to the *jnāna-yoga* of the Indian systems. By promulgating the

34 E. Zeller: *The Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics* (London 1892).

cult of "indifference to emotions" this Stoic philosopher was propagating virtually the Jaina cult of Mahāvīra.

Among the Romans this *Riṣi-* cult as the doctrine of universal reason and law was taken over by Cicero[35] (B.C. 106-43). The *pax sārvabhaumicā* (peace of the *sārvabhauma* state or world-empire) of Hindu idealists found shape, so to say, in the Ciceronian doctrine of universal monarchy.[36] The most philosophical—Stoic—of all the Roman intellectuals was Seneca[37] (B.C. 4-65 A.C.), the contemporary of Jesus and Aśvaghoṣa (?). Seneca's *De Clementia* (55 A.C.) taught the king in the right *nīti* style of Manu that he should remember that he out of all mankind has been chosen to act in the place of the gods and that the life and death, the fate and lot of all men were in his hands.[38]

Seneca's "wise man" was like the Mahāyāna *Bodhisattva* a servant of society.[39] The Stoic *Riṣi*, as portrayed by Seneca, could not afford to be a morally self-sufficient entity like the Epicurean "wise man" who corresponded somewhat to the *Nirvānist*, so to say, of Śākyan or Hīnayāna Buddhism.

In India the deification of Sākya the moralist as Buddha the god as well as the initiation of *avatāras* like Rāma and Kriṣṇa were almost synchronous with the

35 A. Trollope: *The Life of Cicero* (London 1880).

36 F. Atger: *Histoire des doctrines du contrat social* (Nimes 1906) p. 26.

37 R. M. Gummere: *Seneca the Philosopher and His Modern Message* (London 1922).

38 A. J. Carlyle: *Mediæval Political Theory in the West* Vol. I. (1903) pp. 30-31.

39 Carlyle, Vol. I, pp. 26-27.

transformation of Jesus the Jew into Jesus the Christ.[40] Here Aśvaghoṣa and Vālmīki, there Seneca and St. Paul were consummating the profoundest remaking of mankind. While the Hīnayāna *Vinaya Piṭaka* would remind one of the contemporary Roman jurists and constitution-makers, the Mahāyāna *Buddha-Charita*, *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* and other treatises of selfless social services, love of humanity and so forth would appear to have their natural cognates in the Mark, Matthew, Luke, Paul and Peter chapters of the *New Testament*. Readers of the *Gītā* and the *Kurāl*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Viṣṇu Purāna* could have easily joined the Romans in listening to such messages as the following from St. Paul (Gal. III, 28, 1 Cor. XII, 13). "There can be neither Jew nor Greek," said he, "there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female, for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus."

Jaina, Buddhist, Hindu or Chinese idealism was not the only force in the East or the West in the first centuries of the Christian era. In Europe Gaius (*c* 150 A.C.) and Ulpian (*c* 200 A.C.) were laying the foundations of Roman jurisprudence. In India Manu (*c* 150 A.C.) and Yājnavalkya (*c* 350 A.C.) were consolidating the legal institutions. But in Europe there arose the problem of

40 See the chapter on the "Birth of "Buddhism" (B.C. 150—A.C. 100) in B. K. Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916): Introduction of Buddha-cult into China; Chinese Romanticism; The Religion of Love, Exit Sakya, Enter Buddha and His Host; The Psychology of Romantic Religion; Spiritual Experiences of Iran and Israel; Buddha-cult and its Indian Cognates; The "Balance of Accounts" in International Philosophy; Rival Claims of the East and the West; Parallelism and Open Questions; pp. 138-161; cf. Charles: *Between the Old and the New Testaments* (Home University Library, London); Hogarth: *Ancient East* (*H.U.L.* London).

temporal *vs.* spiritual power, a problem which was not paralleled in India. St. Augustine (354-430 A.C.) taught in his *City of God* that even the Neros received their power through God, i.e., that even tyranny was divine.[41] In the fifth century Pope Gelasius wrote that the "Emperor was the son, not the ruler of the Church." In other words, the Church was declared to be independent of the state in this system of dyarchy. Finally, while the *Digest* (old laws) was compiled, the *Institutes* promulgated and the *Code* (constitutions) brought together under Justinian (526-565), Pope Gregory I. the Great, early in the seventh century (590-606) brought to a head the doctrine of "divine right" for the king in a categorical manner. In his thinking, resistance was inadmissible under any circumstances. To the Hindus, Buddhists and Jainas of the time, used as they were to Kāmandaka, Nārada, Brihaspati, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Siddhānta*, and the *Śikṣāsamuchchaya* the language of these Patristic messages would have been unintelligible.

The category, "from Kauṭalya to Varāhamihira," is only a convenient expression. We have taken the period of nine hundred or nearly one thousand years from Alexander and Aristotle to Justinian and Gregory the Great, which corresponds to the Indian age from Pāṇini to Brihaspati. The most varied phases of culture, nay, the most varied culture-worlds are to be seen in growth and development during this millennium. For the purposes of intensive study, naturally, we should have to divide this period up into several stages.

41 Carlyle, I, pp. 151, 187.

CHAPTER X

From Harsa to Hemādri (*c.* 600-1300)

Economics, politics, jurisprudence and sociology as developed on Indian soil have grown in intimate *liaison* with the exact sciences. Their relations, first, with philosophy and metaphysics, and secondly, with *belles lettres* are equally profound. These interactions are to be seen as much in the Vedic culture-complex as in the Śākyan *milieu* (*c* 600 B.C.). They are equally manifest in the evolution of Hindu positivism from, say, Kauṭalya to Kālidāsa, or from Pāṇini to Varāhamihira (*c* B.C. 300-600 A.C.). The impact of "science," philosophy and literature on the "social" *vidyās* or *śāstras* as well as of the latter on the former, in one word, the "functional" relations characterize the subsequent epochs as well of cultural expansion in India.

From Harṣa to Hemādri (*c* 600-1300) we encounter the same *rapprochements* between the diverse disciplines. From Chaṇḍeśvara to Rāmmohun Roy (1772-1833), the last of the mediaevals and the first of the moderns, also, the story of growth in the juxtaposition and mutual interactions of the diverse branches of intellectual activity is a signal fact of India's literary history. The interactions are embodied, in the first place, in unacknowledged influences, nay, assimilations of one another. In the second place, direct quotations of words or phrases and wholesale incorporations of chapters, sections or para-

graphs occupy in important place in this regard. And finally, criticisms, often hostile and relentless of one another, are no less prominent. The "scientific," philosophic, metaphysical and literary perspectives of the *Dharma, Artha, Nīti* and allied treatises are therefore to be explored and appraised as much in the case of the period from Harṣa to Hemādri as in that of the others.

From the *Rigveda* to the *Kāmandakīnīti* none of the documents of Hindu positivism can, as we have seen, be dated without controversy. We have observed also that no matter what be the epoch, age or century in which the books more or less in the form in which they are available today got their final forms, the materials or *data* contained in these texts can be traced several centuries back in every instance. This is an aspect of Hindu culture bearing on absolute as well as relative chronology that ought to be remembered in connection with every epoch.

At the threshold of the period that we are now starting, namely, that from the Vardhana Empire to the Chola Empire, or from Harṣa to Hemādri, from, say, A.C. 600 to 1300 let us once more get oriented to this fundamental fact of Hindu culture-history. Without reference to the exact dates of the final redaction of the texts we have to remember that among the master-minds of Śākyasimha's age (c. 600 B.C.)[1] there were grammarians of the Pāṇini cycle, whose comprehensive work on Sanskrit language stands the most rigorous test of modern philologists as a monument of logical insight and thorough-going research. There were the chemists, botanists and zoologists of the

1 B. K. Sarkar: *Chinese Religion Through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916), pp. 51-52.

Charakan school whose encyclopaedic work in *Āyurveda* (the science of life) continues to be the basis of Hindu medical practitioners even today. Then there were the sociologists who, following the lead of the eponymous culture-hero Manu, were the compilers of the *Dharmaśāstras, Smritiśāstras, Nītiśāstras* etc., each of which is at once the Hindu *Yi-King* and *Li-King* and partly also the *Shu-King*. It was out of this class of literature that about two hundred years after Śākyasimha Kauṭalya derived materials for the Hindu *Chou-li*, called the *Arthaśāstra*. We have also to call attention to the discussions on the human anatomy, physiology and psychology as well as psycho-analysis (?) initiated by the Nandis, Śvetaketus, Bābhravyas, Dattakas and others which were in the course of centuries to constitute the foundations of Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* (science of enjoyment with special reference to love). There remain still to be mentioned the students of the *Upaniṣads* and *Darśanas*, those systems of psychology, logic and metaphysics whose name was legion. Last but not least come, again, the Vyāsas, eponymous heroes, the compilers of Vedic literature, and subsequently also of the *Mahābhārata*.

Six Fundamental Formative Forces in Positivism

By the commencement of the sixth century A.C. most of the sciences whose "unwritten" beginnings, so to say, are to be found in the sixth century B.C. were definitely established in chapter and verse. For the classification of arts and sciences, *vidyās* and *ḳalās*, from the standpoint of formal logic, such as may indicate the lines of evolution in positivism and secular endeavours

during the next seven hundred years we may single out the following rubrics:

1. The *Dharmaśāstras*, with their commentaries and digests.
2. The *Nītiśāstras*.
3. The *Vārttāśāstras*.
4. The *Śilpaśāstras*.
5. The *Purāṇas* with their *Upapurāṇas*. Since Gupta times these encyclopædic treatises have gone on expanding in all the three dimensions, so to say. From the seventh to the end of the thirteenth century each one of the *Purāṇas* that has been mentioned in the previous epoch maintained its position as a library of world-culture in the intellectual *milieu* of India.

Each one of the eighteen *Purāṇas* can be drawn upon not only for the topics of *Dharmaśāstras* but for those of *Vārttāśāstras*. In the modern compilation on gems and precious stones entitled *Maṇimālā*, for instance, all the *Purāṇas* have been used as authorities.[2]

The tenacity of the Pauraṇic tradition in modern times, so far as political thought is concerned, may be seen to some extent in a recent work in Bengali. The *Agni Purāṇa* has been utilized by Madhusudan Bhattāchārya for his Ratnamāla, Vol. I. (*Hindu Rājanīti*, Calcutta 1904, 1909). It is a book of Bengali translations with original Sanskrit texts as footnotes. Incidentally be it observed that he has made use of the *Kāśī-Khaṇḍa*, the *Devī Bhāgavata*, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata* and the *Gītā* as well. As containing very often whole treatises

2 By Saurindra Mohun Tagore, Calcutta, 1881, vol. II., p. 1034. For the *Dharmaśāstra* data of the *Purāṇas* see P. V. Kane: *History of Dharmaśāstra* (Poona 1930), pp. 164-167.

on *dharma, nīti* and *vārttā* these *Purāṇas* and *Upa-Purāṇas* are valuable documents of positivism for the seven hundred years in question.

6. The *Mahābhārata.* This great epic has been functioning as the fifth *Veda* or the *Veda* of the people since it acquired its more or less present form in Gupta times. From the seventh to the thirteenth century it may be taken to have maintained its influence and, like the *Purāṇas,* to have been growing all the time in bulk. If the *Purāṇas* are Encyclopædias, the *Mahābhārata* is the Encyclopædia of Encyclopædias. Naturally therefore in order to come into contact with the Hindu command over the realities of life as comprehended in *kāma, dharma, artha, nīti, vārttā* and *śilpa* one does not have to go out of the *milieu* of the *Mahābhārata.* While dealing with the humanism and secularism of Hindu India from Harṣa to Hemādri we can always safely trust ourselves to the contents of the *Mahābhārata.*

It is interesting to observe that in the extensive work on *Hindu Rājanīti,* a Bengali translation of Sanskrit originals referred to above, the following *Parvans* (Books) of the *Mahābhārata* have been used: 1. *Sabhā,* 2. *Vana,* 3. *Udyoga,* 4, *Bhīṣma,* 5. *Droṇa,* 6. *Śānti,* 7. *Anuśāsana.* We understand how the *Mahābhārata* tradition in politics has been ruling the thought of the orthodox scholars of today and continues to be a living force even in the twentieth century.

The same is to be said of the *Rāmāyaṇa* also. The following *Kāṇḍas* (Cantos) of the *Rāmāyaṇa* have been utilized by Bhattāchārya as documents of political thought: 1. *Ādi,* 2. *Ayodhyā,* 3. *Araṇya,* 4. *Kiṣkindhyā,* 5. *Sundara,* 6. *Lankā,* 7. *Uttarā.* Naturally, therefore,

for the period from Harṣa to Hemādri the two epics are invaluable as sources of *nīti* philosophy.

In order to make the list of sources for Hindu positivism complete we should have to add to these six groups of literature, first, the *belles lettres*, stories, legends, etc., and secondly, denominational works like those of the Buddhists and Jainas. The literature contained in the Indian vernaculars, especially of the North can hardly demand recognition at this stage.[3] For all practical purposes the provincial languages like Bengali, Hindi etc. grew into important dimensions after the thirteenth century. But so far as the South Indian Tamil is concerned, the literature was important enough to be discussed for the age of the Guptas. For the period from the Vardhanas to the Cholas Tamil inscriptions and books constitute of course a substantial guide to Hindu positivism.

Broadly speaking, the most fundamental formative forces as well as evidences of energism in worldly speculations and secular enterprise during this period are to be seen in the six rubrics enumerated above.

Bhāṣyas and Nibandhas of Smriti Śāstras

The work of Nārada, Brihaspati and Kātyāyana as *Smriti* writers of the later Gupta period was continued during the seventh and eighth centuries by quite a number of jurists. Without being precise or even ap-

3 See the chapter on Language in C. V. Vaidya : *History of Mediaeval Hindu India*, Vol. II. (Poona 1924), pp. 167-172, and Vol. III. (1926), pp. 471-474.

proximative we may mention the following:—1. Vyāsa (c 650), 2. Paulastya (c 700), 3. Pitāmaha (c 750), 4. Dakṣa (c 800), 5. Angiras (c 800), 6. Yama (c 800). They all wrote regular *Dharmaśāstras* in verse in the literary tradition established by Manu and Yājnavalkya.

The number of *Smriti* writers was great. The need of *bhāṣyas* (commentaries) was felt, and already as contemporaries of original writers like Yama, Angiras etc. commentators like Asahāya (c 800), Samvarta (c 800) and Bhartriyajna (c 800) are seen flourishing. And they are important enough to be quoted by subsequent scholars.[4]

1. *Medhātithi and Viśvarūpa*

Two of the greatest commentary writers lived in the ninth century. The first is Medhātithi[5] (c 850 A.C.) celebrated for his commentary on Manu. The author was probably an inhabitant of Kashmir as Bühler suggested. Jolly considered him to be a Southerner. Medhātithi knows of a *Vārttā* treatise by Brihaspati and is familiar with the *Artha* treatises of Brihaspati, Uśanas and Kauṭalya. He is the author of an original *Smriti* work also, namely, the *Smritiviveka*.

The other great man in this line was Viśvarūpa (c 800-825) whose commentary on Yājnavalkya is called *Bālakrīḍā*. The author was perhaps a contemporary of Śankarāchārya (c 800), and may have been one of his pupils or followers. He is one of those jurists who make

4 Kane: *History of Dharmaśāstras* Vol. I. (Poona 1930) pp. 221, 225, 227, 233, 238, 242, 250, 252.

5 Kane, pp. 224, 252-254, 261-263, 265, 269-270, 275, Winternitz III, p. 449.

use of *Arthaśāstra* texts, e.g., those of Brihaspati, Viśālākṣa, and possibly Kauṭalya.

Bhruchi (*c* 850) is perhaps a contemporary of Viśvarūpa.

The *Chaturvimśatimata* (*c* 850), complete in 525 verses, embodies the essence of 24 sages, namely, Manu, Yājnavalkya, Atri, Viṣṇu, Vaśiṣṭha, Vyāsa, Uśanas, Āpastamba, Vatsa, Hārīta, Guru (Brihaspati), Nārada, Parāśara, Gārgya, Gautama, Yama, Baudhāyana, Dakṣa, Śamkha, Angiras, Śatātapa, Sāmkhya (Sāmkhyāyana) and Samvarta. This synthetic compilation belongs to the age of Medhātithi and Viśvarūpa.

2. *Śrīkara*

The tenth century saw several great works.[6] The synthetic jurist Śrīkara (*c* 950) is the author perhaps of a commentary or of a *Nibandha* i.e. digest. He is said to have filled in the gaps of *Smritis* and established order out of chaos. He may have been greatly under the influence of Yājnavalkya. According to Chaṇḍeśvara in his *Rājanītiratnākara* (ch. XV) Śrīkara had views on public law i.e. politics as well. He held that the revenues of the state have the poor and the helpless as some of their *amśī* (co-sharers or owners).

The doctrine quoted by Chaṇḍeśvara runs thus: *rājadhane dinānāthādisakalaprāṇinām amśitvam*. The poor, the orphans, and all other creatures are *amśī* or co-sharers with the king in his wealth, property or revenues. It is on this argument that a state cannot be partitioned

6 Kane, pp. 238-239, 242, 268; See the *Rājanītiratnākara* by Chaṇḍeśvara, *ed.* by K. P. Jayaswal (Patna 1924) pp. 40, 81.

between the sons just as ordinary property can be (*Rājyam abibhājyam*). The recognition of this distinction between personal property and the state in a categorical manner marks a great progress in political thought. We touch the concept of an abstract political organism which is independent of dynasties, individual attributes and personal equations. The unknown or rather lost treatise of Śrīkara is thus to be credited with having propounded a tenet of major importance in the world's political speculations.

Then, again, the category, *amśitva* (co-sharership), as enjoyed by the poor etc., possesses a more than ordinary significance in speculative politics. It is something essentially distinct from the commonplace thought in constitution or public law which says that the king is the servant, benefactor or protector of the people. We are forced to understand that in point of civil law these enumerated classes are his equals or at any rate colleagues so far as the use of wealth, i.e. the state, is concerned. Naturally, therefore, it is possible to read something of socialistic "idealism" into this doctrine. Śrikara the jurist, although interested in private law (e.g. the law of property) has made a tremendous contribution to public law by enunciating this dictum. It is worth repeating that Śrīkara is here not talking of ordinary charity, philanthropy or dole but of the *right of co-sharers* to the national revenues. It is understood, of course, that we find ourselves here not in *Realpolitik* but in speculation.

It is on account of this doctrine of the distinction between the state and other properties that a definitely practical object in constitutional law can be served. The

theorists do not want that the state should be inherited by anybody except the eldest son. The people who are not used to primogeniture in private law are likely not to appreciate it in public law. Hence the importance of the theory which establishes the socialistic copartnership of the masses in the affairs of the body politic.

The doctrine of Śrīkara, which was handed down by Gopāla in his *Smriti-Kāmadhenu* (c 1100) and *Lakṣmīdhara* in his *Smriti-Kalpataru* (c 1159) and was considered important enough to be utilized by Chaṇḍeśvara in his *Rājanīti-Ratnākara* (c 1370), has another part. It runs thus: *Vahunāyakatvādrājyavinaśaścha.* The state may be destroyed on account of the plurality of leaders or rulers. This is a fresh argument against the partition of the state among the king's sons on the lines of the partition of private property. Altogether Śrīkara's logic against the application of the ordinary law of inheritance to the state-affairs is the greatest single contribution of Hindu India to social science in the tenth century.

The *Ṣaṭtrimśanmata* (c 950) is a compilation from 36 sages. It appears to be older than the *Mitākṣarā, Smritichandrikā,* Aparārka and others.

The *Smritisamgraha* (c 1000) is a collection between Viśvarūpa or Medhātithi and the *Mitākṣarā* or the *Smritichandrikā.* It may be taken to have flourished in king Bhoja's territory, Dhārā, and may have been compiled by or in the age of the king-jurist Bhoja Dhāreśvara.

The eleventh century is very important in certain respects.[7] Bhoja Dhāreśvara (c 1050), king of Dhārā,

7 Kane, pp. 258, 277, 279, 281, 290.

whose name is associated with works on the most diverse subjects like grammar, medicine, astronomy, politics (*Yuktikalpataru*) and so forth is known to have written commentaries, digests and even independent works on *Smriti*.

Devasvāmin's (*c* 1050) *Smritisamuchchaya*, a digest like that by Śrīkara, was composed during the age of Vijnāneśvara.

3. *Jitendriya, Bālaka and Yogloka*

Bengal's[8] contribution to law during the eleventh century is mentionable. Jitendriya (*c* 1050), author of an original work on *Smriti*, was an inhabitant of Bengal. He is quoted by Jīmūtavāhana in *Kālaviveka* as well as as *Dāyabhāga* but is eclipsed by him. The *Dāyabhāga* doctrine that the widow succeeds to her deceased husband's estate has been traced to Jitendriya.

Bālaka (*c* 1100), also an inhabitant of Bengal, wrote an independent work on *Smriti*. He is quoted by Jīmūtavāhana, Raghunandana and Śūlapāṇi.

Yogloka (*c* 1100), another inhabitant of Bengal, is the author of an independent *Smriti*. His views on *Kāla* and *Vyavahāra* were popular in his days. Jīmūtavāhana used to make fun of Yogloka's claims to being exponent of a new logic (*nava-tārkikam-manya*).

4. *Vijnāneśvara*

Greater than all his predecessors in the *bhāṣya* (commentary) line and indeed the greatest for all ages is

8 Kane, pp. 283, 284, 286.

Vijnāneśvara (c 1100), whose *Mitākṣarā* commentary on Yājnavalkya is influential until today throughout India, including Bengal also for certain purposes. He is said to have flourished during the reign of the Western Chālukya King, Vikramānka Vikramāditya VI. of Kalyāni, who ruled for half a century (1076-1126). This is the same Vikramānka about whom Bilhana wrote the *Vikramānkacharita* and whose son, king Someśvara (1127-1138), wrote the *Mānasollāsa*, a treatise on *Nītiśāstra* or politics in 1131.[9]

5. *Gopāla and Lakṣmīdhara*

Several other writers of the eleventh century deserve notice:[10]

1. Gopāla (*c* 1100): *Kāmadhenu*. He took interest in *Artha* topics also and composed *Rājanīti-Kāmadhenu*. In Chaṇḍeśvara's *Rājanīti-Ratnākara* ch. XV. (c 1325) he is described as having held the view along with Lakṣmīdhara and Śrīkara that among the "owners" of a state are to be named the poor and the helpless.
2. Halāyudha I. (c 1100): *Nibandha*. The author was perhaps a contemporary of Dhāreśvara and Jitendriya. His name is cited often by Lakṣmīdhara (c 1125) and Chaṇḍeśvara (*c* 1325). He was probably an inhabitant of Mithilā.

9 The text of *Mānasollāsa* Vol. I. has been edited by G. K. Shrigondekar (Gaekwad Baroda Series, Baroda 1925), see p. VI. cf. Smith: *Oxford History of India* (1919) p. 202. See also Kane, Vol. I p. 290.

10 Kane, pp. 293, 295, 297, 315; See *Rājanītiratnākara* ed. by K. P. Jayaswal (Patna 1924) p. 81.

3. Govindarāja (*c* 1124):
   (i) Commentary on Manu,
   (ii) *Smritimanjarī*, an original work.

The contributions of the diverse regions of India to the evolution of Hindu law in the twelfth century[11] were no less significant than in the previous century. Lakṣmīdhara (*c* 1150) wrote *Smriti Kalpataru*. The author was foreign minister of Govindachandra, the Gahadavāl or Rāṭhor Emperor of Kanauj (1104-1154). His influence on Bengal and Mithilā was very great. He is quoted by Aniruddha, Ballālasena, Śūlapāṇi and Raghunandana of Bengal. He was plagiarized by Chaṇḍeśvara (1315).

Lakṣmīdhara took great interest in political philosophy also. The *Rājadharma* section of his *Smriti-Kalpataru* was substantial enough to be used by Chandeśvara of Mithilā in his *Rājanīti-Ratnākara* (*c* 1370).

Aparāditya (*c* 1150) wrote a commentary (called *Aparārka*) on Yājnavalkya. He was a ruler of Northern Konkan (Bombay).

6. *Jīmūtavāhana and Ballālasena*

It is during this epoch that the great Bengali jurist Jīmūtavāhana (*c* 1150) flourished. His *Dharmaratna*, *Smriti* work, has a section on inheritance called *Dāyabhāga*, the code so dominant in Bengal. Two other sections are known, namely, *Kālaviveka* and *Vyavahāramātrikā*. According to the *Dāyabhāga*, as is well known, the widow succeeds to her husband's interests on

11 Kane, pp. 289, 300, 314, 315, 317, 318, 325-30, 332, 337, 340.

his death even if he be joint with his brother. His date has been placed between the eleventh and the sixteenth century.

Aniruddha (c 1160) wrote *Haralatā*. The author was a *guru* of king Ballālasena of Bengal and helped him in the preparation of *Dānasāgara* (the Sea of Gifts).

Ballālasena (1170), King of Bengal, was the author of four works:

1. *Āchārasāgara*.
2. *Pratiṣṭhāsāgara*, relating to the dedication of reservoirs of water and temples.
3. *Dānasāgara* dealing with the sixteen great gifts.
4. *Adbhūtasāgara*, dealing with the rites calculated to remove celestial and terrestrial potents. The work was completed by his son Lakṣmaṇasena.

Parāśara (*c* 1200) wrote an independent *Smriti*.

Śrīdhara's (1200) *Smrityarthasāra* is quoted as an authority by the *Smritichandrikā* and Hemādri.

An influential jurist of the age is Halāyudha II. (1200), author of the *Brāhmaṇasarvasva*. He was the son of the judge (*dharmādhyakṣa*) of King Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal and was himself made a judge.

Two great Southerners[12] of the thirteenth century belong to the very first rank among Hindu socio-legal philosophers. The first is Devanabhatta, author of *Smriti-chandrikā* (c 1250). This digest even now exer-

12 Kane, pp. 258, 289, 346, 354-359.

cises an influence in judicial decision second only to the *Mitākṣarā*.

7. *Hemādri*

The other great jurist of the age is Hemādri (c 1300), author of *Chaturvarga-chintāmaṇi*. This is an encyclopædic treatise of socio-legal topics. Portions published up till now (*Bibliotheca Indica Series*) already cover 6000 pages. Much remains yet to be printed.[13] The author was a Southerner, being a minister of King Mahādeva (1260-1271) and Rāmachandra (1271-1309). He describes himself also as being the keeper of this king's archives or state records. The *Chintāmaṇi* was the standard work of the Maraṭha and Telugu territories.

For the purposes of sociological thought in the field of positivism no work is more valuable than Hemādri's. The division of his great treatise which is given over to *Dāna*, charities or gifts furnishes an objective picture of the morals, manners and sentiments in regard to "social service," community work, public benefactions etc. And as this division is based on the *Purāṇas* and other treatises including the *Mahābhārata* such as preceded and were formative forces in the epoch of Hemādri its importance as a document of Hindu social institutions for the entire period from Harṣa downwards is considerable.

Ārogyādāna (gift of health) is one of the *anantaphaladānas* (gifts fraught with eternal or infinite effects) described in chapter XIII of the *Dānakhaṇḍa*. The

13 *Chaturvarga-Chintāmaṇi* text (edited by Bharata Chandra Siromani) in the Bibliotheca Indica Series Vol. I. *Danakhanda* (Calcutta 1873) pp. 891-893, 951-953, 1001-1003, 1029-1048.

establishment of *ārogyaśālā* (cure-houses or hospitals) is to be found among the suggestions cited from *Nandī Purāṇa* and *Skanda-Purāṇa*.

The construction of bridges on roads and rivers is one of the measures quoted by Hemādri from the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* as calculated to offer relief to the travellers (*pānthaśuśruṣā*). For gifts in the form of wells Hemādri's authorities are the *Viṣṇudharmottara, Nandī-Purāṇa, Āditya-Purāṇa, Viṣṇu-Purāṇa,* and *Devī-Purāṇa*.

For the planting of trees for public convenience Hemādri quotes the *Skaṇḍa, Nandī, Vāyu, Devī, Matsya,* and other *Purāṇas,* as well as the *Mahābhārata*.

Hemādri's master, the Yādava King Rāmdeva of Deogiri, was the contemporary of the Karṇāṭa King of Mithilā, Hari Simhadeva (1304-1324), at whose court the celebrated writer of *Smriti* and *Nīti,* Chaṇḍeśvara, flourished. Rāmadeva had to fight against and surrender to the Mussalman forces under Malik Kafur sent by Alauddin Khilji in 1309. Hari Simhadeva failed to withstand the attack of the Mussalman army under Ghiyasuddin Tughlak and retired into Nepal in 1324. They were thus two of the last independent Hindu Kings in two different parts of India. Hemādri and Chaṇḍeśvara were thus contemporaries and represent the last strands of Hindu social thought in politics and jurisprudence on the eve of Moslem contacts.[14] A chapter of Hindu culture may then be closed indifferently with either of these two great thinkers. Let us close a period with Hemādri and embark upon a new one with Chaṇḍeśvara.

14 The *Rājanītiratnākara* by Chandesvara (Patna 1924) pp. i, j, l, r.

It is worth while to observe that Chaṇḍeśvara's *Rājanīti-Ratnākara* was not composed while Harisimha was still reigning. It appears to have been written under King Bhaveśa who was perhaps the first ruler set up by the Tughlaks of Delhi as their feudatory. In that event Chaṇḍeśvara's political treatise is virtually one of the first Hindu works produced under new socio-political (Hindu-Moslem) conditions. It is therefore by all means to be treated as somewhat different from the work of Hemādri.

Certain works like those of Viśvarūpa, Vijnāneśvara and Aparārka, are formally known as commentaries. But contentually they ought to be described as *nibandhas*.

The style of *nibandhas* may be seen from Hemādri's work. Hemādri has made it a point to give the meanings even of individual words whenever necessary. Besides, lengthy interpretations or explanations in prose are to be found every now and then. It is not out of place to observe that Hemādri's name is to be found in the third person.

The *Kalpataru*, the *Smriti Chandrikā*, and the *Chaturvarga-chintāmaṇi* are *nibandhas* i.e. digests of different *Smritis* or *Dharmasūtras*. They represent the synthesis attempted at by the compilers and may be placed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[15] Such digests are more important from the standpoint of law and politics than mere commentaries on individual *Smritis*.

The influence of *Smriti politics* on orthodox scholarship in modern Bengal is considerable. The *Smritis* or *Dharmaśāstras* as sources of political (*nīti*) thought have been utilized by a contemporary writer, Madhusūdan

15 Kane, p. 247.

Bhattāchārya of Nadia, for his *Ratnamālā*[16] (Garland of Gems) or Collection of Extracts. The following texts are to be found in his references:—1. *Manu*, 2. *Atri*, 4. *Hārīta*, 5. *Yājnavalkya*, 6. *Parāśara* 7. *Gautama*, 8. *Vaśiṣṭha*. The chronological order has not been used in this enumeration.

Nītiśāstras

1. *Brihaspati's Sūtra*

The epoch from Harṣa to Hemādri may rightly commence with the *Bārhaspatya-sūtram*.[17] This is a *Sūtra* treatise of *Nītiśāstra* ascribed to Brihaspati, exponent of the cult of *pauruṣa* or manliness as the architechtonic force in human affairs. *Pauruṣe niṣṭhito devo*, says he (II, 61). It is on manliness that fate is established. He is, again, the exponent of the doctrine that it is because of *Daṇḍa-nīti* that the sun is the ruler of men (III, 76).

The treatise is complete in six short chapters. The *sūtras* are really aphoristic, mostly pithy and very often incomplete as sentences. The entire work is in prose. One may find the Kauṭalyan style in certain aphorisms.

At II. 1, Thomas is right in taking *guṇa* in an untechnical sense. But it is better to render *guṇavato rājyam* by "Kingship (state of sovereignty) belongs to the qualified" rather than by "Sovereignty belongs to one possessing advantages," as he does. Accordingly II, 2,

16 Vol. I. *Hindu Rājanīti* (Calcutta, first edition 1904. Second edition 1909). The treatise, covering as it does 960 pages, consists of Bengali translation as text and Sanskrit original as footnotes.

17 Edited in Devanagari character by B. Datta. Text and transl., by F. W. Thomas (Lahore 1921).

vidyāguṇorthaguṇāh sahāyaguṇāścha may be rendered more precisely as "Learning (or knowledge) is a qualification, wealth is a qualification and aid (aliance or friendship) is also a qualification."

III, 1. (*jitakleśasya pauruṣam*) is translated by Thomas as "Manliness is the quality of one superior to weakness." He renders *kleśa*=weakness. But the sense requires that it should be rendered as difficulties, troubles, pains etc. We then understand Brihaspati as saying that "manliness comes through conquest of difficulties and troubles etc." It is only then that Brihaspati's message about *pauruṣa* can become explicit in the next verse which describes the manner of acquiring it. *Deśāntaravāsena jitakleśo bhavati.* In Thomas's rendering "one becomes superior to weakness by residence in other countries." More appropriately, we should say that it is by residence in other countries that one becomes conqueror of difficulties and troubles, etc. The word "weakness" applies to something subjective inherent in the person himself while *kleśa* as used by Brihaspati is something external to the person, engendered by the circumstances or conditions of life. It is by overpowering those unfavourable or unpleasant conditions that the person acquires the mental or moral attributes of *pauruṣa*.

An interesting feature of this treatise is the geographical section in chapter III (64-148). The earth is divided into seven *dvīpas*, "islands," regions or continents and has an area of fifty crores of *yojanas*. The continents are named as Karma, Bhoga, Atibhoga, Divya, Śringāra, Siddha and Kaivalya. At 105 there is a reference to the Yādava Kānchī *Viṣaya* (country). This leads Thomas to suspect the twelfth century as the age of this

treatise or rather perhaps of this line (p.17). But the context, again, is suspected by him as an interpolation. In any case the name Yādava as that of a tribe or family need not necessarily bring even this particular line down to the twelfth century.

India is known as *Bhāratah Khaṇḍah* (72). The different regions of India are mentioned along with their areas in *yojanas*. The *Yavanaviṣayāh* (Yavana countries) are mountainous and are located in *Mlechchhadeśa* (117). Brihaspati enumerates the *puṇyakṣetras* (sacred places or points of pilgrimage) also, namely, the eight *Vaiṣṇava*, the eight *Śaiva*, and the eight *Śākta*. The mountains as seats of the gods are specially enumerated. The four Pauranic ages are described with reference to the qualities of the races living in each. The fourth age is not called *Kali* but *Tisya* (140). And men of this age are described as "proficient in *Daṇḍa nīti*" (146). Bhārata is known as *Karmabhūmi* or land of action (134).

The problem of auspicious (*śubha*) and inauspicious (*aśubha*) sights and sounds has a place in chapter IV. (20-26).

Brihaspati has given us a bit of his mind in the following *sūtras*: "People are happy when relatives are in trouble" (10). Relatives, cruel in their hidden hearts, cause troubles or relatives (11). The most dangerous of all fears is that from relatives. *Sarvabhayeṣu jnātibhayam ghoram* (12). Friendship is like a drop of water on a leaf (14). The conception of such *Realpolitik* in human relations is not peculiar to Brihaspati among the social or political philosophers of Asia or Europe.

In Chapter VI. 10-12 Brihaspati announces *dhanamūlam jagat* (the world has its roots in wealth) and

sarvāṇi tatra santi (everything is to be found there). Further, we are told that the man without wealth is as it were dead, a *Chaṇḍāla* (pariah). In these messages an indologist might be tempted to suspect the germ of the Marxist "economic interpretation of history." But Brihaspati is not a moṇist. He makes his position clear in the very next *sūtra* (13) which says that "in the same manner (*evam*) one should acquire learning which is the root of *dharma* (*dharmamūlām cha vidyām arjayet*). He does not stop at this point, however, but promulgates *vidyāmūlam jagat* (the world has its roots in *vidyā*) as well as *vidyā punah sarvam*, i.e. knowledge again is all (15).

Brihaspati is thus a pluralist. He is not prepared to discover the roots of anything in one particular force, but finds each and every force as of some value in the making of man's personality, *dharma* and what not. And this position is in keeping with what in the domain of religion is known as heinotheism as contrasted with polytheism. In heinotheism every god is adored for the time being as the Supreme Being, so to say, in regard to man and the universe. No one god can claim this status exclusively. On every occasion we have to remember "the other gods" who are equally to be adored in the same terms. *Artha* is thus nothing more than a god of this heinotheistic Hindu *nīti* philosophy.

At V. 30. *ityāhāchāryo brihaspatih* (Thus said the preceptor Brihaspati). The work begins as follows: *brihaspatirathāchārya indrāya nītisarvasvam upadiśati* (Now the preceptor Brihaspati is teaching Indra the whole substance of *Niti*). Brihaspati is thus mentioned by name twice.

In I. 112 the preceptor is not mentioned by name but is described as the *bhagavān āchāryah surendraguruh* (divine preceptor, the *guru* of the gods). In II. 75 the message is given as simply that of the *guru*. III. 148, IV, 50, and VI. 15 also indicate nothing but the *āchārya* and the *guru*.

Altogether, one will have to take the treatise as a compilation of aphorisms fathered upon Brihaspati. On account of the somewhat archaic character of the language it possesses some special interest. But otherwise as a compilation on *Nītiśāstra* it does not do much credit to the compiler. One cannot of course overlook the fact that the work is fragmentary.

The work is perhaps posterior to Kālidāsa (*c* 400). In the *Meghadūta* Kālidāsa speaks of Kamkhal but ignores Hardwar or Gangādvāra,[18] possibly because as a Śaiva sacred place the latter spot is comparatively recent. But in the *Bārhaspatya sūtra* III, 122, Gangādvāra is mentioned as a *Kṣetra* (p. 8). The material may perhaps be old, as old at least as the Kauṭalyan *Arthaśāstra*. But because of some comparatively recent names the compilation may have to be placed somewhere in the age of Harṣavardhana (*c* 650), if not still later. Be it observed at once that the spirit of Harṣavardhana in certain respects, at any rate, is the farthest removed from the atmosphere of this *Sūtra*. The references to the Bauddha (II. 9, 15, 34) are entirely un-Harṣalike.

According to Brihaspati the Buddhist family is destroyed either in the present generation or in that of the sons and grandsons (34). The Buddhist is one of those

18 This observation of Pandit Jayadeva's is quoted by the editor of the Lahore text (1921).

pāṣaṇḍas (abominable creatures) or heretics with whom contact is forbidden even in thought (35). Such *mores* (II. 12-35, III. 15) are promulgated in regard to the other heretics, for example, the *Laukāyatika*, the *Kāpālika* and the *Kṣapaṇaka*. The presence of such prejudices, on the one hand, as well as the mention of *Tāntrikas* (III. 144) as important in the *Dvāpara* age, on the other, may easily suggest an epoch in which the late *Mahāyāna* and the neo-Hindu systems are jumbled together in the social polity. The compiler does not happen to be a symbol of *rapprochement* or synthesis and reconciliation between the diverse elements. We can believe of course that even in the epoch of Harṣa's eclecticism not every Indian was an eclecticist like the Emperor himself. The anti-heretical and anti-Buddhist sentiments of previous epochs have therefore found a place side by side with the pro-Tantrik sentiments of the age of Harṣa and his successor (600-800) in this queer collection that goes by the name of Brihaspati.

2. *Somadeva's Nītivākyāmrita*

Somadeva (*c* 950) is known to be a Jaina by faith, but in his *Nītivākyāmrita*[19] there is hardly any trace of Jainism outside of the very first chapter. Indeed it is throughout a-religious. The treatise is really a book of *Nīti-śāstra*, pure and undefiled. As such, Somadeva's work is a fine specimen of tenth century Hindu culture in the realm of social philosophy. The true *Nīti* spirit is embodied in the *Nītivākyāmrita*, in which, therefore, may be seen registered the progress and expansion of positivism during the Indian Middle Ages.

19 Gopalanarayana Co. Bombay.

It is indeed questionable if Somadeva is a genuine Jaina when we see that he commences his work with salutation to Gaṇeśa in the orthodox Brāhmaṇical manner. Perhaps like many other Jainas he represents in his life and thought the conquest of electicism in Brāhmaṇic-Jaina religious intercourse.

What is still more interesting is that in his orientations to group life, the society and the state, Somadeva is fundamentally at one with Brihaspati. There is nothing to choose between the two in the emphasis on *puruṣa-kāra, pauruṣa* (manliness), etc.

The arrow does not shoot out of the bow of itself from the hands of the man who depends on *daiva* (chance or luck), says Somadeva (ch. XXIX). It is to the person who depends on *pauruṣa* that there is the problem of gain or loss (*pauruṣāvalambinorthānarthayoh sandehah*). But to the fellow dependent on *daiva* loss is certain. The relations between *daiva* (luck, chance, fate) and *pauruṣa* (human energy, exertion, manhood) are those between life and medicine. It is with such philosophy of faith in the efficacy of *pauruṣa* as capable of deciding the issue between success and failure or life and death, that Somadeva analyzes the relations between man and man, prince and prince, state and state. In his treatise, then, we are to encounter action, active life, the ability to transform the external conditions, activism.

The atmosphere of the *Nitivākyāmrita* introduces us to the fundamental *milieu* of *vikrama* (prowess), *puruṣa-kāra* (energism), *vijigīṣu* (aspirant to conquest), *sārvabhauma* (world-ruler) and so forth. We are talking the language of Kauṭalya on a large scale. In *Bārhaspatya*

sūtra the key is Kauṭalyan, materialistic, secular, energistic. But perhaps because it is too short and fragmentary, Kauṭalyaism does not come out in a well-formed manner. But Somadeva is out and out Kauṭalyan.

Even the chapters are generally Kauṭalyan in phraseology. The thirtyone *samuddeśas* (topics) are indicated below:

1. *Dharma* (duties), 2. *Artha* (wealth), 3. *Kāma* (enjoyment), 4. Six enemies, 5, Learning and Age, 6. *Ānvīkṣikī* (metaphysics), 7. *Trayī* (Vedas) 8. *Vārttā* (farming, cattle-breeding and commerce), 9. *Daṇḍanīti*, 10. Ministers, 11. The Family Priest, 12. The General, 13. The Representative or Ambassador, 14. The Spies, 15. *Vichāra* or Discrimination, 16. The Vices, 17. The King, 18. The Officers, 19. The Country, 20. The Forts, 21. The Treasure, 22. The Army, 23. The Ally, 24. Guarding the King against dangers, 25. Daily Routine, 26. Good Conduct, 27. Morals and Manners, 28. Judicial affairs, 29. The Six *Guṇas* (attitudes) *vis-à-vis* other states, 30. War, 31. Marriage.

The *Nītivākyāmrita* (ch. on the six *guṇas*) has a very significant message. It furnishes hope to everybody,—to the small man, to the ruler of the petty state. "Even when planted on earth carelessly, the tree becomes firm-rooted, "says he (*avajnayāpi bhūmāvāropitastarurbhavati vaddhamūlah*). "Does not likewise the king? (*Kim punarna bhūpatih*?). That is, a ruler who somehow gets hold of a territory eventually establishes his dominion over it. Indeed, as we are told, "nobody's territory is derived from his family (*Na hi kulagatā kasyāpi bhūmih*). The Earth is to be enjoyed only by the hero (*vīrabhogyā vasundharā*)." And that is why even the "small man"

or the ruler of a small territory, provided he be furnished with *upāyas* (diplomatic methods) and prowess as well as lucky in devoted subjects can become *sārvabhaumah* or universal monarch.

Somadeva is an uncompromising hater of subjection. In case one is too powerless one should seek protection in order to avoid being meat to others (*śakti-hīnah samśrayam kuryādyadi na bhavati pareṣāmāmiṣam*).

He is discussing the position of the "small man" in international politics. What is the most expedient policy for a ruler that happens to be weak? Somadeva is emphatic in his answer, which is as follows:

"For a person with the sense of self-respect death is preferable to disgrace (*apamānena varam mānino maraṇam*)." Further, "one should not sell oneself by living according to the will of another (*na parechchhānuvartanenātmavikrayah*)."

And yet Somadeva is not carried away by idealism too far. He can think of the chances, the hopes, the fortunes of the future relations.

But of course protection is to be sought only in case there be the prospects of an eventual good turning up in the future (*āyatikalyāne sati kasmimśchit samvandhe parasamśrayah śreyān*). That is, the weak is not advised tc seek protection of others under all circumstances. He must have to consider the pros and cons carefully and then when he decides upon seeking somebody's tutelage he has only to utilize it with a view to the long run effect. It is the conjuncture of circumstances that he has to study all the time.

Finally, it should be observed that in social atmosphere *Bārhaspatya-sūtra* and *Nitivākyāmrita* are as the

poles asunder. In Somadeva (ch. I.) the message is one of equality. The highest of all social dealings and attitudes consists in sameness or equality to all beings (*sarvasattveṣu hi samatā sarvācharaṇānām param charaṇam*), says he. It is the farthest removed from Brihaspati's prejudices of all sorts. We are here led to the doctrine of equality *vis-à-vis* not only men but all sentient beings. And so far as human beings are concerned, Somadeva is equally precise and positive. Among the ways of acquiring *dharma* he attaches the first importance to *ātmavat paratra kuśalavrittichintamam*, i.e., the cultivation of thoughts regarding other people's welfare as one's own. In his analysis of *dharma* he propagates the doctrines of *tyāga*, i.e., self-sacrifice or gifts and charities as well as of *tapas*, i.e., the control of senses and the mind. Last but not least, the doctrine of *ahimsā* or non-injury to animals finds its proper place in his moral system. Neither in this world nor in the next can any action, we are told, leading to the injury of living beings, be productive of good results. The conduct of persons who do not perform *vratas* (ceremonies) but whose minds are not given to killing can lead to heaven (*ajighāmsumanasām vratarikṭamapi charitam svargāya jāyate*). In these and similar passages of chapter I, entitled *Dharmasamuddeśe* we encounter the catechism of Jaina religion and morals.

A very noteworthy feature of *Nitivākyāmrita* remains to be mentioned in this estimate, short as it is. Just after offering salutation to Gaṇeśa Somadeva offers another salutation. This, however, is not to a god or the *guru* but to the *rājya*, the state. The *rājya* is there conceived by him as *dharmārthaphala*, i.e., as an organism of which the fruits are *dharma* and *artha*. The concep-

tion of the king as the maker of time is well-known in *Śukranīti* (I. lines 43-44). It is specially to be observed that Somadeva does not use the category *rājā* or the ruler but *rājya*, the entire socio-political complex. In so far as the *rājya* has been adored by the author of the *Nīti-vākyāmrita* as the source of *dharma* and *artha* he must be credited with having made a contribution of extraordinary value in the history of human thought. It is here that we encounter the doctrine of *étatisme* in a nutshell. It is perhaps the greatest single contribution of the tenth century to Indian social philosophy.

3. *Bhoja's Yuktikalpataru*

The literary activities and propaganda of Rājā Bhoja of Dhārā (Malwa) during the eleventh century (*c* 1050) have been handed down as a venerable tradition in India. A textbook of *Nītiśāstra* is also ascribed to his pen or patronage. While dealing with this work it is necessary to get oriented to the "Vikramādityas" of Indian culture.

The association of gods and *Rishis* with the works on *Nīti* and allied topics, and the tradition about their vast size and large number, as well as the custom of attributing works to one's *gurus* (teachers or preceptors) make the problem of a systematic treatment of Hindu political, social or economic science all the more difficult. Equally puzzling is the association of works with historical characters, men of real flesh and blood, round whom, however, legends like those of Alexander and Charlemagne have grown up mystifying their age, *locale* as well as personality. One such work is *Yuktikalpataru*, giving "an account of all requirements in a royal court," as

Aufrecht observes in the *Catalogus Catalogorum*. The work was first noticed by Rajendralal Mitra, and since his time, has been drawn upon by indologists in their treatment of things Indian, specially secular matters. The work is attributed to King Bhoja (Vikramāditya) of Dhārā in Malwa and has been described by the author as compiled from *nibandhas* or treatises of various *munis* or masters on the subjects. The following account of the work is being given from the manuscript (108 leaves, written in Bengali character, belonging to Prof. Ādityarām Bhattāchārya) in the possession of the Pāṇini Office.[20]

The botanical name of the work has been explained at the beginning just after the salutation to Kriṣṇa, "the Parameśvara, who by undoing the happiness of Kamsa did really promote his happiness, who is worshipped by the gods and is really unadorable," and to the "makers of Śāstras whose words purify good men, even for the hearing." Just as a *Kalpa-vriksa* or the wishing-tree (like the wishing-cow), celebrated in Hindu mythical lore, yields the satisfaction of all desires, so "wise men by resorting to this *Kalpataru* (the treatise so-called) can achieve the most longed-for objects." The root of this tree is *Daṇḍanīti* (the science of punishment), the stem is *Jyotiṣa* (implying astronomy, astrology, horoscope and mathematics according to the conception of the Hindus), the branches and flowers are the diverse *Vidyās* which deal with the facts observed (or the phenomenal world), the fruits are unknown, and the *rasa* or sap is the *nectar* of the good, i.e., promotes their welfare." "That

20 Available in print from another manuscript (Calcutta Oriental Series, 1917).

Kalpataru should be respected by kings and ministers, who ought to study their affairs and deliberate on them according to its dictates as well as those of other *śāstras.*" "This is most conductive to the welfare of kings and promotes also the weal of others" (i.e., people).

Thus the very definition of the term *Yukti-Kalpataru,* as the title of a book, introduces the topics of a *Nīti Śāstra;* and, as a matter of fact, all the subjects dealt with in the work are the proper themes of works like *Śukranīti.* The following table of contents in the *Yukti Kalpataru* would indicate that the work is, like the *Arthaśāstra, Kāmandakīnīti, Śukranīti,* and *Ghaṭakarparanīti,* really a socio-economic and socio-political treatise, and is an additional document of Hindu secular literature in the field of *Dharmasūtras, Arthaśāstras* or *Nītiśāstras*:

1. *Nīti śāstra.* 2. *Guru* (Preceptor) and *Purohita* (Priest). 3. *Amātya* (Land Revenue Officer). *Mantrī* (Foreign minister) and Dūta (Ambassador). 4. *Lekhaka* (Scribe) and *Jyotirjna* (Astronomer). 5. *Purādhyakṣa* (Mayor or Superintendent of the City), *Vanādhyakṣa* (Superintendent of Parks and Forests). 6. *Koṣavardhana* (Development of Financial resources). 7. *Rājadāyāda* (Sharers of the royal income). 8. *Kriṣi karma* (Agriculture). 9. *Rathin* (Charioteer), *Sādi* (Horsemen or Cavalry). 10. *Gajāroha* (Art of elephant mounting, driving etc.) 11. *Yāna* (Land and Water conveyances). 12. *Yātrā* (Expeditions). 13. *Vigraha* (Warfare). 14. *Chara* (Spy). 15. *Dūtalakṣaṇa* (Characteristics of ambassadors and spies). 16. *Sandhi* (Truce and Peace). 17. *Āsana* (Siege). 18. *Dvaidha* (Duplicity—a military technical term in siege-craft). 19. *Āśraya* (Seeking refuge or protection). 20. *Daṇḍa* (Punishment).

21. *Mantra* (Policy or statecraft). 22-3. *Dvandva* (Rivalry and hostilities undertaken under two sets of circumstances, e.g., i. *Akritrima*, i.e., conditions of natural fortifications and, ii. *Kritrima*, i.e., conditions of artificial barriers and barricades, etc.), described with quotations from *Nīti Śāstra*, Garga, and one Bhoja.

24. *Pura-nirmāṇa* (Building of cities). 25. *Kāla* (Auspicious time). 26. The *Vasati* (Arrangement of various wards or quarters) described by quotations from Bhoja and Parāśara. 27. *Doṣaguṇa* (Good and bad effects, according to Astrology). 28. *Vāstu* (Houses). 29. *Dingnirṇaya* (Directions). 30. *Lakṣaṇa* (Style or characteristics of buildings). 31. *Māna* (Measurements). 32. *Doṣaguṇa* (good and bad effects). 33. *Kālanirṇaya* (When to begin building new houses). 34. *Vāstu pravesa-kāla* (When to enter new houses). 35. *Dvāranirṇaya* (Laying out of doors). 36. *Prāchīra* (walls). 37-41. *Vāstudaṇḍa* (Various measurements of houses), *Vināśa griha*, *Ranga*-and *Rāja-griha* (the twelve kinds of buildings).

42. *Āsanas* (Thrones). 43. *Khaṭikās* (Bedsteads). 44. *Piṭha* (Stools made of metals, stones or wood). 45. *Chhatras* (Umbrellas). 46. *Dhvajā* (Flags). 47. *Chāmara* (Flap). 48. *Chasaka* (Drinking vessels). 49. *Vastra* (Clothes). 50. *Alankāra* (Ornaments).

51. Diamond. 52. *Padmarāga* (Species of emerald). 53-4. Examination, prices etc., of diamonds. 55. Examination of *Vidruma* (Corals). 56. *Gomeda*. 77-8. Pearls—their examination and prices. 59. *Vaiduryya*, *Indranīla* (Sapphire). 60. *Chhāyā* (Transmitted Light). 61. *Marakata* (Emerald, its origin, and good and bad effects). 62. *Puṣparāga* (Topaz). 63. *Bhīṣmamaṇi*.

64. *Pulaka*. 65. *Sphatika* (Quartz). 66. *Ayaskānta*. 67. *Śankha* (Conch).

68. *Astra* (Missile). 69. *Khadga* (Dagger). 70. *Dhanu* (Bow). 71. *Bāṇa* (Arrow). 72-3. *Yātrā* (Expedition), the proper time for it. 74. *Nirājanā* (Ceremony with horses and elephants).

75-9. Horses—Testing, their defects, how to strike them, etc. 80. *Ritucharyyā* (Seasons—and seasonal treatment of horses). 81-2. Elephants. 83-5. The Examination, Merits and Defects of Bulls. 86. Buffaloes. 87. Deer. 88. Dogs. 89. Goats. 90-3. Carriages of various kinds.

94. *Naukā Kāṣṭha* (Woods or timber for boats). 95. Boats of various kinds.

4. Lakṣmīdhara and 5. Gopāla

The eleventh and twelfth centuries were important in political speculation as in legal discussions. Certain authors were exponents of law and politics at the same time. The Jaina scholar Hemachandra's *Laghu Arhannīti* is, like *Śukranīti*, a comprehensive treatise although within a small compass. Then we have Lakṣmīdhara[21] (c 1100-1160) who wrote a substantial section on *Rājanīti-Kalpataru* in his great work, *Smriti-Kalpataru*. He was the foreign minister of King Govindachandra of Kanauj (1105-43) and was a powerful statesman.

Gopāla (c 1100), the jurist of the *Kāmadhenu* fame, was the author also of a *Rājanīti-Kāmadhenu*. This was utilized by Chaṇḍeśvara of Mithilā (c 1325) in

21 Kane, Vol. I. pp. 77, 289, 317.

his *Rājanīti-Ratnākara,*[22] who quotes likewise *Lakṣmīdhara* and Śrīkara along with Gopāla as exponents of *rājadhane dīnānāthādisakalaprāṇinām amśitvam* (i.e., cosharership of the poor, orphans and all other "creatures" in the wealth of the king or revenues of the state).

6. *Hemachandra's Laghu Arhannīti*

In the *Laghu Arhannīti*[23] of Hemachandra (1089-1173), the small Jaina work in Sanskrit verse, we have, as it were, an interpretation of Hindu culture through Jaina eyes. *Nītiśāstra* is declared by the author to have been taught by Mahāvīra, the founder of Jainism himself, to the king of Magadha, who approached him for lessons in this science. And in Mahāvīra's version the science sprang out of the Tīrthamkara *milieu.* The first king of the Jaina tradition, namely Riṣabha, is, according to Mahāvīra, the founder or rather restorer of *Nīti* among the Bhāratas. They are said to have lost their former glories owing to the inroads of the *Kali* (Iron) Age. And so in Riṣabha we are taught to see a benefactor who placed the Bhāratas on the proper lines of progress. It is interesting that Mahāvīra does not ignore the *dharmam purātanam* (the old, previous or traditional *mores*). It is out of the old *mores* that Riṣabha is presented by him as having constructed the new (I. 14-15).

Among the achievements of Riṣabha (I. 15-17), as narrated by Mahāvīra to king Bimbisāra, we have the promulgation of the following :—(1) the societal stratification

22 *The Rājanītiratnākara by* Chandeśvara ed. by K. P. Jayaswal (Patna 1924), pp. q., 81.

23 Published by the Jainodaya Press, Ahmedabad, with Gujarati translation, 1906.

according to *varṇas* (colours, castes or professions) and *āśramas* (physiologico-psychological stages of individual personality), (2) the method of reforming or reconstructing the social system, (3) farming, commerce and crafts, (4) judicial matters, (5) statecraft of rulers (*nītimārgaṁcha bhūpānām*), (6) the laying out of towns and villages, (7) all the sciences (*vidyā*) (8) all the activities (*kriyā*) bearing on this world as well as the next. In this enumeration of Riṣabha's promulgations we have in reality Hemachandra's conception of the scope of *Nītiśāstra*.

The first *Adhikāra* or chapter has the following topics: 1. Qualifications of the King, 2. Moral disciplines of Kings. 3. Qualifications of Ministers. 4. Education of Ministers. 5. Qualifications of the General. 6. Education of Officials. 7. Qualifications of the Representative or Ambassador.

Chapter II. has the following topics: 1. Discussion of policy. 2. Four Methods (*Upāyas*). 3. Expeditions. 4. Distribution of booty. 5. Punishments, general and special. 6. Who are not to be punished.

In chapter III. the following subjects have demanded the author's attention:—1. Judicial proceedings (The material is partly in prose some of which is Prakrit). 2. Witnesses, 3. Debts, 4. Securities, 5. Collective Organizations (*sambhūyotthāna*), 6. Gifts, 7. Partition of property (*Dāyabhāga*), 8. Boundary Disputes, 9. Wage, 10. Buying and selling, 11. Master and servant disputes, 12. Deposits, 13. Unowned property, 14. Abuse and Slander, 15. Breach of contract, 16. Adultery, 17. Gambling, 18. Theft, 19. Burglary, 20. Amounts of Punishment, 21. Duties of man and woman.

In the fourth chapter are described the penances of all sorts. There are prose passages in Chapters II, and III as in I.

Hemachandra's work is described as *laghu* or small. But it is really comprehensive. Its scope is wider in certain respects than that of Somadeva's *Nītivākyāmrita*. The chapters on law are full and deserve intensive analysis for comparison with ordinary Brāhmaṇic (Manu) texts. The chapters on punishment have many details which ought to be interesting to students of criminology. Altogether, it is a valuable document of Hindu positivism, from the Jaina side, for the twelfth century.

The author has commenced the work (I. 6) with a reference to king Kumārapāla on account of whose interest (*āgraha*) *Arhannīti śāstra* was composed. It is out of that work, evidently large in size, that Hemachandra has extracted the essence in order to prepare the *Laghu Arhannīti*. In the Jaina tradition as in the Hindu-Brāhmaṇic the role of abridgment is a literary convention, which is to be taken for what it is worth.

7. *Someśvara's Mānasollāsa*

An important work of the early twelfth century remains to be added.

The *Mānasollāsa* (The Hilarity of Mind) has a peculiar title. But it is a veritable work of *Nītiśāstra* like the *Yuktikalpataru* and the *Śukranīti*. The special importance of this treatise consists in its being what may be described almost as a dated book, about whose author's personality and home-surroundings there does not appear to be any doubt for the time being. The author *pro forma* is King Someśvara Bhūlokamalla of the

Western Chālukya dynasty which was established at Kalyānī in 973 by Taila or Tailapa II. Someśvara reigned from 1127 to 1138. He is the son of his illustrious father Vikramankā Vikramāditya VI., whose reign lasted for half a century (1076-1126). Vikramānka is the hero of Bilhana's *Vikramānkacharita* like Harṣavardhana of Bāṇa's *Harṣacharita*. It is, again, at Vikramānka's court that Vijnāneśvara, the immortal jurist of India, composed his world-renowned *Mitākṣarā* commentary of Yājnavalkya about 1100.[24] The *Mānasollāsa* was composed in 1131 (p. vi).

The *Mānasollāsa* is described by the author as a *śāstram viśvopakārakam,* i.e., a science calculated to promote the welfare of the world (*śloka* 9). It is, besides, a *śikṣakah sarvavastūnām* (teacher of all topics) and a *jagadāchāryapustakah* (book for teaching the world). The encyclopaedic scope and the amibitious range of the contents are apparent from these short descriptions.

The treatise is complete in five *prakaraṇas* or chapters, each containing twenty *adhyāyas* or sections. Vol. I., as published, offers the first two chapters only.

Chapter I. has the following twenty contents:

1. The giving up of untruth, 2. The giving up of inflicting loss on others, 3. The giving up of illicit intercourse, 4. The giving up of eating or drinking the things that should not be taken, 5. The giving up of jealousy, 6. The giving up of association with the

24 The text of *Mānasollāsa* Vol. I. has been edited by G. K. Shrigondekar for the Gaekward Oriental Series, Baroda, 1925. See the section on Vijnāneśvara; also Smith: *Oxford History of India* (1919) p. 202.

fallen, 7. The giving up of anger, 8. The giving up of self-praise, 9. Gifts, 10. Sweet words, 11. Sacrifices, temples, images etc., 12. Devotion to gods (verse 106 teaches that one should give up insulting or running down the gods of others), 13. Cows and Brāhmaṇas, 14. *Śrāddha* ceremony for the dead parents, 15. Entertainment of guests, 16. Honour to teachers, 17. Physical mortifications, 18. Bathing in sacred rivers, 19. Maintenance of the poor, orphans, diseased, friends and servants, 20. Protection of those who seek asylum.

There are altogether 308 *ślokas* in this chapter. It looks like a string of "platitudes, platitudes all the way." But such moralizings belong to the irreducible minimum in the training of the *vijigīṣu*. It is interesting and somewhat curious that the author has introduced 152 *ślokas* in section 19 to give a lecture on diseases and their treatment (*vaidyakam*). Half the chapter is then entirely an extract or digest in verse from a treatise of *Āyurveda*. This is followed by 11 lines in prose on *Auṣadhaparyāya* (medicines). The relevancy of this sudden infliction of a medical lecture is hardly apparent. It comes in because the author has four verses on the *dīna* (poor), *anātha* (orphan), and *ārtta* (distressed and sick). We are perhaps to understand that medical help or relief is an important form of the king's services to these classes of needy persons. *Vaidyas* (medical men) are to be appointed by him and they are to be sent out with diverse medicines on a mission of free medical service (139-140).

Chapter II. has 1300 verses and is divided into the following twenty sections: 1. The King, 2. The Officers, 3. The Territory (*Rāṣṭra*), 4. The Treasure,

5. The Forts, 6. The Army, 7. The Friend, 8. The Force of the King, 9. The Force of the Plan (*Mantra*), 10. The Force of Enterprise (*Utsāha*), 11. Treaties, 12. War, 13. Expeditions, 14. Siege, 15. Asylum, 16. Duplicity, 17. Friendly Attitude, 18. Separation, 19. Gifts, 20. Punishment.

The section on expeditions contains references to all sorts of auspicious and inauspicious occasions. Some prose *mantrams* (hymns) are introduced in connection with the removal of evils and portents. The influence of astrology, sorcery, *Tantra,* and the Atharvavedic tradition is manifest in such sections.

The king, Someśvara, is himself supposed to be the author of the book. In the colophons at the end of the two chapters we are left in no doubt as to the royal authorship. In verses 9 and 10 also the king is described in so many words as the maker of the treatise. But as the editor of the text points out, the verse 371 introduces a simile in which Someśvara is mentioned by name as the standard of comparison; and we can easily agree with the editor that "no author would be guilty of so flagrant piece of vanity." In other words, the author must be somebody other than Someśvara, say, a scholar at his court. It is interesting that we are landed once more in the Kauṭalya question. The reference to Kauṭalya (*iti Kauṭalyah*) in the Kauṭalyan *Arthaśāstra* must be taken to point to the authorship of somebody other than Kauṭalya (*Supra,* pp. 218, 306, 355).

There is a word *gālidānam* in verse 38. One can easily suspect it as a colloquial Bengali term for reproach or abusive language. The word is not unknown in colloquial modern Hindi. But one wonders as to how it

could find a place in a Sanskrit work of the early twelfth century in a Deccani (Maratha) atmosphere.[25]

Vārttāśāstras

We shall now enumerate some of the *Vārttā* documents in manuscript or in print. Be it observed at once that no reference to absolute or relative chronology is at the present moment possible. They are being mentioned at random as embodiments of Hindu interest in materialism and materialistic literature.

Let us take a more or less generic work first. In the South Indian work in Malayalam entitled *Manavala-Nārāyaṇa-śatakam*[26] there is a verse on the honour of merchants (*vaisiyar perumai*). The merchants are advised to conduct their business skilfully. They should not hanker after high rates of profit. An even and correct balance is to be used in connection with every customer. No loans are to be offered to the dishonest even if they should offer a collateral. On the other hand, loans on personal security may be offered to the honest. In book keeping not even the eighth part of a mustard seed should be allowed by way of mistake. Public measures ought to be assisted by merchants even to the extent of a crore (of the monetary unit).

A separate stanza is given over to the *vellarher perumai* (honour of agriculturists). The agricultural work done by the *vellarher* (farmers) is to maintain the

25 Prof. Vidhu Sekhara Sastri has found the word in the *Rājataraṅgiṇi* VI. 157; *Bhartrihari*, III, 133, *Vodhasāra Layayoga*, 14.

26 Taylor: *A Catalogue Raisonnée of Oriental Manuscripts in the Library of the late College of Fort St. George* (Madras 1857), Vol. III, p. 15.

prayers of Brāhmaṇas, the strength of kings, the profits of merchants and the welfare of all. Charity, donations, the enjoyments of domestic life, connubial happiness, homage to the gods, the *śāstras*, the *Vedas*, the *Purāṇas* and all other books, truth, reputation, renown, the very being of the gods, things of good report or integrity, the good order of castes, manual skill,—all these things come to pass by the merit or efficacy of the *vellarher's* plough. This sort of what, to use a Marxist category, may be described as the "agricultural interpretation of history" can be traced back, as we have seen, to the *Atharva Veda's* hymns on the cow, the draft-ox, etc. (IV, ii). We must not, however, read into Indian texts the monistic determinism of Marxist economics or sociology. Hindus, used as they are to heinotheism, are fundamentally pluralists in as much as they can appreciate, admire and deify any and every force for the time being as a supreme influence in life and thought.

We shall now deal with the specialized *śāstras* on different branches of *Vārttā*.

Several treatises on *loha* [iron and other (?) metals] are to be found among the manuscripts in Sanskrit.[27] One is known as *Loharatnākara* (Ocean of Metals), another as *Lohārṇava* (Ocean of Metals) and a third as *Lohaśāstra* (Science of Metals).

A South-Indian Sanskrit treatise on gems and their qualities found in Tanjore is the *Ratnaparīkṣā*.[28] Agastya's *Maṇiparīkṣā*,[29] (Testing of precious stones), the

27 Aufrecht: *Catalogus Catalogorum*, Part I, (Leipzig, 1891) p. 546.

28 A. C. Burnell: *Classified Index to the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Palace of Tanjore prepared for the Madras Government* (1880), p. 141.

29 Oppert: Aufrecht: *Catalogus*, Part I, p. 240.

Ratnasamuchchaya,[30] Paśupati's *Ratnamālā*[31] and others may be singled out. The section on gems in the *Yuktikalpataru* has also to be noted.

Parāśara's *Kriṣisamgraha* (Agriculture) is available in print.[32] A treatise named *Kriṣviṣaya*[33] is described as a guide to agriculture. The first few verses quoted in the catalogue are identical with those of *Parāśara's Kriṣisamgraha* published at Calcutta in 1915. But there is a discrepancy towards the end. A South Indian Sanskrit work on agriculture is *Śasyānanda.*[34]

Horticultural treatises[35] are plentiful in Southern India, for instance, *Pādapavivakṣā* (Nourishment of plants,) *Vriksadohada* (Treatment of plants), *Vriksāyurveda* (Treatment of plant diseases).

Gangārām Mahadakar's *Ārāmādi-pratiṣṭhāpaddhati*[36] is a treatise on gardens.

Nārada's *Mayūra Chitraka,*[37] *Meghamālā* or *Ratnamālā* gives indications of coming rains, famine or plenty from the appearance of the atmosphere.

On cattle we come across treatises like *Gosūtra* and *Gośānti*[38] etc. *Gośāstra,* a treatise on cattle, and

30 Aufrecht: Part I, p. 464. 31 Rajendra Lal Mitra; *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts* (Calcutta 1871), Vol. I.

32 L. D. Barnett: *A Supplementary Catalogue of Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit Books in the Library of the British Museum* (acquired during 1892-1906), London.

33 Rajendra Lal Mitra; *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts* (Calcutta 1871) Vol. I, p. 179.

34 Oppert: *List of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Private Libraries of South India,* Vol. II, p. 371.

35. Oppert: *List of Sanskrit Mss.* (Madras) Vol. pp. 223, 371.

36 Aufrecht: *Catalogus Catalogorum,* Part I, (Leipzig 1891) p. 53.

37 Aufrecht: *Catalogus Catalogorum,* Part I, (Leipzig, 1891) p. 432.

38 Aufrecht: *Catalogus Catalogorum,* Part I, (Leipzig 1891 p. 169.

Govaidyaśāstra (On cattle disease or veterinary topics) are also mentioned.

That the manuscripts or printed works mentioned here belong to a period previous to the thirteenth century is not beyond doubt. Most probably many of them do not. But they are being given here as suggestive specimens relating to the formative and early periods of these sciences.

Śilpaśāstras and Vāstuśāstras

We shall now see a bit of the *Śilpaśāstras* in the same manner.

Viśvakarmā, the divine architect or Vulcan, is an eponymous hero like Manu, and is encountered as an author, founder or patron-saint in connection with the arts, sciences or crafts called *śilpa* and the *śilpaśāstras*, i.e., treatises bearing on the *śilpas*. We know of a *Viśvakarmīya-śilpam*[39] which is described as a treatise on the manual arts attributed to Viśvakarman. The contents comprise such items as the origin of *Viśvakarman* and the derivation of terms like *takṣaka* (carpenter), *vardhaki* (sculptor), and so forth. The human stature of diverse *yugas* (Hindu epochs), wood and stone as material for sculpture, sacraments for sculptors and carpenters, proportions bearing on the images of plants and *lingams*, consecration of cars, etc. are to be found among the topics. The forms of Brāhmī, Māheśvarī and other goddesses have found a place in the discussion.

Oppert: *List of Sanskrit Mss. in the Private Libraries of Southern India* (Madras) Vol. I, p. 533.

39 Rajendra Lal Mitra: *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts* (Calcutta 1871), Vol. II, p. 142.

Attention has been devoted to the sacrificial or Brāhmaṇical thread, the sacrificial threads of gold, silver and *munja* fibre, the qualities of a special stone called *hemaśilā* (golden stone) to be found to the south of the Meru Mountain. Then there are discussions on crowns, crests and other head ornaments, movable and fixed thrones for images, etc. The proportions of doors of temples for *lingams*, the proportions of doors for other temples, the temples for Vighneśa and allied topics belong to the table of contents.

The *Mayamata*[40] is a treatise on architecture available in print and deals with the following among other topics: 1. examination of the ground, 2. measurement, 3. ascertainment of the points of the compass, 4. rules for laying out villages and towns, 5. plinth, base and pillars, 6. stone work, cementation, 7. spires, 8. one, two, three and four storied houses, 9. *gopuras* or gates, 10. *maṇḍapas*, 11. out-offices, barns, treasuries etc.

All the topics bearing on architecture are discussed in *Mayamatam*. According to the editor Gaṇapati Śastri it appears to be the oldest among the extant treatises in Sanskrit on the subject. An old Tamil translation is available in manuscript. The work is complete in 38 chapters, of which four are missing. The treatise is in verse.

The *Samarāngaṇa Sūtradhāra*[41] (Architect of human dwellings) is a peculiar name for a work on *Vāstuśāstra*. It has been published in two huge volumes comprising

40 Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 1919.

41 Baroda, Vol. I, (1924), Vol. II, (1925), Editor T. Ganapati Sastri, See the two prefaces.

altogether 63 chapters. The two tables of contents alone cover 54 pages. Architecture has been taken in a very wide sense. The construction of machines (*yantra-vidhāna*), for instance, occupies a significant part of this work (ch. XXXI). There is a chapter on painting (*chitroddeśa*) also (ch. LXXI).

The work contains also discussions on *rasa*, literary "flavour", statues made of gold, silver etc., *patākā* (flag) and so on. Certain machines have interesting names such as *gajayantra* (elephant machine), *vyomachāri vihamgayantra* (wooden bird-machine travelling in the sky), *ākāśagāmī dārumaya vimānayantra* (wooden *vimāna* machine flying in air), *dvārapālayantra* (door keeper machine), etc. The chief topics of the work are furnished by the construction of cities, palaces, and mansions of the most diverse classes. It should be observed that the entire treatise is in verse.

There is a treatise in Tamil entitled *Śilpaśāstra*[42] which is said to have been originally composed in Sanskrit.

Vāsavāchārya's *Viśvavidyābharaṇa*[43] deals with the duties of artisans.

A treatise on shipbuilding and navigation is *Nāvaśāstram* also known as *Kappal Śāstram*.[44] An unnamed work deals with navigation as well as house-building and other topics taught in 36 works which are enumerated.[45]

42 Meyer in the *Indian Antiquary* for 1876.

43 Aufrecht: *Catalogus*, Part II, (Leipzig 1896) p. 139.

44 W. Taylor: *A Catalogue Raisonnée of Oriental Mss. in the Library of the late College of Fort St. George* (Madras 1857), Vol. III, p. 6.

45 *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 350.

Kalyāna Śivanārāyaṇa's *Śilpaśāstra-samgraha* deals with architecture.[46] The author was an inhabitant of Surat (in Gujarat).

Viśvakarman's name is associated with *Viśvakarmā-prakāśa* (Architecture).[47]

The most universal topic of *śilpaśāstras* is house-building. But it deals with many other topics directly or indirectly allied to edifices, for instance, furniture, decorations and ornaments, etc. Besides, the topics of sculpture as well as painting are also discussed in *śilpaśāstras*. There are chapters on sculpture and painting in the *Agni* and *Matsya Purāṇas*. The *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, for instance, has a chapter on *chitra* (painting).

A very common name for treatises on building is *vāstuvidyā* or *vāstuśāstra*. They may be said to specialize in architecture, although sculpture also comes in for treatment. Very often *vāstuśāstra* and *śilpaśāstra* have to be taken almost as convertible terms. Perhaps in any case we should treat the *śilpaśāstras* as somewhat wider in scope and more generic in nature.

The name of treatises on *vāstu* (building or architecture) is legion. Jeva Nath Jotishi's *Vāsturatnāvalī*[48] Śyāmācharaṇa's *Vāstusankhyā*,[49] which is an extract from *Todarānanda*, Viśvakarman's *Vāstuvichāra*,[50] Sūtradharamaṇḍana's *Vāstusāra*[51] may be mentioned. Gaṇa-

46 Edited with a Gujarati transl. by Kalyanadas Bhunabhai Gujjar, Rajnagar, 1898.

47 Edited with Hindi transl. by Saktidhara Sukula, Lucknow, 1896.

48 Burnell: *Classified Index* (Madras 1880).

49 Sudhakara Dvivedi: *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the N.W.P* Part IX, (1885), p. 56.

50 *Ibid.*, p. 56

51 Aufrecht, Part I, p. 569.

pati Sastri's edition of *Vāstuvidyā* (Trivandrum Sanskrit series 1913) has rendered accessible the contents of a work attributed to Viśvakarman.

The *Vāstuvidyā* is entirely in verse and complete in 16 chapters. The last chapter deals with earth and tile making. Building materials, ground and other things connected with house construction constitute the subject matter.

Gangādhara's *Śilpadīpaka*[52] is a metrical treatise on architecture in five sections. Bhoja Vikramāditya's *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*[53] is perhaps to be taken as one of the oldest treatises on architecture (c. 1050). His *Yukti-kalpataru* which has been mentioned in connection with the *Nītiśāstras* is to be noted in the present context also.

Sudhākara Divedi's *Vāstava-chandra-śringonnati* is a work on architecture.[54]

It is to be understood that *śilpaśāstras* are by all means treatises on aesthetics or rather applied aesthetics. They deal chiefly with the problem of form (*rūpam*). But in the present context we are interested in them exclusively as documents of exact science, mathematical measurements, calculations of proportions etc. bearing on Nature and man. It is as furnishing fresh evidences of Hindu command over the things of this earthly earth and of their preoccupation with non-transcendental, unmetaphysical and matter-of fact realities as well as the human world of daily secular interests that *silpaśāstras* are being introduced as twins of the *vārttāśāstras*. Be it observed once more that none of the texts in manuscripts

52 Barnett : *Supplementary Catalogue* 1892-1906, London.

53 Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 1924.

54 Bombay Venkatesvara Press.

or print such as have been mentioned for the period from *c.* 600 to 1300 may belong to this period at all. But it is presumed that the *chitralakṣaṇa, pratimālakṣaṇa* (i.e. marks or characteristics of paintings, images etc.) were known during those centuries and earlier and of course the principles were practised by the painters, sculptors and architects.

Like the eighteen *Purāṇas,* eighteen *Upa-Purāṇas,* eighteen *Smritis* and eighteen *Upa-Smritis,* the eighteen masters of *Vāstu-vidyā* became traditional in Hindu culture. The *Matsya-Purāṇa* (XXVIII) enumerates them as follows :[55]

1. Bhrigu	10. Brahmā
2. Atri	11. Kumāra
3. Vaśiṣṭha	12. Nandīśa
4. Viśvakarmā	13. Saunaka
5. Maya	14. Garga
6. Nārada	15. Vāstudeva
7. Nagnajit	16. Aniruddha
8. Viśālākṣa	17. Śukra
9. Purandara	18. Vrihaspati.

It is strange that Varāhamihira is not mentioned in the *Matsya Purāṇa.* He is, however, mentioned in the sixteenth century work *Todarānanda.*

Hindu Positivism in South Eastern Asia, Tibet, China and Moslem Asia

Buddhism is known to have reached Siam through Cambodia early in the fifth century (422 A.C.). Burma also played some part in the propagation of Buddhism in

55 P. N. Bose : *Principles of Indian Śilpaśāstra* with the Text of *Mayaśāstra* (Lahore 1926), p. 65.

Siam. Along with Buddhism came the entire Pāli literature furnished as it is with the elements of positivism and the morality of strenuous and energistic life.

It is to be remembered that in the early centuries of the Christian era Siam had no independent existence, being but a province of Cāmboja. Whatever is known about the establishment of Greater India in Cāmboja during this period may refer therefore equally to Siam also. From the earliest inscriptions of Cāmboja, e.g., those from the sixth to the ninth century A.C., be they in Khmer or in Sanskrit, we understand the prevalence of Hindu gods, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva alongside of Buddha.

It was during the period in question that Siam also came to be annexed to the sphere of Hindu positivism. The earlier beginnings of the Hinduization of this country are not yet clear. But early in the thirteenth century when the first royal dynasty of Siam was established (1218 A.C.) it had already a Hindu name. The first historical king is known to have been Śri Indrāditya and his successors also had Hindu names. The name of the capital of this dynasty was also Hindu or rather Indian, namely, Sukhodaya.

The third king Rāma Rājā (1283) bore on his very name the influence of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. He was a Buddhist by faith. The inscription (1293)[56] issued by him describes temples with the image of Buddha as well as monks and a *Mahāthera* (head priest) well-versed in the *Tripiṭaka*.

56 Fournereau: *Le Siam Ancien* (1895), 2 vols; Bradley: "The Oldest Known Writing in Siam" in the *Journal of the Siam Society* (1909) and "The Proximate Source of the Siamese Alphabet" in the *J.S.S.* (1913); all cited in P. N. Bose: *The Indian Colony of Siam* (Lahore 1927), pp. 32-42, 90-91, 101-102, 118-120.

The Siamese alphabet that was invented by him (1284) was modelled on the Cambojian which is well known to be Sanskritic.

The titles of ministers of the state council as well as of the principal officials are found to be Hindu. The *montree*, the *parohita* (*purohita*), the *mahāsenāpati*, the *rājakoṣādhipati*, the *amancha* (*amātya*) etc. are all Indian categories. The five Hindu symbols of royalty are in use. The civil and criminal law of the *Manu Samhitā* has furnished the basis of Siamese law. The influence of the *Mahābhārata* also as of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is no less patent.

The influence of Hindu positivism in the history of Champā from the seventh to the thirteenth century is patent in the royal dynasties of the period, of which each one of the fifty rulers bears a Sanskrit name. And most of these names end in Varman, no matter how varied be the dynasties.[57]

A Sanskrit inscription of King Prakāśadharma Vikrāntavarman I. (655-690) has a fine verse on *śakti* (prowess) in which *daṇḍa* (punishment) and *bheda* (disunion), two of the important categories of Hindu *Nitiśāstra* are utilized in the right eulogistic manner of Hariṣena and other Indian *praśasti-kāras*.

Another inscription of his shows familiarity with the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Familiarity with the ideology of the *Manu Samhitā* can be seen in the inscriptions of Vikrāntavarman II (710-730), Indravarman I. (799), Indravarman II. (875) The atmosphere is throughout one of the promotion of *dharma* (law and duty) as the function of the king who is "a god in human form."

57 R. C. Majumdar: *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*, Vol. I. *Champa* (Lahore 1927), Book IIII, pp. 14, 49, 69, 82, 165, 171-172, 199.

Familiarity with the *Mahābhārata* is evident in an inscription of Rudravarman III (c 908-917) and with the *Artha-Purāṇaśāstra* in an inscription of Jaya Harivarman I (c 800-820).

In Harivarman IV's inscription (1081) which is partly in Sanskrit verse and partly in Cham prose, the portion in Cham has reference to *sāma, dāna, bheda* and *daṇḍa.*

An inscription entirely in Cham of 1088 describes Śrī Jaya Indravarmadeva V as virtually an embodiment of all the good things to be found in the Hindu *nītiśāstras.* In this description we are told that the eighteen titles of law prescribed by Manu were followed by him and that he knew also the *ṣādguṇya* (the six military attitudes). The inscription makes use of the categories, *trivarga, artha, dharma, kāma, sāma, dāna, bheda, upapradāna* (bribery), *krodha, lobha, moha, mada, mātsarya, yoga, dhyāna, samādhi* etc. among others.

The *Dharmaśāstras,* especially the *Nāradīya* and the *Bhārgavīya* are referred to in the inscription (in Cham) of Jaya Indravarman VII (1180-1190). These and other inscriptions of Champā may indeed be regarded for certain purposes as exquisite and concrete illustrations (some of them in fine Sanskrit verse) of the principles or theories adumbrated in the texts of political philosophy created on Indian soil.

It may not be difficult to connect the architecture and sculpture of Champā with those of India. The theme of the figures, of course, is Hindu and their forms also could not but be derived in the main and originally from Indian executions. As regards the buildings, the temples also, in spite of great difference in details their forms may be described as having some family likeness with the

Hindu temples, e.g., of South India and of Buddhist *vihāras*. The influence of the *śilpaśāstras* may then have to be detected in the Champā art also.[58]

The *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* of Bali is older than the tenth century and can be traced to the fifth or the sixth.[59] In this treatise a Kṣatriya dynasty of Indonesia has been linked up with the Indian sage Pulaha.

It is possible to suspect also the existence of the Indian *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* in Bali during this period, since some of its stories are found to have influenced the Balinese *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* and other works.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the Indian *Tantras* also were powerfully influencing the literature of the Indonesians. The frequent use of Sanskrit verses in these texts is a noteworthy feature. It is interesting to observe that the peoples of Java and Bali used to offer salutations in verse to the *Panchakanyā* (five ladies), Ahalyā, Dropadī, Sitā, Dārā, and Mandodarī, in the same manner as the Hindus of those days as well as of today.

Vyāsa's *Nītipraya* is said to have been written for a prince. It deals with what Indian *smriti* and *nīti śāstras* call *rājadharma* or duties of kings. Another Balinese work, the *Nītiśāstra Kawi* is in the same strain. Incidentally it may be observed that Viṣṇugupta Kauṭalya is referred to in a Bālinese inscription of 1041.

58 R. C. Majumdar, pp. 272-274; H. Parmentier: "The Common Origin of Hindu Architectures in India and the Far East" (*Rupam*, Calcutta, January 1929)

59 H. B. Sarkar: *Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali* (Calcutta 1934), pp. 31-33, 46, 60, 74, 89-92, 94-99, 125-128, 175, 194, 213, 234-235; S. K. Chatterjee; "Some Rāmāyaṇa Reliefs from Prambanan, Java" (*Rupam*, Calcutta, January-April 1928); H. Zimmer: *Kunst -form und Yoga in indischen Kultbild* (Berlin, 1926).

about the Indianization of China and Japan applies equally if not more appropriately to the Indianization of Tibet also.

The frescoes in the monastery at Luk illustrate Amitābha, Vairochana, medicine-gods, the thousand-handed and thousand-eyed Avalokiteśvara, and scenes in the life of Buddha.

In the temple at Gumphug one comes across fine specimens of indigenous Tibetan art. Chinese influence can hardly be detected here. But on the other hand the direct imitation of Tāntric *paṭas* (paintings or drawings) of India is in evidence. Manuscripts of medical treatises bear illustrations of gods or masters of medicine. Indian *Āyurveda* seems to be well represented in Tibetan culture.

The *maṇḍala* type of architecture is represented by the largest temple at Toling. The form might have been borrowed from the temple at Somapura near Pāhārpur in North Bengal. It is the Vajradhātumaṇḍala of the Tāntric cycle that is reproduced in this temple. Vairochana is in the centre, Akṣobhya is placed in the east, Ratnasambhava in the south, and then come Amitābha and Amoghasiddhi. The entire Mahāyānic pantheon is visible here, especially the one connected with the Sarvavid, Vairochana, Guhyasamāja and Samvaratantra.

The chapels surrounding the great temple are twenty in number. In the company of Vairochana, Vajrapāṇi, Samvara, Śākyamuṇi, Lokapāla, etc. are found very often the eight gods of medicine. Vijayā, Sitapatrā, Tārā,

of Buddhism in India," "The Bodhisattva-cult in China, Japan and India," The Buddhism of China and Japan euphemism for Shaiva-cum-Shaktaism." "Neo-Hinduism in Trans-Himalayan Asia," and "Modern Hinduism" in Sarkar: *Chinese Religion through Hindu Eyes* (Shanghai 1916), pp. 281-303.

Prajnāpāramitā are the conspicuous figures in the "white temple."

At Tsaparang a temple is dedicated to Vairochana. As the centre of Vajradhātumaṇḍala the figure of Vairochana is the special favourite of the sect founded by Rin c'en bzan po. Statues of Maitreya in gilded bronze and of Bhairava with five heads (of which the central is that of a buffalo) are likewise to be met with in some of the temples of Tsaparang.

Lamaism is the joint product of the labours of Tibetan devotees who had been to India aspiring after spiritual perfection as well as of Indian sages who were invited by the Tibetans as their guides or who were forced to leave their fatherland on account of hostile attacks. Tibet is literally dotted over with bits of Hindu culture in religion, literature and fine arts.[65]

Emperor Harṣavardhana's (606-647) Chinese contemporary was the Tang Napoleon Tai-tsung (627-650); and the contact between the two was established by Yuan-Chwang, the Max Müller of those days (the exponent and popularizer of Hindu culture), who visited India in 629 and returned to his native country in 645. The travels of Itsing, another great Chinese scholar-saint, perhaps more learned than Yuan-Chwang the "organizer", and Fa Hien the devotee or man of *bhakti* (faith), were also undertaken (671-695) under the Tangs (618-905). The seventh and eighth centuries witnessed the Indianization of Chinese culture on a magnificent scale such as had not been attempted before.

65 *Cronaca della Missione Scientifica Tucci nel Tibet Occidentale* (1933) by G. Tucci and E. Ghersi (Rome 1934), summarized by B. K. Sarkar in the *IHQ.*, (Calcutta), June 1935.

The conquest of Tibet by Tang Tai-tsung (627-650) brought India into contact with China by a new land-route. During the rule of this Tang Napoleon there were in Loyang more than three thousand Indian monks and ten thousand Indian families. It was through Indian "culture-contacts" that Chinese ideographs were furnished with phonetic values. As a result the Japanese alphabet was also created in the eighth century.[66]

The dramatic art of the Chinese was likewise influenced to a certain extent by Hindu pantomimic dances and acrobatic performances etc., as Bazin suggests in *Le Theatre Chinois*.

During the eighth century the scholar, Itsing, on his return from travels and researches in India could count among his collaborators a large number of Indians settled in China. Some of them may be mentioned as follows :

1. Anijana, a priest from Northern India,
2. Dharmaratna, a priest from Tukhara,
3. Dharmānanda, a priest from Kabul,
4. Śringīśa, a layman from Eastern India,
5. Gotamavajra, likewise a layman from Eastern India,
6. Harimati,
7. Arjuna, Prince of Kashmir.

The mighty Tangs were followed by the brilliant Sung dynasty which ruled the entire Empire from 960 to 1127, and later only South China down to 1279. Under the Sungs the fortunes of Hindu culture were no less prosperous than under the Tangs. Indeed by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries not only Taoism but even Con-

66 K. Okakura : *Ideals of the East* (London 1905).

fucianism had been thoroughly transformed under Indian influence. The result was a reinterpreted Confucian cult or Neo-Confucianism.[67]

This was the epoch of Chu-hsi (1130-1200) *par excellence* who commanded the intellect and morals of Young China. And it is the Neo-Confucianism as propounded by this philosopher of Sung times under the influence of Buddhist or Indian ideology that has ruled China and Japan since. The story of Hindu humanism from Harṣa to Hemādri becomes thus the story of a world-process which embraced virtually three fourths of Asia in its endeavours at remaking.

The ancient and medieval Chinese were strong in historiography. In catalogue-making also they were past masters. The progress of Indianization in China can be followed step by step in and through the catalogues of Buddhist *sūtras*. In Chinese the treatises bearing names which end in *"lou"* may conveniently be taken for catalogues.

In *Litai san pao ki*[68], a catalogue compiled in 597, there is a list of 24 previous catalogues of Buddhist works, the oldest of which is by tradition ascribed to the epoch of the first Chinese Emperor, Tsin Shi Hwangti (c B.C. 246-209). But none of these catalogues were seen by Fei Tchang-fang the compiler of the *Li tai san pao ki*.

The catalogues of Buddhist *Sūtras* such as could be used by Fei Tchang-fang in 597 were three in number. By 730 three more catalogues were compiled. Down to the end of the thirteenth century sixteen catalogues were prepared and all these are available today.

67 Edkins: *Chinese Buddhism* (London 1893), ch. XX.

68 P. C. Bagchi: *Le Canon Bouddhique* (Paris 1927), pp. xxxii-lii.

The *charaiveti* ("march on") of Hindu culture was not confined to those Asian regions which accepted the Indian faiths as their own. Moslem Asia also was considerably Hinduized in culture. During the period from Harṣa to Hemādri Greater India was thus flourishing in the Saracen Empire in Western Asia as in Central, Northern, Eastern and South-eastern Asia including the Islands of the Indian Archipelago.

The *Panchatantra* was translated first into Persian. From Persian it was rendered into Arabic as *Kalila and Dimna*. The medical work of Charaka likewise passed through Persian version into Arabic. Practically all the other Arabic versions of Hindu texts were made direct from the original.[69]

The astronomical (mathematical) works of Brahmagupta, namely, the *Brahmasiddhānta* (called *Sindhind* in Arabic) and the *Khaṇḍa-khādyaka* (Arkand) were translated into Arabic by Alfazari and Yakub Ibn Tarik during the reign of Mansur (753-774).

Under Harun-Alrashid (786-808) the ministers, belonging as they did to the Barmak family, were Buddhists converted to Islam. It was under their auspices that Hindu scholars were invited to Bagdad and Sanskrit works on medicine, pharmacology, toxicology, philosophy, astrology and other subjects were translated into Arabic.

At this time the son of Dhanya or Dhanin was the director of the hospital at Bagdad. A Hindu physician named Kanka was also practising there. Atri's work on drinkables was introduced to the people. Vedavyāsa's work on wisdom or philosophy, allied perhaps to Bāda-

69 E. C. Sachau: *Alberuni's India* (London 1910), Vol. I. pp. xxvii-xi.

rāyana's *Vedānta* philosophy, was likewise to be found among the Sanskrit texts known in the Saracen capital. This may have had some part in the formation of Arabian Sufism. A *Jātaka* by Satyavarman perhaps belonged also to the Indian literature imported into the Saracen Empire under Harun. Vyāghra's book on the signs of swords and a work on astrology attributed to SNGHL, a name which it is difficult to decipher, are likewise mentioned. The Buddhist story adapted in Christian literature under the title of *Joasaph and Barlaam*, as well as some of the fables of Buddhaghoṣa relating to the cunning of women were also rendered available in Arabic during this period.

Treatises on snakes (*sarpavidyā*), on poisons (*viṣavidyā*), auguring, talismans, veterinary art, sex-lore, logic, ethics, politics, war, and general philosophy are known to have been translated by the Saracens. The Moslem authors wrote also commentaries, adaptations and summaries etc. of the Hindu books.

At home in Khiva Alberuni (979-1048) was in a position to study the *Brahmasiddhānta*, the *Khaṇḍakhādyaka*, the *Charaka Samhitā* and the *Panchatantra* in Arabic versions. An Arabic translation of Vitteśvara's *Karaṇasāra* could likewise be used by him. There were in existence also certain Arabic treatises on astronomy and chronology in which the knowledge of Hindu mathematics was implied.

While in India (1017-30 ?) he wrote his work on India in which in addition to his special subjects, astronomy and mathematics, philosophy, literature, general culture etc. are introduced. The sub-title of the book is "an accurate description of all categories of Hindu

thought, as well those which are admissible as those which must be rejected." Besides, during the same period he produced a number of independent treatises. These are being enumerated below:

1. A treatise on the determination of the *nakṣatras* or lunar stations.
2. The *Khayal-alkusufaini* in which among other items the theory of *yoga* is described.
3. The Arabic *Khaṇḍa-Khādyaka*, more or less similar in contents to No. 2.
4. A book in which the *karaṇas* are described.
5. A treatise on the various systems of numeration in use among different nations including the Indian.
6. The key of astronomy.
7. Treatises on the methods for the computation of longitude.

Two works of Varāhamihra were translated into Arabic by Alberuni. The one was the *Brihatsamhitā* and the other the *Laghujātaka*. A Sanskrit treatise on loathsome diseases owes its Arabic rendering to him. Among philosophical works he is responsible for the translation of Kapila's *Sāmkhya* and Patanjali's treatise on *Yoga* as well as of the *Gītā*.

Translations from the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa, Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Matsya Purāṇa, Vāyu Purāṇa* and the *Āditya Purāṇa* are to be found in Alberuni's work on India.

As for the works on astronomy, mathematics etc. his book exhibits knowledge of (1) Brahmagupta's *Puliśa-siddhānta, Brahmasiddhānta, Khaṇḍakhādyaka, Uttara-*

khaṇḍakhādyaka, of which the first three were translated by himself into Arabic, (2) Balabhadra's commentary on the *Khaṇḍakhādyaka*, (3) Varāhamihira's *Panchasiddhāntikā* and *Brihadjātakam* in addition to the two other works translated by himself, (4) Utpala's commentary on the *Brihatsamhitā*, (5) a book by Aryabhata II, (6) Vitteśvara's *Karaṇasāra*, (7) Vijayanandin's *Karaṇatilaka*, (8) *Śrīpāla*, (9) *Book of the Ṛiṣi Bhuvanakoṣa*, (10) *Book of the Brāhman Bhattila*, (11) *Book of Durlabha*, (12) *Book of Jīvaśarman*, (13) *Book of Samaya*, (14) *Book of Auliatta*, (15) Panchāla's *Minor Mānasa*, (16) Mahādeva Chandrabija's *Sarvadhara*, (17) a calendar from Kashmir.

Among other Hindu books that went to the making of Alberuni's *India* may be mentioned (1) Haribhaṭa's dictionary, (2) a treatise on the medicine of elephants, (3) the *Mahābhārata*, (4) the *Rāmāyaṇa*, (5) Manu's *Dharmaśāstra*, and last but not least, (6) the *Gītā*.

Previous to the composition of the work on India Alberuni had translated two Sanskrit books into Arabic, as he says in the preface (Vol. I. p. 8), one about the *origines* and a description of all created beings called *Sāmkhya*, and another about the emancipation of the soul from the fetters of the body called *Pātanjali*. According to this eleventh century Moslem "indologist" "these two books contain most of the elements of the belief of the Hindus." He hoped that the work on India would "enable the reader to dispense with these two earlier ones, and with other books of the same kind."

Alberuni was convinced that "misrepresentation" (Vol. I. p. 5) was "much in fashion among those who undertake the task of giving an account of religious and philosophical systems from which they slightly differ or to

which they are entirely opposed." While examining the manner in which he classifies the "misreporters" and liars about other nations we are easily reminded of another great Moslem scholar, Abul Fazl, who nearly six centuries later analyzed the causes of intolerance and prejudices of races against one another. It is interesting that two of the greatest intellectuals of the Moslem world were inspired by the selfsame ideal, namely, the love of truth as well as the desire to rescue the Moslem conception about Hindu culture from hearsay as well as secondhand information. Not less significant is the fact that in attempting to be "objective" narrators of a "simple historic record of facts" both have exhibited their pro-Hindu leanings, although, of course, Alberuni's propaganda in favour of the Hindu achievements does not verge on the almost hundred per cent identification of Abul Fazl, the "Hindusthani Shaikh," with the fortunes of his countrymen.

In regard to Hindu religion and philosophy Alberuni makes it a point to distinguish between the educated and the uneducated classes. This distinction is with him fundamental. In the case of the Arabs and Greeks also he observes that the ideas of men and women differ according as they are cultivated or not.

"It is well known," says he, "that the popular mind leans towards the sensible world and has an aversion to the world of abstract thought which is only understood by highly educated people, of whom in every time and every place there are only few." He is therefore not surprised that among the Hindus "idols are erected only for uneducated low-class people of little understanding and that the Hindu never made an idol of any supernatural being, much less of God" (Vol. I. p. 122). In

the sixteenth century (1598) Abul Fazl also took the same liberal view about Hindu images.

Alberuni describes the "educated people among the Hindus as calling God *Īśvara*, i.e., self-sufficing, beneficent, who gives without receiving. They consider the unity of God as absolute" (Vol. I. p. 31). Then passing "from the ideas of the educated people among the Hindus to those of the common people," he observes "that they present a great variety and that some of them are simply abominable."

But Alberuni is faithful to the Koranic gospel of "speaking the truth even if it were against yourselves" (*Sura*, 4, 134). It is therefore quite in keeping with his love of truth to admit at once that "similar errors also occur in other religions. Nay, even in Islam we must decidedly disapprove, e.g., of the anthropomorphic doctrines, the teachings of the Jabriyya sect, the prohibition of the discussion of religious topics and such like."

The Hindu culture that was assimilated by Alberuni was presented by him to his readers in the perspective of Greek thought. It is very noteworthy that the manner in which we moderns try to institute parallels or identities between the Hindu and the Hellenic ideologies can be traced back to this Afghan-Moslem scientist and philosopher of the eleventh century. In his work on India the Moslems found Plato, Proclus, Aristotle, Grammaticus, Alexander of Aphrodosias, Apollonius of Tyana, Porphyry, Ammonius, Aratus, Galenus, Ptolemy, Pseudo-Kallisthenes rubbing shoulders with the authors of the *Sāmkhya*, the *Yoga*, the *Gītā* and other systems (Vol. I. pp. xlii, xxlii). Nor is this all. His comparative method served to bring in the Hindu ideas into the *milieu*

of Zoroastrian, Christian, Jewish, Manichaean, and Sufi sources.

Arabic culture was in those days the connecting link between Asia and Europe. Alberuni was thus functioning in Moslem Asia and beyond, indeed, in the entire Christian world in much the same manner as his great Chinese predecessors of the seventh century, Yuan Chwang and Itsing, in China and Japan, so far as the propagation of Hindu culture is concerned. This Moslem mathematician of Khiva is an important landmark and agent in the establishment of Greater India. His services to the *charaiveti*, the dynamic march, of Hindu culture are immense. Not the least paradoxical feature in this evolution consists in the fact that while his masters of the Ghazni House were laying the foundations of a Moslem *rāj* in India his scientific and philosophical researches in Hindu culture were contributing to the Hinduization of the Moslem world and, through the Moslems, of the culture of Europe in exactly the same friendly spirit as had been shown by the Barmak ministry and others during the days "of good Harun Alrashid."

CHAPTER XI

From Chandesvara to Rammohun (c. 1300-1833)

During the period from the beginnings of the fourteenth to the end of the eighteenth century Hindu culture has to orient itself to two sets of foreign cultural agencies. The first are furnished by the Moslem *milieu*, and the second by the European, especially, the Portuguese, Dutch, French and British. The seventeenth century may be taken to be the real starting point of the influences from the European side. The virility of Hindu positivism is as manifest in these two *milieux* as in the previous ones.

Hindu Impacts on Islam

The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VII, 15) philosophy of *charaiveti* (march on) should appear to have continued unhampered even in the epoch of Moslem intercourse with the Hindus. The tenacity of Hindu positivism made itself felt in Islamic circles. And if there were no converts to formal Hinduism among the Mussalmans there were at any rate signs of spiritual assimilation by them of the gifts of Hindu culture. The impact of Hindu arts and sciences on the Mussalmans was considerable.

It is not perhaps possible to say in this instance as in many others that "captive Greece captured Rome." But there is no doubt that a large section of the Mussalmans,—rulers, scholars, authors, and the public,—came to be Hinduized in morals, manners and sentiments.

Indianized Persian or Persianized Hindi evolved us Urdu in the fourteenth or even in the thirteenth century.

Perhaps one of the first Urdu writers is Amir Khusru who flourished under the Khiljis (1290-1320) and is known to have died in 1325.

The translation of Sanskrit works into Persian is at least as old as Sultan Firoz Shah Tughlak (1351-1388). It was on the strength of such translations that the Hindu physical sciences had a place in *Dalail-i-Firuz Shahi*,[1] a lengthy poem by Izzul-din Khalid.

While on the one hand Sanskrit texts were being rendered into Persian and mainly through Moslem interest and under Moslem auspices it is significant to observe that Sanskrit works were being rendered into the spoken languages of the Indian people,—the vernaculars,—and this also through Moslem interest. The first translation of the Sanskrit *Mahābhārata* into Bengali, for instance, was accomplished under the order of King Nasir Shah (1282-1325).

The translation of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* into Bengali by Mālādhar Basu was done under the orders of Husain Shah (1493-1518). Parāgal Khān, a general of this ruler, as well as Parāgal's son Chhuṭi Khān are famous in Bengal as inspirers of the Bengali translation of portions of the *Mahābhārata* by Kavīndra Parameśvara and Śrī Karaṇa Nandi.[2]

Hindu-Moslem *rapprochement* was thus in evidence in Pre-Moghul India. The movement got a fillip under the Moghuls.

1 *Maathirul-Umara*, Vol. II. p. 190, in M. Z. Siddiqi: "The Services of the Muslims to Sanskrit Literature" (*Calcutta Review*, February, 1933).

2 D. C. Sen; *History of Bengali Language and Literature* (Calcutta, 1911), pp. 10-12, 14; N. N. Law: *The Promotion of Learning in India during Muhammadan Rule by Muhammadans* (London, 1916), pp. 107-111.

The translation bureau of Akbar the Great published Persian renderings of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Gītā*, the *Atharva Veda*, the *Yogavāśiṣṭha*, the *Maheśamahānanda*, the *Harivamśa* and other treatises. Hindu texts had another great Moslem patron in Prince Dara Shikoh (1614-1659), the eldest brother of Aurangzeb or rather the eldest son of Shah Jahan (1628-1659). The translation and in certain instances the retranslation of the *Vedas* into Persian was undertaken on account of the interest of Dara Shikoh.

With the help of Benares *Paṇḍits* Dara Shikoh is known to have translated several Hindu philosophical works into Persian. In 1657 was ready *Sirr-ul-Asrar* (The Secret of Secrets). This is the title of his rendering of the *Upaniṣads*. He was the translator also of the *Gītā*, the *Yogavāśiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* etc. His attempt to reconcile Sufism and Hindu pantheism found shape in the work *Majima-ul Bahrain* (1654).[3]

Interest in Hindu prosody, *ḳāmaśāstra* (sexology), *alamḳāra* (rhetoric), music, physiognomy etc. was keen among the Mussalmans in the time of Aurangzeb (1659-1707) also. It was for his grandson, Prince Jahandar Shah, that these Hindu *vidyās* were incorporated in a Persian textbook entitled *Tuhfatul-Hind*.

Hindu-Moslem cultural co-operation was manifest in the eighteenth century in the establishment in 1724 at Delhi under Muhammad Shah's orders of an observatory by the Hindu astronomer and ruler of Ambar (Jaipur), Jai Singh.

3 N. N. Law : *Promotion of Learning* etc. (London, 1916), pp. 185-186.

The Humanism of the Modern Indian Languages

In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the *caraiveti* (march on) or expansion of Hindu culture was likewise in evidence in the new or "modern" Indian (vernacular) literatures. It was going on in Marathi-speaking regions through the development of the *abhangs* or folk-songs of *bhakti* in honour of Viṣṇu. The *Gītā* was thereby rendered accessible to the people in their spoken language by poets like Jnāneśvara (c 1300) and Nāmadeva (1270-1350). The democratization of the *Gītā* is an achievement of first rate importance as furnishing the folk with the gospel of life's duties.

By the beginning of the fifteenth century the Bengali translation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* by Krittivāsa was available to the people of Bengal as a fountain of the social philosophy of daily life. The work was inspired by the cult of *bhakti* (faith or devotion), an attitude of life such as became a passion with Chaitanya (1485-1553) two generations later.

The equalitarian philosophy which sought to abolish the distinctions between the castes was a prominent characteristic of Hindu societal thinking in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,—with Nāmadeva as with Chaitanya. A founder of this movement is the Southerner Rāmānanda (c 1400?), who derived his cult of *bhakti* from another Southerner, Rāmānuja. Although a Southerner, he was a maker of Hindi language, and in point of social liberalism or radicalism was but distanced by one of his *chelās* or followers, namely, Kabīr (1470-1518?), a Mussalman weaver of Benares. It is well-known that Kabīr called himself the child of both Āllāh

and Rāma. The annihilation of the distinction between Hinduism and Islam was the *Leitmotif* of his preachings and verses. Kabīr was by all means a pre-Moghul personality.

Another pre-Moghul personality in whom socio-religious radicalism ran to greater extremes than even in Kabīr and who indeed was his *chelā* (disciple) was Nānak (1469-1538), the founder of Sikhism.

Secular occupation was not discounted by Nānak. In his conception the state of a householder was no less acceptable to Hari (God) than retirement from the world.[4] He did not consider secular business as an obstacle to the attainment of final emancipation. He preached likewise that emancipation was not confined to the higher castes but accessible to all men, including the Chaṇḍāl, the *pariah*. All men were received by him as disciples and the foundation of a popular religion was thereby laid.

In this system it is the duty of the disciple to destroy the enemies of his faith and to help in the diffusion of the Sikh religion.[5] The disciple is strictly to obey the order of the *Guru* (preceptor or leader) and never to forsake him; he is also to minister to his brother Sikhs. He is to pay taxes, if demanded by the Guru.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Hindu positivism was strong enough to express itself in the different regions of India in a manner such as might enable the people to energize in a spirit of hopefulness. The old texts were reinterpreted to assimilate new races, castes and creeds. Hinduism proved to be a going concern

4 Trumpp: *Adi Granth*, Eng. transl. (London 1877), pp. cxi-cxii.

5 Nand Lal's *Rahitnama* (Rules of Conduct), pp. 9, 80, in Trumpp. cxv, cxvi.

even under the conditions of the first two or three centuries of Moslem politics. And in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Hindu positivism was once more in a flourishing condition. The age of Kavi-Kankaṇa, the Bengali poet who wrote the *Chaṇḍī-mangala* in 1589, and Tulsīdās (1532-1624) who completed the Hindi *Rāmāyaṇa* about the same time is, as an era of the expansion and democratization of Hindu culture, not to be beaten by any epoch of Indian social achievements. Along with these two senior contemporaries of Northern India Tukārām (1608-1649), the Maratha writer of *abhangs*, constituted a triumvirate of extraordinary importance in the annals of Hindu humanism during the period of Indo-Moghul Renaissance.

It is as an expression of the traditional democratic or socialistic strands in Hindu culture such as we have seen even in the earliest Vedic and post-Vedic *milieux* that we have likewise to assess the works of the great Telugu poet of the seventeenth century, namely, Vemana. The devotional or *bhakti* egalitarianism of the Tamil *Kurāl* is carried forward in Vemana's verses to a pitch verging on revolution. In his sarcasm on the inequalities of material possession he is no less radical and realistic than in his invectives against the disabilities engendered by caste distinctions.

On one occasion we encounter this Telugu poet of equality and fraternity declaiming as follows:

"Why should he constantly revile the Pariar? Are not his flesh and blood the same as those of our men? And of what caste is He who pervades the Pariar as well as all other men? Why should you plunge in water to purify yourself if a Pariar touches you?"

Again, "call not him an outcaste who possesses a good disposition. Did not the hermit Vaśiṣṭha take a Pariar wife? How can he be called Brāhmaṇ whose qualities are those of a Pariar?"[6]

In the same strain are the following lines: "If a man still has in his heart the principles of a Pariar, and yet scorns Pariars, why should he become twice-born, while devoid of any good quality?"

Vemana's condemnation of socio-economic inequalities is no less emphatic. "If one be possessed of wealth," says he, "they look upon him as the god of love; but if he falls into poverty, and is unable to rise and help himself, be he as Cupid himself, they look upon him as a Pariar."

The problem of the Pariar, of the untouchables and of the distinctions between the higher and the lower castes found in Vemana a powerful exponent. His place in Hindu positivism is of the same rank as that of Kabīr, Chaitanya and the others, if not even higher.

Democratic Strands in Hindu Social Thought

It has been the custom to treat the social reform movements among the Hindus from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century as due to the impacts of Islam, monotheistic and democratic as this latter is. Sociologically, however, it is necessary to dive deeper into the phenomena. For one thing, it is patent to every student of the Hindu institutions and ideologies that both monotheism and democracy are coeval with the Hindu mind itself. Historically

6 Verses III, 227-229 (Brown) in B. A. Saletore: *Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire (1346-1646)*, Vol. II. (Madras 1934), pp. 8, 54, 58.

speaking, the concepts of the unity of Godhead and the equality of classes have never been absent in the Indian socio-religious and socio-economic tradition. The processes by which the non-Indians, non-Aryans, non-Brāhmaṇs, the Vrātyas, the Śūdras, the "wild tribes" and what not have got themselves Indianized, Aryanized, or Brāhmaṇized constitute the most solid realities of race-history and cultural development in every nook and corner of India and in every epoch of India's growth. In other words, it is not so much the *varṇāśrama* as the protests against the *varṇāśrama*, not so much the law and order, as the violations of law and order, not so much the alleged pure races or castes as the *varṇa-saṃkaras*, the "mixed colours", fusions of ethnic elements,—or rather the simultaneous operations of these two sets of forces that constitute the norm of Hindu cultural evolution. In the socialistic or democratic movements of Hindu India in the Moslem *milieu* we have but to read the continuations of the eternal society-making process, the millennium-old social metabolism, that has led to the vertical mobilization of groups from the lower to the higher strata. The very category, "expansion of Hindu culture," implies nothing but this democratization or rather impact of the masses upon the main stock of Hindu institutions and ideals.

Thus considered, the history of Hindu social evolution can furnish evidences of socialism and democracy, understood in a general sense, such as have been analyzed by the Italian sociologist Salvatore Cognetti de Martiis in his *Socialismo Antico* (1889).[7] The study of "economic ideals" as distinguished from economic realities is the

7 B. K. Sarkar: "Hindu Politics in Italian" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, September, 1925.

subject matter of this treatise. And India is exhibited from the standpoint of the ideas of "social utopia" which came to evolve in its literature and folk-tradition.

He does not consider the struggle between the old and the new aristocracies to be a special phenomenon of any particular race-history, say, that of the Phoenicians. It is in his judgment a universal fact of civilization in the old and the new worlds, in Egypt, Greece and Rome as much as in India, China and Peru. The protests against private property, and glorifications of equality, fraternity, justice, peace and happiness are to be encountered, for instance, in the literature of every country, says he.

Already even the Rig Vedic tradition of Yama (IX, 113, 8, X, 14, 13, X, 17, 1, X, 58,1) introduces us to conditions of bliss such as had existed in some golden age, after which therefore the social reformers of the day were aspiring. The Buddhist conception of equality and fraternity did not disappear with the so-called Buddhist ages. It reappeared in the Vaiṣṇava *milieu*. The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* accords great importance to the Śūdras. The democratic spirit associated with Rāmānandism exercised a beneficial influence on the souls of the popular classes, leading to the energetic manifestation of the consciousness of self-importance. Viṣṇudās Kavi's *Svargārohaṇa* (Ascent to Heaven) dwells at length on the merits of the oppressed classes to the exclusion of the upper ten thousands who are exhibited in the worst colour. We are therefore in a position to assert that from the *Vrātya* Book of the *Atharva Veda* to the *Svargārohaṇa* of the Vaiṣṇava poet the Hindu democratic or egalitarian tradition has broadened down from precedent to precedent. And so far as the Moslem atmosphere is concerned, we

should be prepared to admit that it did not kill the traditional Hindu spirit of expansion and social democracy as promoted by race-fusion.

Śilpaśāstras

Most of the *Śilpaśāstras*, available in manuscript or in print, belong really to this period, nay, to its latter half, say, to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A few are being enumerated in the following statement.

Maṇḍana (*c.* 1525) wrote *Rājavallabhamaṇḍana* (architecture)[8] The author was an inhabitant of Udaypur.

By the sixteenth century the masters of *vāstu-vidyā* were known to be more numerous than the eighteen of the *Matsya-Purāṇa* as indicated in the period from Harṣa to Hemādri. The *Todarānanda* mentioned the following[9] authorities:

1. Varāhamihira,
2. Chyavana,
3. Kāśyapa,
4. Vriddhagarga,
5. Utpala,
6. Māṇḍavya
7. Bharadvāja,
8. Vridhhavaśiṣṭha,
9. Lalla.

Śrīkumāra's *Śilparatna* is a systematic and comprehensive treatise of large size in Sanskrit verse dealing not only with the construction of houses, villages and other allied things but also with iconography and things connected therewith. The last chapter deals with painting. The author was an inhabitant of Kerala in South India and may have flourished in the sixteenth century, as suggested by Gaṇapati Śāstri, the editor of the text.[10]

8. Edited with Gujarati translation by *Narayan Bharati Yasavanta*, Bharabi, Baroda, 1891.

9 B. B. Dutt: *Town Planning in Ancient India* (Calcutta 1925), p. 17.

10 Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 1922.

The author of the *Manuṣyālayachandrikā*[11] was an inhabitant of Kerala in South India. He acknowledges his debt to Nārāyaṇa's *Tantrasamuchchaya* (*c.* 1450). The first chapter deals with the examination of the soil, the second with the auspicious days, etc., the third with measurements, the fourth with classes of buildings and rooms. Out-houses, wells and tanks also have been discussed in the treatise which is entirely in verse.

Viśvakarmā wrote *Bhūvanapradīpa*.[12] The text is partly in Sanskrit verse and partly in Oriya prose. It deals with temple architecture.

In the printed edition use has been made of five manuscripts in Sanskrit, which happen to be different recensions of *Bhūvanapradīpa*.[13] The two other manuscripts used are copies of a book, entitled *Śilpipothi* in Oriya, which deals with the erection of thatched huts. Certain general matters regarding the selection of building sites, the classification of soils etc., are common to both the treatises. But the *Bhūvana-pradīpa* specialized in the architecture of temples. All the manuscripts appear to be quite recent in language and style.

An Oriya treatise entitled *Śilpaśāstra*[14] is already in print. The author is supposed to have been Bauri Mahārāṇā.

Among the works attributed to Viśvakarman is to be found in Gujarat the manuscript of the *Aparājita vāstu śāstra*,[15] an architectural treatise.

11 Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 1917.

12 N. K. Bose: *Canons of Orissan Architecture* (Calcutta 1932).

13 Bose, p. 5.

14 Published by Mohan Sahu (Cuttack fourth edition 1923).

15 *Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. contained in the private libraries of Gujarat, Kathiawad, Kach, Sindh and Khandesh* edited by G. Bühler, (Bombay 1872), p. 276.

A treatise dealing with aviaries as well as houses is the *Pakṣimanuṣyālayalakṣaṇa.*[16]

A treatise on tanks and wells is the *Kūpādijalasthānalakṣaṇa,* of which a manuscript is available in Travancore.

A treatise on painting is the *Chitrasūtra.*[17] Another work on the same subject is called *Chitrabhārata.*[18]

A work on sculpture is known as *Tārālakṣaṇa,* another as *Mūrtti-dhyāna.*[19]

Treatises on gems and precious stones are to be found under various names, e.g.,[20]

1. *Ratnalakṣaṇa*
2. *Ratnaparīkṣā*
3. *Navaratnaparīkṣā*
4. *Ratnadīpikā* by Chaṇḍeśvara.

The tradition of Hindu positive thinking in regard to the arts and crafts has then come down to our own times.

Purāṇas

The entire *Purāṇa* literature should be taken as having assumed an almost final shape in the previous period, i.e., from Harṣa to Hemādri. But in the Moslem *milieu,* i.e., from the beginnings of the fourteenth to the beginnings of the nineteenth century new socio-cultural conditions

16 *List of Sanskrit Mss. in the private libraries of South India* edited by G. Oppert, Vol. II, p. 371.

17 Aufrecht: *Catalogus Catalogorum* (Leipzig), Vol. I. p. 187.

18 Monier Williams *Sanskrit Dictionary.*

19 Aufrecht, Vol .I. pp. 229, 464.

20 Oppert, Vol. I., p. 478, Vol. II. p. 320; Aufrecht, Vol. I. p. 281, Vol. II. pp. 26, 138.

must have furnished authors with inspiration for additions, alterations and modifications. It will take quite a long time to disentangle these new incorporations in each *Purāṇa* and assign to each its time and space value, i.e., the period and the region.

We need not spend time over the *Purāṇas* in this period. But it is interesting to observe that the following *Purāṇas* are quoted in the *Vivādaratnākara* of Chaṇḍeśvara :[21]

1. *Devī Purāṇa*
2. *Brahma Purāṇa*
3. *Matsya Purāṇa*
4. *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa.*

The following *Purāṇas* are quoted by Mādhava in his commentary on the *Āchārakāṇḍa* of *Parāśara Samhitā* :[22]

1. *Agni Purāṇa, Āgneya* or *Vahni Purāṇa,*
2. *Kūrma Purāṇa*
3. *Garuḍa Purāṇa*
4. *Nrisimha Purāṇa*
5. *Matsya Purāṇa*
6. *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*
7. *Linga Purāṇa*
8. *Varāha Purāṇa*
9. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*
10. *Śaiva Purāṇa.*
11. *Kālikā Purāṇa*
12. *Vāmana Purāṇa*
13. *Skanda Purāṇa*
14. *Nandī Purāṇa*
15. *Nārada Purāṇa*
16. *Parāśaropapurāṇa.*

These extracts furnish us with an idea as to the *Purāṇas* well known by the midlde of the fourteenth century.[23]

The Positivism of Bengali Poetry

Writings on the history of Bengali literature as on that of other Indian literature have been vitiated by a

21 Text of the *Vivāda-ratnākara* (in the Bibliotheca Indica Series) edited by Dinanath Vidyalamkara, Calcutta 1887, Preface, p. vi.

22 Text of *Parāśaradharma Samhitā* edited by V. S. Islampurkar (Bombay 1893), Vol. I. Part I., Preface, pp. 4-15.

23 Vol. I. Part II. Preface, pp. 6-10; Vol. II. Part II. Preface, pp. xi-xvii.

fundamental fallacy. In the story of a thousand years' literary development, for instance, people have managed to watch only the struggle for supremacy among the various orders of gods and socio-religious systems.[24] According to the methodology of literary historiography and art-criticism prevalent in and about Bengal or for that matter All-India, *Aeneid,* the great national epic of the Romans, would have no significance except what may be gathered from the ultimate triumph of Venus over Juno in the life-history of Aeneas. The method is not uninteresting, but when art-appreciation is obsessed by such a religio-theological "interpretation" the result is likely to be misleading, as in the case of Max Weber's *Religionssoziologie.*

As an expression of this ultra-religiosity in the interpretation of literature and art is to be mentioned the attempt to exhibit the creations of poets, painters and sculptors in terms of *dhyāna* (meditation), *yoga* (communion with God) and what not. Love between man and woman has likewise been attacked by this method and presented as nothing but an allegory of the union between God and the soul.

The successive stages in the evolution of Hindu literature,—in Bengali, Hindi, Marathi, Gujarati, Tamil, Telugu, etc.,—have been labelled with the hall-mark of one or other of the metaphysico-religious systems, e.g., Vedic, Upaniṣadic, Śaiva, Buddhist, Tāntric, Vaiṣṇava, Jaina, Śākta, etc. The entire literary material of India is

24 D. C. Sen: *History of Bengali Language and Literature* (Calcutta 1911); T. C. Das Gupta: "Mediæval Bengali Literature" (c. 1250-1750) in the *Calcutta Review,* June, 1934.

generally presented to the world as the hand-maid of creeds, dogmas and rituals.

The absurdity would be evident if one were to treat the whole course of Western literature as nothing but Hellenic and Roman paganism, Oriental Christianity, Roman Catholicism, Lutheranism, Pilgrim Fathers, Oxford Movement, Unitarianism, Christian Science and so forth in succession. Students of world literature who are obsessed by the influence of religious ideas on human achievements would read in the *Aeneid* only a *Purāṇa* of Latin mythology, in the *Divine Comedy* only an encyclopædia of mediaeval Christianity, and in the *Paradise Lost* just a Bible of the Puritans. Or, where in modern literature and art they find the treatment of subjects from Hellenic mythology they would be inclined to interpret it as "Back to Paganism!"

It is necessary to cry halt to this sort of ultra-religious or metaphysical approach as has been done by the present author in *Love in Hindu Literature* (Tokyo 1916). A sober interpretation of the facts of Hindu literature is a desideratum. Even where the setting or scaffolding is religious or mythological and the *dramatis personae* divine or semi-divine one need not be tempted to mean by the texts "more than what meets the ear."

Most of what has been passing in India for other-worldly literature and art is in reality the literature and art of human passions, human ideals, human interests and conflicts. To be more definite, it may be said that folk-life and sex-life have been the two chief *motifs* of a considerable portion of Indian literature and art. The medieval writings like the Rādhā-Kriṣṇa songs (*Padāvalī*) of Vidyāpati (c. 1450), the *Kavikaṅkaṇa-Chaṇḍī*

(1589) etc. of Bengal ought to be approached as one approaches the literary creations of Eur-America with the methodology of modern art-criticism.

Under the title of *Bāra-māsyā* or the "twelve month" story of men and women an extensive literature grew up in Bengal. Generally it was incorporated as a section in large works the titles of which end as a rule with *Mangala* (Welfare, Blessings). In the *Chaṇḍī* by Mādhava of East Bengal, available in manuscript one comes across a narrative of the joys and sorrows of the year. Such calendars of human vicissitudes constituted a stock in trade, so to say, of the poetry of creative Bengal.

These stories are not always the stories of opulence and happiness. The hunter-girl Fullara, for instance, in the *Kavikankaṇa-Chaṇḍī* (pp. 199-202) describes her own *Bāramāsyā*, and this is nothing but a tale of woes, both physical and economic.

Perhaps after the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Krittivāsa (*c.* 1450) no Bengali poetical work is more popular than Mukundarāma's *Kavikankaṇa-Chaṇḍī* (*c.* 1589), already referred to several times. This work *pro forma* should appear to be a treatise on *Chaṇḍī* the Mother, and therefore something like a contribution to religious poetry. But one has only to open the work, available in print, at any page and be convinced that no literary work in any language is more profane, secular and worldly than this Bengali composition, written as it is with the object of propagating the cult of Kālī. Every line in it breathes the spirit of living human beings, their daily exploits and ambitions, their hatreds and quarrels, their joys and sorrows. Mukundarāma is the poet *par excellence* of man's mastery over the things of this Earth, and the prophet born to accord an

"Everlasting Yea" to life. It is of life and the world that he sings, of men and women in action and in struggle. He has furnished the Bengali masses with the well of *śaktiyoga* (energism), pure and undefiled. It is for a dose of inspiration in human endeavours and for the sunny atmosphere of human humour that one turns to this apostle of humanism in the sixteenth century.

The establishment of a town by Kālketu belonging to the lowly and untouchable caste of *vyādha* (hunter or fowler) is an important item in this work.[25] And this furnishes the poet with an occasion for describing the diverse races and classes of population, the occupational structure of the people,—the milkmen, the Kāyasthas, the Brāhmaṇas etc., and the different wards of the city. The Moslems also come in for treatment and their manners and customs, marriage ceremony, and other social institutions have commanded the author's attention. In this realistic account given over to the Moslem *mores* the Mollahs (Moslem priests) are described as officiating in the *jabāi* (i.e., ceremonial sacrifice) of hens and of she-goats for the Moslem householder. The poet is objective enough to mention that the fee obtained by the Moslem priest in connection with the hen-"sacrifice" is 40 *cowries* (=0-0-6 pies approximately) and that that for the she-goat "sacrifice" is the *head* of the animal *plus* 120 *cowries* (=0-1-6 pies approximately). It is interesting sociologically to observe that in sixteenth-century Bengal the Moslem householders are described in a manner which we of today should consider similar to the *āchāra* or practice of

25 *Kavikaṅkaṇa-Chaṇḍī* (Calcutta University, 1924), Vol. I. pp. 258-261; J. N. Das Gupta: *Bengal in the Sixteenth Century A.D.* (Calcutta 1914), pp. 57-95.

the Hindus in so far as the services of a priest in regard to the *jabāi* or sacrifice of animals are being requisitioned. The socio-religious *rapprochement* between Hindus and Moslems is a phenomenon that strikingly arrests our notice.

The animal world of Bengal has been the subject matter of a special section (pp. 99-101). The diverse animals are described in their relations with one another. And these relations are found to be identical with those obtaining in the human society. The king and his officers, priests, medical men, school masters etc., are all brought together in this survey.

The movements and activities in which Mukundarāma is interested in this *Chaṇḍī* are not all confined to the home and the village. He knows the larger world too,—the cities, the merchants, law courts, battles, pilgrimages, boat life, social intrigues and what not. Nay, a considerable part of his poetry is given over to foreign lands, trade with distant countries,—Ceylon, for instance, and the exchange of goods (p. 814). The result of all this "world-sense," of wear and tear among diverse men and movements is noteworthy. His merchant, Dhanapati, is quite a reasonable man in whom sobriety has been engendered because of the experiences of life. While his wife Khullanā's character is being publicly impeached in his own gild he knows how to keep his head high. He is realistic enough to remember the stories of the *Mahābhārata* in which the morals such as can be questioned by the conventional standard have even been glorified. Nay, he tries to dissuade Khullanā herself from the determination to submit to the fire-test, famous in the Śītā-story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (pp. 582-585).

The author of the *Kavikankaṇa-Chaṇḍī* is a chastened man. He knows of all the excesses and vices of the *Kali Yuga* (pp. 992-996). But he does not get inspired to moralize over them or indulge in hysterics. He is a fine story-teller, an objective dramatizer, so to say, and endowed with the Chaucerian outfit.

Moralizations do not belong to the grain of this poet's temperament. He is too human to be upset by the indiscretions of life, however grave they be. It is the sweet milk of human kindness that he administers to the people. His spiritual patents are very democratic, simple, naïve. Just the use of the divine name of Hari is enough to save anybody and everybody (997), he believes.

Dvija Rāmachandra is the poet-singer of the narrative poem *Ambikā-Mangala*,[26] a work which is still in manuscript. Much of the material contained in this work resembles the contents of the *Kavikankaṇa-Chaṇḍī*. In point of literary excellence it should appear to be of at least the same merit as this famous *Chaṇḍī*, which happens to command the attention of the reading public perhaps on account of the sheer accident of being available in print.

At one point of the *Ambikā-Mangala* we have the description of the marriage ceremony of the heroine *Rambhāvatī*. Among the festivities are described the musical entertainments, dances by female dancers etc.

At another point the merchant's wife Khullanā is being assisted by the maid Durvalā in the kitchen. The

26 It is accessible in the Calcutta University collection of Bengali manuscripts. The information is derived from Sj. Haridas Palit, author of *Ādyer Gambhīrā*, a treatise on the socio-religious history of Bengal, who

description of cooking points to the diverse items of household economy such as is prevalent in Bengal even today. One finds here among other things the jack-fruit seeds, pulse-cakes, prawn, *chitol* fish and *māṅ-kachu* so characteristic of Bengali dietary.

The literature of creative Bengal has contributed untold springs of action for social energism. It is not surprising that a most remarkable emphasis on the dignity of man should be associated with the Vaiṣṇava poetry of Chaṇḍīdāsa (c. 1350).[26a] No two lines in the entire range of the world's classics can possibly vie with the following from this great poet of Bengal consecrated as they are to the apotheosis of man as the only reality or truth:

"Sabār upare mānuṣ satya
Tāhār upare nāi."
(More real than all else is man,
Beyond or above him is nothing).

Thus sings Chaṇḍīdāsa, who as the creator of this tiny verse can rank among the greatest *avatāras* of humanism and benefactors of mankind. And this is a bit of Bengali mind in the fourteenth century.

Nothing short of an "Earthly Paradise" is furnished by Vidyāpati (c. 1450) in his *Padāvalī*,[27] thus:

"Drunken are the honey-bees in honey-season
With the honey of the honey-flowers:
In Honey-Brindāban resides
The Honey-Lord of honey-love.

26a See *Chandīdāser Padāvalī* ed. by N. R. Mukherji (Bangīya Sāhitya Pariṣat, Calcutta), p. 345, No. 809.

27 Englished by A. K. Coomaraswamy as *The Songs of Vidyapati* (London 1915). See Sarkar: *Love in Hindu Literature* (Tokyo 1916).

Amid the companies of honey-maids
Is honey-honey-dalliance:
Honeyed are the blissful instruments of music.
Honeyed hands are beating honey-measures.
Honeyed is the dance's sway,
Honeyed are the movements of the dancers,
Honeyed are their happy songs,
And honeyed are the words of Vidyāpati."

Pessimism and other-worldliness are the farthest removed from this mentality.

A specimen of "dalliance in spring" is furnished below:

"The new young maidens, maddened with new longings,
Are hurrying to the groves.
For ever and for ever new diversions such as these
Delight the heart of Vidyāpati."

These are some of the delights with which Vidyāpati, the Bengali-Maithili or Maithili-Bengali poet of the fifteenth century, enriches the Bengali households from the lowliest upto the highest. Indeed, in the Chaṇḍīdāsa-Vidyāpati complex as in the *Chaṇḍī*-poems it is the masses that speak. We encounter here the direct delineations of the diverse incidents in the life that is actually lived by the folk,—the hunters, the milkmen, the cowherds, the traders, the boatmen, the cultivators. Bengali poetry is nothing if it is not democratic. It is life's urges, the *élan de la vie* in its thousand and one forms, that furnish the Bengali poets with the sunshine of Bengal's villages and towns.

While dealing with the Vaiṣṇava love-poetry of the Bengali people it is appropriate to observe that humanism

in India as in classical Hellas and in the modern West has ever been an expression of all-round secularism or positivism. And of this humanism sex-interest has been a great part. The sex-element is as important a factor in Hindu culture as the folk-element. Instead of starting with the hypothesis that Vaiṣṇava poetry is the metaphysics or allegory of God and the soul it should be more reasonable to begin with the objective anthropological foundations of daily sex-life among the cowherds, cultivators, and other teeming millions.

The Rādhā-Kriṣṇa songs or sex-hymns of Vidyāpati have a background or context sufficiently wide and varied not only in India's art and literature but also in the incidents of her daily existence. They constitute indeed some of the specimens of actual folk-life, or folk-lore elevated to the status of "dignified" culture-lore. The worship of *lingam* or phallus as the creative male element is too deep-rooted in Bengali and other Hindu consciousness to be treated as an aberration. Nor is the male sex deified only in its generative function. Śiva "the Great God" stands for the thousand and one functions and aspects of the male principle, both beneficent and malevolent. If the Bengali and other Hindus know one Kriṣṇa to be a lover and a sweet-heart they know another Kriṣṇa as a statesman and a warrior. And there are the ideal husband, the ideal father, the ideal brother, the ideal ruler and so forth of the Rāma-stories.

None the less prominent in Bengali and other Indian poetry is the deification or extollation of the female element. If Rādhā is a sweet-heart and a darling, Kālī, Chaṇḍī, Ambikā, Annadā, Bhavānī, etc. is the inspirer of a Perseus the Deliverer, of an Andreas Hofer, so to

say, e.g., of a Pratāpāditya of Bengal or of a Śivāji the Maratha. If Rādhā enlivens maidenhood and young age, Sītā and Sāvitrī are the idols of the *Hausfrau's* daily life. The female sex as the embodiment of *śakṭi* or energy has been really accorded the highest and most comprehensive place in Bengali societal polity.

Bengali positivism expressed itself also in democratic and socialistic forms. The *bhakṭi* (faith or devotion) movement associated with Chaitanya (1485-1533), which led somewhat to the annihilation of barriers between the castes as well as those between the Hindus and the Moslems, has been no less powerful in the pluralistic make-up of the Bengali mind than the cult of *śakṭi* which has come down to Rāmaprasāda (1718-75) and Rāmakriṣṇa in the nineteenth century (1836-86).[28]

While in the atmosphere of the Bengali poetry of *śakṭi* and *bhakṭi* it is desirable to observe once more that the external paraphernalia of gods and goddesses, rituals and ceremonies, i.e., the apparently religious or mythological scaffolding should not blind one to the genuine literary qualities of these productions. The authors are real artists, i.e., creators of characters and situations. Indeed, the gods and goddesses themselves are to be treated as the creations or inventions of these poets, representing as they do the folk-consciousness or rather the constructive capacities of the folk-imagination. The

28 H. M. Mukhopadhyaya: *Bangabhāṣār Lekhaka* or "Writers in Bengali" (Calcutta 1904), pp. 210-227; B. K. Sarkar: *The Folk-Element in Hindu Culture* (London 1917), pp. 258-262; which is based in the main on H. Palit's Bengali work *Ādyer Gambhīrā*; S. K. De: *History of Bengali Literature in the Nineteenth Century 1800-1825* (Calcutta 1919), pp. 35-38, 412-419; J. N. Sarkar: *Chaitanya's Life and Teachings* (Calcutta 1922). *The Life of Sri Ramakrishna* (Advaita Asrama, Calctuta, 1925).

Hindu god-lore is essentially an item in the creative achievements of the human brain,—and hence an aspect of positivism in the most profound sense of the term.

The Bengali *Śūnya-Purāṇa* (c. 1050) has created the semi-Buddhistic gods and goddesses of all sorts. Rāmāi Paṇḍit's *Dharma-Pūjā-Paddhati* is likewise cast in the mould of folk-Buddhism. In the *Dharma-mangala* of Ghanarāma (c. 1350 ?), Māṇik Gānguli and others, again, is encountered the *rapprochement* of folk-Hindiusm and folk-Buddhism on a common Tāntric foundation. Among the other folk-deities prevalent in medieval Bengal may be mentioned *Śītalā*, the goddess to propitiate against small-pox, and *Manasā*, the goddess against snakes. Many of these are directly or indirectly associated with the Śiva and Kālī (Chaṇḍī, Tārā, Ādyā) complex.

No matter what be the name, and what the formal affiliation of these gods and goddesses to the leading pantheons, their sociological significance is self-evident. The inventions or creations of these deities by medieval Folk-Bengal are calculated to annihilate the enemies and difficulties, both natural and human. In the second place, these are some of the agencies that are invoked to promote health, wealth, success in life and general prosperity. In Bengali folk-consciousness the gods and goddesses are but handmaids to human welfare. They are the instruments of man in the achievement of worldly success.

One type of gods and goddesses is exhibited as incorporating *śakti* or energy. A second type of divinities was created by Folk-Bengal to furnish the masses with "Great Exemplars" from whom might be learnt the duties and obligations of life, individual, domestic and

social. It is in and through this group of gods and goddesses that the people are instructed in the ideal relations between parent and offspring, husband and wife, brother and brother, ruler and subject and so on. The literature through which such gods and goddesses become the instruments of positive morality has its chief *forte* in *bhakti*, the emotional element in human personality. It is to love, faith and hope that this *bhakti*, devotional or emotional poetry appeals rather than to the practices of intellectual gymnastics and ratiocinative argumentation. Krittivāsa's *Rāmāyaṇa* has furnished the Bengali people with positive morality in and through the stories of Rāma and his consort Sītā as well as the ancestors and allies of the great hero. It is by this Bengali epic that Folk-Bengal is introduced to the "whole duty of man." The rôle of man as the creator of gods, goddesses and God has nowhere been so prominent as in Hindu Bengal, nay, in Hindustan through the ages. And this is an aspect of world-culture that remains yet to be assimilated to the investigations into the universal currents in positive philosophy.

To come down to our own times, it may be said that Folk-Bengal of the nineteenth century has not cared much to inquire into the Sanskrit *Vedas, Samhitās, Purāṇas, Tantras*, etc. for the origins and legends of its faith and devotion, but has sought for the "whole duty of man" in Bengali treatises like Krittivāsa's *Rāmāyaṇa*, Vidyāpati and Chaṇḍīdāsa's *Vaiṣṇava Padāvalī*, and the *Kālī Songs* of Mukundarāma and Rāmaprasāda. Through all this literature there has been a steady increase in the number of gods and goddesses, saints and *avatāras*. In some cases a new interpretation

has been imparted to the older deities and heroes, who have thereby acquired an altogether fresh significance in the people's thought and activity. There has been no generation of Bengali history without its own mythology, hagiology and anthology.

This is perfectly natural: because the Hindu is fundamentally an agnostic, i.e., has never believed in the possibility of human intelligence ever to unravel the mysterious eternal truths of the universe, or to understand, except negatively, the nature and attributes of God; and therefore he has ever felt to be at complete liberty to *imagine* and invent whatsoever God or Gods he chooses to adore. He has not feared to conceive the Divinity as He, She, It or They. He has worshipped his Deity as father, mother, brother, sister, sweetheart, lover, friend, and what not; and has endowed his own creation or invention with any attributes he likes for the time being. He has borrowed his god-lore from the Mongols, he has taken his god-lore from the hill-tribes, he has imbibed his god-lore from the speechless message of sunshine and snows, and he has evolved his god-lore out of his own head and heart. His polytheism or heinotheism is based essentially on his agnosticism.

An expression of this profound agnosticism and human creativeness in regard to the Divinity or Divinities is to be found in the intimacy and man-to-man familiarity with which Rāmakriṣṇa (1836-86), a modern saint, wants the peoples of the world to attitudinize themselves to God. "Why do you dwell so much upon the glories of God?" asks Rāmakriṣṇa, "Does a son when with his father think of his father's possessions,—his houses, gardens, horses and cattle? On the contrary, he

thinks of his father's love. He knows that it is proper for a father to maintain his children and look out for their welfare. We are all children of God. So what is there to wonder at in His paternal care of us?"[29]

According to Rāmakriṣṇa the "real devotee never thinks about these things. He looks upon God as his very own,—his nearest and dearest,—and says boldly, 'Thou must fulfil my desires—must reveal thyself to me'." "If you dwell so much upon His glories, you cannot think of Him as your own," says Rāmakriṣṇa, "nor can you feel intimate with Him. You are awed by His Majesty. He is no longer near. No, no, you must think of Him as your nearest and dearest. Then only can you realize Him."

The Hindu tendency to deify the energies, Nature-forces or personal attributes and emotions has constructed all the gods and goddesses of India, practically speaking, as so many embodiments of the various phases of the Country itself and of the Culture it has developed through the ages. And the invention of deities has not yet ceased.

Rabindranath Tagore, probably an iconoclast in socio-religious opinions, has been, however, pre-eminently an idolator, nay, a polytheist, in and through his art. His celebrated hymn (*c.* 1895) to Mother India is in the right orthodox strain which is noticeable in the psalms and songs in eulogy of Sarasvatī (Goddess of Learning), Lakṣmī (Goddess of Wealth), Durgā, Jagaddhātrī and other goddesses. With Tagore we sing as follows:

"O Thou, who charmest all mankind!
O Thou, whose lands are ever bright

29 *Life of Sri Ramakrishna* (Advaita Asrama, Calcutta 1929), p. 310.

With ray serene of pure sun-light!
Mother of fathers and mothers!
With the blue deep's waters thy feet ever wash'd
Thy scarf of green ever waving in breeze,
Sky-kiss'd on high thine Himalayan brow,
Crown'd white thy head with tiara of snows.
First in thy firmament appeared the dawn,
First rose *Sāma*-chants in thy holy groves,
First were revealed in thy forest-abodes
Wisdom and virtue and poesy's self.
Ever beneficent! glory to Thee!
From Thee flows food to countries far and wide;
Jāhnavī and Jumna, streams of thy love;
Giver of sweet sacred milk, O Mother!"

It is again the traditional folk-imagination, saturated with the monism of Vedantic thought, that has inspired the following verses of Tagore:

"O Thou Dust of my Motherland!
Down to Thee alone do I bend my head.
Upon Thee is the mantle spread
Of universe-bodied Mother Divine!"

The same deification of the Country is evident in the following outburst (1905) of Dwijendralal Roy:

"Goddess mine! meditation's aim!
Country mine! O Heaven on earth!"

But the man who has started them all in this modern Bengali *bhakti*-literature is Bankimchandra Chatterji. According to him the ten-armed Durgā (consort of Śiva) with her whole family and retinue, the most popular goddess of Hindu Bengal in the nineteenth century and after, who was, historically considered, one of the Tārās (Energies) of Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva in mediæval

Mahāyānic India and still receives worship as Tārā in Buddhist China and Buddhist Japan, nay, can perhaps be traced back to the Mother Goddess of the Mohenjo Daro epochs, is none other than Motherland itself with all its resources and forces in natural agents and human arts. This synthetic interpretation, crystallized in the song *Vande Mātaram* (c. 1885), is bound to remain the greatest hymn of Folk-India during the twentieth century. Bengal, and with her India, sings as follows:

Hail! Motherland!
Vande Mātaram!
Thou art my muse, Thyself my creed;
In Thee my heart and soul;
And in my limbs the spirit Thou!
In mine arm Thou art strength (*śakti*);
Thyself heart's devotion (*bhakti*);
Thine the images bodied forth
In temples one and all, Mother!

To worship Durgā is to worship Motherland, or to worship Motherland is to worship Durgā. This is the cult that in diverse forms has been invented by the brain and soul of creative India from the Vedic age of the adoration of World-Forces,—or rather, as just indicated, from the epochs of the Indus Valley Culture (c. 3500 B.C.), down to the present epoch of neo-Tantrism represented by Bankimchandra and Rāmakriṣṇa-Vivekānanda.

The Doctrine of Political Deliverers as Yugāvatāras in Vijayanagara

In the imagination of the Hindus the Vijayanagara Empire (1346-1646) was like the subsequent Maratha

Empire a bulwark of Hindu culture established against the avalanche of Islam. The founders of these Empires were therefore esteemed as veritable *avatāras* or incarnations of Lord Krishṇa. Bukka I. (1343-76), the virtual founder of the Vijayanagara State, is described in an inscription as one in whom the God "reappeared" to deliver the world of the Mlechchhas.[30] This account embodies the famous declaration of Lord Krishṇa in the *Gītā* to the effect that it is whenever *dharma* finds itself in jeopardy that he appears age by age.

Folk-poetry as that embodied in the *Madhurāvijayam* associates the exploits of the Hindus with the interventions of the gods. The manner in which the magic sword of the prospective deliverer of the Hindus from the thraldom of the Moslems came into his hands is described in this Telugu poem in the mystical manner of the Irish poet Yeats. "O Sovereign, once upon a time the divine Viśvakarmā, gathering the splinters from the weapons of all the *Devas* (gods) and melting them together," says a strange woman to the son of Bukka I, "shaped this strange sword and presented it to Parameśvara for gaining victory over the *Daityas* (demons)." The fortunes of this magic sword,—like those of that in the Arthurian legend,—are then narrated briefly. The young prince is finally presented with it with the following words: "By wielding this weapon," says the strange woman, "you will attain unabating vigour and the weapons of the enemy will become powerless against you. Just as Krishṇa slew Kamsa in Mathurā in olden times, O king! do you

30 B. A. Saletore: *Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara* Empire, Val. I. (Madras 1934), pp. 8-10, Vol. II. (Madras 1934), pp. 1, 5, 272, 273.

proceed now to the southern Mathurā and slaughter the Mussalman king, the enemy of the world."

Equally deified in folk-imagination was Kriṣṇa Deva Rāya the Great (1509-20) under whom the Vijayanagara Empire witnessed the zenith of its expansion. In the *Vyāsayogacharitam* the poet Somanātha describes the monarch's death as the departure of Lord Kriṣṇa from the ken of mankind at the end of His *avatārahood*.

A private Tamil inscription of 1380 has its chief item of prayer as the exercise of "universal sovereignty" by Bukka Rāya. "Universal dominion" is sought for Deva Rāya in an inscription of 1428 associated with merchants.

We are to understand that Hindu positivism popularized in folk-tradition the doctrine of political deliverers or "world-conquerors" as being none other than *Yugāvatāras* or Gods in human form. The secularization of alleged religious texts or rather the interpretation of alleged god-lore in terms of worldly personalities and human exploits was in the very blood of the Hindu masses and classes. The records from Vijayanagara as from the Maratha annals should furnish concrete illustrations as to how a scientific and critical student of Hindu social institutions and theories ought to interpret them. Those who would follow the folk-tradition of India through the ages are not likely to be shunted off into misleading tracks by mere names of gods and goddesses and the atmosphere of religious ritualism or metaphysical speculations. It is the things "human, all-too human" that they would encounter in Hindu institutions and theories. Hindu religion is nothing if it is not in the main a handmaid to worldly progress and material prosperity.

The Hindu Tradition in Maratha Politics

The Anti-Foreign and Democratic Tendencies

The Maratha positivism such as in politics took shape in the *dharma-rājya* of Śivāji the Great is not an isolated phenomenon in the Hindu culture of Southern India or of the Deccan. Among the formative forces of Śivāji's *Hindwi Swarājya* are to be detected from his mother's side the memories of the war of self-defence against the Moslems conducted by the Yādavas of Devagiri (*c.* 1200-1318). And on account, again, of his father's experiences in Vijayanagara, the Empire (1346-1646) which successfully upheld Hindu liberty for several centuries although with vicissitudes of fortune, the ideas of Hindu statehood were imbibed by Śivāji as a matter of course.[1] Śivāji can then be regarded as but a continuator under Moghul conditions of the traditional Hindu spirit, the *dharma*, which is obstinate enough not to submit to foreign forces. In Śivāji's ambitions, exploits and achievements are, further, to be seen the embodiments of the same *parākṛama* (prowess) and *digvijigīṣā* (conquest of the quarters) which enabled Chandragupta Maurya to emancipate the north-western frontiers of India from the Hellenistic Seleukos (*c.* 305 B.C.). In subsequent times the same assertion of the Hindu spirit against foreign domination found expression in Skandagupta's expulsion of the Huṇs (*c.* 455 A.C.) furnishing thereby another precedent to Śivāji's triumphant service to Hindu culture. Historically, however, it is the South-Indian exploits of the Yādavas and of the Vijayanagara Rāyas that in point

1 G. S. Sardesai: *The Main Currents of Maratha History* (Bombay 1933), pp. 5-7.

of time as well as region served to inspire Śivāji with direct examples.

Śivāji was a nationalist in culture. "Back to Hindu tradition" may be said to have been his war-cry. It is the language of the *Manu Samhitā* and the *Nīti Śāstras* that was on his lips on the most important problems of life. Speaking to a Bundella ("Rajput," "Kṣatriya") chieftain Śivāji gave a bit of his mind when he declared as follows:

"Does not the Kṣatriya faith consist in protecting the cow and the Brāhmaṇa, in guarding the Vedas, in showing skill and valour in battle? And if you lose your life will you not through the solar orb enter the mansion of bliss, enjoying plenitude of happiness and repose?"[2]

In this inspiring message of Śivāji's the Rajput chief was introduced to the deliberate restoration of ancient ideals, to the *renaissance* of Hindu culture by which Śivāji's personality was fired. It is as apostle and embodiment of *Hindwi Swarājya* (Hindu independence) and a *dharmarājya* (kingdom of *dharma*, i.e., law, duty, and justice as conceived in the *Nīti Śāstras*) that he wanted to hold forth.

There are other items in the Maratha *milieu* which point likewise to the strength of the Hindu tradition. It is out of tailors, carpenters, potters, gardeners, shopkeepers, barbers and even untouchable *mahars* that the Maratha saints and prophets of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries arose.[3] The rise of the lower tribes into the

2 W. R. Pogson: *A History of the Boondelas*, pp. 52-53 in Sen: *The Military System of the Marathas* (Calcutta 1928), p. 24.

3 M. G. Ranade: *Rise of the Maratha Power* (Bombay 1900), pp. 10, 24, 146-147, 150.

higher orders of the Hindu society, "social mobility" of the "vertical type," has been an eternal fact of Indian culture history since the earliest epochs of the Vedic period. In the Marathi-speaking regions during the epoch of the Hindu re-assertion expressions of the same democratic social "metabolism" were witnessed as elsewhere in India as but regular phases of the dynamic "culture-contacts." To a certain extent this ascendancy of the under-world was partly an expression of the great *bhakti* or Vaiṣṇava movement which was almost universal during the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. Democracy and *bhakti* (love or faith) went hand in hand as much in Northern India and Bengal as in South-western India and the Deccan.

It was therefore as an integral feature of the Hindu societal tradition that by following the profession of arms the Mores of Jawli, the Savants of Wari, the Ghorpādes of Mudhol, the Nimbalkārs of Phaltan, the Jādhavas of Sindkhed, the Jedhkes, the Mānes, the Dāfles, and others rose into prominence in the Maratha world.[4] Śivāji the Bhonsle himself belonged to a low caste (cultivator). And prior to coronation he had to be dubbed a Kṣatriya. Not only Śivāji but all his successors down to the last Peshwa had to recruit the army from the lower tribes or castes. Husbandmen, carpenters, shopkeepers, men of mean birth always constituted the backbone of the Maratha army, as says the *Tarikh-i-Ibrahim* towards the

4 S. N. Sen: *The Military System of the Marathas* (Calcutta 1928), pp. 11, 26; J. N. Sarkar: *Shivaji* (Calcutta 1929), pp. 210, 212. The idea of the lowly origin of Śivāji is contested by Bal Krishna: *Shivaji the Great* (Bombay) Vol. I. (1932) p. 4. See the discussion on the Paretian circulation of elites in the section on the "State-systems of the Hindus," pp. 108-110.

end of the eighteenth century. All through the ages in India as elsewhere the military profession has functioned as a most potent "social ladder," to use a modern sociological category.

In the matter of organizing his army from among the lower orders Śivāji was but following in the wake of the Hindu generals and statesmen of yore. He followed the Hindu tradition in other ways too, as we shall see later.

The Positivism of the Dāsabodha

The *Dāsabodha* by Rāmdās (1608-1681) is a work in 20 books. Each book is furnished with 10 sections, and is therefore called a *daśaka*. The sections are called *samāsas*. So there are altogether 200 *samāsas* in the entire treatise, each of which is furnished with a colophon. The *samāsas* are of diverse sizes. The *Dāsabodha* is described in every colophon as *Guruśiṣya-sambāda* (conversation between the master and the disciple). It is, however, throughout composed in the form of the master's sayings rather than in that of questions and answers.

The sayings[5] in these 200 *samāsas* deal with such topics as *bhakti* (faith), *rajoguṇa* (activism), *tamoguṇa* (inertness), *dukkha* (pain), *mrityu* (death), *Brahma*, *mokṣa* (liberation), *ātmā* (self), *anātmā* (not-self), *yuga-dharma* (duties or *mores* of the Kali age). It is necessary to observe that of politics there is hardly anything in this treatise. There are but just a few references to *rāya-*

5 L. R. Pangarkar: *Sārtha Śridāsabodha* (Poona 1923).

karaṇa (king's functions) in this work, voluminous as it is. Its make-up is non-political.

The work is mainly made up of ideas relating to man as an animal and as a person. The verses are terse and epigrammatic and simple enough to pass from mouth to mouth becoming thereby the household words of the masses. Although the gods are mentioned once in a while the *Dāsabodha* is not a treatise of god-lore. It is principally a work of psychology and morals, such as we get from the genuine saints and *sādhus* even of today. Its teachings are calculated to have a sober influence on the mind and character of individuals. As such its spiritual significance is considerable. Like the Sanskrit *Gītā* and the Tamil *Kurāl* the *Dāsbodha* is one of the greatest classics of world-literature. Not less important as a moral and spiritual force than the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Tulsīdās (1532-1624), the *Dāsabodha* of Rāmdās (1608-1681) has a special literary feature in so far as it is, unlike the former, entirely independent of a story but is a collection of precepts bearing on man's nature and goal. It was by such doses of positive philosophy that the moral atmosphere of the masses in the midst of which Śivāji had to live, move and have his being in order to organize invincible legions was impregnated. Whether Rāmdās was the guide-philosopher-friend to Śivāji is perhaps a controversial point.[6] But that he wielded the moral dynamo with which to energize the springs of action of the folk that Śivāji was destined to serve there is no doubt. Rāmdās can by all means then be treated as a colleague of Śivāji in the self-same mission of establishing the *dharmarājya* of the Marathas. The personal relations

6 J. N. Sarkar: *Shivaji* (Calcutta 1929), pp. 381-382.

between Rāmdās and Śivāji are likely to be debated for some long time. Whether he had any finger in Śivāji's military plans and constructive statesmanship may always remain among the unsolved questions of Maratha "antiquities." But as makers of Mahārāṣṭra and remakers of Hindustan Rāmdās and Śivāji will always go together as creative twins, so to say, as one ideological complex in the historical scholarship of future generations just as tradition has brought them together in a more direct and personal relationship.

Rāmdās's Utopia of Ānanda-vana-bhūvana

It is possible to detect an utopistic futurism in Rāmdās's writings. That futurism took shape in his conception of *ānanda-vana-bhūvana* (the bower and world of bliss) such as he is said to have seen in a dream.[7] The contents of this dream introduce us to the kind of miseries which he saw removed from his people and the kind of relief, joy or happiness that he found brought or restored to the community. The hindrances to *svadharma* were, we are told, things of the past. The emergence of the *sureśa* (the hero) and the *sura-senā* (the army of the hero), on the one hand, and the discomfiture of the *Mlechchha daitya* (the barbarian devil), on the other, constituted two important features of the *ānanda-vana-bhūvana* (the happy world) as envisaged in the dream. The *pāpīs* (sinners and criminals) of all sorts as well as the *abhaktas* (faithless) disappeared or diminished in number. The expansion of *dharma* was consummated. The *pāpī* (sinner) Aurāngyā's (Aurangzeb's) "sinking" or decline was distinctly seen (*buḍālā aurāngyā pāpī*). On the positive side were noticed,

7 V. L. Bhave: *Mahārāṣṭra-Sārasvat* (Poona 1921), p. 224.

again, the assured facilities for *snāna* (bath) and *sandhyā* (evening prayers), *japa tapa* (sacrifices) etc., ceremonial items such as affected the Hindus of those days as of today. Then, again, love, fellow-feeling and sympathy were on the increase (*chaḍhatā bāḍhatā premā*).

In Rāmdās's doctrine of *ānanda-vana-bhūvana* which has been exquisitely put in as the fourth hemistich in every verse we are indeed getting a seventeenth century (?) paraphrase, adaptation or application of the celebrated *Gītā* doctrine of *yugāntara*. The great transformation, transvaluation of values, or remaking of epochs is initiated by God Kriṣṇa, as declared to Arjuna, whenever corruption creeps in into *dharma* (law, order and justice) and ascendancy is enjoyed by *adharma* (disorder, vile practices, negation of law, justice and morals). Kriṣṇa takes shape in human form under those calamitous conditions in order to protect the *sādhu* (the good, the just and the honest) and to annihilate the *duṣkṛita* (the culprits, the evil-doers and the ruffians) as well as to re-establish *dharma*, i.e., law, order, justice, morality, virtue and allied desirables.

Rāmdās's dream saw *kalpānta*, the end of a *kalpa*, i.e., the close of an era of *pāpī*, *Mlechchha*, *Chaṇḍāla*. *abhakta* and others of the kind. And at the same time the establishment of *svadharma*, *premā*, *ānanda*, etc., was an item in the consummation achieved by the hero dreamt of. It is interesting that the *Gītā* doctrine of God's *sambhavāmi yuge yuge* (I appear age by age) was serviceable to the Maratha poet-saint of the seventeenth century in the formulation of his professedly futuristic politics.

In Rāmdās's ideology there is no vagueness about the particular *pāpī* who was responsible for the miseries

and calamities and against whom it was necessary to raise the *surasenā* in order that *ānanda-vana-bhūvana* (the Kingdom of God, so to say) might flourish on earth. Aurangzeb has been singled out in the verses as the butt of Rāmdās's wrath, and naturally the *sureśa*, the hero, who is responsible for the break-up of the old conditions and the inauguration of the new era is none other than Śivāji.

Evidently all this jubilation over the annihilation of the *pāpī* and the restoration of *dharma* and expansion of *premā* is to be attributed to a date after the *dharmarājya* of Śivāji has become a *fait accompli* (1674-80). We encounter here perhaps a "pious wish," the expression of patriotic idealism on the part of Rāmdās. The material, as we have it, is of course regarded as a part of something dreamt of by Rāmdās in a period of national calamity, i.e., previous to Śivāji's exploits and successes. The dream is narrated in the form of a prophecy and as something that is to happen at some future date. This futuristic forecasting of Maratha glories is in keeping with the prophetic form of the *Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa's* dynastic history. One may often suspect as to whether the verses on *ānanda-vana-bhūvana* are to be ascribed to Rāmdās at all. Besides, one cannot be positive about their being composed even in the life-time of Śivāji himself. Whatever be the actual history of the composition, sociologically there can be no harm in believing that some Maratha author of the eighteenth century, while studying the glorious origins of the *dharmarājya* which had been established by the veritable *yugāvatāra* Śivāji and which maintained its career of *digvijaya* for quite a long time

afterwards, should have been inspired by holy imagination to father such prophetic verses on the greatest patriot-poet of Śivāji's times, Rāmdās. In any case, we understand from almost contemporary sources how powerfully the imagination of the young Maratha was inspired by the epoch-making and *kalpānta*-consummating achievement of Śivāji, the Indian Frederick the Great, perhaps the greatest Hindu of all ages, and one of the profoundest remakers of mankind. The fine lyrical verses on *ānanda-vana-bhūvana* constitute a valuable document of Maratha history as much as a text of Maratha *nītiśāstra* or political philosophy. Such texts, be it observed *en passant*, are very rare in Indian literature.

The Pluralistic World of Śivāji

In the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Maratha masses and classes were used in daily life to the Mussalman institutions and practices. The Hindu tradition survived by all means in the more important items of personal and domestic life.[8] The social polity may in general be taken to have been still governed by the *Manu Samhitā*, and the general *mores* by the *Mahābhārata*. Certain branches of public law, i.e., political life, also, e.g., the land revenue system, the law of property, and agricultural practice remained Hindu to the last although somewhat Moslemized in a few items. But the other branches of public law, i.e., the executive and the judiciary, the army and the police had become Islamic in the main and did not possess more than mere

8 M. G. Ranade: *Rise of the Maratha Power* (Bombay 1900), pp. 27-38, 44-45.

traces of the Hindu institutions.[9] In the Moslem states of the Deccan and South India the Hindu *personnel* was however always a noticeable feature even in the higher rungs of service.

In Śivāji's politics are therefore to be seen both these strands, Hindu and Moslem. He is a representative not only of the tribal contacts and caste-fusions so common to the Hindu culture of all ages, but at the same time a specimen and embodiment of Hindu-Moslem cultural *rapprochement*. Like Abul Fazl the Hinduized Moslem, Śivāji was to a certain extent a Moslemized Hindu, both being true indices to the Indo-Saracenic Renaissance of the times. Śivāji's sympathy with Moslems in the practice of their religion and patronage of Moslem mosques is worthy of mention in this connection.[10]

It is in the perspective of these Hindu-Moslem culture-contacts, extensive and profound as they were, that we are to appraise the attempts of Śivāji to hold forth as a Hindu monarch, nay, as a Hindu nationalist bent upon reviving, or rather providing a fresh fillip to, the institutions and *mores* of Hindu culture. An important item as well as evidence of Śivāji's cultural nationalism is to be found in the very coronation itself.[11]

This ceremony, administered as it was by the "Brahmadeva and Vyāsa" of those days, namely, Paṇḍit Viśveśvara Bhaṭṭa (nicknamed Gāgā Bhaṭṭa) of Benares, served to establish his *liaison* with the entire

9 For Moslem contribution to Maratha polity see S. N. Sen: *Administrative System* etc. (Calcutta 1925), pp. 593-664 and J. N. Sarkar: *Shivaji* (Calcutta 1929), pp. 216, 386-387.

10 Ranade: *Rise of the Maratha Power*, p. 277; J. N. Sarkar: *Shivaji* p. 381.

11 J. N. Sarkar: *Shivaji* (1929) pp. 208-219.

Hindu world of the time. On the other hand, it was by this ceremony that his *Hindwi Swarāj* was affiliated to the great pre-Moslem Hindu empires of antiquity.

The *Śukranīti* can very often be cited in illustration of the institutions and principles of the polity established by Śivāji and developed by the Peshwas.[12] The state-council of eight (*aṣṭa pradhāna*), town-planning, land revenue, forced labour, agricultural policy, military ideas, punishments, legal procedure, etc., can be explained in terms of this *nīti-śāstra*. Indeed, in the first edition of the present work (Vol. I, 1914, p. 259) it was pointed out that Śivāji's war-cry about the inviolability of the cow might suggest a date for that line of the *Śukranīti* (IV, vii, 453) which declares the killing of cows to be one of the most serious *casus belli*. And the ideas of Manu, nay, of Kauṭalya can likewise be detected in the system of Śivāji and his successors.

The Cultural Nationalism of Śivāji

Śivāji was fully conscious of his mission as a restorer of Hindu political dignity to its ancient or rather pre-Moslem conditions. Accordingly he wanted to go back to the fountain of Hindu culture in the smallest details of his life. The very words and phrases of daily existence especially in public, civic, administrative or political life,

12 S. N. Sen: *Administrative System of the Marathas* (Calcutta 1925), pp. 488, 489, 499-501, 527, 531, 533, 534, 541, 549, 551-552, 556, 570, 573, 577. It is to this author that I am indebted for most of the books in Marathi language utilized in the present work as well as for the meanings of some of the more difficult words and phrases such as are beyond the competence of my very limited knowledge of Marathi. He is, however, not responsible for any of the interpretations offered in this study.

had become Persianized in his time on account of long-standing Moslem influence. His first and foremost ambition in this regard consisted in Sanskritizing these terms. He desired the old Hindu atmosphere to be reborn even in the common-place conversations of the day. A veritable *renaissance* (rebirth) of the ancient conditions has thus to be ascribed to the conscious patriotism of this Hindu *avatāra* of the seventeenth century. As a specimen of the linguistic remaking of his fatherland may be presented the *Rāja-vyavahārakoṣa*[13] (Dictionary of Royal Conduct) in Sanskrit prepared under his orders by Raghunātha Paṇḍit more or less in the form of *Amarakoṣa*.

It is a work complete in 386 verses and comprises the following *vargas* or groups:

1. *Rājavarga* (relating to the king).
2. *Kāryasthānavarga* (relating to the office).
3. *Bhogyavarga* (relating to food and drink).
4. *Śastravarga* (relating to arms and accoutrements).
5. *Chaturangavarga* (relating to four parts of the army).
6. *Sāmantavarga* (relating to officers of the army).
7. *Durgavarga* (relating to forts).
8. *Lekhanavarga* (relating to writers).
9. *Janapadavarga* (relating to territory).
10. *Paṇyavarga* (relating to goods).

The classification into *vargas* does not indicate any special respect for logic, however. There are some 1500 words in this Lexicon.

13 Apte and Divekar: *Śiva-Charita Pradīpa* (Poona, 1925), pp. 144-175.

Some of the words in the *Rājavarga* are given below :

Sanskṛit		*Persian*
Rājā	=	Pādsāh
Swāmi	=	Sāheb
Rājaputra	=	Sāhajādā
Pradhāna	=	Peshwā
Amātya	=	Majumdār
Senādhyakṣa	=	Hukumat
Sandeśa-lekha	=	Chitnis
Dūta	=	Hejiva
Dhanika	=	Saudāgar
Sannihita	=	Huzuri
Anuchara	=	Mahaldār
Sarvakarī	=	Harkarā
Parichāraka	=	Āfrādā

The second chapter describes some of the offices and things relating to them as follows :

Sanskṛit		*Persian*
Kāryasthāna	=	Kārkhānā
Koṣāgāra	=	Khājānā
Koṣarakṣaka	=	Jāmdār
Nikṣepa	=	Dafinā
Samchita	=	Dāstānā
Śrimkhalika	=	Janjeriā
Nupūra	=	Painjne

In the third group, that on food and drink, we have the following synonyms :

Sanskṛit		*Persian*
Dhūmayantra	=	Guḍguḍi
Dhūmapatraka	=	Tāmākhu
Sugandhidravya	=	Khusavaya

The section of forts commences in the following manner:

Durgam killeti vijneyam
giridurgo gaḍah smritah
Prākārah koṭo ityukto
Janjirā dvīpa uchyate.

We get the following synonyms:

Sanskrit		*Persian*
Durga	=	Killā
Giridurga	=	Gaḍ
Prākāra	=	Koṭ
Dvīpa	=	Janjirā

It is as an expression of Śivāji's cultural nationalism that we have to watch his sedulous re-christening of old hill forts in Sanskrit.[14] The names of such forts as Sinhagaḍ, Viśālgaḍ, Rājgaḍ, Suvarṇadurg, Vijaydurg, Bhīmagaḍ, Pāndavagaḍ, Sundargaḍ, Prachaṇḍagaḍ bespeak his interest in the age-long tradition of the Hindu states.

Students of modern nationalism or of the "nationality question" are aware of the rôle that has been played by language in the military history and "geopolitics" of nineteenth century Europe and is still being played in the "minorities" problems of post-war Europe. Evidently Śivāji was no mere dare-devil soldier, victorious general and successful statesman. He was a political and social philosopher too and a champion of culture. In his life's work are to be detected the influences of linguistic patriotism. As a nationalist, more precisely as an exponent of

14 Bal Krishna: *Shivaji the Great* (Bombay 1932) Vol. I. Part II. p. 11.

national language in politics Śivāji can claim recognition as one of the first among the modern makers of history as a precursor of Herder (1744-1803) and Fichte[15] (1762-1814). No estimate of Śivāji's achievements in political action and thought can be adequate which ignores his great solicitude for emancipating his countrymen from the thraldom of a foreign tongue.

It is to be observed that his linguistic patriotism is not restricted to Sanskrit. His mother-tongue Marathi also he rescued from Persianization and rendered more popular among the masses and the classes.

As a result of the linguistic nationalism initiated under Śivāji the Marathi language became Sanskritized. In the sixteenth century the great Marathi writer Eknāth had used Persian words to the extent of 75 per cent. But in the eighteenth century the amount of Persian words to be found in Moropant's Marathi is not more than 5 per cent.[16] The success of the nationalist movement pioneered by Śivāji the Great was thus colossal.

Śivāji as Avatāra in the Śiva-Bhārata

In the imagination of Maratha poet-patriots Śivāji was certainly a *yugāvatāra*. In the Sanskrit epic *Śiva-bhārata*,[17] complete as it is in thirty-two *adhyāyas*, Kavīndra Paramānanda has left no room for doubt on this point.

15 R. E. Ergang : *Herder and the Foundations of German Nationalism* (New York 1931); B. K. Sarkar : *From Herder to Hitler* (Calcutta 1933).

16. Sardesai, p. 23.

17 Edited by S. M. Divekar with a lengthy Marathi introduction, Poona (1927); P. K. Gode : "Harikavi *alias* Bhānubhatta, A Court Poet of King Sambhāji and His Works" (*Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Poona, Vol. XVI., 1935).

In the very first chapter this *Śivā-bhārata* is described as a *purāṇamiva nūtanam*, i.e., something like a new *Purāṇa*. It is said to be known in all the words. The messages of *dharmaśāstra* and *arthaśāstra* are likewise referred to as inspiring the contents of this epic (I. 18).

In this work *Śivāji* has the reputation of being the protector of gods, Brāhmaṇas and cows (*devadvijagavāmgoptā*) and *durdāntayavanāntaka* (destroyer of the vehement Yavana). He is, besides, known to be an *amśa* (part) of god Viṣṇu and descended from the parts of the eight *Lokapālas*, gods of the quarters (I. 12, 15).

In chapter VI. we are presented with the miracle of Śivāji's birth. He is none other than a child of God Viṣṇu himself (2-7). In order to favour the *devas* (gods) and suppress the *daityas* (evil doers) the Lord of the worlds got himself born in the family of Bhonsles (VI. 38).

It is with the application of the six military attitudes (*ṣāḍguṇyasya prabhāvena*), we are told, that Śivāji's father Śāhāji reduced the whole of Karṇāṭa to submission (XI, 3). The author has a command over racy and vigorous style adapted to ballads and chronicles and has his *forte* in descriptions of wars and war-preparations. One may believe that Paramānanda had always with him Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa* as his literary model. And as for some textbook of *nītiśāstra*, the author was by all means familiar with its contents. At certain points the *Śivabhārata* reads almost like a *nīti*-treatise in motion or historic application. In the colophons it is called an *Anu-Purāṇa*. We may call it a text book of applied politics in verse.

The story is given out in the form of questions from a number of Paṇḍits in Benares and the replies by Paramā-

nanda. If one overlooks the interview character of this piece one will not fail to find in it the application of Kālidāsan "fine frenzy" to some of the objective facts of solid history. But most of this material is to be taken as pure poetry and enjoyed as such, without reference to history.

The work is said to have been composed in the lifetime of Śivāji. Nay, it is alleged to have originated in his express order to describe all his *charitra* (exploits) commencing with his grand father Maloji (I. 36-37). But curiously enough the story comes down to Śivāji's conquest of Ratnāgiri (1661). Whatever be the historical basis, the work has grown into a treatise on *dharma, artha, kāma, mokṣa*, horses, elephants, forts, and what not. *Śiva-Bhārata* has turned out to be nothing short of a *rājanīti śāśvatī*, i.e., a text of eternal politics (I. 40).

The *Śiva-Bhārata* appears to have been composed both in Tamil and Sanskrit. The Tamil text is said not to be very old.

Incidentally, attention may be called to the Sanskrit *mahākāvya, Sambhājicharita* (1685) by Harikavi, a court-poet of Sambhāji. This is but another instance of the continuity and renaissance of the Sanskritic tradition as fostered by Śivāji the Great.

Rājanīti

1. Chaṇḍeśvara's Rājanītiratnākara

Chaṇḍeśvara's *Rājanīti-ratnākara* (Ocean of Politics) is a virtually dated treatise. It can be confidently placed in the fourteenth century. Hence its unusual importance in the history of Hindu thought. Moreover, it is one of

the first writings of the Hindus in the period of early Moslem rule. As such, the treatise should be valuable as a document of Hindu reactions to the conditions of political and social life.

Chaṇḍeśvara (c. 1290 ?-1375 ?) became minister of peace and war or foreign minister to king Harisimhadeva of Mithilā (reigned 1304-14) in North Bihar about 1310 A.C. His *Smṛiti-ratnākara* (law book) was composed in seven sections. Section I. (*Kṛitya-ratnākara*) must have been written before 1314, Section II. (*Dāna-ratnākara*) subsequently. Section III. (*Vyavahāra-ratnākara*) was composed while he was judge in addition to being foreign minister. Section VI. (*Vivāda-ratnākara*) was complete while Harisimha was still king. About the date of Section VII. (*Grihastha-ratnākara*) it is not possible to surmise.[1]

Chaṇḍeśvara was like Gopāla and Lakṣmīdhara at once a student of law and politics. In a sense every student of *dharmaśāstra* was a student of *rājadharma*, and on the other hand, every student of *rājadharma*, *nītiśāstra*, *daṇḍanīti*, or *arthaśāstra* was also a student of *dharmaśāstra* from the earliest times. But it appears that men like Gopāla and Lakṣmīdhara had produced the *rājadharma* sections of their *Smṛiti* works, *Kāmadhenu* and *Kalpataru*, separately. The *Rājanīti-Kāmadhenu* and the *Rājanīti-Kalpataru* were in this sense to be differentiated from the *rājadharma* sections in Manu, Yājnavalkya etc. This is perhaps why Chaṇḍeśvara quotes the *Rājanīti-Kāmadhenu* and the *Rājanīti-Kalpataru* as independent texts. It should appear that his own

1 See the editor's introduction to the text (Patna 1924) pp. k, r.

Rājanīti-ratnākara may have been inspired in form by the appearance of the political works of Gopāla and Lakṣmīdhara. His *Smriti*-work had been completed in seven *ratnākaras* before he composed the *ratnākara* on *Rājanīti*.

The *Rājanīti-ratnākara* does not pretend to be an original work. It is in the form of a *nibandha* or digest, the form which we have noticed in connection with the *dharma* or *smriti śāstras* from Harṣa to Hemādri. Chaṇḍeśvara takes a topic and on this topic quotes a number of authorities but apparently not in the chronological order. The original texts are given in full and along with them their authors. In connection with each text cited he offers his notes or comments. Chaṇḍeśvara's chapters thus look like a string of quotations with few explanatory words or sentences to tie them together.

The readers are thus presented with a psychological or logical analysis of the subject matter. This analytical method ought by all means to be appreciated. It is questionable if we can often speak of Chaṇḍeśvara as furnishing the historical evolution of ideas. He has not cared to follow the strictly chronological order. Let us take ch. V. which discusses the *Sabhā*, Council or Court of Justice. His first authority is Hārīta, then comes Brihaspati, then Manu, Nārada, Viṣṇu, Nārada again, Lakṣmīdhara, Kātyāyana, Vyāsa, Brihaspati again, Nārada a third time, Kātyāyana again, Manu again, Nārada the fourth time. Chaṇḍeśvara's strength lies in the analysis of ideas. If to this were added the chorono-logical or historical presentation we might get the medieval analogue of, say, a work like Cannan's *Review of Economic Theory* (London 1929).

No matter, whether analytical or historical, the *Rājanīti-ratnākara* does present us with the history of Hindu political philosophy for nearly fourteen hundred years from Manu down to Chaṇḍeśvara. The author's bibliography is rich. Regrettably enough for us moderns, he has not cared to mention Kauṭalya or Chāṇakya. But he is well read, and no modern professor of political science in the East or the West could beat him either in the perspicuous manner of presentation and lucidity of treatment or in the extent of literature covered by him within the short compass of less than 90 pages. Any Western author today who is called upon to deal with the leading ideas of European political philosophy from, say, Seneca to Bartolus (1314-1357), the prince of jurists, will know how to admire the command of subject-matter as well as the skill in handling it as displayed by our Brāhman of Mithila in the fourteenth century.

Let us now analyze the contents of the *Rājanīti-ratnākara* with reference to the bibliography of Chaṇḍeśvara. The sixteen *tarangas* (waves) of his "Ocean" are indicated below along with the authorities cited in each :

I. The King : Kulluka Bhaṭṭa, *Rājanīti-Kāmadhenu* (twice), Guru (Brihaspati or Chaṇḍeśvara's preceptor), Yājnavalkya (thrice), *Nārada-Nīti* (This seems to be a *Nītiśāstra* independent of the *Smriti* work by Nārada), *Māhabhārata* (twice), Manu (four times), Yasa, *Nāradīya* (*Smriti*), *Smriti* (without name), *Nītikalpataru*, Hārīta.

II. The Minister : Manu (four times), Yājnavalkya, Vyāsa, *Amarakoṣa*, *Mahābhārata*, *Nārada* (Not the *Smriti*), Hārita, Nārada (*Smriti*).

III. The Family Priest: *Vyāsa*, Manu (twice), Yājnavalkya.

IV. The Judge: Kātyāyana, *Smriti* (without name), Brihaspati, Pallavakāra, Lakṣmīdhara, Hārīta, Vyāsa, Manu, Nārada (*Smriti*).

V. The Council (Court of Justice): Hārīta, Brihaspati (twice), Manu (twice), Viṣṇu, Nārada (*Smriti*, four times), Lakṣmīdhara, Kātyāyana (twice), Vyāsa.

VI. Forts: Manu (twice), Yājnavalkya, *Mahābhārata*.

VII. Deliberations: Manu (thrice), *Mahābhārata* (twice), Yājnavalkya, *Nīti*, *Rājanīti* (it is interesting that Chaṇḍeśvara means *Kāmandakī nīti* when he uses the term *Rājanīti*). There is a lengthy extract from Kāmandaka in the present connection.

VIII. Treasure: *Nīti* (Kāmandakī) twice, Manu, *Śruti* (without name), Yājnavalkya, Chaṇḍeśvara, *Pallava*, *Sāgara*, *Anye* (others).

IX. The Army: Manu (7 times), *Anye* (others), Guru (Brihaspati or Chaṇḍeśvara's preceptor?), Kāmandaka, *Mahābhārata* (twice), Śrīkara, Lakṣmīdhara, *Pallava*.

X. The General: Manu (twice), *Mahābhārata*, *Rājanīti* (*Kāmandakī*).

XI. The Ambassador and others: Manu, *Śukranīti* (apparently different from the treatise translated by the present author), Manu (twice), *Nīti* (*Kāmandakī*), Yājnavalkya (thrice), *Mahābhārata*, *Rājanīti* (*Kāmandakī*, lengthy extracts), *Pallava* (twice), Kāmandaka, "Vāchaspati and others."

XII. The King's Functions: Manu (seven times), Yājnavalkya (five times), *Arthaśāstra* (*Kāmandakīnīti*), *Sruti*, *Gītā*, "Maya, Maitra, Viśālākṣa, Manu, Brihaspati, Śukra and others," *Nītiśāstra* (*Kāmandakī*).

XIII. Punishment: Manu (thrice), Yājnavalkya (thrice), Nārada (*Smriti*), *Pallava*, *Mātākṣarā*.

XIV. Giving the Kingdom Away to the Eldest Son (Abdication): Manu (four times), *Rājanīti* (not however the *Kāmandakī*, says the editor), Hārita, Nārada (*Smriti*, twice), Vyāsa, *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, Vaśiṣṭha, Brihaspati, *Kāmadhenu*, Kātyāyana.

XV. Giving the Kingdom away to the Eldest Son through the Priest and others: Lakṣmīdhara, *Nārada Rājanīti* (not *Smriti*), Pallavakāra, *Śukranīti* (not identical with the one translated by the present [illegible] Brihaspati, *Padma Purāṇa*, *Bhāgavat*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, Manu (thrice), *Koṣa* (Amara), Viṣṇu, Yājnavalkya, *Arthapradīpa*, Nārada (*Smriti*), Kātyāyana, *Dharmaśāstra*, *Arthaśāstra*, Vyāsa, Śukra, "Gopāla, Lakṣmīdhara, Śrīkara, and others."

XVI. Coronation: *Rājanīti*, Lakṣmīdhara (twice), *Pallava*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Madgurupaddhati* (Chaṇḍeśvara's own preceptor), *Pallava*, Manu (twice), Koṣakāra (Amara), Gopāla, *Nīti* (*Kāmandakī*, twice), Yājnavalkya, *Mitākṣarā*, Nārada, Kātyāyana.

Chaṇḍeśvara cites 48 authors or treatises.

The most popular authors with Chaṇḍeśvara are Manu and Yājnavalkya. The influence of the *Mahā-*

bhārata is great. Nārada and Kāmandaka are also two of his great authorities. The following will give an idea of the number of times he has quoted his chief sources :

Manu	: 38 times		
Yājnavalkya	: 19 times		
Mahābhārata	: 14 times		
Nārada	: 13 times		
		(+ *Nāradīyam*	1
		Nārada *Nīti*	1
		Nārada *Rājanīti*	1)
Kāmandaka	2		
		(+ *Nīti*	5
		Rājanīti	5)
Pallavakāra	: 8 times		
Lakṣmīdhara	: 7 times		
Kātyāyana	: 6 times		

Students of politics in the technical sense (i.e. *arthaśāstra* as contrasted with *dharmaśāstra*) will have to note that in chapters V. and XV. Chaṇḍeśvara uses the category *arthaśāstra*. *Nīti* and *Nītikalpataru* as the names of a literary work are known to him. And *Rājanīti* of course is the title of his own book. *Rājanīti-Kāmadhenu* is mentined by him. It appears that he knows of treatises on *rājanīti* by Nārada and Harītā. These should appear to be different from the *smriti* or *dharmaśāstra* works by the same authors. Śukra is mentioned by him once in a group, namely, Maya, Maitra, Viśālākṣa, Manu, Brihaspati and Śukra. On another occasion Śukra is referred to as an author of *Rājanīti*. Finally, the book *Śukranīti* is quoted by Chaṇḍeśvara twice. But that book is not the one used by the present author.

But so far as *nītiśāstra* or pure politics is concerned we understand that the *Kāmandakīnīti* is a living force

with Chaṇḍeśvara. One can almost say that in his *milieu Kāmandakīnīti* = political science. In the fourteenth century, and especially in Mithilā, Kauṭalya or Chāṇakya may be said to have lived in and through Kāmandaka.

There is a passage where we encounter a situation such as may throw light on the interpretation to be applied to the old question of *iti Kauṭalyah* (*Supra*, pp. 218, 224, 273, 306, 355).

The *nibandha* (digest) writer of the fourteenth century (c. 1370), Chaṇḍeśvara of Mithilā in his *Rājanīti-ratnākara* (ch. V) writes *manmate ubhayoravirodhah* (i.e. in my opinion there is no conflict between the two). He is discussing the views of ancient (*prānchāh*) and modern (*navyāh*) writers on the definition of *dharmaśāstra* and offers his own view in the first person. The use of the first person by an author, it should appear, is not unknown in Hindu tradition. Kauṭalya might have done it too, had he cared. But the reference to Kauṭalya in the third person naturally leads us to suspect that the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* was not written by Kauṭalya.

Among the persons from whose tortures the king is to protect the people are enumerated the Kāyasthas. This passage from Yājnavalkya (I. 334) is interpreted by Chaṇḍeśvara (ch. XI) as follows: "The Kāyasthas are *lekhakāh* or writers, i.e. scribes, *gaṇakāh*, book keepers or accountants. On account of their *rājavallabhatā* (favoured or privileged position with the king) and *māyāvitayā* (personal influence) they are *durnivāra* (difficult to avoid or control). This is why the people has to be protected *viśeṣatah* (specially) from the Kāyasthas."

Chaṇḍeśvara knows *arthaśāstra* as a category distinct from *dharmaśāstra*. But he does not mention any

text by name. In chapter V. (*Sabhya*) he is explaining the epithet *dharmaśāstrakuśala* of *Nāradasmriti* (III, iv. 5). First, he gives the old view which by *dharmaṣāstra* understands the works of "Manu and others." Then he gives the view of the moderns (*navyāh*) according to which is implied "any *śāstra* composed by *munis* (sages) which teaches the duties" including the "collection of *Mīmāmsā* and other treatises." Finally, he gives his own interpretation. "In my view" (*manmate*), says he, there is no conflict between the old and the modern interpretations. In so far as the expression "and others" has been used Chaṇḍeśvara believes that the "*dharmaśāstra* composed by Manu and others, *arthaśāstra, Rājanīti* and other treatises" are implied. That *arthaśāstra* also is an important authority (*nirṇayaka*, regulator) was the conviction of Lakṣmīdhara on the strength of the *Nāradasmriti* passage (I. 39) which refers to an eventual conflict between *dharmaśāstra* and *arthaśāstra*. Lakṣmīdhara's interpretation about the status of *arthaśāstra* is quoted by Chaṇḍeśvara with approval (*Lakṣmīdhareṇa*) *tatraiva vyākhyātam iti yuktam*).

On the other hand, Gopāla, the author of the *Smriti-Kāmadhenu,* is quoted as an authority by Lakṣmīdhara in his *Smriti-Kalpataru* (*c.* 1150). Lakṣmīdhara is therefore later than Gopāla (*c.* 1100). But since Gopāla is unknown to the *Mitākṣarā,* he is later than 1050. Altogether Śrīkara instead of being the juniormost becomes the seniormost. Perhaps the order in which Chaṇḍeśvara (ch. XV) cites Gopāla (*c.* 1100), Lakṣmīdhara (*c.* 1150) and Śrīkara (*c.* 950) in connection with the doctrine of *rājadhane dīnānāthādisakalaprāṇīnām amśitvam* indicates that Śrīkara is perhaps the juniormost. But this is

hardly possible. One does not know the title of his work nor as to whether it was a commentary (*bhāṣya*) or digest (*nibandha*). But as Śrīkara is quoted by the *Mitākṣarā* he is older than 1050 A.C. and certainly older than Lakṣmīdhara by nearly a century and a half. Chaṇḍeśvara's quotation should have read like "Śrīkara-Gopāla-Lakṣmīdhara and others."[2]

The doctrine referred to, then, prevailed in the Hindu philosophical *milieu* for four or five centuries from, say, 950 to 1400.

An interesting classification of kings from the standpoint of status is furnished by Nārada in his *Nīti* which is evidently different from his *Smriti*.

"There are two kinds of *rājā*: (1) the *samrāṭ* and (2) the tributary and the untributary *rājā*," says Nārada; "The *samrāṭ* is the ruler who regularly receives taxes or tributes from all rulers. He is the *chakravarttī*. The *rājā* who pays taxes every month and every year is known as *sakara* (tributary). But the *rājā* who offers tribute voluntarily (*svechchayā*) is the *adhiśvara*."

Chaṇḍeśvara quotes this view of Nārada's in chapter I. with approval and makes the following remark: "But the *dharma* or duties of all the three are identical."

2. *Mādhava's Rājadharmaprakaraṇa of Parāśara Samhitā*

The *Rājadharmaprakaraṇam* of the *Parāśara Samhitā*[3] is to be found in the *Āchārakāṇḍa*, chapter I. It comprises only three verses (60-62) as follows:

2 Kane: *History of Dharmasastras* (Poona 1930), Vol. I. pp. 266-268, 293-296, 317-318.

3 The *Parāśara Dharma-Saṃhita* or *Parāśara Smriti* with the com-

'Avratā hyanadhīyānā yatra bhaikṣyacharā dvijāh
Tam grāmam daṇḍyedrājā chorabhaktaprado hi sah (60).
Kṣatriyo hi prajā rakṣan śastrapāṇih pradaṇḍavān
Nirjitya parasainyāni kṣitim dharmeṇa pālayet (61).
Puṣpam puṣpam vichinuyān mūlachchhedam na kārayet
Mālākāra ivārāme na yathāmgārakārakāh (62).

"The king should punish that region where the Brāhmaṇas are first *avrata*, i.e., do not practise *vrata* (daily ceremonial and moral functions), secondly, have not discharged their functions as students, and thirdly, live by begging. A region like that is offering food to thieves (60).

"The Kṣatriya, equipped with arms as well as furnished with punishment, should maintain or govern the state according to the rules by protecting the people and conquering foreign enemies (61).

"He should pluck the flowers piece by piece and not destroy the roots, behaving thus like the maker of garlands in a garden and not the maker of charcoal (62)."

On these three verses of Parāśara, Mādhava has a *vyākhyā* covering some thirty pages.[4] In regard to *daṇḍa* Parāśara quotes the *Nārada Smriti*, the *Yājnavalkya Smriti*, the *Manu Samhitā*, the *Mahābhārata*. The item *prajārakṣan* is elucidated by references to Yājnavalkya, Manu, the *Śāntiparva* (of the *Mahābhārata*), the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* and the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*. The different kinds of *daṇḍa* are described on the authority of Manu, Viṣṇu (*Smriti*), Brihaspati, Kātyāyana and Yama. On the subject of conquests, battle arrays, expeditions

mentary of Sāyana Mādhavāchārya, edited by V. S. Islampurkar (Bombay 1893), Vol. I. Part I.

4 See Text Vol. I. Part I. pp. 445-475.

etc. Mādhava's authorities are the *Śāntiparva* and Manu. The financial policy is explained by citations from the *Śāntiparva*, Manu and the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*.

Mādhava introduces a new category *vahiramgarājadharma* as contrasted with *antaranga rājadharma*. He quotes Yājnavalkya on the *vahiramga* duties of the king. Policy and forts are the two items discussed in this connection and his quotations are derived from Yājnavalkya, Manu and the Śāntiparva. For some other duties of kings Mādhava quotes Manu, Yājnavalkya, the *Śāntiparva*, Uśanas, and the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, e.g., in regard to the exemption of Brāhmaṇas from taxes, the construction of works of public utility like tanks, temples, halls, *prapā*, residences for Brāhmaṇas, gifts, and so forth.

Mādhava has made it a point to quote chapter and verse of most of his authorities.

Mādhava's treatment of the subject leaves much to be desired. He has introduced all sorts of topics, even such as are not in the least suggested by the three verses of Parāśara. Perhaps one need not quarrel with Mādhava on this score. This enables us to see somewhat more extensively of his conception of public law or politics. But his arrangement of topics is rather perfunctory. The entire discussion (pp. 463-475) after the introduction of the category *vahiranga rājadharma* is specially marked by absence of system and coherent thinking. One should not be surprised if "Mādhavāmātya," busy minister as he was, depended on some assistant for the compilation of this portion. The extracts from Manu, the *Śāntiparva*, Yājnavalkya, Uśanas, the *Mārkaṇḍeya* etc., have been placed here in such a careless, irrelevant and unthinking manner that one should hesitate to ascribe the compilation to the

alleged author, who describes himself at the commencement of the work as past master in *Mīmāmsā*.

3. *Vaiśampāyana's Nītiprakāśikā*

Vaiśampāyana's *Nītiprakāśikā*[5] is a small treatise in eight chapters. But it is valuable because it appears to describe the conditions of the political world under which it was composed. The origin of this work may be traced to the very practical need of carrying certain internal reforms through as well as of preparing for war against some specified enemies. The "home" as well as the "foreign" situations have been described in no equivocal or vague and platitudinous manner. We feel that some practical things are in view. The author hastens from point to point in a very businesslike way.

The chapters are described below:

I. The Duties of Kings.
II. The Science of Archery: the different classes of weapons.
III. The Origin of the Sword.
IV. The Weapons such as can be thrown or hurled.
V. The Weapons such as cannot be thrown: the terrible machines of the *kali yuga* (51-54).
VI. The Army Organization.
VII. The Military Division.
VIII. The Activities of Kings.

The political and social *mores* of the times are condemned by Vaiśampāyana as being very deplorable

5 Edited by G. Oppert, Madras 1882.

(chapter I, pp. 12, 15). *Dharmanyāya-vyavasthāyām kāraṇam valamerva hi.* Might alone is being treated as right in matters of duty and law, he complains. Wearing the sacred thread has become the sole claim to Brāhmanhood. The author notices some new phenomena in social life with the object, of course, of condemning them. Thus he refers to *lāvanye keśadhāraṇam* (i.e., keeping hair on the head for the sake of beauty). Apparently, he is an upholder of the old practice of wholesale shaving. Then, again, he notices that something like free love has become popular, for he condemns the practice of *svīkāra eva chodvāhe* (i.e. marriage as being accomplished only by the fact of taking a woman).

The expansion of such *adharmas* or vices furnishes the *rationale* for the composition of the *Nītiprakāśikā*. We are told that everybody is behaving like the Śūdras and that the kings are no better than thieves. The situation then calls for the promulgation of political science. The story has of course been placed by the author in the hoary antiquity of King Janamejaya of Takṣaśilā. But the incidents itemized in the treatise leave no doubt that the author is quite a modern fellow and is describing the conditions round about himself.

The author of the *Nītiprakāśikā* assumes on the part of the readers the knowledge of the entire science of politics as developed up to his time. He talks glibly of all the categories known to the Hindu theorists in the course of eight verses (chapter I. 49-56) without caring to spend a minute on any of these categories in order to explain them. Besides, he has a fixed arithmetical number attached to each, which indicates how stereotyped *Nītiśāstra* had grown to be in the author's genera-

tion. The categories mentioned as well as the number indicated by the author are given below:

1.	*Guṇas* (Military Strategy and Tactics)	: 6
2.	*Rājaguṇas* (Qualities of the king)	: 6
3.	*Upāyas* (Policies)	: 7
4.	*Rājadoṣas* (Faults of the king)	: 14
5.	*Karmāṇi* (Activities)	: 8
6.	*Tirthas* (Officers)	
	a. Enemy's	: 18
	b. Own	: 15
7.	*Charaka* (Spies)	
	a. to watch the enemy's officers	: 3
	b. to watch one's own	: 3
8.	*Vala* (power)	: 3
9.	*Angas* (Limbs of the Army)	: 8
10.	*Vala* (Divisions of the Army)	: 4

In most treatises the *upāyas* or policies *vis-à-vis* other states are known to be four (*sāma, dāna, bheda* and *daṇḍa*). Vaiśampāyana gives the number 7. And this figure is given also by Mitra-Miśra in the *Rājanītiprakāśikā* (pp. 304-306). The additional three are *upekṣā, māyā* and *indrajāla*. It is to be observed, further, that Mitra-Miśra's authority for the three new *upāyas* is the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*. The doctrine of seven *upāyas* thus brings Vaiśampāyana chronologically somewhere in the neighbourhood of this *Purāṇa* and Mitra-Miśra.

Incidentally be it observed that Oppert (p. 4) fails to understand the category, "seven *Upāyas*," and takes it in the sense of the seven *amgas* of the *saptāmga* state.

The international perspectives of Vaiśampāyana are furnished by chapter V. 55-57. There the author speaks of the coming increase in the malpractices of war on

account of the expansion of *adharma*, i.e., non-observance of codified duties. The *Nītiprakāśikā* enumerates a number of races through whom these violations of *dharma* are likely to be perpetrated. The list comprises the Hūṇas, Pulindas, Sabaras, Varvaras, Śakas, Mālavas, Konkanas, Āndhras, Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, Keralas, Mlechchhas, Chaṇḍālas, *Svapachas*, Khaśas, Mavellakas, Lalitthas, Kirātas, and Kukkuras. They are described as *gojonayah*, descended from the cow, *vijonayah* or born of improper, i.e., illicit union, *pāpa*, i.e., sinful or criminal. It is because of such races that *kūṭayuddha*, i.e., wars with improper or forbidden weapons, are going to grow from more to more in future, says Vaiśampāyana. The enumeration is rather puzzling. We are asked to look upon even the Cholas as a condemnable race and place them in the same social rank as the Hūṇas, Mlechchhas, Sabaras and others. The grouping renders them all the offsprings of questionable unions and of course low in social estimation. Besides, the implication is that all of them are used to fighting with forbidden weapons. In any case, the peril or menace of *kūṭayuddha* is a serious proposition in the author's estimation.

We seem to read in these fears almost the anxieties of a Grotius facing the questionable morals or negation of morals in the international relations of his times.

This perhaps is the immediate cause of promulgating *dhanurveda* or the science of archery. The special feature of the *Nītiprakāśikā* is its military chapters. No matter what be the actual races against whom military preparedness is in view, the treatise owns its origin to a period of warfare and war-mindedness. The work shows the progressiveness and adaptability of the Hindu

mind to new conditions. The *Nītiprakāśikā* is a fine specimen of Hindu authors changing the form and matter of their composition when necessary and presenting something very timely and uptodate, nay, entirely new although under old titles. The object of the author is just to militarize the people, as it were, overnight. He has accordingly prepared what is nothing but a military manual. And as for the ordinary topics of *nīti-śāstras*, he has not ignored them but devoted to them just enough attention to entitle the treatise to being described as a contribution to political science.

4. *Abul Fazl's Ain-i-Akbari as a Semi-Moslem and Semi-Hindu Nītiśāstra*

A very important document of the sixteenth century in the domain of politics is the semi-Hindu, semi-Moslem treatise in Persian entitled the *Ain-i-Akbari*[1] by Abul Fazl (1551-1602). It was composed about 1596-1597.

A glance at the table of contents of the *Ain-i-Akbari* exhibits its rough similarity in formal features with a Hindu *Nītiśāstra*. We may call it the *Akbar-nīti*, so to say. The contents are in short as follows:

I. The Household. The Treasury. The Mint. The Method of separating the silver from the gold. Illuminations. The Kitchen. The Days of Abstinence. Writing and Painting. The Arsenal. Elephants. Horses. Camels. Cow-stables. Buildings, Building materials etc.

1 H. Blochmann: The *Ain-i-Akbari* (Calcutta 1873), Vol. I. Biography, p. xxx. See also Gladwin's translation (*Ayeen Akbari*).

II. The Army. The Civil Services. Salaries. Donations. Feasts. Regulations regarding marriages. Regulations regarding education. The Admiralty.

III. The Eras (Hindu and other). Revenues. Measurements. The Executive. The Judiciary. Nineteen Years' Rates of Revenue.

IV. The Twelve *Subahs* or Provinces. The Assessment of Land.

V. A Description of Hindustan. The Character of the Hindus. Their Astronomy and Geography. The Nine Philosophies. The Eighteen *Vidyās*. The Eighteen *Purāṇas*. The Eighteen *Smritis*. Music. *Rājanīti* (Politics). *Vyavahāra* (Law). Marriages. Festivals etc.

VI. Moral Sentences. Epigrams. Rules of Wisdom emanating from the Emperor, etc.

The *Ain-i-Akbari* is generally considered to be an Imperial Gazetteer of Moghul India. But it is not quite correct to describe it as a Gazetteer in the strictest sense of the term. The descriptive and statistical data bearing on Akbar's times, especially the *Subahs* or provinces, are certainly to be found in this treatise. But the author is not all an historian or statistician. He has his interpretations, messages, and moral ideas to propagate and they do not appear to be in any way subsidiary to something else. Abul Fazl is indeed a student of ethics, spirituality, life's mission and so forth. He is a philosopher.

Many passages and paragraphs, nay, chapters of the *Ain-i-Akbari* cannot be taken as contributions to objective history or records of actual facts. Even in regard to the land revenue settlements and figures relating thereto as

given by Abul Fazl one is not quite clear as to whether we always and everywhere have the things actually in force or come across the general scheme of financial administration such as served as the basis for executive action. These features of Abul Fazl's treatise become apparent by the side of another great Persian work, the *Seir Mutaqherin*[2] (View of Modern Times), the history of India after Aurangzeb composed by Gholam Hussein of Bengal in 1780. This work of the eighteenth century is more objective as history, although no doubt it is furnished with its personal equation as every historical composition is bound to be. A comparison with such formally historical treatises enables us to feel that the *Ain-i-Akbari's* place in the history of political, economic and financial literature cannot be limited to its realistic historicity alone. The work has been conceived by the author as a much more than historical treatise. It is an account in which the messages, norms, ideals etc. play as prominent a rôle as the objective book-keeping and compilation of registers.

The *Khatima* (supplement) to the *Mirat-i-Ahmadi*[3] (History of Gujarat) in Persian by Ali Muhammad Khan, which was composed between 1750 and 1760 and is somewhat contemporaneous with the *Seir-Mutaqherin*, is likewise another work with which it should be considered generally irrelevant to compare the *Ain-i-Akbari*. The author of this *Khatima*, although influenced in scholarship by Abul Fazl, has produced nothing but a descriptive work, almost a guide-book, so to say, to the shrines of

2 Eng. transl. by M. Raymond (Calcutta 1902), four volumes.

3 English translation by Nawab Syed Ali and C. N. Seddon (Baroda 1924).

the saints, Hindu temples etc. as well as a register of the Government officials and departments, the Sarkars paying tribute, and so forth. A work like this may be drawn upon by the researchers of today as a source book for the economic, administrative and socio-religious facts and institutions of Gujarat in the eighteenth century without even a word of criticism. There is nothing else in the *Khatima* to occupy the reader's interest or intellect. The atmosphere in the *Ain-i-Akbari* is far otherwise.

In the preface to the Book which is given over to Hindu civilisation Abul Fazl enables us to see something of his inner springs of action. The "love of his native country," Hindustan, is referred to by himself in so many words as one of the motives impelling him to write this history. He is one of the first "patriots" of modern India. We are also told that the desire to remove the strife and animosity between the diverse races of India (Hindus and Moslems) is also an urge in this literary endeavour. He wants to function as a bridge between the two great religions, to be a peace-maker. The ambition of establishing peace and unanimity is a burning passion with him.

This Introduction gives us seven reasons for the origin of conflict among persons of diverse religions. In his treatment of the subject we come into contact with a brain which is not only modern in its makeup but which it is almost impossible to improve upon. He is discussing of course the problems of other religions, especially Islam *vis-à-vis* Hinduism. But in his analysis are to be found the profoundest considerations of comparative sociology with reference to the race-questions. As an essay in toleration this Introduction can be used even to-

day anywhere on earth. His logic is unchallengeable in theory and fruitful in practice. We are reminded in this context of another great Moslem scholar, Alberuni.[4]

The comparative method is a remarkable trait of Abul Fazl's logic. This manifests itself not only in the discussion of the questions relating to the conflicts arising from the diversity of faiths but also in the manner in which he deals with the arts and sciences of the Hindus. At important points he turns to the Greeks, and this also in the manner of Alberuni, and places Hindu achievements by the side of those of the former. In astronomy he finds analogy with Ptolemy and remembers the Persian, the Egyptian and the Greek philosophers. The references to Greek culture constitute the general perspective, so to say, of his researches in "indology." As one of the modern founders of comparative methodology in world-culture this Indian Mussalman of the sixteenth century deserves his rightful place in the history of science and philosophy and is by all means a great precursor of the Hindu Rammohun Roy of the end of the eighteenth and the early nineteenth century.

Abul Fazl's ideals are definite and precise. It is the moral and social philosophy that concerns him the most. History, economics, statistics, biography, the personality of Akbar are to him but the pegs on which to hang his moralizings, ideals and spiritual propaganda. There is hardly any chapter of importance, especially in the first two Books, in which we do not again and again come into contact with this great key to his life. He is

4 E. C. Sachau: *Alberuni's India* (London 1910), two volumes. See the section dealing with Greater India in Moslem Asia ("From Harṣa to Hemādri", *Supra*, pp. 459-465).

writing about Akbar's India or rather about Akbar himself but all the time with an eye to the illustration of his own spiritual ideals. To him Akbar should appear to be an interesting character simply because it is this monarch who happens to embody all that he considers to be great and divine in personal and public life.

Throughout the *Ain-i-Akbari* we encounter but one problem. To the author it is a moral problem and a political problem in one. He is never tired of discussing it or referring to it and has therefore succeeded in imparting to the treatise a lofty tone such as is associated with the greatest political masterpieces of the world.

And what is the life-blood of the ideal preached in season and out of season in the *Ain-i-Akbari*? It is the category of the "just king" (pp. viii, ix, 12). This is the doctrine that occupies the central place in Abul Fazl's political philosophy. And it is here that we see how profoundly he assimilated the eternal problem of Hindu politics, namely, the *rājarṣivrittam* (the conduct of the philosopher-king or royal sage) of our old Kauṭalyan tradition.

In the first edition of the *Positive Background* the *Ain-i-Akbari* was quoted simply as an evidence of the persistence of the Hindu political ideology in the sixteenth century. The passages are reproduced below:

"The political literature of the Hindus was known to Abul Fazl, who in *Ayeen Akbari* has given a short synopsis of probably some of the *nīti śāstras* in his possession in the chapter on the various branches of learning cultivated by the people of Hindusthan ruled by his master, the great Akbar. Besides giving an elaborate description of Hindu law under the heading

beyhar (*Sans. vyavahāra*) and referring to 'many other sensible books upon government' the compiler of this Moghul Gazetteer gives the following summary of *Rājneet,* 'the art of governing a kingdom:'

'It is incumbent on a monarch to divest himself of avarice and anger, by following the counsels of wisdom. * * * * It is his indispensable duty to fear God * * * to pay particular respect to men of exalted rank and behave with kindness towards his subjects of every description. * * * He should be ambitious to extend his dominions. * * *No enemy is so insignificant as to be beneath his notice. * * *A wise prince will banish from his court all corrupt and designing men. * * *

'The king resembles a gardener, who plucks up the thorns and briers, and throws them on one side, whereby he beautifies his garden, and at the same time raises a fence which preserves his ground from the intrusion of strangers. * * * The king detaches from the nobles their too numerous friends, and dangerous dependents. * * *

'In affairs of moment it is not advisable to consult with many. * * * Some ancient monarchs made it a rule to consult men of a contrary description and to act diametrically opposite to their advice. * * * They found it the safest way to join with the prime-minister a few wise and experienced men and to require each to deliver his opinion in writing. A prince moreover requires a learned astrologer and a skilful physician.

'If any monarch is more powerful than himself he continually strives to sow dissension among his troops; and if he is not able to effect this, prudently purchases his

friendship. * * * The prince whose territory adjoins to his, although he may be friendly in appearance, yet ought not to be trusted; he should always be prepared to oppose any sudden attack from that quarter. With him whose country lies next beyond the one last-mentioned he should enter into alliance; but no connexion should be formed with those who are more remote. If he finds it necessary to attack his enemy, he should invade his country during the time of harvest.'

"Here we have from a non-Hindu source the traditional ideas of the Hindus regarding constitution, international morality, etc. as preserved in the Hindu literature of the sixteenth century."

The student of comparative politics will be justified to go farther. In so far as the general, philosophical or theoretical ideas are concerned, the *Ain-i-Akbari* is to be treated virtually as a Persianized edition, so to say, of a Sanskrit *nītiśāstra*. It is within the philosophical framework of a Hindu treatise on politics that Abul Fazl has put in the statistics and administrative details of Akbar's Empire. It not only preserves the Hindu tradition by describing Sanskrit literature and Hindu philosophical ideas in Book IV. but is a document of the most profound assimilation of Hindu culture by a philosophically minded Mussalman.

Let us analyze a bit of his own philosophical synthesis. In the general preface to his *Ain-i-Akbari* Abul Fazl says about royalty as follows:

"If royalty did not exist, the storm of strife would never subside, nor selfish ambition disappear. Mankind, being under the burden of lawlessness and lust, would sink into the pit of destruction, the world, this

great market place, would lose its prosperity, and the whole earth become a barren waste. But by the light of imperial justice some follow with cheerfulness the road of obedience, whilst others abstain from violence through fear of punishment; and out of necessity make choice of the path of rectitude."

In this political philosophy of Abul Fazl we have an adaptation from the Hindu doctrines of *mātsya nyāya* (logic of the fish) as well as of *daṇḍa* (punishment). He is a first class writer and stylist and he has presented the Hindu philosophical "patents" in a most polished and dignified language, which only the Persianist of course can appreciate in the original.

Among the "excellent qualities" flowing from royalty as conceived by Abul Fazl we are told that the king "puts the reins of desire into the hands of reason; in the wide field of his desires he does not permit himself to be trodden by restlessness nor will he waste his precious time in seeking after that which is improper. * * * He is for ever searching after those who speak the truth and is not displeased with words that seem bitter but are in reality sweet." Here, again, we have but a paraphrase from the Hindu doctrine of *vyasanas* (vices) and *rājadoṣas* (faults or disqualifications of a king).

It is exceedingly interesting that even in regard to the professional structure of the people Abul Fazl cannot think of anything but the fourfold Hindu social stratification. He says that the political constitution becomes well tempered by a "proper division of ranks." The four classes into which according to him the world may be divided are (1) warriors, (2) artificers and merchants, (3) the learned, and (4) husbandmen and labourers. We are

taught also that it is obligatory for a king to put each of these in its proper place, and by uniting personal ability with respect due for others, to cause the world to flourish."

It does not take anybody acquainted even cursorily with the Hindu *artha, smriti* and *nītiśāstras* long to understand that Abul Fazl is reproducing the most fundamental concept of the king's functions *vis-à-vis chāturvarṇya* (the four-ordered social polity). It is curious that no modern scholar seems to have even suspected that the words, phrases and sentences of a philosophical, theoretical or general character in all these paragraphs are almost *verbatim* copies from the *Manu Samhitā* ch. VIII (*Rājadharma*).

We shall now point to one or two other Sanskritisings or Hinduizings of the Persian text. In *Ain* 13 which discusses the origin of metals, Abul Fazl speaks of the "seven bodies" within quotation marks. According to some manuscripts the Hindus are referred to as giving the opinion that the metal called *ricac* is a "silver in the state of leprosy." One wonders if Abul Fazl is not dealing in this chapter with the Hindu doctrine of seven metals. And one may not be surprised if *zinc*, the seventh metal, which began to be recognized by the fourteenth century Hindu writers on medicine like Madanapāla, is Abul Fazl's "silver in the state of leprosy," for some of the Sanskrit names for zinc, namely, *rasaka, rūpyabhrātā* etc. connect it with silver.

In *Ain* 41 which deals with the imperial elephant stables the four kinds of elephants (namely, *bhaddar, mand, mirg* and *mir*) and their three dispositions (namely, *sat, raj,* and *tam*) are derived from the Sanskrit treatises

on elephants. Abul Fazl names also the eight *diggajas* or elephants as guardians of the quarters or points of the earth in the Hindu manner and gives likewise another Hindu classification of elephants. The entire chapter (pp. 117-124) points to a fine assimilation of Sanskrit *gajaśāstras* by Moslems in regard to other items as well. Abul Fazl quotes neither Varāhamihira's *Brihat Samhitā* nor Bhoja's *Yukṭikalpataru* nor any treatise like the *Śukranīti*. He is, however, not a plagiarist as he says explicitly that these ideas about elephants are Hindu.

Ain 72 describes the "manner in which His Majesty spends his time" (pp. 153-156). In such expressions as the "care with which His Majesty guards over his motives and watches over his emotions," "he listens to great and small," "he does not allow his desires or his wrath to renounce allegiance to wisdom," "his august nature cares but little for the pleasures of the world," etc. one may read the echoes or reminiscences of the "qualifications" and "vices" of kings with which the Hindu *artha* and *nītiśāstras* deal as a matter of course. Some of these virtues are of course but generalities and platitudes found in every treatise on ideal polity from Plato and Kauṭalya to Al-Farabi (c. 950), the great Arab encyclopaedist who based his *Al-Madinat-al-Fadila* (*Model City*) on Plato. Abul Fazl does not therefore have to copy such maxims from any specifically Hindu sources.

Such moralizings or ascriptions of moral qualities to a *Padshah* may also be expected of Abul Fazl quite independently. It should still be observed however that he is writing in a Hindu atmosphere about a monarch who is pro-Hindu with vengeance, nay, who is con-

demned as *Kafer* by orthodox Mussalmans.[5] Further, Abul Fazl is actually using Hindi words at every turn and referring to Hindu customs in the most familiar way. One may perhaps suggest, therefore, that the author of *Ain-i-Akbari* is not uninfluenced by the traditional (Kauṭalyan) Hindu conception of the *rājarṣi*, the philosopher-king, while describing Akbar's daily routine, meals and other habits, as well as temperament etc. in *Ains* 72-75 (pp. 153-160). The characteristic Muslim salutations (*taslim* and *kornish*) are, however, not included in these remarks. But Abul Fazl's *dicta* that "royalty is an emblem of the power of God and a light-shedding ray from this Sun of the Absolute" (p. 159) or that "even spiritual progress would be impossible unless emanating from the king in whom the light of God dwells" (p. 158) point perhaps to the fact that Abul Fazl is here making propaganda about his hero for a people that is used to the language of the *Manu Samhitā*. Not the least *tendenciös* item in all these statements is the one, as told by Abul Fazl, that "His Majesty abstains much from flesh so that whole months pass away without his touching any animal food." The author makes it a point to observe in this connection that the animal food, "though prized by most, is nothing thought of by the sage." This can be easily interpreted as an attempt on the part of Abul Fazl at "speaking to the gallery." But the fact that these statements about Akbar are truths and not mere propaganda furnishes all the more ground for believing that the emperor, his court, as well as Abul Fazl were Hinduized in thought and form.

5 For the pro-Hindu habits and laws of Akbar as described and condemned by Badaoni, see Blochmann, vol. I. pp. 176-184, 193, 205.

These suggestions about Abul Fazl's Hinduization of the *Ain-i-Akbari* will derive fresh strength from what is known about his personal character.

According to the *Maasir-ul-Umará* quoted in Blochmann's *Ain-i-Akbari* (pp. xxvii-xxviii), Abul Fazl is reported to have been "an infidel." "Some say, he was a Hindu, or a fire-worshipper or a free thinker, and some go still further and call him an atheist; but others pass a juster sentence, and say that he was a pantheist, and that like other Sufis he claimed for himself a position above the law of the prophet." All these descriptions, repugnant naturally as they are to an orthodox Mussalman, are however quite in keeping with an academically high placed or philosophically-minded Hindu or Hinduized scholar. And since Prince Salim in his *Memoirs* describes Abul Fazl as a "Hindusthani Shaikh by birth, who was well known for his learning and wisdom"[6] we may not be far from the truth when we surmise that this Indian-born Shaikh was well up in the Hindu *smriti* and *nīti śāstras* and at any rate had grown up by assimilating the contributions of the Hindu cultural tradition.

It is interesting to have to observe that even as a profound student of Arabic literature Abul Fazl must have been introduced to the Hindu *vidyās*, because, as is well known, a considerable portion of Arabic texts was made up of translations of or adaptations from Sanskrit treatises in the eighth and ninth centuries. The amount of original researches in Hindu culture embodied in the work

6 Blochmann, vol. I. (1873), Biography p. xxvi. For the translations from Sanskrit works into Arabic from 750 to 850 A.C. See E. C. Sachau: *Alberuni's India* (London 1910), vol. I. pp. xxviii-xxxv. Alberuni's own translations or adaptations from Sanskrit may be seen *Ibid.*, pp. xxxvi-xl.

on India by Alberuni (973-1048) the great Arab mathematician and philosopher was immense.

Had we known less than we actually do about Akbar's socio-religious pro-Hindu propaganda and the ultraliberal intellectual activities of Abul Fazl, his elder brother Faizi, and their father we might perhaps have been led to suspect that part of the idealism in Abul Fazl's work,—the general preface as well as the text—is to be ascribed to an acquaintance with Al-Farabi's treatise on the *Model City* (*c.* 950). As a learned scholar Abul Fazl may certainly have studied the Arabic treatise on governmental statutes (*El Akham es Soulthaniyah*) by *Mawerdi* (972-1058), chief justice of Bagdad, or derived profit from the Persian *Siassat Namah* (Treatise on Government) by Nazamoul Mulk (*c.* 1063-1092). And of course the greatest philosophico-historical work of the "Middle Ages," namely, the *Mokaddemah* in Arabic by Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406), the Egyptian judge, could not have failed to furnish this "Hindusthani Shaikh" with literary norms.[7]

But the borrowings, assimilations, reminiscences or adaptations from the Sanskrit texts are too direct and

7 For Al Farabi see the German translation (*Die Muster-Stadt*) by F. Dietrici, Leyden 1895, and Carra de Vaux: *Avicenne*, Paris 1900, The *El-Akham es Soulthaniyah* is available in French as *Les Status Gouvernementaux* by Fagnan, Paris 1915. The *Siasset Nameha* is available in French as *Traité du Gouvernement* by Schefer, Paris 1893.

The *Mokaddemah* is available in French as *Prolegomènes Historiques* by de Slane, Paris 1862-68.

See also T. Husein: *La Philosophie Sociale d'Ibn Khaldhoun*, Paris 1917.

A study as to the nature of Abul Fazl's contacts with these and other Arabic and Persian "old masters" in politics, economics, history and sociology etc. ought to be very interesting for an investigation into the achievements of Indo-Saracenic Renaissance.

palpable as well as pronounced. The surroundings of Abul Fazl's daily life and the literary activities in which he took part while preparing the *Ain-i-Akbari* should appear to be Muslim only in name. The Hindu-Moslem *camaraderies* of his Padshah as well as of himself and his group are enough to explain that forces nearer home were responsible for the kind of idealism and political philosophy which found expression in the *Akbar-nīti*.

The translations from "Hindi" (Sanskrit)[8] into Persian of works like the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Atharva Veda*, the *Harivamśa*, the *Nala Damayantī* etc. such as are described in the *Ain* 34 indicate the Hindu atmosphere which could not fail to leave its impress upon the contributions of Abul Fazl. It is not quite clear, however, whether the translations were made direct from Sanskrit or from Hindi translations. But it is important to notice that he himself had a hand in the translation of the *Mahābhārata*, just as Faizi in that of *Nal Daman*.

In the special preface to the sections dealing with Hindu culture we learn from his own statements that his studies in Hindu culture were commenced early. But he felt that his knowledge was not sufficient. So he renewed his former studies with the help of those who could guide him. He speaks of the painful researches undertaken in order to arrive at the truth about the Hindus, their sciences, philosophies, and religions. This explains naturally the

8 Blochmann Vol. I. (1873) pp. Biography, xvii, 104, 199-200. For the translations of Sanskrit works under Moslem auspices see also D. C. Sen: *History of Bengali Literature* (Calcutta 1911); N. N. Law: *Promotion of Learning in India During Muhammadan Rule (By Muhammadans)* (London 1916); B. K. Sarkar: *Folk-Element in Hindu Culture* (London 1917); M. Z. Siddiqi: "Services of Muslims to Sanskrit Literature" (*Calcutta Review*, February 1932).

almost *verbatim* extracts from Hindu treatises on law and politics in this Muslim work.

It is interesting that at the very threshold of his study on Hindu culture, even in the introduction Abul Fazl makes the readers acquainted with his fundamental conclusion, namely, that the Hindus are not polytheists but are worshippers of God and only one God. And this conclusion he poses against the popular tradition of his times to the effect that the Hindus are polytheists. He repeats his conclusion at the commencement of the lengthy section and remarks that the Hindus are no mere idolators, "as the ignorant suppose." The Hindu explanation of image worship is reproduced by himself as his own conviction, namely, that the images are designed simply to prevent the thoughts of the people from wandering while at prayer. Abul Fazl should here appear to be a twin to Alberuni who preceded him by over five hundred years.

It is evident that Abul Fazl has taken his pen in the interest of a propaganda. It is a propaganda of inter-religious understanding and inter-racial peace. From the view point of his own race and religion this propaganda is fanatically pro-Hindu. Indeed he has made it a point to collect together all the good things that may be said about the people whom he wants to raise in the estimation of his co-religionists. Perhaps from Megasthenes to Nivedita have the Hindus never been flattered in such a dignified manner by any non-Hindu as has been done by Abul Fazl in the *Ain-i-Akbari*.[9]

9 See in this connection Alberuni's sympathetic (although critical) appreciation of Hindu philosophy and general culture in the eleventh century (c. 1017-1030); E. C. Sachau: *Alberuni's India* (London 1910) vol. I. pp. xvii-xix.

In all essentials the *Ain-i-Akbari* has turned out to be a joint Hindu-Moslem literary work so characteristic of the Indo-Saracenic *renaissance* of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Nay, it is perhaps one of the first creative specimens of Hindu-Moslem cultural fusion such as has marked the evolution of Indian arts and sciences since then. And in his emphasis on goodness and moral life as the foundation of spirituality and the key to the kingdom of God he is an *avatar* of positivism representing thereby the very spirit of the *renaissance*. For, no student of *nītiśāstras*, oriental or occcidental, can afford to forget that the statement "that every man of sense and understanding knows that the best way of worshipping God consists in allaying the distress of the times and in improving the condition of the poor" (*Ain* 2) came from the pen of the Indian Mussalman of the sixteenth century.

As a rationalist, as a "protestant," and as a humanist Abul Fazl has served to liberate the Moslem mind. The enfranchisement of the intelligence which was cunsummated in the Christian world by the Renaissance was accomplished in Moslem India by the author of the *Ain-i-Akbari*, the same enfranchisement which was to attack the Hindu mind two centuries later in and through Rammohun Roy. For the students of world culture in political philosophy it is of importance to observe that some of the formative forces in Abul Fazl's toleration, humanism, eclectic approach to the things of matter and spirit, as well as positivism were furnished by the Hindu *Manu Samhitā* and *Mahābhārata*.

5. *Nīlakaṇṭha's Nītimayūkha*

A seventeenth century *nibandha* (digest)-writer on *nītiśāstra* is Nīlakaṇṭha the jurist (*c.* 1610-1645). His patron was Bhagvantadeva, a Bundella ruler with capital at Bhareha near the confluence of the Jumna and the Chambal.[1] It is to be observed that even now Nīlakaṇṭha is held very high as jurist in Bombay, especially in the Maratha country. As his dates make him a contemporary of Jahangir, Shahjahan and Śivāji his work on *rājanīti* possesses a special value as throwing light on the intellectual ferment of that great epoch of new political movements.

The *Nīti-mayūkha*[2] is described in the colophon as a part of the larger work *Bhagavad-bhāskara*. The author Nīlakaṇṭha describes himself there as well as at the commencement as the son of Śankara Bhaṭṭa, the *Mīmāmsā* scholar. There is no reference to his patron. He says only that *rājanīti* is *nripādritā*, i.e., appreciated by kings.

The work is small in size and its contents can be seen in the following account:

1. Invocation, 2. The category *Rājan*. 3. The consecration, described with verses from the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa, Devī Purāṇa, Brihat Samhitā* etc. as well as with a lengthy extract (prose) from the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* (pp. 7-42). 4. The *Saptāmga*. 5. The king's duties, described with long quotations from Kāmandaka among others, e.g., Manu and Yājnavalkya. The *Nītiśāstra* is also cited without Kāmandaka's name, 6. The eighteen vices of kings. In this section also Kāmandaka and *Nītisāra* loom large. Varāhamihira

1 Kane: *History of Dharmasastras* (Poona 1930) vol. I. pp. 438-440.

2 Text edited by M. G. Bakre and V. R. Lele (Bombay 1921) without preface.

and Manu are cited among others. 7. The daily time-table. 8. The court of justice. 9. Meals. The examination of food with reference to poison is described on the strength of verses from Kāmandaka, Nārada and others. 10. Hunting. In this section Kāmandaka is the chief authority. In regard to hunting on land Nīlakaṇṭha once mentions Chāṇakya. 11. Evening functions. 12. Policy. Nīlakaṇṭha follows Manu who says that persons other than Brāhmaṇs also can be appointed as councillors and officers (p. 59). 13. Officers and servants. Kāmandaka is the chief authority. The *Mahābhārata* is also quoted. There are two verses from Chāṇakya.

14. The *guṇas* (military attitudes) described virtually on the sole authority of Kāmandaka. 15. The sphere of twelve kings (*Dvadaśarājamaṇḍala*). Nīlakaṇṭha's authorities are Manu and Yājnavalkya. He has a verse from the *Rājamānasollāsa*. But it is strange that his favourite author Kāmandaka who is an authority on the doctrine of *maṇḍala* has been ignored by him in connection with this important topic. Nīlakaṇṭha has, however, thrown some fresh light on the kinds of friends, foes etc. Each has to be taken as falling into three classes, says he (p. 67). The first is the *sahaja* (natural) friend or foe, coming from among intimate relatives. The *kṛitrima* friend or foe is one who, because of benefits rendered or injuries inflicted by either side, becomes friendly or inimical. The third class of friends, foes etc. is called the *prākṛita*. It comprises those states which are technically known as friends, foes etc. on account of their territorial or geographical propinquity, the neighbour being the enemy, the one next to the neighbour being the friend and so on. 16. The ministers, among whom the son is in-

cluded. Kāmandaka is the chief authority. 17. The friend. 18. The treasure. Varāhamihira, the *Mahābhārata* and Kāmandaka are quoted. 19. The country and the people. 20. Forts. 21. The army. Varāhamihira, Māgha, Kāmandaka, and the *Mahābhārata* are the authorities. 22. Elephants. Four pages are devoted to this animal. The only authority quoted is Varāhamihira. 23. Horses, described on the strength of Varāhamihira. 24. The representative or ambassador. 25. The Spy. Kāmandaka is the authority for these two sections.

26. The Expeditions and omens relating thereto. Varāhamihira is quoted. 27. The camping. 28. The general. Kāmandaka is the chief authority in regard to these two items. 29. *Kūṭayuddha* (unfair war), i.e., with forbidden (e.g. poisoned) weapons and other forms of generally forbidden things. Such wars are justified under certain circumstances. The authorities are Kāmandaka, Manu, Kātyāyana, and Brihaspati. 30. Exhortation to war. This is a rather lengthy chapter for this book of short chapters. Varāhamihira, *Yogayātrā*, *Mahābhārata*, Parāśara, *Gītā*, Manu, *Nārāyaṇa*, and Śamkha are quoted to show that even a sinner goes to heaven if he dies in the battlefield etc. (pp. 101-108). 31. Game.

The *Nītimayūkha* is virtually an abridgment of the *Kāmandakīnīti*. It is interesting that Nīlakaṇṭha has not quoted the *Purāṇas* among his authorities in an appreciable manner. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* has been mentioned few and far between. He is specially interested in Varāhamihira and quotes the earlier *dharmaśāstras*, especially, Manu and Yājnavalkya. One can say that he is trying to revive the past. His atmosphere is that of a

classicist. He is not interested in the latter-day writers. For all practical purposes his authorities belong mostly to the Gupta period.

6. *Mitra-Miśra's Rājanītiprakāśa*

An entirely new *milieu* is furnished by his contemporary, Mitra-Miśra, another Northerner like himself. Mitra-Miśra is a "modernist." To him the past has virtually buried its dead. He appreciates as a rule all those literary men who have risen in post-classic ages and written for their generations. The classics he does not hate. But he does not make any special propaganda in their favour. To him the *Purāṇas* embody the spirit of the age, and in the *Purāṇas* he sees the classics reborn or reinterpreted, modernized and popularized. Mitra-Miśra's work enables us to feel the breath of the generation in which he lives.

The *Rājanītiprakāśa* of Mitra-Miśra[3] is another "virtually" dated work because its author is known in the colophons (pp. 195-196, 493) to have been associated as scholar with the court of Vīrasimhadeva (reigned 1605-1627), son of Madhukarasāha, and grandson of Mahārājādhirāja Pratāparudra, King of Orchchha. Vīrasimha also is known to have killed Abul Fazl, the minister of Akbar and the author of *Ain-i-Akbari*. The work then belongs to the first half of the seventeenth century and points to the philosophical and cultural *milieu* of the Hindus in the most brilliant epoch of the great Moghuls.

3 Lala Sitaram: "Bir Sing Deo" (*Calcutta Review*, May and July, 1924). See also H. Blochmann's biography of Abul Fazl which accompanies the former's English translation of the latter's *Ain-i-Akbari* (Calcutta 1873), vol. I. pp. xxiv-xxvii.

From the dates given about King Vīrasimhadeva it is clear that his reign coincided from beginning to end with the Imperial rule of Jahangir (1605-1627). Akbar died, be it noted, in 1605. We are told that Mitra-Miśra was "ordered" (*ājnapto*) by Vīrasimha to prepare the *nibandha* called *Vīramitrodaya* (p. 8). But whether it was completed by 1627 we do not know. Besides, the *Vīramitrodaya* is an encyclopaedic work like Hemādri's *Chaturvargachintāmaṇi* and is a compendium on the most diverse branches of law. The *Rājanītiprakāśa* is a part of this encyclopaedia and, as the title implies, deals with public law. The order in which the different portions were composed cannot yet be ascertained. It is not improbable that the volume *Rājanītiprakāśa* as well as some other volumes, were composed after Vīrasimha's and Jahangir's time, i.e., during the Imperial rule of Shahjahan (1627-1658). In any case, the *Vīramitrodaya* is associated with the glorious age of Indo-Saracenic Renaissance, nay, one of the greatest epochs of world culture.

The *Rājanītiprakāśa*[4] is a bulky volume of 493 pages, none of which are requisitioned by footnotes. From the standpoint of size it is as large as the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* or the *Śukranītisāra,* if not larger. It is perhaps the most extensive treatise on politics in Hindu literature.

Incidentally be it observed that the *Rājanītiprakāśa* is described as *ruchira* (beautiful) by the author while mentioning (p. 8) that it has been prepared by him under command of Vīrasimha, "the ornament or jewel of kings" (*kṣitipatitilaka*).

4 Text in the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series (Benares 1916).

There is no table of contents or preface published by the editor Paṇḍit Viṣṇu Prasad along with the text. The more important topics can be seen, however, in the following description:

1. The king as a category (*rājaśavda*) of political thought:
   i. any and every ruler or protector of people? (*ḳimayam rājaśavdo jasminḳasminśchit prajāpālaḳe vartate*?)
   ii. or only *ḳṣatriya*?
   iii. or a consecrated *ḳṣatriya*? (p. 10).

2. The Appreciation of kingship. Mitra-Miśra quotes the *Kāliḳā Purāṇa* which says that the king is the son of the sonless, the wealth of the unwealthy, the mother of the motherless, the father of the fatherless, the shelter or help of the unprotected, the husband of the husbandless, the servant of the servantless (*abhrityasya nripo bhrityah*), and the comrade of men (*nripa eva nriṇām saḳhā*) (p. 30).

3. The Appropriate Time of Consecration.

4. The Successor to the State: the Eldest son. No title of the other sons to the State. No partition of the state (p. 31).

5. The Consecration Ceremony, as described in the *Brahma Purāṇa, the Rāmāyaṇa, Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa, Vriddhavasiṣṭha Purāṇa.*

6. The Consecration Hymn of the *Viṣṇudharmottara.* The king is blest with the wish that he may enjoy the *prithivīm samagrām sasāgarām* (entire world together with the seas) (p. 81).

The Consecration Ceremony according to the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.*

7. The Monthly and Annual ceremonies.

8. The Qualifications of kings.

9. The Duties of kings. Mitra-Miśra quotes the *Viṣṇudharmottara* to say that the king does not have to make up for the householder's losses caused by thieving in case the latter's servants are the thieves. The ruling is in modification of that of Yājnavalkya whose recommendation to the effect that the subjects are to be compensated by the king for their losses due to thieving is too universal (p. 127).

10. Things forbidden for kings.

11. The Daily time-table.

12. The Annual Ceremonies.

13. The King's Assistants: The ministers, officials and servants.

14. The Residential Country, the Fort, the City.

15. Things to be stored in the fort. The lengthy section is derived from the *Matsya Purāṇa* (pp. 206-213).

16. Townplanning according to the *Devī Purāṇa*.

17. House-construction according to the *Matsya-Purāṇa, Āśvalyāna Grihyasūtra, Viṣṇudharmottara.*

18. Garden construction as recommended in the *Viṣṇudharmottara.*

19. The Territory as one of the Seven Limbs.

20. The Treasure: This section dealing as it does with public finance is fairly lengthy and is derived from the *Viṣṇudharmottara, Mahābhārata,* Manu, Gautama, Brihaspati, Yājnavalkya, Vaśiṣtha and so forth.

21. The Army.

22. The Ally.

23. The Four *Upāyas* (Policies or Forms of Dealings with Enemies).

24. Punishment in one's own state as well as in the enemy's.

25. The Three Additional *Upāyas* (*Upekṣā* = Insult ? *Māyā* = Camouflage ? *Indrajāla* = magic ?).

26. Policy.

27. Energy (*Pauruṣa*).

28. Protection and Education of Princes.

29. Peace.

30. *Maṇḍala* (or "geopolitical" sphere) of Twelve States (*Dvādaśarājamaṇḍala*). According to Mitra-Miśra the *vijigīṣu* is the prince bent on or starting on a career of conquest (*vijetumabhyudyata*). In his definition the *madhyama* is the one that is able to overpower both the *vijigīṣu* as well as his *ari* (enemy) as long as they are uncombined (*asamhatayor nigrahe*), i.e. more powerful than either of the two. It is wrong, therefore, to describe, as has been usually done, the *madhyama* as the medium or the middling power. The *udāsīna*, as defined by Mitra-Miśra, is more powerful than each of the three states, the *vijigīṣu*, the *ari*, and the *madhyama*. He is such that he can subdue these three as long as they remain ununited (*asamhatānām nigrahasamartha*) (pp. 320-321).

31. The Six Attitudes or Measures *vis-à-vis* the Enemy (*Ṣādguṇya*): Military Strategy and Tactics.

32. Expeditions.

33. Dreams in connection with Expeditions.

34. The War-hymns in "consecration" of the umbrella, horse, flag, elephant, dagger, leather, drum, bow, etc.

35. Auspicious signs and inauspicious omens in connection with expeditions.

36. The *Jayābhiṣeka* (victory-sacrifice) to be undertaken on the eve of the expedition. The ceremony is calculated to ward off unnatural death, i.e., death in the battle-field and ensure the conquest of all enemies. This is the lengthiest section in the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, and is derived from the *Linga Purāṇa*.

37. The Troop-formations for the Expeditions.

38. The Duties in war. The *Mahābhārata* is quoted to show that the Brāhmaṇa also has to fight. Devala is quoted to impress upon the soldiers that death in battle leads at once to heaven.

39. The duties of the conqueror *vis-à-vis* the conquered.

40. Festivals and religious ceremonies during the fourth month while in foreign territories.

41. *Indradhvajochchhraya* (festival in honour of Indra).

42. *Nirājanāśānti* (festival to celebrate the peace).

43. Worship of Kālī.

44. *Lohābhisārika* (post-war festivals).

45. *Gavotsarga* (post-war festivals).

46. *Vasudhara* (post-war festivals).

47. *Satrunāśana* (post-war festivals).

48. Miscellaneous. The Teachings of Vidura in the *Mahābhārata*.

Mitra-Miśra's references are varied. In erudition and scholarship he is not to be beaten either by Hemādri or by Chaṇḍeśvara. It is perhaps worth while to mention that he attaches great importance to the *Purāṇas*. The *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* has commanded his special attention. Evidently in the sixteenth and seventeenth

centuries this *Purāṇa* held a very high place in the intellectual and social life of India.

Like all other *nibandhas* the *Rājanītiprakāśa* is a compilation or digest of original texts. It is not a commentary on a text although it is once in a while furnished with explanations of words or phrases. Thus considered the author or compiler of the *Vīramitrodaya* may be regarded as having contributed nothing to political science or to the other branches of law summarized in his encyclopaedia.

But it is interesting here to recall that all those treatises on *dharma, artha* or *kāma* which are known to be "original" as the works composed by an individual master or his followers (school) almost invariably describe themselves as summaries or compilations of the works written by previous sages. The place of "old masters" is an inevitable item in the documents of Indian thought. Once we are adequately oriented to this item we should be careful not to make any great fuss about the problem of originality of the alleged author's own contribution in Hindu *śāstras*. In other words, a *nibandha,* nay, a *bhāṣya* is not virtually to be treated as less original than the work on which the *bhāṣya* is written or on the basis of which the *nibandha* is compiled. Should the statements of the authors about their borrowings, compilations or summaries from "old masters" be taken at their face value, and not treated as occasioned by mock modesty or perhaps excessive indulgence in genuine humility, we have only to take them essentially as *nibandhas* although they have not cared to quote the texts *verbatim* such as has been done by the writers of *nibandhas* in so many words. A man like Hemādri, Chaṇḍeśvara or Mitra-Miśra could easily have

paraphrased in their own language all the texts they have reproduced with just an indication as to the source in the form of *iti Manuh, iti Agnih* and so forth. In that case they might have acquired the same place *proforma* in the imagination of the reading public as, say, Kauṭalya, Manu, Kāmandaka, Brihaspati, Śukra and others.

In the *Rājanītiprakāśa* Mitra-Miśra has shown as keen interest and as laborious research as Kauṭalya and Śukra. He has not tried to skip over the problems in a hurried manner. In details he is plentiful. Whenever necessary he is prepared to enter into controversies, i.e., quote original texts from the most heterogeneous sources. Although by profession a "mere scholar" or Paṇḍit he is a practical man and writes with an eye to the utility of his *ruchira* (attractive) science. He knows that his work is to be used by rulers, ministers, generals and statesmen. In regard to the question of war and peace he is a *pucca* Brāhmaṇa and continues the tradition of the greatest of the Brāhmaṇas since the Vedic ages, so far as he considers international problems to be the most profound concerns of daily life. He has not, therefore, indulged in platitudes. Foreign policy, diplomacy, international relations,—these are the topics in which every Brāhmaṇa philosopher of politics from the earliest times has exhibited his *forte* as statesman, and aye, as *paṇḍit* or scholar. And Mitra-Miśra is a redoubtable "chip of the old block." Fifty per cent of the huge volume (pp. 248-493) he has consecrated to the profoundest reality of *saptāmga* and organized existence, namely, to foreign relations, and every word in these chapters has a message for all,—the ruler and the subjects,—as to the "duty that lies nearest thee."

As a writer on positive morality and secular happiness and as one endowed with hardheaded mastery over the realities of flesh and blood nobody is a greater man than Mitra-Miśra in the entire range of Hindu culture. The seventeenth century is a great period of Hindu creativeness in the field of life's joys and worldly endeavours. In the *Rājanītiprakāśa* we understand not only that the best of Hindu tradition was being maintained through the *Purāṇas* but also that Mitra-Miśra himself knew what to select and what to propagate in the interests of his own generation. In this selective work he has really functioned as a creator, an original thinker, a man who knows that he has to re-make the personality of his contemporaries,—to reconstruct the Hindu states,—and to "whip the country into shape." Mitra-Miśra deserves the same recognition in the annals of Hindu life and thought as Rāmdās the *guru* of Śivāji (1627-1680). It is strange that such a work as the *Rājanītiprakāśa* should have remained virtually unused in indology although it undoubtedly is one of the masterpieces of Hindu intellectual activity, albeit, be it observed once more, it is but a *nibandha* or digest.

Mitra-Miśra is a Northerner from the "Middle-West" and is a most distinguished representative of the so-called Benares school. But his writings were not confined to any particular Indian region. The *Rājanītiprakāśa*, like the other parts of the *Vīramitrodaya*, was read throughout India. A generation of *paṇḍits* or scholars was nurtured on the great Mitra-Miśra's teachings on the "politics of boundaries" and the theory of international relations (*dvādaśarājamaṇḍalam*). This may be easily taken to have constituted the Brāhmaṇic *milieu* that

furnished the spiritual background of the still greater Śivāji's exploits in the Maratha country. Mitra-Miśra wrote for a great age and for the most momentous issues and he was quite up to the needs and requirements of the generation that looked up to him for guidance. With him the *Rājanītiprakāśa* is not an archaeological study or a dissertation of antiquarian research but an instrument of futurism, an agency in the re-making of the present. Nīlakaṇṭha, as we have seen, did not omit any important chapters; but his past-ridden spirit acts as a damper on the reader and one feels that he is not in touch with the times. Mitra-Miśra is made of another stuff. He has, besides, produced a voluminous work. The fullness of details and the diversity of viewpoints presented by him possess a charm of their own such as is entirely lacking in the almost niggardly manner in which Nīlakaṇṭha has gone to business with political science.

The special importance attached by Mitra-Miśra to the *Purāṇas* has rendered him quite acceptable as an author even for the Hindus of the twentieth century. It is even possible to build up a twentieth century school of Indian political theory on the foundations of Mitra-Miśra. For the Hindus of today the *Purāṇas* represent the spirit of newspapers and journals, so to say, i.e., the most familiar, practical and life-serving literature conceivable. Manu and Yājnavalkya are authorities still by all means. But they are somewhat "archaic" and uncouth. They are respected, nay, perhaps, adored but from a distance. But in regard to the *Purāṇas* the attitudes and feelings of the Hindus are far otherwise. They are direct, personal, friendly. The *Purāṇas* are the manuals for the man in the bazaar. In so far as the *Rājanītiprakāśa* is nurtured

mainly on the *Purāṇas*, the folk literature, as it were, of Hindu India we breathe in it a comradely atmosphere and through it come into contact with a democratic paraphernalia, the mass-mind. Mitra-Miśra as the author of this *liaison* between the folk and political *śāstra* can therefore still be the starting point of new superstructures constructed in accordance with the novel requirements of intercourse between the East and the West.

In Mitra-Miśra's hands political science did not remain the preserve of high-brows. It became attractive to the people, a philosophy in which the people might see reviewed some of their own categories of daily life. *Nītiśāstra* was thus brought into the market-place. No matter what his views regarding the folk *vis-à-vis* the king happened to be, his very equipment as a literary workman served to make of him, unconsciously perhaps, a spokesman of the folk, a philosophical leader of the masses, an exponent of "mass-contacts."

The position may be understood if we take a simple analogy from modern conditions. An Indian author today who writes in Bengali, Hindi, Marathi, Telugu, Tamil or Urdu is automatically taken as a man of the people, a representative of the people's aspirations, although he may not be writing specifically on the folk-interests. The contrast between such a writer and one who writes in a foreign tongue places him in bold relief in the folk imagination. The use of the mother-tongue, the language of the folk, as the vehicle of literary contributions establishes at once a spiritual nexus between the author's work and the mass-mind. Mitra-Miśra's dependence on the *Purāṇas*, those encyclopaedic storehouses of world-culture for the

folk, those products of the Hindu Home University Library, as it were, and his extensive utilization of the *Purāṇa* texts in season and out of season have contributed to the establishment of *nītiśāstra* as a *vidyā* of the people and for the people. And in this tremendous expansion of its influence as well as in the transformation of its character is to be seen one of the most phenomenal achievements of Mitra-Miśra.

From Kauṭalya to Mitra-Miśra we have a story of growth and progress in the annals of the world's philosophical evolution.

7. *Rāmdās's Mahārāṣṭradharma Bārhwāwā*

In Rāmdās's *Ānanda-vana-bhūvana* as in Paramānanda's *Śiva-Bhārata* Śivaji is a deliverer. Gāgā Bhaṭṭa in his *Śiva-rāja-praśasti*[1] also compares Śivāji's work with that of "Viṣṇu who in his *Kamaṭha* (*Kūrma* or Tortoise) Incarnation rescued the Vedas immersed in the ocean." One of his verses reads in part as follows:

"Avarangajeba yavanādhipa bhīta vipra-
Trāṇāya yah parigrihīta navāvatārah."

Śivāji is here described as having assumed a new *avatāra* (incarnation) for the protection of the Brāhmaṇas who were terrified by Aurangzeb, the Moslem monarch.

It is interesting to observe that in Śivāji's times (1626-80) the European mentality was used to such conceptions of Divine incarnation in regard to the political emancipation of certain territories from the tyranny of an impossible despot. The legends afloat in the Dutch atmosphere in the period of unrest and rebellion against

1 B. V. Bhat: *Mahārāṣṭradharma* (Dhuliya, 1925) p. 89.

Louis XIV enable us to realize how William of Orange was virtually looked forward to as one of the *avatāras* or Divine incarnations such as had been popular in the Old Testament stories.

The Dutch situation in 1687 is described in the following manner:[2] "Religion gave her sanction to that intense and unquenchable animosity (against France). Hundreds of Calvinistic preachers proclaimed that the same power which had set apart Samson from the womb to be the scourge of the Philistine and which had called Gideon from the threshing floor to smite the Midianite had roused up William of Orange to be the champion of all free nations and of all pure churches."

From the history of the Netherlands in the sixteenth century also we can cite ideological parallels in connection with the rise of the Maratha power. The charges of the Dutch people (1560-80) against Philip II of Spain bear close analogy with what the Maratha saints and chroniclers of the seventeenth and perhaps of the eighteenth centuries make out against Aurangzeb, described in their own words as the Mlechchha and the Yavana tyrant in regard to the pre-Śivāji political and social conditions of the Deccan, nay, of India.[3] It is the "terrors of the *kali-yuga*" that constitute Śivāji's *Apology*, so to say, corresponding to the *Apologia* of the Prince of Orange (1580). The following statement of the Dutch hero is in keeping with the spirit of the Maratha champions of Hindu liberty:

2 Macaulay: *History of England* (London 1896), vol. II. p. 183.

3 Some of the charges may be read in Bhat: *Mahārāṣṭradharma*, pp. 84-88, 143-144, 154-164, 166, 169-186.

> "I am in the hand of God, my worldly goods and my life have been long since dedicated to His service. He will dispose of them as seems best for His glory and my salvation."[4]

It is something like this religious fervour of the Calvinist William that the Maratha saints propagated. In Maratha ideology the *kaliyuga* or iron age was to a considerable extent the "*Aurāngyā pāpī*" incarnate, so to say. The orientations of the Netherlands to Philip II of Spain and Louis XIV of France were identical with those of the Marathas *vis-à-vis* this *pāpī* (sinner). It is with reference to the problems and achievements of the Dutch people that the politics of Maratha independence, *Hindwī Svarājya*, and the expansion of the Hindu states-system by Śivāji and his successors can be appreciated.

In the present study we are not concerned with the details of Śivāji's political views or of his political institutions. The political theories of his *Hindwī Svarājya* cannot but be of profound interest. For the present, however, to get the approximate philosophical perspective we have but to mention the works like the British treatises on paternal despotism, e.g., the *Patriarcha* of Filmer (1590-1653), published during the year of Śivāji's death (1680). In France about the same time Pascal in his *Pensées* was adumbrating the doctrine of obedience to custom, and in Bossuet's *Politique* (1709), based on the Scriptures, the people were being taught "*O rois, vous êtes des dieux*!" (O kings, you are gods). In that age the

4 J. L. Motley: *History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic* vol. III. (London 1904) pp. 5-12; *The United Netherlands*, Vol. I. (London 1904), pp. 5-12; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. III. (1907) pp. 191, 253.

Bible of contempt towards the people was Richelieu's *Testament Politique* (1668).[5]

Śivāji, be it remembered, is the contemporary of the Stuarts and *le grand monarque*. As in connection with the previous epochs of Hindu political thought, in regard to the Hindu political ideas of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries also the comparison with European ideas is not to be taken in a literal and detailed manner. The analogies must not be stressed too far in any case. The differences in the institutional *milieu* will always have to be noted.

Writing on Frederick the Great the following observation is made by Meinecke:[6] "*Rationalisierung der aus dem Mittelalter her entwickelten sozialen Kräfte für die Zwecke des Staates, das war die Summe seiner inneren Politik*" (The rationalization of the social forces developed since the Middle Ages in the interests of the state,—this was the gist of his internal politics). It is by rationalization of the army, finance, the middle class and the farmers that Frederick the Great sought to transform Prussia into a real *Grossstaat*, i.e., great state (*mahā-rāṣṭra*). This short and pithy description can be used likewise as the key to Śivāji's political life. And he established not only the *Machtstaat* (power-state or military state) but the *Kulturstaat* (culture-state or *dharma*-state, humanitarian state) also of Frederick the Great's *Anti-Machiavel* (1739) and *Das Politische Testament* (1768).

5 P. Janet: *Histoire de la Science Politique* (Paris 1913), Vol. II. chapter on "Bossuet and Fenelon"; F. J. C. Hearnshaw (editor): *The Social and Political Ideas of Some English Thinkers of the Augustan Age* (London 1928), chapter on Filmer.

6 *Die Idee der Staatsräson* (Munich 1925), pp. 349, 350, 353, 354.

Certain interesting items call for notice, however, at this stage of Hindu evolution in positivism. By the middle or rather end of the seventeenth century Hindu political philosophy embarks upon a career of profound enrichment, renovation, and remaking. For the first time in the history of Hindu India it is possible to encounter certain entirely new categories. For the first time do we find ourselves in an atmosphere in which the political theorist does not think in terms of the *saptāmga* (seven-limbed organism) at all. And it is curious that this remaking of Hindu political theory is consummated by one who is not a professional *artha* or *nīti* writer. The man who without being a professor of an *Artha, Smriti* or *Nīti* Academy yet succeeds in imparting to *artha* and *nīti śāśtras* an epochmaking form and spirit is Rāmdās. The most intensely original of Hindu political philosophers and the profoundest remaker of Hindu political theory—second perhaps to none but Kauṭalya, the *avatāra* of political science,—be it repeated, did not write anything on politics. His great work, *Dāsabodha,* is a wonderful treatise on universal morality of the most non-political character. Excepting a few stray references to *rāya ḳaraṇa* (king's functions) there is nothing political in this book. And yet this is the man to whom India owes the rebirth of her political science, the transformation of her *arthaśāśtra.*

In *Dāsabodha* it is hardly possible to find any political teachings. The politics of the kind such as might be useful to Śivāji is the farthest removed from it. This work is, as we have observed, essentially a treatise on morals. It is well calculated to promote noble and lofty ideals as well as help forward the building up of

strenuous habits and righteous personality. But there are other writings attributed to this saint-philosopher-poet in which political messages may be detected.

For instance, we are taught in one connection that *kaliyuga mahāghora sarva dosāchā ākāra.*[7] It is the terrible Iron Age and is the source of all sorts of vices. Among the evils are mentioned short life, premature death, the sale of daughters by Brāhmaṇas, the miseries of cows, the neglect of duties by the castes, etc. It is also pointed out that

mlechchha rājya hoilo pravala
pīdā pāweli dvijakula.

That is, the Moslem state has become powerful and the Brāhmaṇas are in trouble.

Besides, a special political message is generally attributed to Rāmdās, which runs thus:

Mārāthā tituka melwāwā
Mahārāṣṭradharma bārhwāwā.

(Unite all the Mārāthās and propagate the *dharma* of *mahārāṣṭra*).

There are some difficulties in connection with the source of this text, however. The message is alleged to have been communicated to Sambhāji[8] by Rāmdās. The first mention of this message is perhaps to be found in Ranade's work. But regrettably enough he does not cite the original source. Indeed, he reports it as a traditional information.

7 B. V. Bhat: *Mahārāṣṭradharma* (Dhuliya, 1925) pp. 169-170.

8 M. G. Ranade: *Rise of the Maratha Power* (Bombay 1900) pp. 53, 143.

The letter[9] of Rāmdās to Sambhāji (1680) on the occasion of the latter's coronation contains pieces of advice like the following:

(1) *Bahut lok melwāwe* (unite many people or bring together many persons),

(2) *Jivita triṇāsamān mānāwem* (consider life like a blade of grass).

This letter is complete in twenty-one verses. But it does not furnish us with the text in question. The letter is quoted in the Marathi work entitled *Sambhāji and Rājārām* by Malhar Ram Rao Chitnis (*c.* 1810).

The alleged message of Rāmdās is quoted on the title-page of a modern treatise entitled *Mahārāṣṭradharma.*[10] The author quotes it also at pp. 25 and 184. In regard to the first reference we are told, perhaps on the authority of Ranade, that Rāmdās wrote it to Sambhāji. In the second instance, the message is found in the midst of a letter from Rāmdās to Śivāji. It is clear, therefore, that the authenticity of the message is not free from doubts.

But let us accept the tradition as such. We understand, then, that Rāmdās wants, first, a "union among the Marathas." And secondly, as Ranade interprets it in one context (p. 53), Rāmdās is looking for an expansion of the *dharma* or duty of *mahārāṣṭra* (a large or unified state). Thus considered, the category *mahārāṣṭra* did not imply any particular geographical region, namely, Mahārāṣṭra, the country of the Marathas, but a great or powerful nation. The unification of the Marathas was

9 Text edited by K. N. Sane (Poona 1915) pp. 6-7.

10 By B. V. Bhat (Dhuliya 1925).

the first item in Rāmdās's policy. This corresponds to the *Einheit* or unity for which Fichte made propaganda in Germany.[11] The second item was the establishment of a large state. In other words, the territorial expansion of a Hindu state under the auspices of the united Marathas may be taken to have been the goal of action recommended by Rāmdās in the popular adage ascribed to him by tradition.

In another context (p. 172) Ranade explains *mahārāṣṭradharma* in quite a different manner. He considers it to mean the "religion" of Mahārāṣṭra, the country of the Marathas. This religion, again, is interpreted by him to mean not the conventional religion of the Hindus, but the reformed and somewhat liberalized religion and morality as is alleged to have been preached by the "saints and prophets of Mahārāṣṭra" in the days of Rāmdās.

Since Ranade's interpretation or interpretations in 1900 the category *mahārāṣṭradharma* has been the subject of much controversy and historical, philosophical or sociological criticism. The diverse interpretations have been brought together in the treatise entitled *Mahārāṣṭradharma* by B. V. Bhat (1925), which has been already referred to several times. An interpretation of a very suggestive character is that offered by Rajwade, according to whom *mahārāṣṭradharma* is neither to be taken as a category similar to Christian *dharma*, Mohammedan *dharma*, Jewish *dharma* etc. nor as simple Hindu *dharma* (p. 36). He says that *mahārāṣṭradharmāchi vyākhyā hindudharmāchyā vyākhyehun jāst vistrita āhe* (the content of *mahārāṣṭradharma* is more extensive than that of

11 *Reden an die Deutsche Nation* (1808), First Address.

Hindu *dharma*). He thus takes *dharma* in the sense of religion just as Ranade does. But while Ranade takes a reformist view of religion, Rajwade takes the traditional, *varṇāśrama* view. It appears that Bhat also, the author of the Marathi treatise, takes virtually the same orthodox view as Rajwade (pp. 411-457). This indeed is the *Leitmotif* of his thesis.

It is not surprising that *mahārāṣṭradharma* should have so many interpretations. Under our very eyes we notice that a corresponding European category has been passing through the same diversity of treatment. The French sociologist Bouglé, for instance, is the author of a work entitled *Qu'est-ce que l'Esprit Français?* What is the French spirit (*Farāsī dharma*)? And he offers twenty-five different definitions.

On an examination of the material as brought together in Bhat's book it should appear that the orthodox view is more in keeping with the facts of Maratha social history than the reformist view.

Mahārāṣṭradharma, as thus interpreted by Rajwade, Bhat and recently Sardesai, becomes virtually nothing but Hindu religion as generally understood, i.e., in the narrower sense of the term. It comprises (1) practices towards gods (*deva-śāstrāchāra*), (2) local practices (*deśāchāra*), (3) family practices (*kulāchāra*), and (4) caste practices (*jātyāchāra*).[12]

It is questionable, however, if we are justified in attaching either a reformist or an orthodox view of "religion" to the category *dharma*. From the earliest times when the word *dharma* is used in Vedic and post-

12 G. S. Sardesai: *The Main Currents of Maratha History* (Bombay 1933) pp. 12, 65.

Vedic texts down to Hemādri's *Chaturvarga-chintāmaṇi* (*c.* 1300 A.C.) and still later down to Moghul-Maratha times (*c.* 1650), it is not possible to confine *dharma* exclusively to this narrowly circumscribed religious sphere. In the *dharma-sūtras, dharma-śāstras, smriti-śāstras* and *nīti-śāstras,* the category *dharma*[13] is very comprehensive, implying law, justice, duty and what not, although it comprises no doubt the four practices enumerated above and of course also the reformed modes of life. It cannot be taken as identical with "religion" as understood by the folk, by the priests or by the moralists. If any European equivalent is to be sought for this Sanskrit term, perhaps the vague word, culture, civilisation, spirit, *Geist,* ideals, nay, "life," may be conveniently used. Anything and everything for which an individual or group stands and in extreme cases is prepared to die is virtually the *dharma.*

It is this *dharma* of the Aryans, Hindus, Indians, etc. i.e. the life, culture, spirit, or ideals of these races that was "protected," "saved," promoted and expanded by the *yugāvatāras* like Chandragupta Maurya and Skandagupta the Gupta in earlier times. The Rāyas of Vijayanagara also became *yugāvatāras* by functioning as the saviours and protectors of the same life, culture and ideals. In Rāmdās's and Śivāji's *mahārāṣṭradharma bārhwāwā,* likewise, we are to see the life, culture and ideals of the Hindus as being first "saved" from foreign aggression and then promoted under benevolent protection.

It is now necessary to analyze *mahārāṣṭra* in *mahārāṣṭradharma.* By all means it is a territorial or regional

13 On *dharma* see "The Doctrine of Property, Law and Social Order in Hindu Political Philosophy" in B. K. Sarkar: *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922).

concept. But are we to understand simply the geographical area for which the expression Mahārāṣṭra is used?

On the face of it, *mahārāṣṭradharma* might indeed mean simply the *dharma* of the territory known as Mahā-*rāṣṭra*, the Maratha country. In a sense it may not be wrong to take *mahārāṣṭra* here as implying only this geographical area. But perhaps it might be considered more relevant and reasonable to take it as the name of a more extensive region. Here we have an instance of where "more is meant than meets the ear." The item deserves a discussion.

In my judgment *mahārāṣṭradharma* is not to be taken as the *dharma* exclusively of the region Mahārāṣṭra or of the races and castes constituting the people (Maratha) living in Mahārāṣṭra. It is the *dharma* of the Aryans, Indians or Hindus of all regions. We are to understand by this category the eternal or *sanātana dharma* of the Hindus in the diverse regions of India. We have then the following equation: *Mahārāṣṭradharma = Hindu-rāṣṭradharma.*

When Rāmdās exhorts Sambhāji to propagate and expand the *mahārāṣṭradharma*, we are to understand that the great saint of Mahārāṣṭra wants Śivāji's son to hold forth as the champion, embodiment and missionary of this Hindu *dharma*, protect this culture of the Hindus from non-Hindu and anti-Hindu attacks, nay, march on conquering and to conquer in regions where Hindu culture is being menaced by non-Hindu and anti-Hindu aggressions. Rāmdās is not preaching anything short of the aggressive nationalism of Fichte for the Prussians.

Rāmdās is speaking as a Maratha to a Maratha. To him naturally, for the time being, Maratha and Hindu are

virtually convertible terms. The men and women of Mahārāṣṭra, the Maratha *antyajas* (lower castes), saints, Brāhmaṇs and all other occupational and social groups are nothing but Hindus. And in his "geopolitical" perspective the Hindus are for all practical purposes all to be found among the Maratha Brāhmaṇs, saints, *antyajas* and other socio-professional groups or castes. Sambhāji is therefore to appear throughout India as the champion of Hindu *dharma,* determined to carry forward its expansion (*bārhwāwā*) or *charaiveti* in all directions.

The local or geographical colouring associated with the expression *mahārāṣṭra* in *mahārāṣṭradharma* should not by any means mislead us in regard to its real import as having bearing on the Hindus of all India. Rāmdās is not addressing his message to a Rajput. Nor is a Rajput or, say, a North Indian saint, poet or patriot (like Bhūṣaṇa) trying to inspire a Maratha ruler with a call to duty. That is why the pan-Indian category of, say, *Bhāratadharma* or *Dakṣiṇidharma* (Deccani *dharma*) or *Āryadharma* has not been employed. It is as a Maratha patriot that the saint Rāmdās is reminding Sambhāji of the great task that lies before him, and no regional category can possibly be more normal and natural than that about the land in which he is born and bred,—the land which has already shown the way to *Hindwī Svarājya.*

It is to be understood, besides, that the pan-Indian category which we use so glibly in the twentieth century was unthinkable in the seventeenth century. Moreover, the exploits of the Marathas which subsequently rendered them the virtual rulers off and on over the most diverse regions of India thereby enabling the emergence of a pan-Indian Hindu states-system could not have been foreseen

by Rāmdās or even by Śivāji. Indeed, it is perhaps to the realisation of the dream or ideal of such a Hindu Empire or states-system extending as it should over all India that Rāmdās is spurring his prince. It is when the duty of *mahārāṣṭradharma bārhwāwā* has been done into life that the pan-Indian Hindu states-system would come into being, thanks, it might be dreamt of, to the glorious military feats of a son of Mahārāṣṭra. This sort of local pride can be honourably credited to Rāmdās and it is this sort of local patriotism to which Sambhāji is being incited.

It is a political message, pure and simple, that is embodied in the wish, command or exhortation, *mahārāṣṭradharma bārhwāwā*. Sambhāji understands and Rāmdās means that, situated in the Moghul *milieu* as the country is, the message involves two equations, negative and positive.

Nagatively, the command = remove the enemies of the Hindu state.

Positively, it = carry forward the *digvijaya* of Hindu culture, which is tantamount to the expansion of the Hindu state.

The message of Rāmdās is thus ideologically akin to and sociologically identical with, the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VII, 15) cult of *charaiveti* (march on) for Hindu culture, of which the thousand and one expressions have been encountered in the diverse regions of India all through the ages. Altogether, the political philosophy of Rāmdās as exhibited in *mārāthā tituḳā melwāwā, mahārāṣṭradharma bārhwāwā* implies, in plain words understandable to Sambhāji and his compatriots, nothing but the *digvijaya* or expansion of the Hindu Empire or states-

system under the auspices of the Marathas. And since (1) Hindu = Maratha and (2) Maratha = Hindu, the two messages of Rāmdās combined imply more concretely the expansion of the Maratha Empire. We are to understand that in Rāmdās's survey of the Indian "geopolitics" none but the Marathas are in a position to protect and propagate the *dharma*, culture, spirit, *Geist* or ideals of the Hindus. It is nothing but extraordinary political insight and dare-devil mentality of the most virile type that can conceive and promulgate such a fruitful *sūtra* for the guidance of a *vijigīṣu* (aspirant to conquest). Rāmdās does not perhaps know the Kauṭalyan categories of the *maṇḍala*-complex ("geopolitical" sphere) but he has carried India on his shoulders over to the next higher flights of constructive statesmanship. The jump from Kauṭalya to Rāmdās must, however, be considered to be tremendous.

Such a jump is, however, not unparalleled in the world's political speculations. We may recall the French chauvinist of the early fourteenth century, Pierre Du Bois,[14] who in his *De Recuperatione Terre Sancte* (1307) was inspiring his prince Philippe le Bel with extraordinary ambitions for France, little as it was. Rāmdās's dream of an Indian empire,—a *chāturanta* or *sārvabhauma* state,—under the Marathas, naturally in substitution of the Moghul, Tāmra, Mlechchha or Yavana Empire, may be compared to Pierre Du Bois's conception of the French Empire in Europe in replacement of the Holy Roman Empire. It is worth while to note that this

14 F. J. C. Hearnshaw (editor): *The Social and Political Ideas of Some Great Thinkers of the Middle Ages* (London) Chapter on Pierre Du Bois.

French treatise deals with the "recovery of the Holy Land" and naturally, the crusade against the enemies of Christendom. It is just such a crusade in order to recover one's *dharma* that Rāmdās stands for.

Another more celebrated dream may be remembered in this connection. That is the dream of Dante about the universal empire as developed in his *De Monarchia* and as often referred to in the *Divine Comedy*. That Italian conception of the fourteenth century furnished, *en passant*, as it is, with the idea of a *Veltro*, the Messiah or the Deliverer, corresponds to the eternal Hindu doctrine of *Pax Sārvabhaumica* (peace of the *sārvabhauma* or world-state). It is in the Dantesque world-empire that students of Maratha political theories, pious wishes and ideals can see a natural analogy of Rāmdās's *mahārāṣṭradharma bārhwāwā*. Ultimately, it is interesting that we find ourselves in the conception of *mahārāṣṭra* as equivalent to a "large" or "great" state, i.e. an empire, e.g., the *sārvabhauma* or *chāturanta* monarchy of traditional Hindu political philosophy.[15]

In the atmosphere of this Maratha cult we are easily reminded also of the *Prince* (1513) of Machiavelli (1469-1527). The *imminente pericolo delle usurpazioni straniere* (imminent danger of foreign usurpation) of which the Italian treatise speaks is the fundamental consideration with Rāmdās and the other saints. The very title of the last chapter of the *Prince* is an "exhortation to liberate Italy from the Barbarians" (*Exortazione à liberare l'Italia da Barbari*). It is the war of self-defence for the people

15 For the doctrine of *Sārvabhauma* see B. K. Sarkar: *Political Institutions* etc. (Leipzig 1922) pp. 222-226.

and culture of Mahārāṣṭra that furnishes the moral inspiration not only to these saints but also to Śivāji, constituting thereby the bed-rock of *Hindwī Svarājya*.

It is very important to observe that in Rāmdās's formula as presented in this message or in other writings of his, e.g., in the *Dāsabodha* or elsewhere no prejudice against or ill will towards Islam as a religion is perceptible. This is a remarkable feature of Rāmdās's mentality. He speaks of *Aurāngyā Pāpī*, of *Aurangzeb* the sinner, but he is vehement only against the tyrannies perpetrated on the Hindus and their men, women and institutions by this Moslem, Mlechchha or Yavana monarch. Rāmdās's ire is not exhibited against Moslem mosques, Moslem men and women, and Moslem doctrines. It is a war against tyranny and a struggle for freedom that Rāmdās is engineering in and through his teachings. Thus considered, he is essentially secular and territorial in his political views. A state in which the Hindu is no more discriminated against than the Moslem is implied in his conception of *mahārāṣṭradharma bārhwāwā* as in everything else he propagates in regard to the deliverance from the horrors of the *kaliyuga*.

The concept of unification of all the groups, communities or castes within the race or the people speaking the same language is a brilliant contribution of Rāmdās to Hindu politics. He is to be appraised as perhaps the first conscious exponent of linguistic nationalism in India. In the annals of *artha, dharma* and *nīti śāstras* down to the middle of the seventeenth century Hindu political philosophy is hardly in a position to produce a single *sūtra* in this strain. With Rāmdās Hindu *rājanīti* makes its *début* in an altogether novel domain.

The doctrine of *mahārāṣṭradharma* is regional or territorial just as that of *mārāthā titu* is racial or linguistic. As promulgator of the *mahārāṣṭradharma* cult Rāmdās is formally introducing an altogether unknown alphabet into the *artha* or *nīti śāstras* of the Hindus. Not that territorial patriotism as a fact was unknown in Hindu history previous to Rāmdās. Rather, the factual state-systems of the Hindus from the earliest times were sometimes racial but mostly regional or territorial. It is often round race-groups or linguistic nuclei but oftener round territorial units that the political *śaktiyoga* or *parākrama* (energism) of the people manifested itself. But it is questionable if it is possible to cite from the vast mass of *artha, nīti* or allied texts any passage which can approach the doctrine of *mahārāṣṭradharma* as a deliberate and consciously designed promulgation of a territorial patriotism.

While assuming this position we do not by any means overlook the consideration that the eternal Hindu doctrine of *saptāmga* (the seven-limbed organism) includes *rāṣṭra* or territory as a limb. The territorial concept is organically bound up with the most traditional theory of Hindu politics. But even in this theory we are to see nothing but a statical analysis of a societal complex, the state. The doctrine which exhibits the interdependence of the seven limbs on one another has certainly a value of its own. In the doctrine of *mahārāṣṭradharma,* however, the territorial unit, the region or the *rāṣṭra* is posed in its solitary greatness and is enabled to tower above every other factor of societal organization into an extraordinary prominence. This isolation of the regional or territorial unit in the political consciousness must be considered to be something unique in Hindu political theory. By con-

tributing the doctrine of territorial nationalism as a war-cry Rāmdās has carved out for himself a position of paramount significance in the world of political speculation. In mankind's history of nationalist philosophy Rāmdās, as the creator of these two epoch-making categories, should be treated as a forerunner of Herder (1744-1803) and Fichte (1762-1814), the prophets of nationalism in Europe.[16]

8. *The Marathi "Rājanīti" of Rāmachandrapant (1716)*

A document known as *Sambhāji's Ādnāpatra* (Edict)[1] was issued on November 21, 1716 by Sambhāji II (of Kolhapur) (1712-50). The writer is believed to have been Rāmachandrapant Amātya. The work is generally described as his *Rājanīti*. The language is Marathi.

This Royal Edict is stated to have been prepared "in accordance with the *śāstras*" (p. 14).

The work begins with the short historical survey of the *Svarājya*, the Maratha state, from Śivāji the founder down to 1716, the year of the promulgation of the edict by Sambhāji II, son of Rājārām who began to rule at Kolha-

16 Herder: *Sämmtliche Werke* (Berlin 1877-1913), Vol. XIII, pp. 258, 384-385, Vol. XVII, pp. 58, 59, 288-289; Fichte: *Reden an die Deutsche Nation*, First and Fourth Addresses; K. Francke: *A History of German Literature as Determined by Social Forces* (New York 1911); J. Baxa: *Einführung in die romantische Staatswissenschaft* (Jena 1923); P. Kluckhohn: *Die deutsche Romantik* (Leipzig, 1924); B. K. Sarkar: *The Political Philosophies Since* 1905 (Madras 1928), *From Herder to Hitler* (Calcutta 1933); R. E. Ergang: *Herder and the Foundations of German Nationalism* (New York 1931), pp. 238-266.

1 Available in English translation by S. V. Puntambekar as *A Royal Edict on The Principles of State Policy and Organization* (Madras 1929).

pur in 1712. In the course of this survey the author has tried to bring in general maxims of *nītiśāstras* by way of illustration. The historical portion is thus to a certain extent seen as a concrete embodiment of Hindu political philosophy.

In one passage the Edict says that many soldiers firmly believed that "the servants whose lives are lost in the cause of their master attain that state which even the sages and *yogins* do not reach and went to heaven whilst fighting in the cause of their master in accordance with the duties of *Kṣatra*" (p. 5). Students of *Śukranīti* and other *nītiśāstras* like those of Mitra-Miśra and Vaiśampāyana will be interested to see how powerfully the Maratha mind was influenced by the traditional Hindu political speculations.

The achievements of Śivāji are described in very general terms. In regard to the states subdued by him the processes are described in the following manner: "Upon some he made sudden attacks. Amongst some he fomented mutual quarrels. Between some he caused breaches of friendship. By entering the tents of some he fought with them. By personal venture he defeated some in single combats. With some he made alliances. Of his own accord he went to visit some. Some he forced to come and visit him. He imperilled the lives of some by creating mutual disunion. Others he conquered one after another by making other kinds of efforts without their knowledge." (p. 7) The hoary Kauṭalyan *śāstra* in regard to the four *upāyas* and six *guṇas* (strategy and tactics) can be seen here as exercising some sway over the Marathi *Ādnāpatra*. We are not interested for the present in Śivāji's exploits and policies but only in the manner

in which they are being described by Rāmachandrapant in Marathi.[2]

In connection with post-Śivāji political conditions there is an observation to the following effect : "A place or country when invaded by others continues to exist with outside help. Therefore at first they should be cut off. Then efforts should be made against it directly. This is proper policy" (p. 11). Rāmachandrapant is here functioning as a pupil of the Kauṭalya-Kāmandaka-Śukra complex in regard to the application of the doctrine of *maṇḍala* ("geopolitical" sphere).

The category "*dharma*" occurs very often in this *Ādnāpatra*. (pp. 15, 16, 26, 37). While discussing some of the general principles of politics Rāmachandrapant is virtually paraphrasing all that the *smriti* and the *nīti śāstras* have to say about *dharma* in relation to the social order (pp. 15-16). The value of the paraphrase consists in the fact that the author is not dealing like, say, Kauṭalya, Manu, Śukra etc. with abstract entities called the state. The author is every moment conscious that he is writing of a particular state. And that is his "this kingdom" (pp. 3, 5, 7, 8, 15), "Hindu kingdom" (p. 13), *svarājya* (p. 3) etc. In this Marathi Edict we are in season and out of season made conscious of the great reality that the *Hindwī Svarājya* of Śivāji the Great, perhaps the greatest Hindu of all ages, and one of the profoundest remakers of mankind, is the "Kingdom of God" and that this kingdom is being governed according to the principles of the *śāstras*. "Out of compassion for the people", we are told, "God in his

2 As I do not happen to have the original text before me it is not possible to point to the Marathi words in which the echoes of Sanskrit treatises can be found.

full favour has granted us this Kingdom" (p. 15). The patriotic ring is ever manifest in this treatise and the author is fully convinced of the noble mission of the Maratha state as the bulwark of *dharma* against the inroads of the *Tāmras* (Moghuls) or *Yavanas* and their allies (pp. 6, 11). This mission is not conceived in a futuristic manner but as something already [illegible] as an achievement. For the student of Hindu political speculations from Kauṭalya to Mitra-Miśra and Śukra it is interesting to observe that even as late as the second decade of the eighteenth century an *Amātya* of a successful Hindu Empire should have felt proud to connect the methods, tactics, strategy and general policies of the state served by him with, and interpret them in the light of, the theories adumbrated by the "old masters" of political philosophy. The virility, tenacity and pragmatic utility of the *artha* and *nīti śāstras* of the Hindus are thus brought home to us in a remarkable manner. Simultaneously also the deeper foundations of Maratha political idealism and constructive statesmanship are laid bare. The *dharma*-mindedness of Maratha diplomacy and statecraft as well as the solicitude of the Maratha thinkers for affiliations to the permanent tradition of Sanskritic or Hindu culture are items that impress us most powerfully. Verily, in the eighteenth century the Maratha statesmen and generals were encompassed in their daily life with the same ideals and messages of philosophers, poets, and preachers as the Mauryas, Guptas, Vardhanas, Chālukyas, Pālas and Cholas of yore.

Hindu positivism did not come to a close at the seventh century, or the tenth or the thirteenth or even the seventeenth century. It was living gloriously in the eighteenth century and came down to the nineteenth

century, for instance, in Malhar Ram Rao Chitnis's *Rājanīti*, the Sanskrit treatise based like a *nibandha* on the *nītiśāstras*.

In regard to the actual achievements of the *Hindwī Svarājya* of Śivāji and the Marathas one should not be too hypercritical. It would be desirable to get oriented to the military methods, external politics, diplomatic manoeuvres, criminal justice, religious policy as well as social and economic legislation as pervalent in contemporary Europe, say, the Europe of Louis XIV and Frederick the Great in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[3]

There is a tendency among historiographers of today to sit in judgment on the Marathas with the canons of modern nationalism, democracy, social justice, "economic planning" and what not. This is an entirely fallacious method and ought by all means to be avoided. On the other hand, it is necessary also to be more critical and objective in regard to the achievements of the "golden age" of Hindu history, such, for instance, as those for which the Hindu states from those of the Mauryas to those of the Cholas and Senas are responsible. The contributions of the Marathas of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries to the politics and culture of the Indian people would appear to be more or less on a par with, and the significant continuations of, those of the pre-Moslem Hindu races.

The student of world-culture, one who is as much at home in the institutions and theories of the Orient as of

3 *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. VIII, (1902) p. 49; W. G. F. Phillimore: *Three Centuries of Treaties of Peace* (Boston 1918) pp. 13-61. Freeman: *The Historical Geography of Europe* (London 1903).

the Occident, one who knows of the economic, political and social conditions of Europe from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, should be in a position to appraise the Marathas as having made substantial contributions to human freedom and progress. We cannot afford to withhold from "giving the Devil his due." In sociological evaluations and by the standard of comparative culture-history the Marathas do undoubtedly deserve the glorious credit of being "a people that put down the Muslim power, that for long resisted the British advance in all parts of India, that conquered and civilized the Gonds and other tribes in the distant north and south, that have left plentiful permanent marks of their influence in a triangular tract, of which the three corners may roughly be put down as Nagpur, Surat and Tanjore, and ever stood for order, peace and culture, and that finally saved the soul of India and enthused it with a new hope."[4]

In Rāmachandrapant's *Rājanīti* we are furnished with an analysis of *dharma* directly or indirectly in diverse contexts (pp. 8, 15, 35-38). And this should throw some light also on the doctrine of *mahārāṣṭradharma* as inculcated by Rāmdās (*Supra*, pp. 567-572).

We understand indeed that the practices and customs such as are, generally speaking, dear to the Hindu heart are comprised in the category *dharma*. Thus considered, *dharma* would be virtually identical with the fourfold *āchāras* as analyzed by Rajwade, Bhat and others. It would, therefore, be more comprehensive than the more or less exclusively democratic and reform-

4 G. S. Sardesai: *The Main Currents of Maratha History* (Bombay 1933) pp. 27-28.

istic tendencies of religious thought and life as stressed by Ranade. Indeed, Rāmachandrapant, at any rate, is fundamentally orthodox in his conception, and his view of *dharma* gives hardly any support to Ranade's and can be cited in the main in favour of Rajwade's. But in Rāmachandrapant's analysis it is possible to come into contact with something which is wider even than the fourfold *āchāras* of Hindu life. We must observe that he is not writing an exhaustive digest on *dharma*. The treatment of the topic is incidental and merely suggestive.

There is a strand of some undefined and undefinable traits of thought as well as practice,—"that which is traditionally the best and which his ancestors had followed" (p. 15)—somewhat vague and elastic conceptions such as go beyond the concrete *āchāras* actually in force and are associated with the equally vague category, ideals, spirit, *Geist*, culture etc. of a people. We are led to feel that anything and everything, positive or negative, defined or undefined, which distinguishes the Hindus from those who are known to be non-Hindus is comprehended in the category *dharma*. Rāmachandrapant has not referred to Rāmdās's celebrated cult. But today it is patent to us that in Rāmdās's futuristic ideology as in Rāmachandrapant's analysis of past achievements the *dharma* of the *mārāthā titu* is something which distinguishes this Hindu people from the non-Hindu and anti-Hindu peoples. Rāmdās the prophet or apostle and Rāmachandrapant the historian or philosopher of events are talking the same language and they mean the same thing, namely, that the Maratha state, the *Hindwi Svarājya* = the organization of the Hindus and by the Hindus for the expansion of Hindu culture and the anni-

hilation of everything inimical to the Hindus and their thousand and one interests.

Rāmachandrapant is interpreting *Realpolitik* in terms of the political philosophy of the *nītiśāstras*. To a certain extent he is not a writer of political philosophy strictly so called. His *Rājanīti* is often a philosophical explanation of political history. He looks like an historian and his work appears to be somewhat of a contribution to the philosophy of history. But on the whole the general philosophical or speculative character of the work cannot be missed.

In this Marathi treatise the general principles of the Sanskrit *nītiśāstras* are to be found, further, in the cult of prowess, courage, perseverance, industriousness, energism etc. (p. 6), the policy of foresight in international diplomacy (p. 13), the qualifications of the ruler and his relations with officials etc. (pp. 15-19, 23-25).

The *Ādnāpatra* says, for instance, in the right *nīti* style that "while protecting what is already acquired, new achievements should always be attempted; and this should continuously remain the aim of the king." More concretely we are told that "if he regards the glory which he has achieved as satisfactory, then he does not feel inclined for further exertion. As a result the enemy would find the occasion for an invasion and the kingdom would suffer. This should not be allowed to happen." (p. 19). Students of the *Mahābhārata* (Book VI. ch. ii) will not fail to encounter here the Marathi adaptation of the ethics of "manliness" and "unceasing upward striving."[5]

5 "The Theory of International Relations" in Sarkar: *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig 1922) p. 215.

And here we may recall with interest that about a century after Rāmachandrapant, Fichte, the German philosopher, lecturing at Königsberg in 1807 declared his fundamental principles in the following words:[6]

"1. The neighbour is always ready to enlarge himself at your cost at the first opportunity if he can do it safely. He must do so if he is clever enough and cannot avoid it even if he were your brother (*Er muss es tun und kann es nicht lassen, und wenn er dein Bruder wäre*).

"2. It is not at all enough that you are defending your own territory. Keep your eyes open on everything that can have an influence on your position. Do not by any means submit to the fact that anything within the boundaries of your influence should be changed to your disadvantage. Neglect no moment when you can use the situation to your advantage. Rest assured that the neighbour will do it as soon as he can. If you neglect it on your part you will remain behind him. One who does not grow decays while others are growing (*Wer nicht zunimmt der nimmt wenn andere zunehmen ab*)."

In Rāmachandrapant's lengthy statement about the functions of the king we have a good summary of *nīti* literature on the subject (p. 26). In the statement that "a king alone cannot, even if he wishes to perform all these functions," and that "therefore he has to appoint as his representatives *pradhānas* (ministers) in order to conduct the affairs of the kingdom" we are, again, in the atmosphere of the *nītiśāstras* (pp. 26-30). But the author is an *amātya* (minister) of the Maratha state. So he introduces a good deal of objectivity and *Realpolitik* into his

6 Meinecke: *Die Idee der Staatsräson* (Munich 1925) pp. 462-463.

analysis of the position of ministers in the state. An interesting observation runs to the effect that "ministers are the pillars of the house whose name is kingdom" (p. 27). In the *dictum* that "when one is appointed a minister, one should not at all be disrespected and insulted at every turn" (p. 29) we feel that it is not a copybook maxim cited from *Śukranīti* or some other text but a bit of the author's own mind. This Maratha *amātya,* like many other ministers of Hindu states, nay, like the ministers of many royal dynasties of Europe—knew from bitter experience what it is to serve a king. In the capacity of a writer on *rājanīti* Rāmachandrapant is therefore but pleading the cause of his own profession throughout the world while offering the advice as to how the ruler should behave with the ministers. This piece of advice might be administered, be it observed *en passant,* as much to the Hohenzollerns, Bourbons and the British despots of the New Monarchy as to the Marathas.

While dealing with the Marathi *Rājanīti* (1716) of Rāmachandrapant let us observe once more,—what we are always aware of in the discussion of Hindu political theories,—that his ideal of a king is the *rājarṣi* of the Kauṭalyan tradition. This *rājarṣi* (royal-sage), again, is none other than the philosopher-king of Plato. To cite a somewhat contemporary parallel from Europe we should to a certain extent envisage the *milieu* of the *Idea of a Patriot King* (1738) by Bolingbroke (1678-1751), in which the Hanoverian contemporaries of the Marathas

7 J. N. Figgis: *From Gerson to Grotius* (Cambridge 1907), *The Divine Right of Kings* (Cambridge 1914), F.J.C . Hearnshaw (editor): *Social and Political Ideas of Some Thinkers of the Augustan Age* (London 1928), Chapter on Bolingbroke.

used to live. For general orientations[7] in regard to political ideas it is necessary likewise to remember some of the absolutist treatises like Bodin's *Les six Livres de la République* (1576) and Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651) as well as the treatises of Bossuet and Filmer already referred to (*supra*).

The economic interests of the *saptāmga* organism are well taken care of in the categories, *ḳoṣa* and *rāṣṭra*, of the *nītiśāstras*. The Marathi *Rājanīti* likewise devotes considerable attention to these considerations. Certain characteristic and rather new principles enunciated by Rāmachandrapant deserve however to be singled out. "Merchants are the ornament of the kingdom and the glory of the king," says he, "They are the cause of the prosperity of the kingdom. All kinds of goods which are not available come into the kingdom. That kingdom becomes rich" (p. 31). As a practical statesman he knows, besides, that the *nerfs de la république*, the "sinews of war" are furnished by the mercantile classes. "In times of difficulties whatever debt is necessary is available. With its help danger is averted. There is a great advantage in the protection of merchants."

In Rāmachandrapant's *Rājanīti* the protection of merchants is comprehensive enough to include foreign traders. Freedom of intercourse in trade should be given to sea-faring merchants at various ports by sending an assurance of safety, says he. In *dicta* like these we realize that the Marathi treatise on politics is not a mere paraphrase or adaptation of the Sanskrit *artha and nīti śāstras*. The protection of foreign merchants is not unknown in Kauṭalya. But the language and form in which the doctrine is enunciated by the Maratha writer are

original. The fact that it is the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,—the *milieu* of European traders and mercantile houses,—is forced upon us in his treatment of the subject. Rāmachandrapant has enriched the scope of Hindu political science by introducing the *Topīkārs* (the hat-wearers, Europeans) as merchants and the relations of the state with them during peace and war. For instance, we are told that the punishment which is inflicted on the servants of the enemy is not to be meted out to the European merchants who happen to live in enemy territory. They may, however, be fined but discharged with due respect (p. 33).

Among the *Topīkārs* (hat-wearers) Rāmachandrapant mentions the *Firāngis* (Portuguese), the *Ingrāj* (the English), the *Valands* (the Dutch), the *Farāsis* (the French) and the *Dingmār* (the Danes) by name. It is interesting that they are described according to their countries and that there is no reference to them as Europeans or as Christians. The common name for them, however, is *Topīkārs* (hat-wearers).

The special features of these sea-faring hat-wearers have commanded Rāmachandrapant's attention. They are not like other merchants, says he (p. 32). Their masters, every one of them, are known to be ruling kings. Rāmachandrapant knows that it is under royal orders and control that these European merchants come to trade, and asks, "How can it happen that rulers have no greed for territories?" The aims and ambitions of these *Topīkārs* are described by him as follows:—"They have full ambition to enter into these provinces, to increase their territories and to establish their own opinion (religion?)." Further, he describes them as obstinate and is aware that

once a place falls into their hands they will not give it up even at the cost of their lives (p. 32).

Rāmachandrapant would, therefore, restrict the intercourse of the hat-wearers to the extent of their coming and going for trade purposes only. He is positively against giving them places to settle. By no means are they to be given factory lands at the mouth of an inlet or on the shores of the sea. For they might become dangerous by building forts. The outstanding facts that the strength of the European lies in navy, guns and ammunition is recorded by the author as a positive reality. He should like by all means to avoid them. "It is enough," we are told, "if they occasionally come and go and do not trouble us; nor need we trouble them."

The Fundamental Defect in Rāmachandrapant's Positivism

It is worth while to pause a moment here. Rāmachandrapant is evidently aware that the "dangerousness" of these *Topīkārs* lies in their "strength" in "navy, guns and ammunition." Had he cared to go into details in his treatise he would most probably have admitted that in these "industrial" and "military" techniques, at any rate, the *Topīkārs* were relatively stronger than and hence to that extent superior to the Marathas and perhaps other Indians. During the early years of the eighteenth century, then, the consciousness of *Topīkār* superiority in certain items of positivism was not absent among the thinking sections of the Indian people.

But it is worth while, again, to observe that the author of the Marathi *Rājanīti* does not discuss as to how the inferiority of the Marathas and perhaps of other

Indians in navy, guns and ammunition might be removed. He has not cared to suggest that the Marathas and the other Indians should attempt mastering the new arts, sciences and industries with which the superiority of the *Topīkārs* in navy, guns and ammunition was associated. One might expect Rāmachandrapant to declare to his countrymen the need for visiting the lands of the *Topīkārs* in quest of the new learning,—the new *vidyās* and *kalās*,—in order that the *Brahmāstra* (the divine weapons) of the modern times might be mastered by hook or by crook. The *argumentum ex silentio* does not prove anything definite. But it is necessary to point out that no reference to the necessity of learning or stealing the new arts and sciences, the new tools and appliances, the methods and machines of the new factories is to be found in this work. And naturally, therefore, the importance of studying these industrial inventions and military tactics at first hand by coming into contact with the pioneers in their own workshops at home does not occur to Rāmachandrapant. On the contrary, he is satisfied with the naïve, puerile, nay, old-womanish methodology of avoiding the *Topīkārs* altogether, of neither troubling them nor being troubled by them, i.e., of having no social or cultural intercourse of any sort. This is a capital short-coming in Rāmachandrapant's philosophy or statesmanship.

It is impossible to overlook this fundamental defect in the mentality of Rāmachandrapant as perhaps of other Indians of his age. The same shortcoming is to be observed in the character of still greater and more influential and powerful men among his contemporaries and predecessors, for instance, Akbar the Great, Śivāji

the Great and Aurangzeb, men who guided the destinies of the Indian people in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In regard to the cultural growth of the world both Hindus and Moslems were equally ignorant and defective in outlook and statesmanship. Both demonstrated the poverty or rather the bankruptcy of their intelligence by remaining blind to the greatest reality of their age, namely, that some of the Western countries had already established their claims to be utilized as the *gurus* of the Hindu and Moslem scholars, artisans, and soldiers. Indian statesmen of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries must have already felt that in certain branches of material and military life they could not do without the assistance, nay, guidance of the few Westerners who happened to be present in India as travellers or merchants. But none of them appear to have felt that the time had come for them to organize scientific missions to the lands of these men equipped with the new qualifications. The fact that Indian *paṇḍits* and *mollahs* would have to learn at the feet of the European Brahmans and Maulavis beyond the seas in the *chatuṣpāṭhis* and *maḳtabs* of Europe was not realized by the greatest Hindus and Mussalmans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, although they were already conscious on account of daily experience that the men beyond the seas had in certain spheres of life already proven their worth in a significant manner.

The Mussalmans were as defective and therefore as guilty in this respect as the Hindus. It should not be reasonable to attribute this defect, guilt or sin to Hinduism as a religion or as a system of caste-ridden social groups. The Moslems who observe neither the religious rites of

the Hindus nor the *mores* and customs of the Hindu castes do not equally appear to have recognized the utility, nay, the necessity of sending their would-be statesmen and generals to the Western countries for training in the new arts and sciences. The *Meiji* (enlightenment) era that commenced in Japan in the middle of the nineteenth century along with the first objective demonstration of Western superiority ought to have commenced in India in the middle of the seventeenth century, the epoch, say, of Aurangzeb and Śivāji, or perhaps in the middle of the sixteenth century, the age of Akbar and the Vijayanagara Empire.

Had the recognition of the necessity of studying or stealing the new arts and sciences from the countries of the inventors and discoverers of those arts and sciences dawned upon the Hindu Varāhamihiras and Mussalman Alberunis of the sixteenth, seventeenth or even the eighteenth century India might have had another history in the nineteenth. The "industrial revolution" which commenced changing the face of Europe between, say, 1750 and 1850, might have made its appearance among the Hindus and Mussalmans also almost simultaneously. The political, social and philosophical aspects of this technocratic—*cum*—scientific transformation would then have manifested themselves in the Indian *milieu* nearly during the same decades as in the European. The calamitous chronological distance[8] that we find between India and the more advanced regions of Eur-America today might not at all appear as a fact of history.

8 For the "equations" of culture-history and the chronological distances in development between races or regions see the present author's *Creative India* (Lahore 1937), pp. 433-438.

The Niti Tradition in Rāmachandrapant

Rāmachandrapant never uses the category, *saptāmga* or the seven-limbed organism. But he virtually describes all the seven categories of the *nītiśāstras* in his own way. The author deals with the *svāmi* (king) and the *amātya* (minister) at some length. The topics of *ḳoṣa* (treasure) and *rāṣṭra* (territory) are discussed in connection with the commercial interests of the state. This subject has not however, been discussed, it should be observed, in an adequate manner. Public finance has virtually been neglected. The slight references to income and expenditure, salaries and gifts (pp. 19-20), *vrittis* or grants etc. and *inams* or estates (pp. 35-38) do not enable us to feel that the importance of the financial considerations has been grasped by the author.

"Finance is the life of the state," says he in the manner of the writers of *nītiśāstras*. The practical aspect of this consideration in times of war is noticed by him. He advises that the state treasury should be filled and well looked after but does not go much farther in analysis or prescriptions.

The problem of *suhrit* (ally), one of the seven categories, should seem to be touched upon incidentally at almost every place where the problem of foreign invasion has been discussed (pp. 6-7). The topic may be said to have been rather carefully dealt with in the section on the treatment of *watandars*, i.e., hereditary officials, e.g. heads of villages, districts, provinces etc. They are no doubt small but independent chiefs of territories, says he. When a foreign invasion comes they are known to make peace with the invader and can become harmful to the kingdom. These "feudal" chiefs are therefore to be controlled in a

careful manner so that they may be made to remain friendly to the king (pp. 33-35). In this discussion there are important considerations preparatory to an active foreign policy. But the formal treatment of friends and foes such as one is familiar with in the doctrine of *maṇḍala* has been avoided. The ideas of *sāma, dāna, bheda* and *daṇḍa* are accessible here although not in so many words. Rāmachandrapant has dealt with the actual circumstances of the Maratha political *milieu* and the method of adding to the strength of the *Svarājya* that he has to serve. All the same, his analysis has not considered it necessary to use the terminology or methodology of the "sphere of states" while detailing the manner in which the *Svarājya* is to become thornless and expand in all directions.

What little Rāmachandrapant has to say about dealings with other princes or feudatory chiefs shows that the realism of Spinoza (1634-77) is in his grain. Passages from the *Tractatus Politicus*[9] (I. 5) of Spinoza like the following would be congenial to Rāmachandrapant's spirit: "Men are of necessity liable to passions and so constituted as to pity those who are ill and envy those who are well off and to be prone to vengeance more than to mercy;" "And so it comes to pass that, as all are equally eager to be first, they fall to strife, and do their utmost mutually to oppress one another." Rāmachandrapant would, therefore, like Spinoza spurn a rosy view of interstatal relations. The Spinozistic statement that such

9 *Works*, Vol. I. (New York 1883), p. 289, G. Engelmann: *Political Philosophy from Plato to Jeremy Bentham* (New York 1927), chapter on Spinoza; cf. in this connection the character-analysis of the "upper strata," the "aristocracy," "leaders," "builders" etc. in P. Sorokin: *Social Mobility* (New York 1927), pp. 308-311.

persons as persuade themselves that the multitude of men distracted by politics can ever be induced to live according to the bare dictates of reason must be dreaming of the poetic golden age or of a stage-play can also be taken as Rāmachandrapant's.

In external politics, therefore, it is *das Imperativ der Staatsnotwendigkeit* (the imperative of state-necessity) that compels Rāmachandrapant like Frederick the Great to discover his *Staatsräson* (reasons or interests of the state) in the philosophy of *Macht* or power.[10]

The words of Frederick the Great himself in his *Considerations sur l'état present du corps politique de l'Europe* (Considerations on the present condition of the body politic of Europe, 1737) would be congenial to the Maratha *Amātya*. "The politics of the great monarchies was always the same," says the Prussian monarch; "Their fundamental principle consisted in seizing everything in order to expand oneself ceaselessly, and their wisdom in anticipating the tricks of their enemies and to play the finest play."

It is virtually the analysis of neighbours as presented by the Maratha *Rājanīti* of the early eighteenth century that we find in the modern theorist Stier-Somlo when he says in *Politik* (1926) that the states of our environment are bound to find themselves in eternal competition, rivalry, struggle, and at any rate, in the midst of conflicts or clashes of interests. The considerations of high "ethical culture" are according to him out of place in such a world. This circumstance compels the *Staatsmoral*

10 F. Meinecke: *Die Idee der Staatsräson* (Munich 1925) pp. 356-358, 360-361. See also the analysis of the state in L. von Wiese's *System der Allgemeinen Soziologie* (Munich 1933), pp. 549, 554-555 for another analogue of Hindu conceptions.

(state or political morality) to be entirely different from the individual morality (p. 122).

Rāmachandrapant would therefore be prepared to admit with Vierkandt that every state has two faces, one towards the internal affairs, and the other towards the external. From one standpoint, of course, it is the *Rechtsstaat* (law-state), or *lo stato etico* (the ethical i.e. moral state) of Ugo Redanò (1927). But the essential characteristic of the state in its external relations[11] is its character as *Macht,* organized force, culminating in what von Wiese calls *Ich-Einzig-Wahn* (I-Alone-Mania).

Leaving aside the category *suhrit* (ally) we notice that the two categories *durga* (forts) and *vala* (army) have been dealt with in a somewhat detailed and practical manner. Rāmachandrapant's observations on forts do not betray the influence of academicians. Indeed he talks like a contractor, engineer and manager. In regard to the treatment of the king and the ministers he is quite prepared to indulge in academic generalities and ethical first postulates or political principles. But in regard to forts he makes short of them. Indeed he virtually avoids those theoretical considerations. He is chiefly interested in their actual construction and administration (pp. 39-48).

In his judgment the forts and strongholds "alone mean the kingdom." They mean "more than the treasury." They mean the "strength of the army." They "mean likewise the prosperity of the kingdom," "our places of residence," "our places of peaceful sleep," nay, "our very protection of life" (p. 39). All this apotheosis of forts, so to say, might be easily ascribed to the

11 A. Vierkandt: *Staat und Gesellschaft in der Gegenwart* (Leipzig 1921) p. 10.

political and military conditions to which Maratha writers are used. But we ought to remember our old Kauṭalya (Book VIII) also, where the relative importance of each of the seven limbs is discussed in succession. The importance of forts as *a* or *the* supreme factor in the political organism is fathered upon Parāśara in that discussion. But otherwise, as usual in the pluralistic and "heinotheistic" philosophy of Hindu thought, each one is found in Kauṭalyan analysis to be something very fundamental. We may take it that by thus dwelling on the importance of forts Rāmachandrapant is perhaps philosophizing not simply as a Maratha scholar but to a certain extent also as a traditional Hindu author.

The questions of *vala* or the army have been dealt with in connection with the troops and their organization (pp. 20-22). The five-fold force of cavalry (*laṣkar*), infantry (*hasham*), light-armed men (*adal*), musketeers (*banduki*), archers (*tirandāji*) and artillery men (*ḳarol*) is substantially different from the elephant-corps, cavalry, chariot and infantry divisions of the *nīti* tradition. The navy plays a considerable part in Rāmachandrapant's treatment. It is an independent limb of the state, says he. Excluding the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya the *nītiśāstras* hardly appear to know anything of the navy and naval organization. Rāmachandrapant's observations constitute new items in Hindu political philosophy (pp. 48-52).

Altogether, we are inclined to treat Rāmachandrapant's work as in the main an adaptation in Marathi of Sanskrit *nītiśāstras*. The treatise has been so well and nicely adjusted to the achievements as well as problems of the Marathas that the author's attempts at paraphrasing the Sanskrit texts are hardly palpable. It has some

special merits, however. First, it has served to expand the scope of *nītiśāstra* by introducing new items. In the second place, the author has enriched the discussions of old topics with observations from Maratha experience. And it is in this regard that this Marathi treatise should appear to be intensely valuable to us. Many of the words and phrases used by "old masters" such as might appear rather vague or unintelligible, nay, perhaps platitudinous generalities have acquired in this treatment living flesh and blood. We are thereby enabled to grasp the real import of the contents of the *arthaśāstras* and *nītiśāstras*. It may be regarded as such a fine commentary, so to say, of the well-known texts of Hindu political theory that every body may be recommended to commence his first studies in Kauṭalya, Manu and Śukra along with Rāmachandra-pant's Marathi work.

Sanskrit poetical works like the *Śiva-Bhārata* or the Marathi Edict like this *Ādnāpatra* or *Rājanīti* are not to be consulted solely for dates, names and the succession of events. Poetry and philosophy ought to be approached as poetry and philosophy. The archaeological historian will perhaps find here very little of interest to him in regard to the details of Maratha political history. But it is just in this kind of writings, idealistic and yet somewhat realistic as they are, that the student of political theory, moral ideas and cultural ideals would get the most varied data. Nothing can be more helpful in reconstructing the mentality of Śivāji and the Marathas than the texts in which mainly the dreams, fine frenzies, pious wishes and memories are enshrined.

Śiva-Bhārata and *Ādnāpatra* are, of course, not all made of dreams and pious wishes. But even in so far

as they are dreams and pious wishes they have furnished the Hindus of the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries with the most energistic *élan de la vie*. It is as powerful agencies in "social metabolism" that such Sanskrit and Marathi documents of the Marathas are to be appraised by the students of political philosophy, sociology and culture-history.

9. *The Peshwa's Diaries (1708-1817).*

In a letter[12] to his younger brother Raghunāth (Rāghobā) dated July 19, 1742 Bālāji Bāji Rāo advised him, among other things, to study regularly the *Raghuvaṁśa, Viduranīti,* Chāṇakya as well as the *Mahābhārata* from the *Virāṭaparva* to the end.

It is very interesting to observe that in modern India also these texts are to be mentioned amongst the most popular or favourite works of Sanskrit literature. Another item calls for notice. *Viduranīti* which has been singled out in the middle of the eighteenth century by the Maratha statesman was an important document with Mitra-Miśra also. The last chapter of his *Rājanīti-prakāśa* (c. 1630) is, as we have seen above, given over to the teachings of Vidura as found in the *Mahābhārata.*

Some of the civil and military institutions of Śivāji are described in a contemporary Marathi work, the *Bākhār* (chronicle in prose) by Sabhāsad (1693).[13] This *Bākhār* was later expanded by Chitragupta (1760). The *Sabhāsad Bākhār* is known as *Śiva-Chhatrapati-chen Charitra.*

12 G. S. Sardesai, *Madhyavibhāga* Vol. II. (Bombay 1921) pp. 23-24.

13 Edited by K. N. Sane; Eng. transl. by J. L. Manker as *Life and Exploits of Shivaji* (Bombay 1886).

Early in the nineteenth century Malhār Rām Rāo Chitnis wrote in Marathi a treatise on *rājanīti*[14] (*c.* 1810). It is based professedly on Sanskrit *nīti-śāstras* and is to be regarded as a Marathi *nibandha* on this literature. It may therefore be aptly compared to another Maratha work written likewise in Marathi, namely, *Ādnāpatra* or *Rājanīti* by Rāmachandrapant (1716), which we have discussed above. The tradition of Hindu political philosophy comes down therefore to the very days of Rammohun Roy (1772-1833).

The selections from the Peshwa's Diaries (*Daftar*) from Shāhu to Bāji Rāo II.[15] introduce us to writings in Marathi language from 1708 to 1817 and thus cover almost double the ground of the Persian work of the Bengali Moslem historian, the *Seir Mutaqherin* (1780). This literature of some 22,000 folio pages (including the English summary) brings us into contact with some of the texts bearing on the economic, political and social institutions as well as ideologies of the Hindus during the eighteenth century.

It is in this *daftar* literature that we find the accounts of administration, revenue assessment and collection, the guarding of forts, the organization of the army and the navy, the dispensation of civil and criminal justice, the public debts of the government and so on. These diaries deal likewise with the police, post, mint, prisons, charities, pensions and public works, medical reilef and sanita-

14 M. G. Ranade: "Introduction to the Peshwa's Diaries" in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1900, pp. 448-479.

15 Edited by K. N. Sane, Poona, 1887 (Kavyetihasa-Samgraha Series No. 23). I am indebted to the historian G. S. Sardesai for his kindly placing this text at my disposal.

tion. The same texts describe also the measures adopted by the Maratha state in order to encourage trade and commerce as well as foster learning. We can find in these documents the evidences as to the fact that the Maratha rulers, to quote Ranade, "even went, as some might say, out of their way, in undertaking reforms of social economy with a courage which is thought in these days by some to be outside the functions of the state." Naturally, therefore, as texts of Hindu positivism and secular endeavour no documents can be ranked as superior to these Marathi state diaries of the eighteenth century, kept, as they were, by the responsible officers in the Peshwas' civil service.[16]

These Marathi diaries can be regarded as to a certain extent the *nītiśāstras* of the eighteenth century. From the very nature of the case they are of course more objective, concrete, factual and realistic by all means than the Sanskrit treatises of the same name or the Marathi *Rājanīti* of Rāmachandrapant (1716). Indeed, they are objectivity or realism itself. It is these Marathi texts that enable the modern student to grasp the political ideology of the eighteenth century. One can discover in them the causes which helped the Maratha confederacy in the first half of the eighteenth century, say, down to the battle of Panipat in 1761, to spread its rule and influence over the whole of India. Nay, the points of superiority such as enabled the Marathas to prevail over every Indian power, Mussalman or Hindu, Sikh or Jat, Rohilla or Rajput, Kathis or Gujars, the Portuguese, the Nizam and

16 G. S. Sardesai's *Selections from the Peshwa Daftar* are available in fortyfive volumes (1935) some of which (Nos. 31, 32) are rich in social data.

Hyder of Telingana and Dravid countries are mirrored forth in these official documents.

The diary (*daftar*) literature of the Marathas is valuable in another regard. It is in these diaries that we come across constructive social reform tendencies on the part of the Hindus. The admission of converts or Islamized Hindus back to the Hindu fold is attested. Intermarriage is in evidence. Widow-remarriage in certain cases is spoken of as well as the prohibition of the sale of girls. Last but not least, the equality of the diverse castes before law is an item with which we are made familiar in these texts. We are already talking the language of Rammohun Roy and his circle (1772-1833).

10. The Last Text of Nītiśāstra: Chitnis's Marathi Rājanīti

Chronologically the last work on *nīti*-or *artha-śāstra* is perhaps the *Rājanīti* of Malhār Rām Rāo Chitnis.[17] The treatise is in Marathi prose and was composed in the first decade of the nineteenth century (c. 1810). The text comprises some ninety pages of royal octavo size. The book is divided into seven *prakaraṇas* or chapters. The table of contents is given below, chapter by chapter:

1. Coronation.

1. The King. 2. The Coronation. 3. The Ceremony. 4. The Offerings to the priests etc. 5. Ascending the throne. 6. Rituals bearing on fire, bull, elephant etc.

17 Marathi text edited by K. N. Sane for the *Kāvyetihāsa Samgraha* Series (Poona 1887). I am indebted to the historian G. S. Sardesai (Kashmet, Poona) for kindly placing this work at my disposal.

II. The Throne.

1. The Country. 2. The City. 3. The Fort. 4. The Court. 5. The Throne. 6. Entering the Court. 7. The Order of Precedence for the *Pradhānas* (Ministers) and others. 8. The King's Functions.

III. The King's Virtues.

1. The Seven limbs of the kingdom. 2. The King. 3. The Four Duties. 4. The Acquisition of *dravya* (goods or wealth). 5-7. Their Increase, preservation and consumption. 8. The Control of passions. 9. The Six Vices. 10. The Pursuit of Studies. 11. The Four *Vidyās*. 12. The Giving up of *Himsā* (Killing) and protection of the weak. 13. The Cultivation of good company. 13. Good words. 15. Purity and Simplicity. 16. The Cultivation of new pursuits and the giving up of sloth. 17. The Seven Vices. 18. Alcoholism. 19. Dice. 20. Hunting. 21. The Treatment of the subjects as children. 22. The Payment of salaries. 23. Presents to the learned and the otherwise qualified. 24. The Councillors. 25. The Queen.

IV. The Ministers.

1. The *Rājamaṇḍala* (the Royal Sphere) of Thirteen 2. The Heir-Apparent. 3. The Eight *Amātyas* and their qualifications. 4. The *Mukhya Pradhāna* (Premier). 5. The *Senāpati* (*Pradhāna*). 6. The *Amātya* (*Pradhāna*). 7. The *Sachiva* (*Pradhāna*). 8. The *Mantrī* (*Pradhāna*). 9. The *Sumanta* (*Pradhāna*). 10. The *Paṇḍita* also called *Chhāndoga* (*Pradhāna*). 11. The *Nyāya Pradhāna*. 12. The Duties of the King and

the Eight *Pradhānas*. 13. The Astronomer. 14. The Scribes. 15. The Friend. 16. The Diverse Officials (*adhikari*), e.g. those for the departments concerning stores, clothing, jewels, arms, grains, etc. and for the stables for elephants, horses, camels and cattle. 17. Officials for territorial jurisdictions. 18. The Commander of the Navy (*Naukādhipati*). 19. The Trainer of Horses and Elephants. 20. The Chief of Fire-guns (*Agni-yantrādhikāri*). 21. The Qualifications and Duties of Officials.

V. The Daily Routine of the King, Part I.

1. Music at Dawn while getting up from bed. 2. Toilet. 3. Attending the Court. 4. Trial of Cases according to *arthaśāstra, dharmaśāstra, nītiśāstra* and *deśāchāra* (custom). 5. The Five *Mahāyajnas* (Punishing the wicked, Advancing the good, Inceasing the wealth in a righteous manner, Feeding the hungry, Protecting the kingdom). 6. The Eight Functions (*aṣṭa karma*). 7. The *Pancha Varga* (five items, *sādhya, sādhanopāya, deśakālavibhāga, vinipātapratīkāra,* and *siddhi*). The Three *upāyas* in regard to each function. 9. Meals. 10. Examination of poisons. 11. Rest. 12. Hunting. 13. The Arms (*khaḍga*). 14. The Merits of hunting (by water, on land and in the air).

V. The Daily Routine of the King, Part II.

1. Evening prayers. 2. Listening to the Spy. 3. Meals. 4. Music after meals. 5. Examination of the accounts. 6. Confidential discussions with a few councillors. 7. Six *guṇas* (Tactics). 8. Peace. 9. War. 10. Expedition. 11. Siege. 12. The Double-

Truck Action. 13. Seeking asylum. 14. The Friend, the Enemy, the *Udāsīna* (neutral ?), each of three kinds. 15. The Four *Upāyas* (*sāma, dāna, bheda* and *daṇḍa*). 16. Retiring for the night.

VI. *The Treasure and Forts.*

1. The Eighteen Departments (*Kārkhānā*) of the Koṣa. 2. Solicitude for *dravya* (goods or wealth). 3. Maintenance of the state. 4. The Forts.

VII. *The Army.*

1. Fate *vs.* Manliness. 2. Superiority of energism. 3. The Six kinds of Army (*Maula, Bhūta, Śreṇī, Suhrit, Aṭavī*). 4. The Four limbs of the army. 5. Elephant corps. 6. Elephant stables. 7. Cavalry. 8. Infantry. 9. The Strength and weakness of the enemy. 10. The Messengers or envoys. 11. The Spies. 12. The Soldiers. 13. The March. 14. Auspicious and inauspicious signs (omens). 15. Encampment. 16. The Battlefield. 17. The General. 18. The Battle-array. 19. Fair and unfair battles. 20. Exhortation to soldiers (This is the lengthiest section in the entire treatise). 21. Rewarding of soldiers. 22. No sin in killing the enemy. 23. All sins are burnt to ashes in action and washed away with a bath in the blood of the battlefield.

It is clear from the contents that Chitnis's Marathi *Rājanīti* is a regular *nīti* or *artha* work executed in the conventional style of the Sanskrit *nītiśāstras*. Chitnis does not say in so many words exactly where he has got his material from. But the influence of Manu and the *Mahābhārata* is apparent at every point. Indeed once or twice

he mentions them by name. Had this book been written in Sanskrit we would have called it a *nibandha,* i.e., digest or compilation from diverse sources. But Chitnis writes neither like a *bhāṣyakāra* (commentator) nor like a *nibandhakāra* (compiler). He has not cared to quote passages from others by name and does not give us reasons to feel that he is writing notes on certain texts. The work does not formally look like an annotation. Nor does it compel us to come into contact with the opinions of Chitnis's predecessors. To a Marathi reader who happens not to be acquainted with Sanskrit *nibandhas* on *rājanīti* Chitnis's treatise would look like an original work. This consideration is exceedingly important in the history of Hindu political thought. It is not that Chitnis wants to pose as an original authority or that he is trying to be a plagiarist. He has assimilated the Sanskrit originals in a wonderful manner and has produced a work in Marathi for the benefit of his countrymen.

Chitnis's grasp of the subject is extraordinary. He deals with the most important items and although he is trying to be brief he spends enough time over each and every point of value. The reader cannot feel that Chitnis is doing injustice to the subject matter. His presentation of the topics is delightful. He uses very short sentences and has an almost conversational *tête-à-tête* manner of telling things. In this Marathi work we come across what may be called French lucidity in style. A most noteworthy feature is his employment of Sanskritic words throughout the treatise. With the exception of the verbs and the inflexions one finds here almost what one would call *sādhu* (chaste) *Bānglā*. Perhaps in this item of language we have to watch the result of Śivāji's cultural

nationalism consisting, as it did, among other things, in the revival of Sanskrit studies and the replacement of Persian by Sanskrit terms wherever necessary.

Naturally, the students of Maratha *history*, especially those who are interested in dates, events, diplomacy etc. bearing on Śivāji or the Peshwas, are not likely to get anything attractive in this work. But of the institutions, economic, political, legal etc., such as were introduced by the Marathas it may not be impossible to get traces. For instance, the category *naukādhipati* (commander of the fleet) is unknown in the ordinary Sanskrit *nītiśāstras*. This may point to the Maratha navy. Chitnis speaks of the eventual sea-fights in this connection. Again, the *agni-yantrādhikārī* is an official of whom the Sanskrit *nītiśāstras* know nothing. We exclude from our consideration here the reference to *agni-chūrṇa* and *nālikāstra* in the *Śukranīti* (IV. vii, lines 389-421). But in any case, Śukra does not know of a special official in charge of *agni-yantra, nālikāstra* or the like. The camels of Chitnis are interesting. They are referred to in the *Śukranīti* (lines 41-68) also. But while Śukra knows a camel corps Chitnis speaks only of the stables for camels. The doctrine of eight *pradhānas* might suggest something in common between Chitnis and Śukra. But the *senāpati* who is one of the *pradhānas* of Chitnis has no place in Śukra's count of *prakritis* (departments). In the *Śukranīti*, besides, importance is attached to the doctrine of ten *prakritis* rather than of eight (II. lines 141-175). It is only incidentally that Śukra refers to the doctrine of eight departments as "recommended by certain people." Be it observed, however, that the category *pradhāna* implies in the *Śukranīti* the councillor or

minister of a particular type,—the chief secretary or the premier. But in Chitnis's *Rājanīti* the *pradhāna* is the generic name for all the eight ministers, the premier being known as the *mukhyapradhāna*. These few references suggest that Chitnis is not summarizing slavishly all that he has read in the Sanskrit texts. The influence of the Maratha *milieu* on his *Rājanīti* cannot be altogether ignored. He has evidently tried to Marathanize his Sanskrit originals and adapt them to the conditions of his country.

In Rāmachandrapant's *Ādnāpatra* or *Rājanīti* (1716) we observed that the author was writing something historical about the Marathas but that he incorporated general ideas from the traditional Sanskrit texts. With Malhār Rām Rāo Chitnis the inspiration is just the opposite. He has prepared in Marathi a succinct summary of the Sanskrit *nītiśāstras*. But he has introduced one or two Maratha features. And yet these Marathisms have been made use of so few and far between and in such a skilful manner that it will take a special study on the strength of authentic historical records to detect the references to Maratha institutions.

The work is on the whole very valuable in the history of Hindu positivism. We understand that the Kauṭalyan science was a living force even in the days of Rammohun Roy. The tradition of the *Arthaśāstra* has come down to our own times, so to say. As the last document of political philosophy in independent Hindustan Malhār Rām Rāo Chitnis's Marathi *Rājanīti* possesses a special significance and should deserve a detailed analysis.

It would be interesting to know if such summaries or adaptations of the Kauṭalyan science were prepared in

Hindi, Tamil and other Indian languages in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The first Bengali summary in the form of a *nibandha* is the *Hindu Rājanīti* of Madhusūdana Bhaṭṭāchārya of Nadia published at Calcutta in 1904 (as Vol. I. of his *Ratnamālā*). This work is, as we have seen, made up of translations into Bengali of diverse original Sanskrit texts on political thought. The treatment is topical. The originals are quoted in the footnotes.

It is worth while to mention that not only the Kauṭalyan science but Kauṭalya himself was reborn in "the ideas of 1905" and that since then *bhāṣyas* and *nibandhas* on the basis of Kauṭalya have been the order of the day in India and the world along "modern" methods. Nay, more. For the last thirty years or so Kauṭalya has been undergoing comparison not only with the Western ancients and "medievals" from Plato and Aristotle to Macchiavelli, Hobbes and Frederick the Great, but with the moderns also from Kant, Fichte and Comte down to Bradley, Bosanquet, Croce, and the latest exponents of justice, *la puissance supérieure de l'Etat, Staatsräson, Geopolitik*, and "economic planning" in Eur-America.[18]

18 U. Redanò: *Lo Stato Etico* (Florence 1927). E. Lasbax: *La Cité Humaine* (Paris, 1927) vol. III. F. Meinecke: *Die Idee der Staatsräson* (Munich 1925), K. Haushofer: *Die Geopolitik der Pan-Ideen* (Berlin 1931), and *Raumüberwindende Mächte* (Leipzig 1934), B. Breloer: *Staatsverwaltung im alten Indien* Vol. III. Part. I. (Leipzig 1934). For "Kauṭalya, Economic Planning and Climatology" see *supra*, pp. 329-331, 343-350.

Smriti Nibandhas[1]

Law Scholars of the Fourteenth and the Fifteenth Centuries

Chaṇḍeśvara's *Smriti Ratnākara* is a *nibandha* or digest of law in seven sections, each called *Ratnākara*. The sections are named: (1) *Kritya* or ceremonial observances and festivities (*vratas*), (2) *Dāna* (gifts), (3) *Vyavahāra* (legal procedure), (4) *Śuddhi* (purification on birth, death etc.), (5) *Pūjā* (worship), (6) *Vivāda* (civil and criminal law), and (7) *Grihastha* (householder). Some of these *Ratnākaras* were composed in the first quarter of the fourteenth century (1314-24). His *Rājanīti Ratnākara* is an independent treatise. It may have been composed in the third quarter of the same century.

Mādhava, the minister of Vijayanagara, is the author of a commentary on the *Parāśara Smriti*. His work on *Kālanirṇaya* also is famous. Both these treatises were composed in the middle of the fourteenth century (1335-1360).

Viśveśvara's *Madanapārijāta* is a *smriti* work written for King Madanapāla of Kanauj (1360-70). His *Smriti Kaumudī* is a treatise specializing in the *adhikāra* (rights) and duties of the Śūdra. Two other works, ascribed to him, namely, the *Madana-mahārṇava* and *Tithinirṇaya-sāra* have become famous.

A classic in the line of *bhāṣya* is Kulluka's commentary on Manu. The author is a Bengali but belongs to the Benares school by domicile. He draws substantially upon Medhātithi's commentary (c 850) but does not

1 Kane: *History of Dharmasastras*, Vol. I. (Poona 1930), pp. 308,363, 366, 380, 384, 405, 412-413, 425-26, 434-37, 440, 446, 447-453, 456-62.

mention Jīmūtavāhana (c 1100-50). His dates are uncertain (c 1250-1425 ?).

Vāchaspati's *Vivādachintāmaṇi* was written for Harinārāyaṇa of Mithilā towards the end of the fifteenth century.

The *Sarasvatīvilāsa* was composed under orders of King Pratāparudra (1497-1539) of Orissa in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. The work is authoritative in Southern India. Towards the commencement of the work we come across the Kauṭalyan doctrine of *maṇḍala* ("geopolitical" sphere). It is discussed on the authority of Parāśara, Uśanas, Viṣṇu, Brihaspati, Viśālākṣa, Manu and others.

During the latter half of the sixteenth century the *Toḍarānanda* was composed by Toḍaramalla (d. 1589), the celebrated Hindu commander and statesman of Akbar the Great. This encyclopaedic work, dealing as it does not only with law but with astronomy and medicine as well, is a few years anterior to but may be taken as contemporaneous with Abul Fazl's *Ain-i-Akbari* (1597).

Raghunandana

Raghunandana's *Aṣṭāviṃśatitattva* may have been composed about 1570. He is said to have been a fellow-pupil of Chaitanya (1485-1534) under Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma and may have been his junior contemporary and a senior contemporary of Akbar the Great and Abul Fazl. He is by all means anterior to Nīlakaṇṭha and Mitra-Miśra. The *smriti* encyclopaedia of this Bengali jurist may be taken to represent the ideas of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.[2]

2 M. M. Chakravarti in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (Calcutta 1915) in Kane Vol. I. pp. 416-419.

Raghunandana is a man of Navadvīpa (Bengal). His treatise is a work in twenty-eight sections, each given over to a *tattva* or topic. The treatise as available in print, although not in Devanāgari but in Bengali script however, covers over 690 pages of royal octavo size. The material is made up of some 27,600 verses.[3]

Like other *smriti* works the *Aṣṭāvimaśatitattva* also is encyclopaedic. Only, this encyclopaedia covers nothing but the *āchāra* (individual and domestic *mores*) section of a fullfledged *dharma* or *smriti śāstra*.

The interests of Raghunandana are as wide as life itself. The influences of the season on the human body and mind as well as those of the diverse tastes are to him important enough for an analysis. The food grains, the vegetables, the salts, the fruits, the waters (including the milk of cocoanuts, for instance), the preparations of milk, (curds, whey, ghee etc.), the sugarcanes, the palms, the onions, the garlics, the fishes, and the meats and so forth have been likewise described with reference to their physiological bearings on man (Text pp. 194-200).

Kraya-nirṇaya deals with the analysis of purchase as a category of law and economics. The authorities cited in regard to diverse aspects of sale and purchase transactions are Manu, Yājnavalkya, Nārada, Brihaspati, and Kātyāyana (Text p. 227).

The excavation of tanks, the establishment of gods, the construction of boats, and the treatment of diseases are some of the items of social life described in this treatise.[4] In Raghunandana's discussion of human interests the

3 Edited by Dukkhirām Kāvyaratna (Calcutta 1907).

4 Pp. 293-296, 297-301, 635-636.

agricultural lands and their qualities, the plough, the seeds, the bullocks, the art of cultivation etc. have likewise commanded special attention.

On *rājanīti* also Raghunandana (pp. 296-297) has something to say. He is a chip of the old Brāhmaṇic diplomacy in the statement that *kṛitvā samvandhakam chāpi viśvaset śatruṇā na hi*. That is, the king must not trust an enemy even after some relationship (pact) has been established with him. Among the others not to be trusted are the *rājasevī*, i.e., the king's officers. The bad king is always to be feared (*kurājani bhayan nityam*).

In Raghunandana's judgment the king to be adored by everybody is Kārtyavīrya, the monarch *yena sāgara-paryantā dhanuṣā nirjitā mahī* (by whom the Earth up to the seas was overpowered with his bow). He advises that people should get up in the morning with salutations to Kārtyavīrya.

The king should be neither *mridu* (mild) nor *dāruṇa* (severe). In the first instance, he is likely to be a failure. In the other case he is likely to excite the people (*tikṣṇādudvijate janah*).

The authorities of Raghunandana in political morals are the *Matsya Purāṇa*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Harivamśa*, and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*. He does not mention Manu by name. But Manu's phrases are to be met with. In all the twenty-eight sections this encyclopaedist has quoted altogether some three hundred authorities.

In 1816 Raghunandana's hold on the Hindu society of Bengal was described by Rammohun Roy (1772-1833)[5]

5 Preface to his English transl. of the *Ishopanishad* (The *English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Panini Office, Allahabad 1906) p. 71.

as follows: "The whole community in Bengal, with very few exceptions, have since the middle of the last century (c 1750) forsaken their ancient modes of the performance of ceremonial rites of religion and followed the precepts of the late Raghunandan, and consequently differ in the most essential points of ceremonies from the natives of Bihar, Tirhut and Benares."

Raghunandana was held in great esteem by Rammohun. On the subject of concremation (*sahamaraṇa*) or burning of widows, the so-called *suttee*, against which it was Rammohun's life work to agitate until final penalization by law, he places Raghunandana in an interesting light. He says that "the Smārtta Raghunandana, the modern expounder of law in Bengal, classes concremation among the rites holding out promises of fruition." According to Rammohun, Raghunandana inculcates that learned men should not endeavour to persuade the ignorant to perform rites holding out promises of fruition. Raghunandana is thus interpreted by Rammohun as being opposed to concremation. The verdict of the ancient jurist Angirā to the effect that "there is no other course for a widow besides concremation" is interpreted by Raghunandana, says Rammohun, "as conveying exaggerated praise of the adoption of that course."[6]

In the judgment of Rammohun the position of Raghunandana is very high. In the preface to his English translation of the *Īśopaniṣat* (1823) "the great Raghunandana" is cited by him as having quoted the authority

6. *Abstract of the Arguments regarding the Burning of Widows* (Calcutta 1830) in *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy* (Panini Office, Allahabad 1906) pp. 368, 371-372.

of Jāmadagni thus: "For the benefit of those who are inclined to worship, figures are invented to serve as representations of God, who is merely understanding and has no second, no parts nor figure; consequently to these representatives, either male or female forms and other circumstances are fictitiously assigned." In other words, Raghunandana is a rationalist in regard to Hindu image-worship, and Rammohun who is out to defend Hinduism against Christianity accepts Raghunandana as a reliable interpreter of the Hindu images. It is very significant that both as regards *sahamaraṇa* and idolatry Raghunandana should have been treated as authority by Rammohun with a view to fortify his own social reform propaganda. A man who could furnish even Rammohun with social reform ideas is evidently an extraordinary figure in Hindu sociology.

Legal Thought of the Seventeenth Century

The seventeenth century is very great in the output of works on law. The two cousins, Kamalākara and Nīlakaṇṭha, Mitra-Miśra, Nanda Paṇḍita and Anantadeva are some of the most remarkable names of this period. Nor must we forget Viśveśvara (1602-85), nicknamed the "Gāgā Bhatta," who officiated at the coronation ceremony of Śivāji in 1644. He is a nephew of Kamalākara. The treatise entitled *Kāyastha-dharma-dīpa* (1677) is his work in which there is an attempt to raise the Kāyasthas socially.[7]

The writer on the most diverse sciences and the author of some twenty works is Kamalākara, the Deccani

7 J. N. Sarkar: *Shivaji* (Calcutta 1929), pp. 209-214, 390.

jurist. His *Nirṇaya-sindhu* (*c* 1612) is still influential among the Marathas of the Bombay Presidency. Two other works on the topics of *smriti śāstras* are the *Śūdrakamalākara* and *Vivādatāṇḍava*. The latter deals with the ordinary topics of *vyavahāra*. The former is an interesting work as it is given over exclusively to the rights and duties of the Śūdras. One of his treatises, entitled the *Pūrttakamalākara*, deals with the dedication of tanks, wells, trees, and so forth, the foundation of public buildings, consecration of temples, images, flags etc. and the coronation of rulers. It is strange that he should not have cared to devote a special section or treatise to *rājanīti* like Nīlakaṇṭha, Mitra-Miśra, and Anantadeva.

Nīlakaṇṭha's *Bhagavantabhāskara* is complete in 12 *mayūkhas* (rays). One of the *mayūkhas* is given over to *rājanīti*. The author was a cousin of Kamalākara and may be taken to have composed his works between 1610 and 1650.

Mitra-Miśra's *Vīramitrodaya* is an encyclopaedic treatise of *nibandha*. Its sections are known as *prakāśas*, one of which is the famous *Rājanītiprakāśa*. A commentary on the *Mitākṣarā* commentary of Yājnavalkya is also from his pen.

The author's patron was Vīrasimha at whose hands Abul Fazl found his death (1602). Like Nīlakaṇṭha he flourished in the first half of the seventeenth century and is posterior to Raghunandana.

Nanda Paṇḍita's commentary (called the *Vaijayantī*) on the *Viṣṇudharma sūtra* is still considered to be an authority of the Benares School. Equally authoritative is his treatise on adoption known as the *Dattaka-*

Mīmāṃsā. His works belong to the first quarter of the seventeenth century.

A digest of the seventeenth century which is comprehensive in its sections is the *Smritikaustubha* (c 1675) by Anantadeva, a Deccani jurist. One of its sections is the *Rājadharmakaustubha* divided into several *dīdhitis* (rays). One *dīdhiti* deals with the virtues and vices of kings, queens, ministers, etc., the coronation ceremony and so forth. In another *dīdhiti* is to be found the description of the law court, the judge, the plaint and other items discussed generally in *vyavahāra*. The work was composed under the orders of Baz Bahadur, ruler of Almora in the Himalayan Hills (c 1638-1678).

Bālambhaṭṭa and Jagannātha

Two great *nibandha* writers of the eighteenth century were Bālambhaṭṭa the "Maratha" and Jagannātha the Bengali. Both of them came into contact with the British authorities.

Bālambhaṭṭa's commentary on the *Mitākṣarā* commentary of Yājnavalkya is a late eighteenth century work (c 1775). The author was a Deccani (Maratha) scholar, and a *paṇḍit* to Colebrooke (c 1800). He is said to have died in ripe old age about 1830. Bālambhaṭṭa (1740?-1830?) was therefore a senior contemporary of Rammohun (1772-1833).

The commentary is curiously enough described in the colophons as being the work of his mother Lakṣmīdevī. There are several rulings in this treatise to endow women with rights of inheritance such as are denied by the masters, Yājnavalkya and Vijnāneśvara, themselves, and of course by others. Sisters, for instance, are

authorized by Bālambhaṭṭa to succeed immediately after brothers in case a man dies without a male issue.

The real Bengali contemporary of Bālambhaṭṭa in *smriti* is Jagannātha Tarkapanchānana (1695-1806), whose life is said to have covered something more than the entire eighteenth century at both ends. But his work, *Vivādabhangārṇava*, a digest, was prepared at the suggestion of the British Government under the inspiration of Jones. Parts of it were translated into English by Colebrooke (1797). He was held in great esteem by Rammohun.

Rammohun (1772-1833)

The literary work of Rammohun Roy (1772-1833) belongs to the second and third decades of the nineteenth century. He is different from both Bālambhaṭṭa and Jagannātha in so far as although they came into contact with British scholars, jurists or administrators neither was a student of Western legal or social institutions. Rammohun was born almost at the time when Warren Hastings got the *Vivādārṇavasetu* compiled by several *paṇḍits* (1773), translated into Persian and then rendered from Persian into English as Halhed's *Gentoo Code* (1774). His early years were passed during the period of the expansion of Western administration in India. We may recall that the Asiatic Society of Bengal was founded in 1789 and that the College of Fort William established at Calcutta with Carey as Principal in 1800.

Rammohun was experiencing the new all the time. And if he still appreciated the old it was because of its innate strength and utility. Besides, while Bālambhaṭṭa and Jagannātha wrote in Sanskrit, Rammohun wrote in Per-

sian, Bengali and English and very little in Sanskrit. Last but not least, so far as the present times are concerned, he was convinced of the greater utility (1) of the modern knowledge, i.e., the culture developed in Europe since the appearance of Baconian philosophy[1]—"mathematics, natural philosophy, chemistry, anatomy and other useful sciences"—than of the Hindu *Vyākaraṇa, Vedānta, Mīmāmsā, Nyāya*, etc., and (2) of the English language than of the Sanskrit as medium of instruction and culture. To him Bacon was a veritable *yugāvatāra* for Europe and for mankind, and the entire Hindu culture similar in value to the pre-Baconian achievements of Europe. It is the post-Baconian arts and sciences that he wanted to see introduced in India under British auspices. All this of course had been *ultima thule* to Bālambhaṭṭa and Jagannātha.

The Realism of Rammohun as Champion of the Vedānta, Purāṇas and Tantras

"During the last twenty years," says Rammohun,[2] "a body of English gentlemen who are called missionaries have been publicly endeavouring in several ways to convert Hindoos and Mussalmans of this country into Christianity." One of the methods of the missionaries is described as that of distributing among the people various books, large and small, reviling both Hinduism

1 *A Letter on English Education*, Calcutta 1823 (*The English Works*, pp. 471-474).

2 The *Brahmunical Magazine* (or the Missionary and the Brahman) being a Vindication of the Hindoo Religion against the Attacks of Christian Missionaries, 1821 (*The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Allahabad 1906), pp. 145-147.

and Islam as well as of abusing and ridiculing the gods and saints of the former.

This attitude of the English missionaries is subjected by Rammohun to strong criticism and here we encounter, first, his scientific contribution to comparative methodology, and secondly, his objective approach to the socio-religious realities of life. He begins by observing that if the missionaries were to preach the Gospel in countries not conquered by the English, such as Turkey, Persia etc. they would be esteemed a body of men truly zealous in propagating religion. But in his logic Bengal's case is entirely different because "for a period of upwards of fifty years this country has been in exclusive possession of the English nation." Here the "mere name of Englishman is sufficient to frighten people." And, therefore, argues he, under such conditions of helplessness "an encroachment upon the rights of her poor, timid and humble inhabitants and upon their religion cannot be viewed in the eyes of God or the public as a justifiable act."

Rammohun is a hard-headed realist. His positivism does not allow him to remain blind to the inevitable disadvantage of a subject race in regard to the scientific and philosophical controversy or discussion with representatives of its political masters. "It seems almost natural," says he, "that when one nation succeeds in conquering another, the former, though their religion may be quite ridiculous, laugh at and despise the religion and manners of those that are fallen into their power. * * * It is, therefore, not uncommon if the English missionaries, who are of the conquerors of this country, revile and mock at the religion of the natives."

It is interesting that nearly a century after these epoch-making passages were written the position of comparative sociology or culture-history with special reference to the relations between Asia and Eur-America remained virtually the same. And the present writer's criticism of the "century-old doctrine of superior races" as responsible for the pernicious fallacies in social science was published in the *International Journal of Ethics* (Chicago, July 1918).[3]

Not less positive and realistic is the manner in which Rammohun accepts the challenge of the English missionaries *vis-à-vis* the problems of Indian religions *vs.* Christianity. He knows the realities of the world too well to believe that arguments command respect solely as arguments. Naturally, he suspects that "the small huts in which Brāhmaṇs of learning generally reside, and the simple food such as vegetables, etc. which they are accustomed to eat, and the poverty which obliges them to live upon charity" are likely to be taken as evidences of intellectual inferiority by those who happen to be materially in prosperous circumstances. So at the threshold of accepting the challenge on behalf of Hindu India Rammohun hopes that "the missionary gentlemen may not abstain from controversy from contempt of the poor" as the Brāhmaṇ intellectuals generally are.

To the English missionaries used as they are to political mastery and economic superiority Rammohun's logic that "truth and true religion do not always belong to wealth and power, high names or lofty palaces"

3 Available as a chapter in Sarkar: *The Futurism of Young Asia* (Berlin 1922).

should appear to have been quite revolutionary or radical although expressed in a rather moderate and modest language. We understand, at any rate, that at the beginning of the nineteenth century the Hindu Brāhmaṇa was maintaining the same secular viewpoint and clear-headed grasp of the objective joys and sorrows of the world as everybody who had been anybody in Hindu culture-history from the earliest times on.

The problem of Hinduism *vs.* Christianity or rather East *vs.* West, as it is called today, found in Rammohun the first great controversialist of modern Asia and the most redoubtable champion of Brāhmaṇical culture. In his own field he was successfully accomplishing what had been likewise successfully accomplished by Śivāji the Great in another.

In the first number of the *Brahmunical Magazine* he replied to the arguments that had been adduced against the *śāstras* or immediate explanations of the *Vedas* by the Christian missionaries writing in the *Samāchār Darpaṇ* of July 14, 1821. The objections against the *Purāṇas* and *Tantras* were answered by him in the second number. Rammohun demonstrated (1) that the doctrines of the *Vedas* were "much more rational" than the religion which the missionaries professed, and (2) that the teachings of the *Purāṇas* and *Tantras*, "if unreasonable, were not more so than their Christian faith."

Comparative religion and sociology were thus placed on new foundations, nay, as we have seen, the logic of the comparative social sciences, i.e., comparative

4 *The English Works etc.* pp. 147-148.

5 Re the comparative methodology in Rammohun Roy see Sarkar: *Vartamān Yuge Chīn Sāmrājya* (The Chinese Empire Today, 1921),

methodology itself.[5] One will recall that almost the same foundations of the comparative method in religion had been laid by Abul Fazl in the *Ain-i-Akbari* although he was a member of the ruling race of the time. It is the traditional objectivity, humanism, worldly wisdom and realistic sense of Hindu positivism that enabled Rammohun to encounter the new socio-economic forces and the new *mores* on terms of equality. Thus was modern India once for all endowed with the doctrine of racial equality with which to carry on the subsequent tugs-of-war with the powers that be in the fields of societal reconstruction and the remaking of man. The *Vedānta*, the *Purāṇas* and the *Tantras*, those great documents of humanism and secular strength that had served the Indian millions through the ages with the perennial power to fight the battles of life were once more assured the selfsame status in connection with the new conjunctures of the nineteenth century. Indeed, the era dawned for a fresh career of *digvijaya* for Hindu culture both in the East and the West.

The last word of Hindu culture as embodied in the qualifications, aptitudes and character of the Indian people was found by Rammohun to be eminently satisfactory. Writing in 1832 (Sept. 28) while in London Rammohun gave his opinion that the Hindus and Mussulmans had the "same capability of improvement as any other civilized people." In his judgment, the "people about the courts of the Indian princes were not inferior in point of education and accomplishments to the respectable and wellbred classes in any other country."[6]

pp. 352-362, *The Futurism of Young Asia* (Berlin 1922) pp. 83, 301, 303, 304; *Bāḍtir Pathe Bāngālī* (Bengalis in Progress), Calcutta 1934, pp. 544-548.

6 *The English Works etc.* p. 299.

The passage is derived from Rammohun's paper on the "condition of India" submitted as a part of his communication to the Board of Control in connection with the enquiries instituted by the Select Committee of the House of Commons (1831) to consider the renewal of the Company's Charter. His communications dealt also with (1) the judicial system, (2) the revenue system, and (3) the settlement in India by Europeans.[7]

Be it observed *en passant* that Rammohun, as author of this communication, is the "first" Indian economist of the modern type. It is by offering salutations to this pioneer of economic research and applied economics that every Indian economist of today ought to commence his investigations. Rammohun, the contemporary of Ricardo, is the Adam Smith, as it were, of modern Indian economic thought. And it is very interesting that the lines of thought laid out by him continue in the main to be followed up, unconsciously perhaps, by the Indian economists of today.

The Smriti and Nīti Śāstras of Rammohun

Like Hemādri (c 1300), Raghunandana (c 1550), Mitra-Miśra (c 1650), and others Rammohun is somewhat of an encyclopædist. But his writings did not assume the systematic form of those veritable encyclopædists among his great predecessors. Like his works on the *Vedānta*, the *Upaniṣads*, the *Bible* etc. his works on economics, politics, law and sociology also are "occasional,"

7 *Exposition of the Practical Operation of the Judicial and Revenue Systems of India and of the General Character and Condition of its Native Inhabitants* (London 1832); see the *English Works etc.* pp. 229-320.

i.e., dictated by the circumstances, occasions or needs of the day. He is a philosopher of action and his pragmatic philosophy has grown from need to need. Each one of his literary contributions owed its existence to a definite and precise purpose. His studies are nothing but "applied" and each one is therefore an essay. He is a propagandist, a pamphleteer and an essayist.

In the fields of applied sociology two items demanded his special attention. The first is the law of property affecting both men and women, and the other the doctrine of *sahamaraṇa* or concremation. It is in these two fields that he touches the ground of *smṛiti*-and *nīti-śāstras* and represents the transition between the old and the new in modern India.

Rammohun's *Brief Remarks regarding Modern Encroachments on the Ancient Rights of Females According to the Hindu Law of Inheritance* came out in 1822. It was followed in 1830 by the *Essay on the Rights of Hindus over Ancestral Property According to the Law of Bengal*. It has to be added that eight letters on the Hindu law of inheritance were published in the *Bengal Hurkaru* from September 20 to November 23, 1830. Last but not least are to be mentioned his statements to the Select Committee of the House of Commons (1831-32) on the judicial, revenue and economic conditions of India.

Rammohun's appreciation of the Bengali jurists and social thinkers is noteworthy. In his *Essay on the Rights of the Hindus Over Ancestral Property* (1830) he agrees with Colebrooke in describing Raghunandana, the author of *Dāyatattva* (one of the eighteen sections of the *Aṣṭāvimśatitattva*) based on Jīmūtavāhana's *Dāyabhāga*, "as the greatest authority on Hindu law" in the province

of Bengal. The description of Śrikriṣṇa Tarkālankāra as the "author of the most celebrated of the glosses of the text" of Jīmūtavāhana's *Dāyabhāga* is also accepted by Rammohun as quite valid. And Jagannātha Tarkapanchānana is described by Rammohun himself as the "most learned," as the "first literary character of his day." Jagannātha's "authority has nearly as much weight as that of Raghunandana," says he.

The conservation of the Bengali Hindu tradition in property law has found in Rammohun a staunch supporter. The "doctrine of free disposal by a father of his ancestral property" is alleged in certain quarters to be opposed to the authority of the medieval Bengali jurist Jīmūtavāhana. This allegation is not accepted as valid by Rammohun. For argument's sake he is prepared to concede this for a moment. But he points out at the same time that the three greatest *smriti* writers of Bengal since Jīmūtavāhana have openly advocated this doctrine. Accordingly, Rammohun would ask everybody to support at least the latter-day jurists even if necessary against Jīmūtavāhana and argues that "it would be generally considered as a most rash and injurious as well as ill-advised innovation for any administrator of Hindu law of the present day to set himself up as the corrector of successive expositions, admitted to have been received and acted upon as authoritative for a period extending to upwards of three centuries back."[8] Rammohun functions here as a continuator of the tradition established not only by Raghunandana but by the great starting-point of Bengali jurisprudence, namely, Jīmūtavāhana himself.

8 *The English Works etc.* pp. 411-412.

On *suttee,* the burning of widows, called *sahamaraṇa* (concremation) Rammohun has three brochures, published in 1818, 1820 and 1830. In regard to this question he analyses the *smriti* texts from Manu to Raghunandana and finds that the practice has not been advocated by all. Among the ancients neither the *Vedas,* nor Manu nor Yājnavalkya can be cited in support, says he. On the other hand, Angirā, Viṣṇu, Hārīta and some other latter-day jurists recommend either concremation or a virtuous life. Rammohun argues, besides, that even when concremation is recommended as an alternative by a jurist it is done as a measure for obtaining "future carnal fruition." But measures like this are forbidden by the *Gītā,* Manu and Raghunandana. And Vijnaneśvara, the author of the *Mitākṣarā,* considers concremation as something inferior to virtuous life. Rammohun argues, further, that even Hārīta and other advocates of concremation do not support concremation if it is not free and voluntary, and permits the widow to abstain from it if she so desires. According to Rammohun, therefore, *suttee* is nothing but suicide and female murder.[9]

We observe that Rammohun's logic is realistic enough not to condemn the Hindu *smritiśāstras.* He examines the authorities one by one and finds that they cannot be reasonably held responsible for the *suttee,* inhuman as it is. His profound respect for the juristic and other achievements of Hindu culture is an element in his remarkable positivism. It is the objective *data* of Hindu legal literature that he ransacks and then he applies his reason to the elucidation and comparison of

9 *The English Works etc.* pp. 368, 370, 372.

those texts. It is on the strength of Hindu law that he passes his final verdict against concremation[10] such as became associated with some latter-day self-seekers.

The old Hindu institutions of law and polity are in Rammohun's judgment useful and important enough to be preserved in modern times. "The principle of juries," says he, "under certain modifications has from the most remote periods been well understood in this country under the name of the *pānchayet.*" In his days the system existed "on a very defective plan." "In former days," he observes, "it was much more important in its functions. It was resorted to by parties at their own option, or by the heads of tribes who assumed the right of investigation and decision of differences; or by the government, which handed over causes to a *panchayet.*" He considers, therefore, that the *panchayet*-jury system would be beneficial and acceptable to the inhabitants. Only, as a realist, again, he would like to have it adapted to the circumstances of the times,[11] i.e., supplemented or enriched with the new British juridical institutions.

In regard to the laws of inheritance,[12] again, Rammohun is convinced of the value of the Hindu and Moslem codes in use for generations. He wants them to be preserved. It is the *Dāyabhāga,* says he, that is generally followed by the Bengali Hindus "with occasional references to other authorities." But he observes that in the Western province and a great part of the Deccan, it is the *Mitākṣarā* that is chiefly followed. As for the Mussal-

10 *Address to Lord William Bentinck on the Abolition of the Practice of Suttee,* January 14, 1830. See the *English Works* etc. pp. 475-476.

11 *The English Works* etc. pp. 250-252.

12 *The English Works,* pp. 265-266.

mans the majority is described by him as following the doctrines of Abu Hanifah and his disciples. Their chief authority is accordingly the *Hidaya*. He is aware also of the use of *Fatawae Alamgiri* and other books of decision or cases.

Rammohun does not believe that the diverse Hindu and Moslem laws of inheritance are in need of any change. They should "remain as at present," says he. That is, their diversity is not to be disturbed. But he is an advocate of standardization, and yet not at once. He believes that "by the diffusion of intelligence the whole community may be prepared to adopt one uniform system." The vitality and utility of Indian institutions are to him the first postulates. But he is at the same time modernist enough to admit the importance of assimilations, modifications, uniformizations, codifications etc.

In these statements to the Select Committee Rammohun, the student of law, polity, finance, economics and culture, is functioning in a double capacity. First, he is a spokesman of the Indian tradition and is giving the Devil his due. He is neither writing original *smriti* or *nīti śāstras* nor *bhāṣyas* or *nibandhas* on the same topics. But his short observations furnish us with the final estimate of all that he thinks about their societal value. In the second place, he is convinced of the importance of new forces and their usefulness to the people of India. He wants the association of the European institutions with the Indian or of the Indian with the European in order that the needs of today may be satisfied. Altogether, in Rommohun the jurist, economist, statesman and sociologist we meet two personalities. We encounter, on the

one hand, the last representative of the *smriti-nīti* (or Kauṭalya-Manu-Śukra-Abul-Fazl-Mitra-Miśra) tradition. On the other, the British socio-economic and politico-legal philosophies as embodied in the tradition of Bacon, Hume, Smith, Austin, Ricardo and Bentham has found in him an able exponent for the Indian people. While analyzing the mentality and achievements of Rammohun the economists, sociologists, statesmen and jurists of to-day will have to hark as much back to Āpastamba Vaśiṣṭha, Kauṭalya and Manu as to the Europeans from Aristotle to Bacon and Bentham.[13]

13 Sarkar: *Ekaler Dhana-daulat O Arthashastra* (The Wealth and Economics of Our Own Times), Vol. II. (Calcutta 1935) pp. 603, 604, 607, 646.

CHAPTER XII

HINDU PHILOSOPHY'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO POSITIVISM

The "Sensate" and the "Ideational"

In Eur-America it has been the tradition of scholarship for historians of philosophy to devote attention to political, economic, social and legal speculations along with the speculations on man, nature, knowledge, mind, truth, beauty, good, God, etc. No account of Greek philosophy is held to be complete which overlooks the contributions of the Greek moralists or philosophers to political or social thought. Similarly in the studies relating to the beginnings of "modern" philosophy, say, the philosophy of Herder, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, etc. the politics, economics, jurisprudence and sociology of the thinkers in question and of their contemporaries are accorded an appropriate place. To mention a few works published in the nineteenth century, interest in political philosophy is manifest as much in Victor Cousin's *Histoire de la philosophie*, Lewes's *Biographical History of Philosophy*, and Zeller's *Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie* as in Leslie Stephen's *English Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, Merz's *History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century* and Lévy-Bruhl's *Histoire de la philosophie moderne en France*. And in treatises like Janet's *Histoire de la science politique dans ses relations avec la morale* or Bonar's *Philosophy and Political Economy* one can detect the attempts to bring economics and politics into contact with general philosophy.

In the field of indology, however, scholars both Indian and non-Indian, have up till now as a rule fought

shy of economics, politics, law, or sociology in their studies relating to the history of Hindu philosophy. Works dealing with the ideas of ancient or medieval Indian thinkers on body, mind, soul, universe, reasoning, intuition, meditation etc. have been systematically practising non-co-operation with the Hindu ideas of property, state, society and law, as well as of fine arts, crafts, industries and so forth such as form the subject matter of *vārttā, śilpa* and *vāṣtu śāstras*. The absence of the comprehensive treatment of Hindu philosophy is one of the main reasons for one-sided and therefore fallacious and misleading interpretation of the Hindu mind and its creations. No survey of Hindu civilization or culture-history can be adequate which ignores or is indifferent to the achievements of the Indian people in political, economic and social institutions as well as political, economic and social thought.[1] Those modern treatises dealing with Hindu philosophy which have bestowed attention on, say, *mokṣa* (salvation) to the exclusion of the other three categories in the philosophical *chaturvarga* (*quadrivium*) of *puruṣārtha* (the desirables of man), namely, *dharma* (law, duty, *mores*), *artha* (economico-political interests), and *kāma* (sex-life) can but furnish partial, to say the least, unjust and erroneous pictures about Hindu thought and institutions.

1 The contributions of Hindu philosophy to political categories were first discussed by the present author in the *American Political Science Review* (November 1918, August 1919), the *Political Science Quarterly* (New York, December 1918, March 1921), the *International Journal of Ethics* (Chicago, April 1920), *Revue de Synthèse Historique* (Paris, August-December 1920), *Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques* (Paris, August, 1921) and the *Deutsche Rundschau* (Berlin, March 1922).

An observation in Sorokin's *Social and Cultural Dynamics*,[2] just published, deserves some comment in this connection. Referring to materialism in Hindu thought he observes as follows: "Almost all the Indian and European investigators of the problem (like M. Müller, L. de la Vallée Poussin, R. Garbe, Rhys Davids and many others) unanimously stress that the materialistic thought never gained any important place in the literature of India, except in the legendary, pre-Aryan period, before 2000 to 4000 B. C. of which nothing is known and which did not have as yet the Vedic culture, nor crystallized into a real school of thought, nor if it existed as such had any great influence."

This statement presents in a nutshell the philosophy of traditional indology as popularized by Max Müller and his successors until today. And it is to furnish correctives to this kind of indological researches that the first volume of the *Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* was published during 1912-1914. The ideas of the *Positive Background* have had some impacts on subsequent indology as described *supra* pp. 27-49 of the present work. It has been pointed out also (pp. 49-51) that traditional indology is not altogether defunct but is surviving in a palpable manner. In so far as Sorokin has considered it worth while to depend on traditional indology in his interpretations of world-culture his encyclopædic three-volume work referred to above is to that extent to be appraised as another specimen of this survival.

It is to be observed, however, as noted in pp. 27-36, that some of his previous works, for instance, *Social Mobi-*

2 Vol. II. (New York 1937), pp. 57-58.

lity and *Contemporary Sociological Theories* are "immensely calculated to militate against the methodology as established by Max Müller, Sénart and Max Weber."

The fallacy of the Max Müller school of indology has already been discussed in other places (pp. 17-23). The first chapter of the *Futurism of Young Asia,* referred to there may be mentioned over again. It should be observed, further, that traditional indology, *in so far as it has at all cared to study Hindu materialism,* has, in the first place, tried to search for it in those documents, —"ideational", to use Sorokin's expression,—where materialism is hardly to be found. And in the second place, it has as a rule systematically overlooked, ignored or minimized just those tons of documents which constitute nothing but materialism, pure and undefiled. Traditional indology has ever been supremely indifferent to and has systematically exhibited a lack of interest in the "positivistic strands of Hindu literature", such as those referred to, for instance, in pp. 12-13.

Another point deserves emphasis. Even in those documents where materialism is not likely to be much in evidence, the materialistic ("sensate") basis of some of the non-materialistic ("ideational") speculations cannot by any means be ignored. The *Sānkhya-Vaiśeṣika,* the *Nyāya* and the *Āyurvedic* foundations of Hindu thought constitute the permanent background of materialism in Indian philosophy.[3]

3 See the chapter on "The Philosophical Foundations of Sukra's Materialism" in the *Positive Background* (first edition) Vol. II. (1926), or the section on the "Anti-idealistic Systems of Indian Philosophy in their Bearings on Economics and Politics" in the present author's *Creative India* (Lahore 1937), pp. 46-60.

Interpretations based on the cultivation of blindness to these and allied considerations can have but one result. And that is what Sorokin has described in the passage quoted above.

In the estimation of Sorokin's indologists as well as the philosophers and sociologists dependent on such indologists materialism "never gained any important place in the literature of India", "nor had any great influence", "had a comparatively unimportant place in the philosophic thought of India", "hardly ever became a strong or dominant force", and has been "uninfluential in Hindu thought throughout the three thousand years". But those scholars who are not obsessed by the prejudices of colonialism and Orientalism as described in the *Futurism of Young Asia* and are prepared to study materialism ("sensatism") in those Hindu documents (*kāma, dharma, artha, nīti, vārttā, śilpa, vāstu* and allied literature) where materiaism is naturally to be expected, as for instance, in the main body of the present work will have to be forced to the conclusion that materialism first, materialism second, and materialism always has been the foundation and the background of Hindu civilization for six thousand years from Mohenjo Daro to the age of Rāmakriṣṇa-Vivekānanda.

The present work will serve to indicate that it is not necessary to be specially non-Brahmanic, anti-Hindu, socialistic or Marxistic, as hinted at by Sorokin, in order to be convinced of the "sensatism", positivism or materialistic strands of Indian culture through the ages. Nor should it be necessary to employ a psychological or sociological microscope in order to detect the traces of positivism, few and far be-

tween, in some of the alleged "periods of transition or crisis" in Indian history. Hindu positivism or sensatism does not require any special pleading. Every student of the cultural and sociological realities will find that in every epoch and in every region positivism has furnished the very foundations of Indian creativeness and *élan de la vie*. It is not possible here to go over again the entire ground of the three volumes of the *Positive Background*.

Sorokin has referred to some recent Indian authors of the history of old Indian philosophy. But the fact that these authors happen to be Indian does not improve the situation. They belong to traditional indology in so far as they commit the same fallacies of mal-observation and non-observation as the Western pioneers. As a rule, they are as indifferent to the materialistic sources as the founders of traditional indology. To them as to the Western writers on Indian philosophy the dozens of Chandraguptas, Rājendra Cholas, Bukkā Rāyas, Śivājis and other Indian Napoleons are non-entities and their literary or archaeological documents mere shadows worthy but to be ignored. Like the Western indologists, again, these Indian authors have the knack of treating perhaps as inconvenient exceptions the thousand and one wars of Indian history as well as the million instances of sensuality, luxury, corruption and what not prevailing in the societies of India as of Europe through the ages. And the vast literature bearing on blood-shed, sex-life, economic prosperity, domestic bliss and so forth is apparently considered by these authors as by their Western colleagues to be of hardly any worth by the side of the texts bearing on *ahimsā* (non-killing) and *mokṣa* (salvation). In their sociological or philosophical interpreta-

tions of culture they are no less apathetic to the anthropological, economic, militaristic, historical and other objective realities of life as the Western interpreters. Both care to study a very small part of India's life and thought, institutions, activities and movements and exclude the major portions from their survey. And yet both talk glibly of the "Hindu view of life," "Indian ideals, "the heart of Hindustan," the spirit of India, etc.[4] These Indian authors are as obsessed by monistic interpretations of culture as their Eur-American *gurus*.

Besides, Indian writers of the history of Indian philosophical thought labour under a peculiar misconception. They are generally prone to believing that old Indian philosophy was *higher than* or *superior to* the philosophies of the West, ancient, medieval and modern. As a rule, they believe also that this superiority consists in being non-materialistic and anti-materialistic. It is for them almost a part of life's *credo*, therefore, to accentuate the non-materialistic aspects of some of the Indian texts. At the same time they make it a point to cultivate a thorough-going blindness, at any rate academically, to all the million facts and ideas of materialism in the actual life and thought of the Indians through the millenniums.

Both the Eur-American and Indian indologists or orientalists require to get used to the "whole view" of man, the principles of human personality and characterology as well as societal origins and development. It is necessary for both these classes of scholars to get "depolarized" from their personal or professional tastes, ideals, horrors and prejudices. They have but to open

4 Contrast B. K. Sarkar: "The Hindu View of Life" (*Open Court*, Chicago, August 1919) and *Die Lebensanschauung des Inders* (Leipzig 1923).

their eyes and see the manifold manifestations of life, although they may care to single out just a few for their own investigations. As soon as these orientalists as well as their followers in the philosophical and sociological fields have mastered the elementary fact that the foundations of life are by nature and history no less positivistic than transcendental or no less idealistic than materialistic it will be impossible for them or, for that matter, any set of intellectuals anywhere on earth not to believe that materialism, positivism, "sensatism," or any other ism of this sort has been fundamental in India's creations in personalities, institutions, ideologies and movements.

The best that can be said about all writers of the history of philosophy is that they are correct translators, paraphrasers or summarizes of old "philosophical" texts. But unless they are at the same time interested in and have devoted considerable attention to the thousand and one others items of life it cannot be safe for any scholar dealing with the *Gestalt* of culture and the trends as well as fluctuations of civilization to use them as authorities for data or interpretation. Such historians of philosophy, in so far as they are correct translators or objective summarizers, may perhaps be quite good so far as their own data, circumscribed as they happen to be, are concerned. But they require to be appraised, supplemented, and modified by evidences from the "thousand and one" other sources. One can simply be misled if interpretations by historians of philosophy, such as have not cared to study the other interests of life, about the "view of life," "ideals of culture," "spirit of civilization" etc., based as they are on very limited sources, are accepted as the chief or exclusive evidences for dissertations about the life-history of

whole regions, nay, entire subcontinents not only for decades and generations, but even for centuries and millenniums. In regard to the sensate aspects of the Indian peoples Sorokin's *Social and Cultural Dynamics* has been shunted off the tracks of dependable sociology or philosophical and comparative culture-history because he has given undue importance to the translators of a particular type of texts in the extensive domain of Indian philosophy. He has thereby virtually depended on those authors who have the least to say about sensatism, or who are professionally or intellectually incapable of doing justice to sensatism *vis-à-vis* ideationalism, especially when it is a question affecting Indian culture.

The extent to which Sorokin's interpretation of Hindu sensatism has been shunted off the reasonable position may be gauged from the following statement:[5] "Even in such seemingly purely secular works as the great Hindu treatise on politics, the *Arthaśāstra* ascribed to Kauṭilya we do not find a purely secular, empirical and morally cynical standpoint so pronounced as in many Western works beginning with Machiavelli's *Prince*. The standpoint of the *Arthaśāstra* is sensatism mitigated by pure ideationalism; that is, it is idealistically rationalistic in its epistemology as well as in its ethics and politics."

In the present context there is space enough only to observe that the correct position is just the opposite. The *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya is not a "seemingly purely secular work." It is a hundred per cent secular work, and a secular work with vengeance. As for Machiavelli's

5 Vol. II. (1937), p. 59.

Prince, one will have to be precise in explaining exactly what one means by attaching such expressions as "morally cynical standpoint" etc. to the Italian statesman-philosopher. *En passant*, it is to be recalled that Machiavelli was the author not only of *Prince* but of *Discourses on the First Ten Years of Livy's History of Rome* and other works as well. The morals of Machiavelli can be interpreted in other ways too, as, for instance, in J. N. Figgis's *From Gerson to Grotius*.[6] In Figgis's way of looking at things the "moral cynicism" of Machiavelli should appear to be quite a decent and respectable item in human relations.

In any case, such expressions as "morally cynical standpoint" as well as phrases like "purely secular, empirical" etc. can be applied with the same force not only to the work of Kauṭalya but to the entire range of Hindu economic, legal and political literature. One has only to examine objectively the contents of these documents without the conventional notions imported from the specialists in the history of Indian ideationalism. It is worth observing that the equations between Machiavelli, Hobbes and Hindu political philosophy in regard to the categories more or less identical with those employed by Sorokin, have been established in the Italian scholar Carlo Formichi's *Salus Populi: Sggio di Scienza Politica* (Torino 1908). More damaging for the thesis of Sorokin's *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, in so far as the Indian topics are concerned, is the work by another Italian scholar, G. B. Bottazzi, entitled *Precursori di Niccolo Machiavelli in India ed in Grecia* (Pisa 1914). Bottazzi

6 Cambridge, 1907, pp. 99-101.

establishes an equation between Machiavelli on the one side and Kauṭalya the Hindu and Thucydides the Greek on the other. And of course it is clear that Kauṭalya preceded Machiavelli in Machiavellism,[7] whatever it may mean.

Further, nobody who has handled the texts of Machiavelli can afford to ignore the "ideational" ethics and psychology etc. which Sorokin considers to be characteristic of Kauṭalya. The princes have been taught by Machiavelli in his *Discourses* (III, V) to believe that "from the hour they violate those laws, customs and usages under which men have lived for a great while, they begin to weaken the foundations of their authority." In the *Prince* (ch. XVIII) Machiavelli observes that nothing renders the ruler more contemptible then violence on the property and women of the subjects. The same chapter teaches that there are two methods of combat, the one by law, and the other by force. The first is declared by Machiavelli to be proper to men, and the second to beasts. In case it were necessary to coin a category like "sensatism mitigated by ideationalism" in order to understand Kauṭalya the same category might be employed generically and almost indifferently for the morals, manners and sentiments of Machiavelli.

In the domain of Indian art likewise Sorokin's *Social and Cultural Dynamics*[8] finds "all the ideational traits" and has nothing to say about the

7 See B. K. Sarkar: "Hindu Politics in Italian" in four numbers of the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta, 1925-26). It is accessible conveniently in his *Positive Background* (Allahabad) Vol. II (1926), where Machiavellism, oriental and occidental, has been discussed at length.

8 Vol. I. (1937), pp. 282-284.

presence or otherwise of sensatism. His analysis or rather observation is based on extracts from two authors. It is necessary to point out that the two authors do not make identical observations. One of Sorokin's authorities says that the "Hindu view of art is the Hindu view of life, life as interpreted by religion and philosophy." The lengthy quotation is but an elucidation of this statement. But Sorokin's other authority makes a distinction between the "epochs" of Hindu art and attaches different values to different epochs. He makes it clear that "European art is of two "very different kinds, one Christian and scholastic, the other post-Renaissance and personal." According to this authority "there was a time when Europe and Asia could and did actually understand each other very well." Whatever be the difference between these two authorities they are both believers in the idealistic or transcendental and mystical foundation of Indian art, and both apparently ignore the objective, secular and social inspirations of Hindu artists. In other words, both belong to the traditional indology. Sorokin's sociology of Hindu art, unsuspicious as it is of any other indology and unacquainted as it appears to be with any specimens of Indian sculptures and paintings through the centuries, declares itself in the manner of deductive and formal logic as follows: "The dominant mentality of the Hindu culture has been ideational. Logically, we must expect its art to have been ideational also."

Those who care to cultivate a direct contact with the images, sculptures, frescoes and *bas*-reliefs without the metaphysics of the "knower and the known, seer and seen meeting in an act that transcends distinction" will

find that the creations of Hindu artists have very often been not only sensate but sensuous and sensual as well. Material life in all its forms, the vital impulses of all sorts and denominations, not only the nine *rasas* (tastes, flavours or emotions) of Indian psychology but the manifold emotions and sentiments known to the modern psychological laboratories have all been rendered in stone, bronze, terracotta, wood etc. in the most graphic and realistic manner by Hindu artists of all regions and ages. If men and women, unsophisticated by the touch of traditional indology, view the objective delineations of plants and animal life, human figure, *genre* scenes and so forth by Hindu artists and craftsmen they will realize at the first sight that these works are "human, all too human."[9] They are not likely to be misled into the thought that these works are generally the creations of persons to whom "everything has a divine meaning and no element of life is treated for its own sake."

In the same key has been composed practically everything that Sorokin has to say about the Indian culture-systems." "India is the country,"[10] we are told, "whose socio-political regime and aristocracy have been the de-

9 B. K. Sarkar: *Hindu Art Its Humanism and Modernism* (New York 1920), chapter on "Viewpoints in Aesthetics" in the *Futurism of Young Asia* (Berlin 1922), and "Social Philosophy in Aesthetics" (*Rupam*, Calcutta, 1924).

10 *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, Vol. III (New York, 1937), pp. 141-143. On castes, Brahmans, theocracy, *dharma*, etc. contrast B. K. Sarkar: "The Theory of Property, Law and Social Order in Hindu Political Philosophy" (*International Journal of Ethics*, April, 1920), "Gilde di mestier e gilde mercantili nell' India Antica" (*Giornale degli Economisti e Rivista di Statistica*, Rome, April 1920) and "Die Struktur des Volkes in der sozialwissenschaftlichen Lehre der Schukranitī (*Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie*, Cologne, XI. 1, 1932).

centralized theocracy par excellence." Quotations about the Hindu castes, *dharma*, and especially about the Brāhmaṇas have been offered in order to "corroborate" this thesis. The treatment is conventional. It is to be noted, further, that in this instance as in others there is hardly any logical distinction between the statement and the alleged "corroboration," because the statement has not been advanced on the strength of any inductive study or analysis of factual data. The quotations alone constitute virtually both the statement or the thesis as well as the corroboration.

The impact of traditional indology on Sorokin's *Social and Cultural Dynasties*[11] is indeed very strongly manifest in his ideas about social and political relations. Bouglé's *Note sur le droit et la caste en Inde* published in *L'Année Sociologique* (Paris) of 1906 has been accepted by Sorokin as the key to his interpretations of Hindu polity. According to Bouglé, as Sorokin cites, "*une organisation proprement politique n'a pas été donnée la société hindoue*" (a properly political organisation was not given to the Hindu society). Other statements of Bouglé are quoted by Sorokin with approval, for instance, the following: "In India there is no embryo of the state. The very idea of the state public power is entirely foreign to India." On the strength of this kind of indology

11 Vol. III. pp. 193-194. Contrast B. K. Sarkar: "La Théorie de la constitution dans la philosophie politique hindoue" (*Revue de Synthèse Historique* Paris, August 1920), "La Démocratie hindoue" (*Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques*, Paris, July-August, 1921), "Aspects économiques et politiques de la civilisation hindoue" (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, Paris 1930) and "La Sociographie hindoue aux débuts du capitalisme moderne" (*Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, Paris, February 1937).

Sorokin has delivered a sociology like the following about the Hindu states. "These states," says he, "were either theocratic or mostly organized by foreign invaders."

Acquaintance with the factual Hindu institutions of public or private law would lead to the thoroughly opposite point of view. Theocracy as a category is very well-known in social science, and the first proposition that one should be warranted to make about Hindu states is that as a rule they are the farthest removed from theocracy. As for the alleged "foreign invaders" "mostly" organizing Hindu states, the statistician of diplomatic, military and political history would be at his wit's end if he were called upon to explain, not to speak of corroborating his proposition.

In any case, the number of foreign invaders organizing states among the Europeans was not less, epoch by epoch, than that of foreign invaders organizing states in the Indian sub-continent. The comparative statistics of one people governing another people with reference to the East and the West would be very interesting in this regard. For, instance, there were periods when, as Yule observes in the *Travels of Marco Polo*, "in Eastern Europe scarcely a dog could bark without Mongol leave from the borders of Poland and the Gulf of Scanderoon to the Amur and the Yellow Sea." Freeman's *Historical Geography of Europe* should also prove to be a permanent eye-opener in regard to foreign dominations among the European races of all ages.

The invasions of the medieval Saracens or Arabs in Southern and South-western Europe are equal historical facts about foreigners "organizing" states in

Europe. Then there are the Ottoman Turks whose exploits in South-Eastern Europe ushered in modern history. The neighbourhoods of Vienna and Venice in the heart of Europe furnished on several occasions the boundary posts, as it were, of Western Asia in those days. Once these data of "foreign invaders organizing states" in medieval and modern Europe[12] are assimilated for a system of social and cultural dynamics the question of sensatism *vis-à-vis* ideationalism in India would acquire a fresh valuation in the light of comparative sensatism or comparative ideationalism.

So far as the systems of truth and movement of discoveries and inventions are concerned, Sorokin's *Social and Culture Dynamics*[13] makes a distinction between the "truth of faith" and the "sensate truth." "Great discoveries in mathematics, astronomy, and other natural sciences," we are told, "were made in India but they were probably made in the periods of the relative weakening of truth of faith or by partisans of the truth of reason and senses. Even so, the discoveries cannot even remotely compete with those of the Western world for the last four centuries." Sorokin does not specify the discoveries of the Hindus. But the student of the scientific contri-

12 Howorth: *History of the Mongols* (London, 1876-88), Vol. I. pp. ix-xi, Vol. II, pp. xl-xliii, P. Scott: *History of the Moorish Empire in Europe* (Philadelphia 1904), Vol. II, pp. 35-37, *Cambridge Mediaeval History*, Vol. II. (1913), pp. 379-385, G. F. Young: *East and West through Fifteen Centuries*, Vol. II (London 1916), pp. 131-137, 567-570, H. Barnes: *History of Western Civilization* (New York, 1935), Vol. I. pp. 524-526, 547-548, 549-550.

13 Vol. II (1937) p. 145.

butions of Hindu culture is aware that these can be proven to have been growing for ages since the Vedic, nay, as we should now say, the Mohenjo Daro times. Indian history is generally known to be very poor in records and dates. And yet there is hardly any period which did not have its exact, natural, positive or sensate sciences. In that case, "the partisans of the truth of reason and senses" will have to be admitted as having been playing their rôle in a constant manner through the social and cultural dynamics of India. The partisans of the truth of faith, mystics, idealists and so forth were not evidently bossing the culture-world of India and crushing the sensatists out of existence all the time. Sorokin's further proposition to the effect that the "predominantly ideational mentality and system of truth of India contribute little to the increase of discoveries and inventions" is, in any case, inconsistent with his previous statement.

We can easily admit that the Hindu discoveries down, say, to the fourteenth or sixteenth century A.C. "cannot even remotely compete with those of the Western world for the last four centuries." But we have to admit at the same time the other position, namely, that European discoveries down to the same period "cannot even remotely compete" with the European discoveries for the last four centuries. Under these conditions of comparative scientific development the problem of sensatism *vs.* ideationalism in Hindu culture, or for that matter, in European culture as well acquires an altogether new orientation[14] such as does not appear to have been hinted

14 B. K. Sarkar: *Hindu Achievements in Exact Science* (New York, 1918).

at or adequately taken cognisance of in Sorokin's synthesis.

In *Social and Cultural Dynamics* the categories, "sensate" and "ideational," have been employed as logical dichotomies in the most abstract manner conceivable. Sorokin has not failed, however, to suggest a mixed category. But in the application of these categories to the ideological or institutional data of historic culture-systems he appears to have postulated certain regions or races and epochs as embodying the one or the other category. After having accepted these postulates he quotes certain passages from certain scholars in regard to the regions or races and the ages. And then he believes he has "corroborated" his thesis. The proper method should be entirely the reverse. The data, both institutional and ideological, ought to be presented in the first instance. Then should come the interpretations. It is self-evident that many persons, regions, groups or ages that are interpreted as "sensate" in one manner may be proven to be quite "ideational" in another, and *vice versa*. Be this as it may, it is in the last instance that one is entitled to come forward with the discovery that such and such a region or epoch is sensate, such and such a region or epoch is ideational, and so on. In regard to Hindu culture, for instance, what the world of science wants to know is not the hypothesis or the postulate about its sensatism or ideationalism or a mixture of the two isms but the proof, objective and realistic, that it is really characterized by the one or the other, especially when the traditional and conventional indology has been under challenge for over two decades. Sorokin's *Social and Cultural Dynamics* has not cared to furnish the proofs

by giving a comparative analysis of the Eastern and the Western institutions or ideas. It has given his postulates and then the quotations from a few authors and finally what he calls his corroborations.

Be it observed that the analytical studies of Sorokin as embodied in the *Sociology of Revolution* (1925), *Social Mobility* (1927) and *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology* (1929)[15] are devoid of metaphysical one-sidedness and determinism of any sort in the interpretation of "functional" and causal relations. In *Contemporary Sociological Theories* (1928) also he developed an apparatus of critical judgment which is eminently calculated to overthrow monistic interpretations in every field of societal investigation. Every statement that he has made or rather accepted in his historical work, *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (1937), about Indian culture in regard to the relations between the sensate and the ideational ought, therefore, to be combated by himself with the aid of the methodology and conclusions established in his previous works.

The "whole view" of the data of Indian social and cultural dynamics ought to be exhibited. It is to be observed that ideologies, pious wishes and dreams alone do not constitute society and culture. Objective institutions, historical realities and actual events in inter-human relations have a right also to be heard. As for the ideologies, again, it is not enough to handle exclusively the alleged holy texts in the *Sacred Books of the East Series* and exhibit the conventional interpretations of them as popularized by traditional orientalists. In any case, it ought not to be reasonable to pounce upon some of the

15 With C. C. Zimmerman as part-author.

most mystical-looking pronouncements in these texts as the most characteristic for India and reject, overlook or ignore the thousand and one humane, rational and realistic passages that constitute the core of this literature. The whole view, so far as these ideologies are concerned, would consist in envisaging the literary documents, as has been very often observed in the preceding pages, of entire *chaturvarga* (the four desirables of man), namely, *dharma, artha, kāma* and *mokṣa.* This would require, further, a thoroughly critical attitude in regard to the dissertations of those scholars who deal *exclusively* with the ideational documents of Hindu philosophy, in order that the student of scientific social investigations may not fall a victim to whatever anybody in Eur-America or India may choose to call the "Hindu view of life," the *Eigenart des indischen Denkens,* and so forth. As soon as the socio-cultural data are presented in their entirety and comprehensiveness and the correct methodology (as, for instance, that of Sorokin's analytical sociology in the works of 1925-29 referred to above) applied to their elucidation and interpretation, the "new indology" for which the present author has been raising his cry since 1912-14 is bound to appear automatically, and Hindu sensatism would be taken as a first postulate of every philosophical, sociological and culture-historical inquiry.

The Geometry of "Between-Men" Relations in the Dharma and Artha Śāstras

Coming now towards the end of the present survey we have to observe that the specialized

treatises or *śāstras*[1] on politics, economics and sociology in Hindu literature are numerous. To be very brief, they are to be encountered, generally speaking, under two groups: (1) *dharma* (and *smriti*) *śāstras* and (2) *artha* (and *nīti*) *śāstras*. As a full-fledged treatise, the oldest *dharmaśāstra* is perhaps the *Dharmasūtra* of Gautama (c 550 B.C. ?), and the oldest *arthaśāstra* perhaps that associated with the name of Kauṭalya (c 330 B.C. ?). Excluding the vernacular and English paraphrases or translations of the old Sanskrit treatises in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the last *smritiśāstra* of the Hindu tradition is perhaps the commentary on Vijnāneśvara's *Mitākṣarā* by the Maratha jurist Bālambhaṭṭa (1740-1830 ?) or the Bengali jurist Jagannātha Tarkapanchānana's (1695-1806 ?) *Vivāda-bhangārṇava*. And in the line of *nītiśāstras* the last work is perhaps the *Rājanīti*[2] in Marathi language (c 1810) based on Sanskrit texts by the Maratha scholar Malhār Rām Rāo Chitnis.

We have to face here a lilterature which has a more or less continuous history of nearly two thousand five hundred years. And this literature from beginning to end is essentially "analytical" in its contents. The Hindu speculations have given rise to a number of categories and we find that the philosophers are engaged in defining and analysing them. The topic may be constitutional, legal, economic, financial, social or international. But

1 P. V. Kane: *History of Dharmaśāstras* (Poona) Vol. I. (1931) J. J. Meyer: *Ueber das Wesen der altindischen Rechtsschriften und ihr Verhältnis zu einander und zu Kauṭilya* (Leipzig 1927). See also *supra*, pp. 354-361 (Kauṭalya and His Boswell).

2 Edited by K. N. Sane for the *Kāvyetihāsa Samgraha Series* No. 23, (Poona, 1887).

we notice that in the treatment by these authors one is led to feel that society, polity or economy is nothing but a system of relationships, contacts, *liaisons*, attitudes, dealings, *rapports*, *Beziehungen*. In the Hindu philosophy of *dharma*, *smriti*, *artha* or *nīti* mankind is presented in the form of an individual *vis-à-vis* individuals or groups, or of groups *vis-à-vis* groups or individuals. The stuff is essentially interhuman.

Some of these attitudes, relations or contacts are described under the complex of *saptāmga*, the seven-limbed organism (*Kauṭaliya* VI. i, VIII, I, Viṣṇu III, 33, Śukra, I, lines 121-124, V, 1-2, Kāmandaka, 1, 16, IV, I). Here we are presented with the theory of the constitution involving as it does the analysis of the *svāmī* (ruler), the *amātya* (minister or councillor), the *suhrit* (ally), the *ḳoṣa* (treasure), the *rāṣṭra* (territory), the *durga* (fort) and the *vala* (army). The analysis of these seven categories is not the only topic of Hindu philosophy in political science. Then there are the problems, among others, of *aiśvarya* (sovereignty) which have also demanded the attention of the theorists. And here we encounter the Hindu theory of the state. In this analysis, likewise, the authors have given currency to a number of characteristic categories.

The state (*rājya*) as an entity is grounded in the phenomenon of *aiśvarya* or *svāmitva*, i.e., sovereignty. The theory of the state, therefore, is fundamentally the philosophy of sovereignty. It may be exercised by the one or the few or the many. It may be vested in the long run in the legislature or the executive or the judiciary. It may be identical with the despotism of custom or the rule of positive law. It may manifest itself in

and through a single organ as the *primum mobile* embracing all organized spheres or exhibited simultaneously in several co-existent co-ordinate corporations of the pluralistic universe. And finally, it may happen to be the monopoly of the bourgeoisie or of the proletariat. In any case, it is *aiśvarya* that ushers into being the phenomena called politics in societal existence. In political speculation the central problem obviously is the analysis of the great *śakti* (force) that constitutes the core of "political" relations, i.e., the *élan* of *samūha* (organized or collective) life.

"What is sovereignty?" is then the moot question to be attacked by all political philosophers. The problem was grasped by the *dharma* (*smriti*) and *artha* (*nīti*) theorists of India also. It is to be remembered, however, that we are here concerned with the thought which prevailed in the world ages before the ideas discussed in Preuss's *Gemeinde, Staat und Reich als Gebietskörperschften* (1889), Leory-*Beaulieu's L'Etat moderne et ses fonctions* (1890), Novicow's *Les Luttes entre sociétés humaines et leurs phases successives* (1893), Lecky's *Democracy and Liberty* (1896), Michel's *L'Idée de l'Etat* (1898), Merriam's *History of the Theory of Sovereignty since Rousseau* (1900), Scherger's *Evolution of Modern Liberty* (1904), Joseph-Barthélemy's *Rôle du pouvoir executif dans les républiques modernes* (1906), Duguit's *Le Droit social, le droit individuel et la transformation de l'état* (1908), Hobhouse's *Social Evolution and Political Theory* (1911), Barker's *Political Thought in England from Spencer to the Present Day* (1914), Lenin's *State and Revolution* (1917), Laski's *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty* (1918), Joseph-

Barthélemy's *Problème de la Compétence dans la démocratie* (1918), Watson's *State in Peace and War* (1919), Spann's *Der wahre Staat* (1921), Dewey's *Human Nature and Conduct* (1922), Van den Bruck: *Das dritte Reich* (1923), Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (1924), Sorokin's *Sociology of Revolution* (1925), Meinecke's *Idee der Staatsräson* (1925), Hocking's *Man and the State* (1926) and *The Spirit of World Politics* (1932), Redanò's *Le Stato Etico* (1927), Masaryk's *Making of a State* (1927), Karl Haushofer's *Geopolitik der Pan-Ideen* (1931) and *Raumüberwindende Mächte* (1934), Bouglé's *Socialismes Français* (1933), Köllreutter's *Grundriss der Allgemeinen Staatslehre* (1933), Lasbax's *La France ira-t-elle à un Troisième Empire?* (1934) and Del Vecchio's *Saggi Intorno allo Stato* (1935). The development of political philosophy in the world since the American war of independence and the first industrial revolution should as a rule be left out of the consideration while examining the categories of thought created by the Indian philosophers from Gautama and Kauṭalya to Jagannātha and Chitnis.

The "analytical" treatment of political phenomena, bearing on the constitution or on sovereignty, is a prominent feature of Hindu thinking. The conviction is forced upon us under the guidance of the *dharma*-and the *artha-śāstras* that man in politics is fundamentally a bundle or complex of social or "between-men", i.e., interhuman relationships. These treatises do not seem to be interested in this or that particular state. Neither the Maurya Empire nor the Chola Empire nor indeed any state of Hindu history has engaged their attention. Their topic for discussion is the

state *überhaupt*, i.e., the state as "the thing in itself," so to say. Be it observed that we are not attaching to this phrase any metaphysical implications. No treatment can be more objective, concrete and human than what we find in these works. To these authors a state is a human collectivity and therefore is nothing but a system of relations and orientations. Altogether, we are presented by the Hindu philosophers with the very pattern, form, geometry, so to say, of human relations. Whatever be the content of the state, howsoever varied be the races that constitute its membership, wheresoever located it be, the relations between the members of the state are taken as eternal. Examined in this light, the creations of the Hindu philosophers in and through the *dharma* and *artha śāstras* would appear to be fine logical contributions to what is being described as "pure," "analytical" or "formal" sociology in contemporary Eur-America.

This kind of sociology is called by Leopold von Wiese,[3] the leading exponent, as *die Lehre von den sozialen Beziehungen und den sozialen Gebilden*, i.e., the science of social relations or processes (competition, cooperation, exploitation etc.) and social "forms" (such as the group, mass, state, people, nation, class etc.). It is sometimes shortly named the *Beziehungslehre* or science of relations. And the special feature of this science of relations consists in the fact that it deals not with historical or time-conditioned categories but with the categories such as are "above" or indifferent to time (*überzeitlich*) and somewhat eternal (*quasiewig*). These cate-

3 *Soziologie* (Berlin 1931) pp. 34, 47, 117, 120-124, 131-133.

gories relate to such relations or processes of "to" and "away" from (*Zu-und Auseinander*) as prevailed, are prevailing and will prevail as long as there are human beings.

The formal sociology of the state cannot afford to remain a mere history of the state, as says von Wiese in his *System der Allgemeinen Soziologie*.[4] Its function consists in "abstracting," scratching out (*herauslösung*) or isolating the "between-men" elements (*Zwischen-menschlichen*) out of the historico-empirical raw material. The items such as happen by accident to be the features of contemporary states, for instance, of the German state cannot according to him constitute its subject matter. In formal sociology are to be discussed the striking repetitions, similarities and rhythms etc. of all statal happenings or historical states. Its object is to analyze the common factors in all these social processes. And this is what has been done, along, of course, with other things, by the authors of the *dharma* and the *artha* or the *nīti śāstras*.

The social processes which specifically or peculiarly belong to the statal complex are characterized by von Wiese as consisting in *Herrschaft* (rule or domination) and *Dienst* (obedience or service).[5] The relations between the superiors and the subordinates, the command, the nomination, the delegation, the status of officials, the protocol, the notification, the statute, the titles and so forth constitute the paraphernalia of statal relations. Among the numerous symbols of the state are noted the throne, the flag, the coat of arms, the uniforms, arms, office-buildings, the navy, the court of justice, and so on.

4 Munich, 1933, p. 537.

5 *Ibid.*, pp. 548, 552.

The contents[6] of Somadeva's *Nītivākyāmrita*, Bhoja's *Yukṭikalpataru*, Hemachandra's *Laghu Arhannīti*, Someśvara's *Mānasollāsa*, Chaṇḍeśvara's *Rājanīti-Ratnākara*, Vaiśampāyana's *Nītiprakāśikā*, Nīlakaṇṭha's *Nītimayūkha*, Mitra-Miśra's *Rājanīti-prakāśa* and Malhār Rām Rāo Chitnis's *Rājanīti* may be cited as instances of the "formal" analysis of the state-complex.

"Formal" or "analytical" sociology is claimed by von Wiese to be new and very recent. To a considerable extent the claim is well founded. Starting as analytical sociology did with Tönnies's *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* in 1887 it did not assume a definite form until the publication of Simmel's *Soziologie: Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung* (Sociology: Researches into the Forms of Society-making) in 1908. But in the present author's treatment the entire Hindu literature of *dharma, smriti, artha* and *nīti śāstras* is rich in the analysis of social forms and social relationships or processes and deals essentially with the between-men relations. In other words, the "new sociology" must have to be regarded, methodologically and in its rudimentary elements, at any rate, as very old, at least as old as Gautama and Kauṭalya, nay, much older still, because even Gautama and Kauṭalya had their predecessors in the establishment of the same geometry of social relations. And here it should be reasonable to agree with Sorokin[7] who holds that its "founders were all law-givers who formulated the first rules of social relations, and especially all jurisconsults and theorizers of law." It should be

6 *Supra*, pp. 422, 427-29, 431, 433-434, 516-518, 525, 546-548, 551-554.

7 *Contemporary Sociological Theories* (New York 1928) pp. 495-498.

admitted, however, at the outset that the analytical or formal discussions in the societal philosophies of the ancients and medievals of Eur-Asia cannot by any means be compared with the selfconscious and deliberate attempts at the promulgation of a new scientific discipline as represented by the Tönnies-Simmel-von Wiese group.

It will be noticed that, from the standpoint of content or substance, most of the categories of Hindu political philosophy have analogues in those of European and that it may be reasonable to connect even modern and contemporary theories with the findings of the old Hindus. In so far as political and social phenomena, or for that matter, all mental and moral or human phenomena are universal and eternal, it is possible to detect Platonic, Aristotelian, Patristic or Macchiavellian strands even in the philosophical discussions of contemporary problems. Besides, some of the economic and social institutions of today can be traced back to the Middle Ages for their crude and even semi-developed beginnings. It is from this angle of vision that we can appreciate the attempts of Sorokin's *Contemporary Sociological Theories* to trace virtually every "ism" of today back not only to medieval literary documents but to the most primitive records of human thought.

But in a strictly scientific way of looking at things the theories that have grown around democracy and socialism, technocracy and world-economy, *le marché mondial*, constitutional liberty and class-struggle are essentially the products of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries,—the epochs of the first and the second industrial revolutions. These phenomena were unknown as facts

of "large dimensions" in the previous epochs.[8] It would be psychologically untenable, therefore, to bring in the philosophies of Europe from, say, Plato's *Republic* to Frederick the Great's *Anti-Machiavel* (1736) and *Das Politische Testament* (1768) into the atmosphere of present-day ideologies. For instance, in so far as a "modern" thinker like Hobbes or Bossuet and a still more modern thinker like Hegel was unused to the grammar of trade unions, syndicates, class-struggle, international proletariat and so forth, the "absolutism" or monistic idealism that is associated with their political theories can hardly be invoked to interpret what may be described as the "neo-absolutism"[9] of today, namely, that prevalent among the thinkers of Soviet Russia, Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. One must by no means overlook the very important consideration that it is on the generation-long experience of parliamentary liberties, labour organization, democratic procedure, and international camaraderies that the professedly anti-parliamentary, anti-democratic, anti-socialistic systems of neo-capitalistic *Duce*-states or *Führerstaaten*, i.e., leader-polities and dictatorships have been reared.

In Lasbax's *La France ira-t-elle à un Troisième Empire*[10] we find an interesting analysis of imperialism. This is another political category, which, apparently unchanging, in reality embodies substantially diverse

8 On the question of modernistic economy in medieval Europe see H. Hauser: *Les Origines Historiques des Problèmes Economiques Actuels* (Paris 1930) pp. 3-9, *Les Débuts du Capitalisme* (Paris 1931), 16, 31, 42.

9 B. K. Sarkar: "The People and the State in Neo-Democracy" (*Calcutta Review*, July, 1936).

10 Paris, 1934, p. 251.

contents in different epochs. Imperialism may be taken as an eternal fact. But ancient imperialism was "single and universal", says he, whereas modern imperialism is *imperium dissocié en individualités nationales*, the imperialism of individual nations, i.e., neither single nor universal. The imperialism of the future is expected by Lasbax to bring back the "primitive unity" but in "a regime of the federation of all the peoples." It will be the "supreme imperialism of total peace."

When one is adequately oriented to the diversities between the old and the new regimes in the institutional and other factual experiences of economic and social life one should be careful in establishing equations of the ancient and mediaeval Hindu categories (as of the ancient and mediaeval European) with those prevailing in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Naturally, therefore, the question of the Hindus (or of the Europeans) of yore as having "anticipated" the moderns ought hardly to be raised in strictly scientific discussions. For comparative politics we are likely to be within reasonable limits if we read the *dharma* and the *artha śāstras* in the main as embodying the ideologies of European thought down to the beginnings of the industrial revolution.

The Variables and Constants in Hindu Positivism

We have made a bibliographical survey, so to say, of the leading literary documents chiefly in Sanskrit and to a certain extent also in the Indian vernaculars,—with a view to exhibit the positivistic, "sensate," secular and humane ideologies of the Hindus from the earliest times

down to Rammohun. It has been our chief concern to focus the attention on the treatises of politics or the political sections of social encyclopædias. The treatment is by no means exhaustive. But we must not forget that all this survey has a particular aim, namely, that of furnishing us with hints as to the place-value and time-value, i.e., the *locale* and the age of the *Śukranīti*, the treatise in whose fortunes we are directly interested for the time being.

There are, no doubt, some floating ideas which are common to almost all these treatises and seem to have been the stock-in-trade of every writer on *nīti* or *artha*. The *verbatim* reproductions or occasional modifications and adaptations of the same texts are not difficult to explain. Uniformity was a fact of societal existence. It was promoted in a variety of ways. In the first place, social mobility, both horizontal and vertical, was the basic reality of Indian as of European interhuman relations. The language of the learned world, again, was the same throughout India. Education was imparted orally, and ideas were transmitted for generations from mouth to mouth. Besides, the incessant political changes of the times also promoted a uniformity of culture. Dynastic revolutions, territorial expansions and contractions, transfers of royal seats from place to place, emergence of new areas into political importance, constant transformations of the "old order yielding place to new"—all these tended to produce a remarkable elasticity and flexibility of the Indian mind. It was ever ready therefore to receive new impressions as created by social metabolism due to *rapprochement* and intercourse among peoples.

And here it is possible to adduce facts from extra-Indian culture-zones also. It is interesting that Meinecke

in his *Idee der Staatsräson*[11] should come to the conclusion that during nearly two thousand years certain leading thinkers were expressing essentially the same ideas. "Cicero, Aquinas and Frederick the Great would have understood one another," says he, "because all three spoke the easily comprehensible language of natural law." The entire work is, besides, a testimony to the profound ideological reality that from Machiavelli to Treitschke European political philosophy has traded in two fundamental categories. One has reference to *Staatsräson*, which we may call *śaktiyoga*, i.e., *Machtpolitik*, the doctrine of power or force, and *daṇḍa* (punishment, sanction 'etc.). The other points to *Sittlichkeit* (morality), *Rechtlichkeit* (law), corresponding to the Hindu doctrine of *dharma*, i.e., law, justice, etc. It is the permutation and combination of these two eternal polarities, marked often by the emphasis on one to the exclusion of the other that constitutes virtually the entire encyclopædia of political philosophy as exhibited in this work. This is a very instructive and eminently acceptable generalization. We understand that changes in space and time do not after all invariably engender profound variations in the theories of the state, law, diplomacy, societal organization etc. In social affairs, statics is no less profound than dynamics.

The existence of social "constants" can be borne out in other fields, for instance, in the domain of law. The Italian scholar, Giorgio del Vecchio,[12] invites our attention to the fact that the organism of law became enriched through

11 Munich, 1925, p. 452.

12 "The Crisis of the Science of Law" in the *Tulane Law Review* (New Orleans 1934) p. 331.

new inventions such as the printing press. New institutions were created by the press. But the preceding structure of law remained entire, and no new laws were expressly formulated. Similarly in our times, says he, new branches of law have been created on account of numerous transformations of living conditions and modes of activity. But the main trunk remains substantially unchanged. The structure has been amplified and perfected but its fundamental unity is to be found intact.

This problem of "constants" in social progress can be referred to certain universal considerations. However undeniable and incontestable be the objective signs of amelioration or progress enjoyed by a society, the individual men and women cannot see or feel in them any gounds for feeling happy. It is this paradox of civilisation to which Alfredo Niceforo is led as a result of his investigations *sull' importanza dello studio della distribuzione dei caratteri mentali* (on the importance of studying the distribution of mental characters, Catania, 1933).

An explanation of the impossibility of feeling happy is found by Niceforo in the circumstance that two distinct elements are to be discovered in the social facts, one of which is superficial and variable and the other profound and invariable. The external part is variable. But the part which does not change is internal and is the fundamental element. These are the *résidus sociaux*, the social residues, or *résidus constants*, the constant, permanent residues, and they remain always hidden under all apparent variations of forms. The ideas of equality, liberty etc., the optimistic and humanitarian ideologies, the conceptions of altruism and so forth are considered by Niceforo to be the external and variable

elements of social facts. But they are misleading because it is under them that is hidden the desire to dominate on the part of the minorities, i.e., of the most qualified or the fit. And this desire for domination constitutes the profound and secret motive of all action in social groups.[13]

While it is possible to discover the constants in every culture-zone, Indian and extra-Indian, and explain them also to a certain extent on the basis of "social residues" the fact of the variables must not be minimised or overlooked. For instance, beneath or above these unities and uniformities of Hindu culture are to be found the varieties and diversities which are the characteristic products of particular epochs and areas. A close study of the political maxims embodied in the various branches of Hindu literature is calculated to yield not only a history of the development of polity and political speculation in India through the ages, but also a record of the varying geographical or regional and racial influences bearing upon it.

This dualistic characteristic of Indian national culture in its socio-political aspects, viz., the superimposition, upon a fundamental bed-rock of uniformity, of a diversity adjusted to the conditions of varying localities and races—has been also pointed out in my work on a socio-religious festival called *gambhīrā* connected with the Śaiva-cum-Śāktaism of Bengal.[14] In fact, the diversity that characterises the customs and festivals, hymns and rituals of the people in

13 A. Niceforo: *Les Indices numériques de la civilisation et du progrès* (Paris 1921) pp. 201-205.

14 B. K. Sarkar: *The Folk Element in Hindu Culture* (London 1917), pp. 23-26.

different parts of India in the self-same socio-religious institution is so great to-day that it is often difficult to perceive the unity underlying them.

The relativity and diversity of ideals and institutions modifying the traditional unifying agencies can be explained in much the same manner as their uniformity and unity. The kaleidoscopic political changes which shifted the vital centres of gravity from people to people,—province to province, and district to district,—necessarily converted the border-lands or buffer-states of one epoch into prominent seats of political and cultural life in the next, and occasionally diverted the stream of paramount ideas along new and untrodden channels. The variables were thus engendered on account of military dynamics. These are hardly visible to us today because of the paucity of historical details bearing on the "social metabolism" of by-gone times. In other words, social mobility which has been taken to be a factor in the promotion of uniformity was likewise an agency in the introduction of diversity. On the other hand, the translation of higher culture into the tongues of the people of the various regions from the common storehouse of Sanskrit, the *lingua franca* of educated India, through the ages, and the necessary modifications or adaptations, have imparted a local colouring and distinctive tone to the all-India Hindu traditions, sentiments and customs in the several parts of the country.

Besides, it would be wrong to believe that the social and religious life of the people of India has been for ages governed exclusively by the texts of the *śāstras* in Sanskrit (which, *en passant*, could not escape the natural adaptation to the conditions of time and place). Indian society

and culture have also really and to a powerful extent been influenced and directed by the vast mass of the different vernacular literatures, both secular and religious, that grew up side by side with, and eventually replaced, to a considerable extent, the Sanskritic storehouse.

So far as the Hindu literature on economics, public finance, constitution, jurisprudence, social order, and international law is concerned, the proper analysis of the documents with the object of discriminating from the permanent and basic foundations of unifying thought and tradition the layers and sediments that point to different epochs and diverse local or racial conditions in Indian culture-history, has yet to be undertaken in an intensive manner. That would be tantamount to an analysis of the "variables" *vis-à-vis* the "constants" in Hindu positivism.

And the problem of assigning a particular socio-political treatise to a particular kingdom or empire cannot be solved before a vast amount of spade-work is done. In the first place, the political history of India has to be ransacked so as to give more or less complete pictures of the administrative machinery and economic organisation of the various kingdoms and empires of the Hindu world.

In the second place, the whole field of Indian literature,—Sanskrit, Prakrit and vernacular as well as Persian for the later periods,—has to be ransacked wide and deep to discover socio-political and socio-economic treatises, and their contents minutely analysed and elaborately indexed in the interest of comparative studies.

Much has already been accomplished along both these lines, as would have been apparent from the foregoing survey as well as from the footnotes referring to

Indian and non-Indian publications. But intensive investigations remain yet to be undertaken on a large scale.

The present work,—*The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology*,—is an attempt at placing some of the data of socio-economic and socio-political life gleaned from Śukrāchārya's text-book of politics, economics and sociology before the investigators into the world's political, economic and sociological thought.

INDEX

I. Persons

N.B. The footnotes have not been indexed.

A

Abu Hanifah, 629,
Abul Fazl, 222, 463, 464, 506, 529-545, 549, 611, 616, 623, 630
Agastya, 437
Ahalyā Bāi, 9
Aiyangar (K. V. R.), 80, 241-243
Aiyangar (S. K.), 302
Ajātaśatru, 65
Ajita Keśakambali, 186
Akbar, 468, 529-545, 549, 590, 592, 611
Alauddin Khilji, 90, 413
Alberuni, 460-465, 533, 542, 544, 592
Alexander, 76, 123, 232, 279, 284, 425
Al-Farabi, 247, 539, 542
Alfazari, 459
Ali Muhammad Khan, 531
Amir Khusru, 467
Ammon, 114
Ānanda, 164
Anantadeva, 615
Angirā, 195, 614, 627
Aniruddha, 411
Aparāditya, 410
Aparārka, 414
Āpastamba, 34, 35, 155, 191, 375, 630
Aquinas, 247, 662
Aristotle, 34, 35, 55, 123, 397, 464, 609.
Arnold (Matthew), 10
Āryabhaṭa II, 462
Āryadeva, 365, 372
Āryaśūra, 308, 311, 365
Asaṅga, 183
Ascham, 52
Aśoka, 176, 177, 284, 286, 317, 390
Aśvaghoṣa, 38, 167, 183, 308-310, 312, 362, 395, 396, 450
Atiśa, 453
Aufrecht, 4, 216, 378, 426
Augustus, 345
Aurangzeb, 100, 468, 504, 560, 561, 575, 591, 592
Aurelius, 176, 345
Austin, 630

B

Bacon, 619, 630
Bādarāyaṇa, 460
Bāji Rāo, 17
Bāji Rāo II, 600
Bālabhadra, 462
Bālāji Bāji Rāo, 98, 599
Bālaka, 408
Bālambhaṭṭa, 193, 617, 618, 619, 651
Ballālasena, 410, 411
Bankim Chandra Chatterji, 493, 494
Barker, 653
Barth, 343
Bartolus, 516
Basu (B. D.), 220
Baudhāyana, 155, 191, 192, 200, 290
Bauri Mahāraṇā, 476
Baz Bahadur, 617
Bazin, 457
Bentham, 630
Berr, 46-49
Bhadravāhu 188
Bhadravarman, 386
Bhagavantadeva, 546
Bhandarkar (D. R.), 303-307, 357
Bhandarkar (R. G.), 251-253, 360
Bharata, 66, 188

Bhāravi, 374
Bhartrihari, 373
Bhāsa, 374
Bhat, 567, 568
Bhattāchārya (Adityaram), 426
Bhattāchārya (Madhusudan), 401 414-415, 609
Bhaveśa, 414
Bhoja, 247, 407, 425-429, 539, 657
Bhuṣaṇa, 571
Bilhana, 409
Bimbisāra, 65, 123, 125, 127, 207, 430
Bismarck, 224, 292, 299, 323, 332, 335, 337, 348
Blochmann, 541
Bodin, 249, 345, 587
Bolingbroke, 586
Bonar, 631
Bosanquet, 609
Bossuet, 562 ,587, 659
Boswell, 356, 357
Bottazzi, 36, 231, 281, 359, 640
Bouglé, 101, 568, 644, 654
Bradley, 609
Brahmagupta, 459, 461
Breloer, 37, 281, 313, 323-353, 358, 359
Brihaspati, 35, 39, 203, 370, 397, 403, 415-420, 421, 515, 548, 552, 611, 612
Brissaud, 345,
Brunschvigg, 12
Brunhes, 57
Buckle, 343
Buddha (see Śākyasiṃha), 43, 44, 163
Bühler, 192, 201
Bukkā Rāya, 321, 495, 636
Bu ston, 452

C

Calvin, 171
Carli, 2
Carlyle, 172
Cannan, 515
Carey, 618
Cassell, 329.
Chaitanya, 469, 472, 488, 611
Chakladar, 205
Chānakya, 9, 211, 214-220, 223, 234, 242, 252, 257, 260, 272, 276, 286, 299, 302, 331, 332, 356, 361, 400, 516, 547 569, 599, 636
Chaṇḍeśvara, 398, 405, 409, 410, 413, 414, 429, 478, 513-522, 554, 555, 610, 657
Chaṇḍidāsa, 485
Chandragupta, 9, 16, 83, 123, 188, 207, 210, 215, 223, 231, 234, 241, 244, 252-254, 260, 261, 273, 289, 291-293, 299, 302, 310, 312, 317, 333-335, 497
Chandrakānta Tarkālaṅkāra, 9
Charaka, 9, 256, 459
Charlemagne, 425
Charles the Great, 73
Charpentier, 260
Chaucer, 484
Chhuṭi Khan, 467
Chitnis, 600, 602-609, 651, 654, 657
Chu-hsi, 458
Cicero, 34, 35, 395, 662
Colbert, 348
Colebrooke, 617, 618, 625.
Comte, 1, 2, 10, 11, 609
Confucius, 35
Cooley, 2
Coudenove-Kalergi, 74
Coulange, 22, 198
Cousin, 21, 631
Croce, 609
Crawford, 383

D

Dahlke, 159
Daṇḍin, 211, 274, 374, 383
Dante, 574
Dara Shikoh, 468
Darbhapāṇi, 256
De la Vallée Poussin, 71, 72, 76, 167, 319-320, 633
Del Vecchio, 26, 166, 654, 662
Demolins, 57

de Morgan, 75
Depping, 77
Devala, 193
Devanabhaṭṭa, 411
Devapāla, 81
Devasvāmin, 408
Dewey, 172, 654
Dhanin, 459
Dharmapāla, 81, 82, 83
Dhīmān, 82
Dikshitar, 286, 230-323
Diocletian, 348, 349
Divākara, 449
Dowden, 10
Duguit, 653
Dupleix, 77
Durkheim, 2, 22, 143, 162, 183, 199, 343
Dutt (M. N.), 383
Dvija Rāmachandra, 484
Dwijendralal Roy, 493

E

Eknāth, 511
Elizabeth, 348
Ellwood, 2
Elphinstone, 56, 58
Elyot, 247
Engelbert, 73
Epicurus, 394

F

Fa Hien 385, 387, 389, 456
Faizi, 543
Fei Tchang-fang, 458
Fichte, 24, 25, 172, 511, 567, 570, 577, 585, 609, 631
Fick, 159
Figgis, 640
Filmer, 562, 587
Firoz Shah Tughlak, 467
Fleet, 239, 358, 359
Formichi, 18, 36, 230, 237, 281, 359, 385, 640
Fortescue, 247
Foucher, 72, 77
Frazer, 198
Frederick the Great, 97, 225, 342, 345, 348, 563, 581, 595, 609, 659, 662
Freeman, 645
Freud, 278

G

Gāgā Bhaṭṭa, 506, 615
Gaius, 396
Gaṇapati Śāstri, 282, 440, 475
Gangādhara, 443
Gangārām Mahadakār, 438
Garbe, 633
Gauraśiras, 39
Gautama, 30, 34, 35, 155, 191, 200, 202, 203, 295, 296, 375, 651, 654, 657
Geiger, 49, 51
Gelasius, 397
Ghanarāma, 489
Ghiyasuddin Tughlak, 413
Gholam Hussein, 531
Gini, 110, 145
Goetz, 79, 91, 92
Gopāla, 81, 189, 190, 407, 429-430, 514, 521
Gopāla (jurist), 409-410, 515
Govinda Dikshita, 302
Govindachandra, 410, 429
Govindarāja, 410
Gregory the Great, 397
Groot, 198
Grotius, 528
Guizot, 249,
Gumplowicz, 278
Guṇavarman, 388
Guṇaviṣṇu, 156, 202
Guravamiśra, 82
Guru Govind, 97

H

Halāyudha, 409
Halāyudha II, 411
Halhed, 618

Hankins, 110, 145
Hari Kavi, 513
Harinārāyaṇa, 611
Harisimhadeva, 413, 514
Hārita, 191, 627
Harivarman IV, 447
Harrington, 56
Harṣa, 83, 86, 91, 399, 403, 415, 420, 433, 449, 451, 456, 458, 459, 475, 477, 515
Harun-Alrashid, 459, 465
Hastings, 618
Hauer, 198
Haushofer, 74-75, 172, 654
Hegel, 21, 183, 278, 341, 631, 659
Heimann, 49, 206
Hemachandra, 211, 429, 430-432, 657
Hemādri, 195, 398, 399, 403, 412-415, 449, 451, 458, 459, 475, 477, 515, 550, 554, 555, 569, 624
Herder, 511, 577, 631
Hertel, 219
Hesiod, 123
Hillebrandt, 18, 36, 51 ,157, 202, 207, 214-219, 224, 227, 233, 240, 253, 272-275, 280, 290, 302, 322, 353, 356, 358
Hiraṇyakeśin, 191
Hirth, 198
Hitler, 329, 331, 332, 337, 342, 347, 348, 564
Hobbes, 230, 385, 587, 609, 659, 640
Hobhouse, 172, 653
Hocking, 166, 654,
Homer, 123
Hopkins, 259, 260, 308
Huber, 172
Hume, 630
Huntington, 21, 341
Hussain Shah, 467
Hyder, 602

I

Ibn Khaldun, 542
Itsing, 365, 465
Izzul-din- Khalid, 467

J

Jacobi, 222-226, 241-244, 253, 257, 281, 323, 327, 332, 358, 359, 383
Jagannātha Tarkapañcānana, 617, 618, 619, 626, 651, 654
Jahandar Shah, 468
Jahangir, 550
Jai Singh, 468
Jāmadagni, 615,
Janaka, 65, 133
Janet, 21, 631
Jarāsandha, 133
Jaya Indravarman VII. 447
Jayaswal, 78, 221, 282-284
Jellinek, 171
Jesus, 171, 356, 395, 396
Jeva Nath Jotishi, 442
Jimūtavāhana, 408, 410, 611, 625, 626
Jñāneśvara, 469
John of Salisbury, 247
Johnson, 308-313, 356, 358, 359
Jolly, 201, 216, 226-230, 233, 237-238, 241, 255, 258, 274-283, 292-304, 313, 358, 359
Jones, 618
Joseph-Barthélemy, 249, 653
Justinian, 73, 197, 333, 334, 397

K

Kabīr, 469, 470, 472
Kālidāsa, 13, 15, 239, 278, 362, 374, 385, 387, 398, 419, 450, 512
Kalyāna Śivanārāyaṇa, 442
Kamal Pasha, 74
Kamalākara, 615, 616
Kāmandaka, 52, 211, 230, 247, 253, 306, 381-386, 397, 519, 520, 546-548, 579, 652
Kane, 203, 318-319
Kant, 27, 171, 609, 631
Kapila, 461
Kārtyavīrya, 613
Kāśyapa Mātaṅga, 390
Kātyāyana, 370, 403, 515, 548, 612

Kauṭalya, 16, 42, 51, 88, 123, 155, 163, 200, 204, 209-361, 363, 373, 375, 383, 387, 397, 398, 422, 435, 448, 507, 516, 520, 539, 555, 560, 564, 573, 579, 597, 598, 608, 611, 630, 639-641, 651, 654, 657
Kavikaṅkana, 471
Kavīndra Paramānanda, 467, 511-513
Keith, 38, 228, 240, 241, 299-302, 320, 358, 359, 383
Keller, 332
Koellreutter, 166, 654
Kriṣṇa Deva Rāya the Great, 496
Krittivāsa, 469, 481, 490
Kulluka, 610
Kumārajiva, 389
Kusumavichitra, 449
Kutbuddin, 100

L

Lakṣmaṇasena, 411
Lakṣmīdevī, 617
Lakṣmīdhara, 409, 410, 429, 514, 515, 521, 522
Lāmā Tāranātha, 81
Lapouge, 114
Lasbax, 60, 76, 116, 654, 659
Laski, 653
Law (N. N.), 221, 223, 284-286
Le Play, 57, 343
Lecky, 653
Legge, 198
Lenin, 653
Leroy-Beaulieu, 345, 653
Lévi, 156, 157
Lévy-Bruhl, 12, 631
Lewes, 631
Lippmann, 297, 298
Livy, 35
Loria, 23
Louis XIV, 349, 561, 562, 581
Lowie, 343
Lüders, 40-42, 207
Luther, 171
Lycurgus, 123

M

Machiavelli, 16, 52, 214, 230, 231, 258, 300, 301, 320, 322, 361, 363, 385, 574, 609, 639-642, 662
Madanapāla, 538, 610
Mādhava, 50, 412, 478, 522-525, 610.
Mādhava (*Chaṇḍi*), 481
Madhusūdan Bhattāchārya, 410, 414-15, 609
Mahākośala, 65
Mahāvīra, 123, 127, 168-190, 307-208, 304, 395, 430
Maine, 21
Maitreyi, 9
Makkhali Gosala, 186, 187
Mālādhar Basu, 467
Malhār Rām Rāo Chitnis, 566, 581, 600, 602-609, 651, 657
Malik Kafur, 413
Mallinātha, 216, 239
Māloji, 513
Maṇḍana, 475
Mānik Gānguli, 489
Mansur, 459
Manu, 30, 33, 34, 39, 135, 155, 191-194, 200, 242, 259, 260, 276, 295-299, 318, 345, 371-373, 396, 400, 404, 410, 446-449, 507, 514-518, 521, 524, 546-648, 552, 558, 598, 605, 611-613, 627, 630
Martial, 145
Marx, 11, 23, 278, 437, 633
Masaryk, 172, 654
Masson-Oursel, 46-49
Masurākṣa, 312
Matteuzzi, 343
Mawerdi, 542
Mazzini, 172
McDougall, 2
Medhātithi, 307, 404-405, 407, 610
Megasthenes, 214, 217, 227, 228, 238, 239, 248, 254-256, 260-274, 279, 284, 286, 287, 289, 298, 299, 303, 320-327, 544
Meinecke, 563, 654, 661
Méline, 342

Mencius, 35
Merriam, 653
Merz, 631
Meyer (J. J.), 37, 196-203, 281, 288-298, 302, 358
Michel, 653
Mihirakula, 315
Mingti, 390
Mitra (R. C.), 426
Mitra-Miśra, 527, 549-560, 578, 599, 611, 615, 616, 624, 530, 657
Möller van den Bruck, 172
Moggaliputta Tissa, 164
Monahan, 281, 286-288, 303, 359
Mookerji (R. K.), 220
More, 56
Moropant, 511
Mpu Sedah, 450
Muhammad Ghori, 90
Muhammad Shah, 468
Mukerjee (S. C.), 221
Mukundarāma, 481, 483, 490
Mūlavarman, 387
Müller (Max), 17, 20, 21, 36, 192, 249, 351, 456, 633, 634
Mussolini, 341, 347

N

Nāgārjuna, 183, 365, 372
Nāgasena, 164
Nāmadeva, 469
Nānak, 100, 470
Nanda, 211, 215
Nanda Pandita, 615, 616
Nandi, 388
Napoleon, 15
Nārada, 34, 35, 155, 200-203, 242, 296, 299, 370, 371, 397, 403, 438, 515, 519, 522, 612
Nārāyaṇa, 135, 476
Nasir Shah, 467
Niceforo, 663
Nigantha Nāthaputta, 186
Niveditā, 544
Nizamoul Mulk, 542
Nilakantha, 546-549, 558, 611, 615, 616, 657
Novicow, 653

O

Occleve, 247
Oldenberg, 22
Oppert, 527

P

Pakudha Kachchāyana, 186
Palit (Haridas), 114
Pāṇini, 9, 239, 243, 312, 327, 397-399
Paragal Khan, 467
Parāśara, 411, 438, 522-524, 597, 611
Pareto, 23, 24, 109
Pargiter, 242, 260, 259
Parikṣit, 17, 65
Pārśva, 188
Pascal, 562
Paśupati, 438
Patanjali, 38, 191, 283, 289, 461
Patrizi, 247
Philippe le Bel, 573
Philip II, 561, 562
Pierre Du Bois, 573
Plato, 34, 35, 52, 55, 56, 164, 166, 172, 180, 209, 247, 464, 537, 586, 609, 659
Pliny, 35
Polybius, 35
Prakāśadharma Vikramāntavarman I, 446
Pran Nath, 313-317, 360
Pratāpāditya, 488
Pratāparudra, 611
Preuss, 653
Pseudo-Kallisthenes, 464
Ptolemy, 387, 464, 533
Purāṇa Kassapa, 186
Pūrṇavarman, 388
Pythagoras, 171

Q

Quetelet, 1

R

Rabindra Nath Tagore, 7, 492-493

Raffles, 383
Rāghobā, 98, 599
Raghunandana, 408, 410, 611-616, 624-627
Raghunāth (Raghaba), 98, 599
Raghunāth Paṇḍit, 508
Rājakusuma, 449
Rājarāja the Great, 80
Rājendra Chola, 80, 83, 636
Rajwade, 568, 582
Rāma Rājā, 445
Rāmachandra, 67-70, 412
Ramachandrapant, 577-584, 585-592, 593-598, 600, 601, 608
Rāmakriṣṇa, 9, 488, 491-492, 635
Rāmakriṣṇa-Vivekānanda, 494, 635
Rāmānanda, 469
Rāmānuja, 50, 469
Rāmaprasāda, 9, 488, 490
Rāmdās, 500-505, 560-577, 582
Rāmmohun, 98, 99, 398, 533, 545, 600, 602, 608, 613-615 617, 618-630
Ranade, 100, 567, 568, 583, 601
Rāṇī Bhavānī, 9
Ranjit Singh, 9, 17, 97, 98
Rapson, 73, 259
Ratzel, 343
Ray (P. C.), 228, 256, 257
Redanò, 166, 177, 596, 654
Renouvier, 172
Rhys-Davids, 159, 263, 633
Ricardo, 329, 624, 630
Richard, 101
Richelieu, 563
Rin c'en bzanpo, 453, 454
Riṣabha, 188, 430
Rolland (Romain), 110
Roosevelt, 329, 347
Ross, 2, 102
Rousseau, 16
Rudravarman III, 447

S

Śabhāsad, 599
Sainte-Beuve, 10
Śākyasimha (see Buddha), 65, 123, 127, 135, 148-151, 164-183, 185-190, 207, 208, 304, 310, 361, 363, 364, 390, 395, 398, 399
Salim, 541
Salvatore, Cognetti de Martiis, 473
Sambhāji, 513, 565, 566, 570, 571
Sambhāji II, 577
Sambhūtavijaya, 188
Śambhūvarman, 386
Samudragupta, 83, 375
Sanaq, 219
Sanjaya Belaṭṭhiputta, 186, 187, 190
Śaṅkara, 44, 50
Śaṅkha, 370
Śāntideva, 365, 366
Sarkar (B. K.), 220, 245-251, 354-361
Śāstri, (Gaṇapati), 282, 440, 475
Śāstri, (H. P.), 205, 253
Śātavāhana, 252
Satyavarman, 460
Schaeffle, 2
Scherer, 10
Scherger, 653
Schmidt, 279
Schweitzer, 43, 49, 158, 206
Seleukos, 497
Sénart, 17, 36, 71, 175, 352, 353, 634
Seneca, 34, 171, 395, 516
Shah Jahan, 468
Shahu, 600
Shamasastry, 211-213, 216, 221, 232, 282, 283, 303
Simmel, 101, 162, 657, 658
Śivāji, 9, 97, 488, 497-500, 501-513, 560-579, 581, 590, 592, 599, 615, 636
Skandagupta, 497, 569
Small, 2
Smith (Adam), 329, 624, 630
Smith, V., 21, 73, 213, 214, 221, 232-239, 281, 286, 299, 302, 358, 359
Socrates, 171, 172, 177
Solomon, 276
Solon, 123
Somadeva, 75, 377, 420-425, 657
Somanātha, 453

Someśvara, 409, 432-435, 657
Sorokin, 28-36, 633-650, 654, 657, 658
Spann, 51, 249, 653
Spencer, 2
Spinoza, 594
Spengler, 27, 110
Śridhara, 411
Śri Jaya Indravarmadeva V. 447
Śrikara, 405-408, 409, 521, 522
Śri Karaṇa Nandi, 467
Śrikrishna Tarkālaṅkāra, 626
Śrikumāra, 475
St. Augustine, 397
St. Paul, 357, 396
Stalin, 347
Stein (statesman), 342
Stein O, 227, 254-256, 260-272, 274, 279, 287-288, 300, 320, 325-327, 358, 359
Stephen (L.), 631
Stier-Somlo, 595
Sudāsa, 17, 125, 128
Sudhākara Dvivedi, 443
Śūdraka, 374
Śukra, 1, 4, 15-17, 52-58, 247, 382, 556, 579, 598, 607, 630, 652, 667
Śūlapāṇi, 408, 410
Sūtradharamaṇḍana, 442
Sūryavarman II, 449
Śvetaketu, 39
Śyāmācharana, 442

T

Tagore (Rabindranath), 7, 492-493
Taine, 10
Tang Taitsung, 457
Tarde, 2, 95, 162
Tarkālankāra (Śrikrishna), 626
Tarkapanchānana (Jagannātha), 618, 651
Tipu Sultan, 98
Tiruvallu, 372
Thomas, E. D., 40
Thomas, F. W, 243, 244, 259, 281, 313, 358, 359, 415-416
Thucydides, 35, 231
Thurnwald, 57, 343
Todaramalla, 611
Tönnies, 2, 101, 658
Toramāna, 315
Treitschke, 662
Tribonian, 334, 335
Tsin Shi-hwangti, 458
Tukārām, 471
Tulśidās, 471

U

Ulpian, 396
Upāli, 164
Uśanas, 39, 52, 382, 611
Utpala, 462

V

Vāchaspati, 611
Vaidya, 93
Vaiśampāyana, 525, 529, 578, 657
Vallabha, 50
Vallauri, 238, 359
Vallaux, 343
Vālmiki, 356, 396
Van den Bruck, 654
Varāhamihira, 376, 377, 379, 397, 398, 461, 462, 475, 539, 548, 592
Vāsavāchārya, 441
Vaśiṣṭha, 9, 128, 155, 191, 305, 382, 360
Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma, 611
Vasuvandhu Asaṃga, 365
Vātsyāyana, 205, 239, 241, 252, 298, 321, 400
Vattagāmani, 177
Vedavyāsa, 459
Vemana, 471, 472
Vidyāpati, 485-487
Vidyāraṇya, 321
Vidura, 599
Vierkandt, 596
Vijayavarman, 386
Vijayasena, 83
Vijnāneśvara, 408-409, 414, 433, 617, 627, 651

Vikramāṅka, 409, 433
Villari, 231
Virasimhadeva, 549, 550, 616
Viśākhadatta, 374
Viśālākṣa, 39, 611
Viṣṇu, 24, 34, 35, 155, 200, 259, 295, 296, 370, 611, 627, 652
Viṣṇugupta, 211, 215, 277, 253, 291, 312, 356, 361, 448
Viṣṇudas Kavi, 474
Viṣṇu Prasād, 551
Viśvakarmā, 439, 442, 476
Viśvāmitra, 9, 128
Viśvarūpa, 307, 404-405, 407, 414
Viśveśvara, 506, 610, 615
Vitapāla, 82,
Vitteśvara, 460
Vivekānanda, 494, 635
von Glasenapp, 43-45, 207
von Wiese, 2, 101, 162, 596, 655-658
Vyāghra, 460
Vyāsa, 448

W

Wallas, 2
Warren, 159
Watson, 653
Weber (Max), 18, 22, 36, 187, 216, 479, 634
Winternitz, 158, 203, 228, 237, 254-259, 290, 293, 302-304, 320, 357-359, 383
Wilhelm II, 345
William of Orange, 561, 562
William the Conqueror, 80
Williams, E. T. 40
Willoughby, 21
Worms, 11, 57
Wuti, 390

Y

Yājnavalkya, 155, 192, 193, 200, 239, 242, 259, 276, 282, 283, 295, 296, 299, 312, 318, 370, 371, 396, 404-410, 433, 514, 518, 520, 524, 546-548, 552, 558, 612, 616, 617, 627
Yakub Ibn Tarik, 459
Yāska, 142
Yogīśvara, 449, 450
Yogloka, 408
Yuan Chwang, 365, 453, 456, 465
Yule, 645

Z

Zachariae, 216, 217, 219
Zeno, 35, 394
Zimmer, 22, 142

II. Subjects

N.B. The footnotes have not been indexed.

A

A Brihaspati Sūtra, 243
Abhiṣekanāma, 386
Abul Fazl as precursor of Rammohun, 545
Achievements of Rāmdās in Hindu political philosophy, 564, 573, 576
Activism as a Sākyan tenet, 170
Adhyakṣas of Arthāśāstra, 284-286
Administrative divisions of *Arthaśāstra*, 314, 315
Ādnāpatra, 577-589, 598-600, 608
Aeneid, 479
Aesthetics in Hindu literature, 443
Āgamas, 372, 449
Age of Kālidāsa, 362, 372
Ager publicus, 345
Agganna Suttānta, 175
Agni Purāṇas, 401
Agni-Yantrādhikāri, 607
Agnosticism, a Hindu trait, 491
Agricultural, occupation of Brāhmaṇas, 94, politics of modern states and the *Arthaśāstra*, 341-343
Agriculture in the *Arthaśāstra*, 313
Agriculturist extolled, 436
Ain-i-Akbari, 222, 529-545, 549, 611
Aiśvarya, 652, 653
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 60, 103, 130, 133, 149, 156, 390, 451, 466, 551, 572
Akriyāvādins, 189
Alberuni as Moslem indologist, 461-463
Alcuni Osservazioni sull'epoca del Kāmandakiya Nītiśāstra, 385
Al-Madinat-al-Fadila, 247, 539
Altindische Politik, 36, 51, 227, 272, 280, 353
Altindisches Leben, 22
Altindisches Privatrecht bei Megasthenes und Kauṭalya, 324
Ambattha Sūtra, 174
Ambikā-maṇgala, 484
American Political Science Review, 245
Analytical sociology, 651, 654-656, 657
Ānanda-Bhaddekaratta, 168
Ānanda-vanabhūvana, 502-505, 560
Ancient History of China, 198
Ancient India, 80
Āndhras, 76
Anerbenrecht, 342
Aṅgas, 367
Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 246
Anthropology, and law, 196-200, ignored, 206, in its bearings on economics, 346
Antagada-dasāo, 368
Anti-Foreign and Democratic Tendencies, 497
Antiliberal economics, 329, 344
Anti-Machiavel, 563, 659
Anti-Śākyan forces, 186
Anti-traditional elements in Indian thought, 190
Anuttara-vavai-dasāo, 368
Anuyogadvāra, 299, 308
Apadeśa, 253
Apavāda, 334
Apologia of the Prince of Orange, 561
Appamāda, 170
Arab, domination in Europe, 645 science, 459-469
Arabs and Greeks compared to Hindus, 463
Āraṇyakas, 121, 122
Archaic style of the *Arthaśāstra*, 239

Architecture, 440-444, in Tibet, 453-455
Arhat, 369, 394
Ārogyadāna, 412
Arrogance as injurious to sociology, 621
Art in India, not exclusively ideational, 641-643
Artha, 5, 38, 45, 47, 55, 63, 64, 155, 172, 190, 229, 242, 336, 352, 366, 418, 605, 632, 650
Artha-Purāṇaśāstra, 447
Arthaśāstra, 195, 196, as a comprehensive document of Hindu polity, 335, as document of planned economy, 329, not condemned by the *Ṛṣis*, 295, not younger than *Dharmaśāstra*, 294, the non-Kauṭalyan hand in, 354-356, the question, 209-361, the work of one person, 290
Arthaśāstra und Dharmaśāstra, 227, 233
Arthaśāstras, 203-204, in "formal" sociology, 654-657
Artificial gold, 256
Arts and crafts in Hindu culture, 436-444, 475-477, 632
"Aryanism" of Kauṭalya, 323, 333
Aryanization, 105-108, 110-114, 134-135, 144-149
Asankhata Samyutta, 169
Ascetic writings only a part of Hindu literature, 44
Asia, and Hindu colonies, 60, 77 under Hindu positivism, 386-394, 444-465
Asian domination in Europe, 645-647
Assalāyana Sūtra, 176
Assimilation of races, 140-144, 149
Aṣṭāvimśatitattva, 611-615, 624
Astronomy in Moslem Asia, 461
Aśvamedha, 64
Aśvaśāstra, 378
Atharva Veda, 105, 120, 121, 130-133, 141, 147-149, 229, 278, 283, 337, 352, 437, 474, 543, in Persian, 468
Ātmastūti, 307
Aurangyā pāpi, 562, 575
Authorship of the *Arthaśāstra*, 209-361
Authorities, of Abul Fazl, 537-540, of Chandeśvara, 519, of Chitnis, 605-606, of Mitra-Miśrā, 549-551, 558, of Nilakantha, 546-548, of Parāsara, 523, of Raghunandana, 613
Autolimitation, 171
Avatāras, as political deliverers, 494-496
Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna, 362
Āyurveda, 195, 196, 378, 400, 434, 455, 634

B

Back to Hindu tradition, 498
Bacon appreciated by Rammohun, 619
Bākhār, 599
Bali, 448
Bāra-māsyā, 481
Bārhaspatya-Sūtram, 415
Battle of Kurukṣetra, 65
Baudhāyanasūtra, 290
Bauernstand emphasized by Hitler, 342
Beiträge zur indischen Lexikographie, 216
Bengal Hurkaru, 625
Bengal's social economy, 112
Bengali, jurists, 408, 410, 611-615, 617, positivism, 478-494, sociologist of the sixteenth century, 611-615
"Between-men" relations, 650-658
Bevölkerungsfragen, 145
Bhaddekaratta, 168
Bhagavad-bhāskara, 546
Bhagavanta-bhāskara, 616
Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 467

Bhakti, 100, 306, 469-471, 488, 489, 493, 499
Bhāraśivas, 78
Bhāratah Khaṇḍah, 417
Bhārata-Yuddha, 450
Bhāsyas, 404, 408
Bhavisya Purāṇa, 194, 375, 504
Bhūvanapradīpa, 476
Bibliotheca Indica Series, 412
Biographical History of Philosophy, 631
Boke named the Governour, 247
Bodhisattva, 366-367
Bonifica integrale of Mussolini, 341
Borneo, 387
Boswellism in the *Arthaśāstra*, 356
Brahmajāla-sutta, 174
Brāhmaṇa, agriculturists, 94, intellectuals vs. Christian missionaries, 620
Brāhmaṇas, 121, 122, 369
Brāhmanization, 146, 149
Brāhmaṇasarvasva, 411
Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, 448
Brahmasiddhānta, 459, 460
Brahmunical Magazine, 622
Brief Remarks regarding Modern Encroachments on the Ancient Rights of Females, 625
Brihadāraṇyaka Upaniṣat, 39
Brihaddevatā, 141, 318
Brihat Samhitā, 308, 376, 377, 379, 386, 461
British, German, Indian and Italian Kauṭalyalogists, 281-282
British Kauṭalyalogists in two camps, 359
bs. Tangyar, 452
Buddha completed by Kauṭalya, 361
Buddhacharita, 310, 311, as the *New Testament*, 396
Buddhas Stellung zur Kultur, 43
Buddhism, two categories of, 182-183, in Brihaspati 419, in Sanskrit, 364-366, in translations, 159, of Folk-Bengal, 489, proper, 161, 364
Buddhist, humanism, 161-162, Pali texts, 177-180, secularism, 160
Buddhistic Studies, 159
Building materials in Maurya India, 264
Burma Indianized, 444

C

Caesaro-Papist, 83
Calcutta Review, 228, 254, 284, 300
Calcutta School, 220-222
Cambodia Indianized, 444-445
Cambridge History of India, 244, 259, 260, 281
Canon, Buddhist, 177-180
Caste restrictions a legal fiction, 106
Catalogus Catalogorum, 4, 378, 426
Central Asia under Hindu positivism, 390, 394
Chaityas in Tibet, 389
Chaityasamvibhāga, 452
Chakkavatti, 155
Chakkavatti Sihanāda Suttānta, 175
Challenge to traditional indology 27, 51
Chālukya Empire, 79
Champā, 386, 447
Chāṇakya-nitiśāstra, 312
Chaṇḍī-Maṅgala, 471
Chandragupta above Justinian, 333
Changnan an Indian centre in China, 390-392
Chankisutta, 176
Charaiveti, 60, 103, 110, 149, 184, 390, 451, 459, 465, 466, 469, 572
Charaka in Persian, 459
Chraka Samhitā, 308
Charities in Hindu culture, 412-413
Chāturanta, 155, 573
Chaturvarga, 632, 650
Chaturvarga-Chintāmani, 412, 550
Chaturvimśatimata, 405
Chemical and metallurgical knowledge in *Arthaśāstra*, 297
Chemikerzeitung, 297
Chemistry of the Hindus, 228, 256-258

Chhāndogya-mantra-bhāṣya, 156, 202
Chhāndogya Upaniṣad, 174
China Indianized, 389-394
Chīnas, 284.
Chinese Political Thought, 40
Chinese Religion through Hindu Eyes, 28, 40, 79, 161, 168, 185
Chips from a German Workshop, 17
Chitralakṣaṇa, 444
Chola Empire, 80, 399
Chou-li, 400
Christianity *vis-à-vis* Hinduism, 619-623
Chronological distance between India and Eur-America, 592
Chullavagga as a law-book, 173
City of God, 397
Climate as alleged determinant in Hindu polity, 340, 343
Code, 397
Code Napoleon, 197
Collegian, 8
Colonies of the Hindus, 42, 46, 59-62, 386-394, 444-465
Commercial classes in India, 41
Comparative, historiography, 581, 598, methodology, wrong and correct, 621
Compilation, and originality in the *Arthaśāstra*, 292
Concremation, 614, 628, 629
Conflicts in Kauṭalyalogy, 358, 359
Considerations sur l'état présent du corps politique de l'Europe, 595
Constants, and variables, 336-338, in world-evolution, 658-666
Constitutional achievement of Hitler, 332
Contemporary Sociological Theories 28, 33, 634, 658
Contents of Mārāthi treatises on politics, 577-580, 602-605
Corals in the *Arthaśāstra*, 316
Corpus juris, 331
Correlation not demonstrable between climate and economic structure, 343
Cours de Philosophie Positive, 1
Credit Agricole of Méline and the *Arthaśāstra*, 342
Criminology in Pali literature, 173, 175, 176
Culture, contacts, 101-114, 499, pluralistic, 205

D

Daftar literature, 600-602
Dalail-i-Firuz-Shahi, 467
Dāna, section of *Chaturvarga-chintāmaṇi*, 412
Dāna-Khaṇḍa, 195
Dānasāgara, 411
Daṇḍa, 353
Daṇḍanīti, 415, 426
Darśanas, 400
Das altindische Buch von Welt-und Staatsleben, 288
Das Grundeigentum in Indien, 324
Das Panchatantra, 219
Das politische Testament, 563, 659
Das religiöse Erlebnis auf den unteren Stufen, 198
Das Weib im altindischen Epic, 288
Dāsabodha, 500-502, 564
Daśakumāracharita, 211, 215, 227, 385
Dasāos, 367, 368
Date of the *Arthaśāstra*, 209-361
Date of Hindu law books, 200
Dawn Society, as inspirer of researches in indology, 221
Dāyabhāga, 408, 620, 628
Dāyatattva, 625
De Monarchia, 574
De Ortu et Fine Romani Imperii, 73
De Recuperatione Terre Sancte, 573
Deccani atmosphere, 436
Decline of mankind, 110
Defects, of Indian Kautalyalogists, 360, 361, of Mādhavāchārya, 524, of Mārāṭhās and Moghuls, 589-

592, of Western scholarship, 619-623
Democracy eternal in Hindu thought, 471-475
Democratic, elements in Vedic polity, 128, 129, 130, 131, tendencies of the Mārāthās, 499
Democratization of the *Gītā*, 469
Der Orient und Wir, 40
Der Untergang des Abendlandes, 110
Der wahre Staat, 249
Deutsche Rundschau, 246
Dhamma, 164, 176, 310
Dhammapada, 170, 189
Dhanurveda, 195, 196, 528
Dharma, 5, 38, 39, 45, 63, 155, 176, 190, 242, 336, 352, 353, 361, 497, 566-569, 570-574, 579, 580-584, 612, 632, 644, 650, 651, 662
Dharma-Pūjāpaddhati, 489
Dharma-rājya, 498, 504
Dharmaratna, 410
Dharmaśāstra, 53, 277, 370, 371, 376, 387, 401, 447
Dharmaśāstra in "formal" sociology, 654-657
Dharmaśāstra and Arthaśāstra, 258
Dharmasūtra, 191-196, 305
Diaries, 599-602
De Clementia, 395
Die Elemente der Staatskunst, 249
Die Gestaltung der Wirtschaftsentwicklung, 57
Die indoarische Gesellschaftsordnung, 49
Die Gesellschaftsordnung, 114
Die Lehre von den sozialen Beziehungen, 655
Die sociale Gleiderung im nordöstlichen Indien, 159
Die Weltanschauung der indischen Denker, 43, 49, 158, 206
Dietary of Bengal, 485
Differential fertility, 113
Digest, 197, 397
Digvijaya, 15, 86, 362, 623, of Hindu culture under the Mārāthās, 572
Dipavaṃśa, 363
Diplomacy of the Mārāthās, 580
Discourses on the First Ten Years of Livy's History of Rome, 640, 641
Discrepancies between Kauṭalya and Megasthenes not important, 270-272, 327
Disruptions in world-history, 72-73, 87-88, 95
Diversities, in Hindu culture, 664-666, in positivism, 10-12, in sociology, 1-3, in Vedic culture, 122-124, 131-135
Divine Comedy, 480, 574
Divine, incarnations in Dutch legends 560, right of kings unintelligible in India, 397
Doctrine, of action, 189, of *dharma mūlam jagat*, 417, of *maṇḍala*, 102, 237, 250, 293, 303, 405-407, 547, 553, 573, 594, of *mātsyanyāya*, 537, of *pauruṣa*, 415, 421, of *rājya* as *dharmārthaphala*, 424-425, of superior races challenged, 621, of universal monarchy, 395
Documents, of Hindu positivism, 12-17, 400-403, of materialism ignored by traditional indologists, 634-635
Domesday Record, 80
Domestic rites, 132
Domination, desire for, 664
Doses of economic freedom in *Arthaśāstra*, 350
Dramas and positivism, 374
Droit Public Français, 271
Dualism, in Hindu culture, 664, in sociology acceptable, 23-27
Duce-states, 659
Dukanipāta, 176
Durgā=Motherland, 494
Dutch and Mārāthā situations, 560, 561, 562
Dvādaśarājamaṇḍala, 547

Dynamics and statics in social affairs, 662
Dynastic origins, 104

E

Early History of Bengal, 281, 286
Early History of India, 216, 221, 232, 239
East and West in sociology, 35, 62, 91, 275, 345-349, 451, 396, 560-563, 581, 591, 592, 619-623
Eastern Hūna in the Arthaśāstra, 315
Economic Condition of Ancient India, 159
Economic Journal, 159
Economic, planning in the *Arthaśāstra*, 329, 339, 346-350, superiority and arrogance, 621
Economics, and finance in the *Arthaśāstra*, 211-213, and politics ignored by historians of Indian philosophy, 631-632, 638-639, in Raghunandana, 612
Economist of modern India, first, 624
Economy not a function of climate, 340
Edicts of Aśoka, 176
Education, in Hindu culture, 8-9, universal in Pali literature, 175
Eine neue indische Rechtsquelle, 275
Eigenart des indischen Denkens, 650
Eightfold path, 169
El-Akham es-Soulthaniyah, 542
Elephant-lore in the *Ain-i-Akbari*, 540
Elites in social organization, 108
Empire of Vijayanagara, 96
Energism in Bengali culture, 482
England's Treasure by Foraign Trade, 345
English Thought in the Nineteenth Century, 631
Enlightened despots, 347
Epochs of Hindu history, 82-84, 86-88, 91
Essay on the Right of the Hindus over Ancestral Property, 625
Esukari Sutta, 176
Ethics in Vedic culture, 156-158
Eugenics and hybrids, 114
Eur-America's distance from India, 592
Europe, and India in disruptions, 72-73, 87-88, ruled by foreign invaders, 645-646, under Saracens and Mongols, 91
European, Kautalyalogists in two camps, 358, 359, traders, 588, exploited against European by non-European, 77, in Mārāthā thought, 588-592
Evolution of positivism, 564, 580
Expansion, of Asia, 77, of Hindu culture, 623, of India (see colonies, Greater India), of political science by the Mārāthās, 564, 573, 576, 588
Extra-Indian, parallels to Indian conditions, 341-343, races and Indian society, 107-108, regions of Hindu culture (see colonies), 60-62

F

Fable-collections, 51
Fallacies, of indologists, 49-51, 72-74, 230, 235-237, 351-353, 634, 644, of Müller, Sénart and Weber, 17, 36, of orientalists, 35, of Sénart and Bouglé, 644, of sociologists, 644, of Sorokin, 633-650
Famines in Chandragupta's time, 331
Far East under Hindu positivism, 389-394
Fascist, economics, 329, Italy and the *Arthaśāstra*, 342, Italy not anticipated by previous despots, 659
Fatawae 'Alamgiri, 629
Festivals in Bengal, 664
Fichte *vis-à-vis* Rāmachandrapant, 584-585

Finances and Economics in the *Arthaśāstra*, 211-213
Finanzverwaltung und Wirtschaftsführung, 324
Fire-arms in *Śukranīti* and Chitnis, 607
Flexibility of Hindu mind, 661
Folk-Element in Hindu Culture, 19, 168
Folk-elements, in Hindu civilization, 107, in Vedic society, 120, 141
Folk-life of Bengal, 480
Foreign politics, of Mādhava, 524 of Mitra-Miśra, 556
"Formal" sociology, 651, 654-657
Fortification of Pāṭaliputra, 262,
Frederick the Great's peer in India, 563
Freedom served by the Mārāthās, 582
French finance, 345
From Gerson to Grotius, 640
Führer-staaten, 659
Futurism of Young Asia, 21, 29, 43, 51, 634, 635
Fürsorgestaat, 330, 338, 348

G

Gajaśāstra, 378
Gambhirā, 664
Gāndhāra, 72, 77
Gāndharvaveda, 195, 196
Ganeśa saluted by Somadeva, 424
Gedanken und Erinnerungen, 299
Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft, 2, 657
Gentoo Code, 618
Geographical, data of the *Arthaśāstra*, 314, interpretation of history, 57, 341
Geopolitik, 74, 101, 341, 510, 571, 609, 611
German, Kauṭalyalogy, 358, 359, romanticists, and indology, 275
German Translation of the Kauṭilyan Arthaśāstra, 325
Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssociologie, 18, 22
Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie, 631
Geschichte der indischen Literatur, 203, 254
Gihivinaya, 175
Giornale degli Economisti e Rivista di Statistica, 245
Gītā, 372, 396, 469, 627, in Moslem Asia, 461, 464, in Persian, 468
Gl'Indiani e la loro scienza politica, 385
Gods, invented by creative India 490-491, not prominent, 369 subordinate in Vedic thought, 132
Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, 141
Gosplan, 329, 346
Gosūtra, 438
Gouvernement de la France, 249
Governance of England, 247
"Great examplars" in Hindu religion, 489
Greater, Asia, 77, India, 59-62, 366, 389-394, 444-465
Greatest Hindu of all ages, Śivāji, 579
Grihya-sūtras, 53, 191
Guge, a centre of Indian culture in Tibet, 453
Gumphug, a centre of Indian culture in Tibet, 455
Guṇas in Hindu politics, 547
Gupta, Empire, 79, period, for Kauṭalya, 313
Gurjara-Pratihāras, 85

H

Hanoverian contemporaries of Mārāthās, 586
Haṛalatā, 411
Harappa, 118
'Harijans' of the Hindu society, 113
Harivaṃśa, 613
Harṣacharita, 433
"Hat-wearers" in Mārāthā politics, 588, 589
Hegel to Huntington, 341
Herder and Fichte *vis-à-vis* Rāmdās, 577

Hidaya, 629
Himalayan region in the *Arthaśāstra*, 284, 319
Hinayāna, 372
Hindi humanism, 469-471
Hindu Administrative Institutions, 323
Hindu, as creator of divinities, 489-494
Hindu culture in Pali, 166-168
Hindu mathematics in Moslem Asia, 461-462
Hindu-Moslem, cultural fusion, 545, efficiency, 623
Hindu Politics in Italian, 36, 249, 293
Hindu Polity, 282
Hindu positivism, as a civilizing force in Asia, 389-394, 444-465, cry for, 27, in *Ain-i-Akbari*, 524-545, recognized, 27-29, 36-40, 40-45, 46-49, 158, through the ages, 580
Hindu Rājaniti, 401, 402, 609
Hindu view of life, true and false, 637, 650
Hinduism not polytheism according to Abul Fazl and Alberuni, 464, 544
Hinduization, 113
Hinduized Moslem, 506
Hindwi Swarājya, 197, 498, 507, 562, 571, 575, 579, 581, 583
Hiraṇyakeśi Grihyasūtra, 38
Histoire de la philosophie, 631
Histoire de la philosophie moderne en France, 631
Histoire de la science politique, 631
Histoire du Commerce entre le Levant et l'Europe, 77
Histoire du Droit Public Français, 345
Historians of philosophy, Western and Indian, 631-632, 638-639
Historical Geography of Europe, 645
Historical method, wrong and correct, 581, 598
History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century, 631
History of India, 56
History of Representative Institutions in Europe, 249
History of Sanskrit Literature, 20, 38, 228
History of the Dharmaśāstras, 203
History *vs.* philosophy in the *Arthaśāstra*, 251
Hitopadeśa, 215
Homeric chronology, 123
House-building, 440-444, 475
Householder's duties, 175
Humanism, in Hindu art, 641-643, of Chaṇḍidāsa, 485
Hun milieu of the *Arthaśāstra*, 315
Hybrids as culture-bearers, 114

I

I Primi Principi della Politica secondo Kāmandaki, 385
Ich-Einzig-Wahn, 596
Idea of a Patriot King, 586
Idealism, ancient and modern, 166, not dominant in Vedic literature, 277, not the only force, 396
Ideals in the *Arthaśāstra*, 236
"Ideas of 1905," 609
Ideational, and sensate in human culture, 648-650, elements in Hindu culture over-emphasized by traditional indologists, 634-635
Idee der Staatsräson, 662
Il I Adhikarana dell'Arthaśāstra di Kauṭilya, 238
Imperialism, old and new, 659-660
Imperial Gazetteer of Moghul India, 530
India as school of Asia, 84
India what can it teach us? 17,20
Indian Antiquary, 211, 221, 238, 314
Indian, colonies in Asia, 389-394, Kauṭalyalogists in two camps, 360
Indian Historical Quarterly, 249, 322, 325

Indian Medicinal Plants, 220
Indian tradition, about the *Arthaśāstra*, 215, 244, 289, as starting-point, 324, unproven, 354, unshaken, 357
Indianizing of Tibet, 451
Indika, 213, 221, 238, 248, 255, 261-272, 286, 287, 288, 299
Indische Alterthumskunde, 187
Indo-German equations in statesmanship, 332
Indo-Saracenic renaissance, 506
Indologists, Indian and Eur-American, 636-637
Indology secularized, 27-29, 36-40, 40-45, 46-49
Indology traditional, 206-207, challenged by Meyer, 197
Indonesian literature, 448
Indus Valley, 116
Industrial revolution, retarded in India, 592
Innenkolonisationspolitik, 342
Institutes, 397
Insulindian literature, 388
International Journal of Ethics, 245, 621
Internationalism in Hindu culture, 101-102, 107
Internationalism unreal, 74-76
International, perspectives of Vaiśampāyana, 525, politics in the *Rājanītiprakāśa*, 557
Inventions and discoveries of modern times, 590-592
Iron Chancellor of Kaiser Chandragupta, 335
Is the Arthaśāstra secular? 322
Islam, as a power in India, 88, under Hindu positivism, 459-464, *vis-à-vis* Christianity, 619-623
Iśopaniṣat, 614
Italian Kauṭalyalogy, 359
Iti Baudhāyanah, 290
Iti Kauṭalyah, 218, 224, 273, 290, 292, 302, 306-307, 321, 355, 435, 520

J

Jahrbuch der Schopenhauer-Gesellschaft, 43
Jaina politics, 420-425, 430-432
Jaina positivism, 367-369
Jainism and Buddhism, 186-191
Jambukhandaka Samyutta, 169
Janapada, in the *Arthaśāstra*, 314
Japan and Europe, 78
Jātakamālā, 308, 311
Jātakas, 45, 65, 164, 186, 259, 308, 363, 460
Java, 448
Javadvīpa, 387
Jenseits der Grossmächte, 172
Joasaph and Barlaam, 460
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 308, 340
Jurisprudence in India and Europe, 396
Jurists, 370-371, 404, 415, of the eighteenth century, 617-618, of Later Middle Ages, 610-611, of the seventeenth century, 615
Jury in India, 628
Jyotiṣa-Vedānga, 243

K

Kabul Valley, 89
Kādambari, 215
Kālaviveka, 410
Kāli Songs, 491
Kālikā Purāṇa, 551
Kaliyuga, 562, 565, 575
Kalpataru on positive sciences, 195
Kāma, 5, 38, 45, 190, 229, 352, 632, 650
Kāmadhenu, 409
Kāmandakiniti, 211, 215, 216, 217, 225-226, 253, 274, 305, 308, 372, 381-386, 399, 519
Kāmaśāstras, 205
Kāmasūtra, 239, 241, 252, 277, 278, 298, 299, 304, 305, 308, 320, 321, 400, 468
Kāmboja, 386

Kāpālika, 420
Karaṇatilaka, 462
Kathāsaritsāgara, 164, 215, 368
Kathāvatthu, 164
Kauṭalya, and Vātsyāyana, 298, as chancellor of Chandragupta, 327 completes Buddha, 361, interpreted by a Boswell, 356, on forts objective but theoretical, 267
Kauṭalya=Tribonian, 333
Kauṭalya and Machiavelli, 322
Kauṭalyadarśanam, 249, 304
Kauṭalya-Studien, 37, 313
Kauṭalyalogy, after thirty years, 354, and Indian swarajists, 280, in British, German, Indian and Italian scholarship, 281-282, problems in, 209-361
Kauṭalyan tradition eternal in India, 322, 608
Kauṭalyanism of Somadeva, 422
Kauṭilya, a title of honour, 290
Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra, 228
Kauṭilyaśāstram, 216
Kavikaṅkana-Chaṇḍi, 480, 481, 484
Kāvyālaṁkāravritti, 383
Kawi literature of Bali, 384
Kawi-Rāmāyaṇa, 449
Kāyastha-dharma-dipa, 615
Kāyasthas in Chaṇḍeśvara, 520
Khālsā polity, 97
Khayal-alkusufaini, 461
Khaṇḍa-Khādyaka, 459
Khatima, 531, 532
Khattavijjā, 174, 311
Khuddaka Nipāta, 170
Kingdom of God as *Hindwi Swarājya*, 579
Kingship secular in Vedic polity, 151-155
Kleinstaaterei, 291-293
Koranic gospel, 464
Kraya-nirṇaya, 612
Kṛiṣisaṁgraha, 438
Kriyāvāda, 189
Kultur-Sprach-und Literarhistorisches aus dem Kautiliya, 225
Kūpādijalasthānalakṣaṇa, 477
Kurāl, 372, 396, 471, 501
Kurukṣetra, Battle of, 65
Kūṭadaṇḍa Sutta, 174

L

La Cité Antique, 22, 198
La France ira-t-elle à un Troisième Empire? 659
La Géographie Humaine, 57
La Race Française et la nouvelle conception du Mot Race, 145
La Sociologie, 57
Laghu Arhanniti, 429-432, in "formal" sociology, 657
Laghusamvara-tantra, 453
Lakkhana Suttānta, 175
Lalitavistara, 189, 365
Lamaism, 456
Land-tenure in the *Arthaśāstra*, 313
Laṅkāvatārasūtra, 308, 312
L'Année Sociologique, 644
Law, and anthropology, 196-200, of the Hindus, 370, 371, secular in Hindu culture, 196-197
Law-books of Java, 449
Le Legende du Bouddha, 175
Le Teorie Sociologiche, 2
Le Theatre Chinois, 457
Legal, and political ideas of Rammohun, 624-630, fiction of caste restrictions, 106, institutions, 396, 404-415, literature in Pali, 173-176, literature of the Hindus, 196-203, literature of the later Middle Ages, 610-611
Les Castes dans l'Inde, 352
Les Séléctions Sociales, 114
Les six livres de la République, 249, 345, 587
Les Systèmes Socialists, 109
Letter of Rāmdās, 566
Leviathan, 587
Lexikalisches aus dem Kautilya, 226
Life-Affirming in Hindu culture, 43
Li-king, 400
L'Inde Antique et la Civilisation Indienne, 46

L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas, 319
Linguistic nationalism of Sivāji, 506-511
Litai san paoki, 458
Literarisches aus dem Kauṭiliya-śāstra, 219
Lo stato etico, 596
Logic of the fish, 537
Loharatnākara, 437
Lohāsura, 68
Lohicheha Sutta, 175
Lokāyatika, 420
Lotsava, 453
Love in Hindu Literature, 480
Lower classes in Hindu society, 102, 140-145, 499
Loyang, an Indian centre in China, 391, 457

M

Maasir-ul-Umara, 541
Macedonian army expelled, 323
Machiavellism in Hindu thought, 214, 639-641
Machine-construction in Hindu literature, 441
Madagascar to Tonkin, 46
Madanapārijāta, 610
Magadha (Chandragupta)=Prussia (Hitler), 332
Magga Samyutta, 170
Magic in law, 198
Mahābhārata, 64, 155, 164, 191, 194, 283, 292, 337, 350, 372, 376, 387, 388, 400, 402, 505, 543, 545, 584, 599, 605, 613, in Persian, 468 politics later than *Arthaśāstra*, 296
Mahābhāsya, 191
Mahādukkha Khandha Sutta, 175
Mahāgovinda Suttānta, 175
Mahākaccaṇa Bhaddekaratta, 168
Mahānidāna Suttānta, 175
Mahāparinibbāna Suttānta, 175
Mahārāṣtra and Prussia, 53
Mahārāṣtra dharma bārhwāwā, 560-577, 582
Mahāsudassana Suttānta, 175
Mahāvagga, 173, 337
Mahāvaṃśa, 363
Mahāyānism as Buddhism proper, 161, 388, 454
Maithili-Bengali humanism, 486
Majima-ul Bahrain, 468
Majjhima Nikāya, 168, 176, 186
Mālatimādhava, 383
Malaya Peninsula, 388
Mal-observation and non-observation in Megasthenes, 269
Malwa Empire, as the state of the *Arthaśāstra*, 315
Man apotheosized by Chaṇḍidāsa, 485
Mānasollāsa, 409, 432-436, 657
Mānava Dharma Śāstra, 78
Mānavala-Nārāyaṇa Śatakam, 436
Maṇḍala, 102, 237, 250, 293, 303, 547, 553, 573, 594
Maṇimālā, 401
Maṇimekhalāi, 372
Maṇiparikṣā, 437
Manliness in Hindu positivism, 415, 421, 422, 584
Manu Saṃhitā, 56, 58, 202, 307, 308, 318, 372, 446, 498, 538, 545, 585, in Moslem Asia, 462
Manusyālaya-chandrikā, 476
Mārāthā, achievements *vis-à-vis* world-culture, 581, 582, and Dutch politics, 560, 561, 562, atmosphere, 436, contributions to freedom and progress, 582, Empire, 494-495, jurist, 615-617, masses and classes, 505, positivism, 497
Marathi, *Diaries* and *Nītiśāstras*, 601, humanism, 469, political treatises, 651, *Rājanīti*, 600-609, rescued from Persianization, 511
Marriages, *Anuloma* and *Pratiloma*, 106
Mass movements in Vedic India, 128, 129, 130, 131
Materialism, in Buddhist thought, 159-160, in Hindu culture, 275, 290, in Vedic culture, 125-127, 278, 352

Mathematics in Moslem Asia, 461
Mātsyanyāya, 155
Matsya Purāṇa, 374, 444, 449, 487, 613
Mātugāma-Samyutta, 169
Maurya, Empire, 71, milieu of the *Arthaśāstra*, 244, officials, 284-286
Mauryan Polity, 286, 320
Mayamata, 440
Mc'odrten, 452
Medical, relief in Hindu literature, 434, treatises in Tibet, 455
Medicine in Moslem Asia, 459-460
Megasthenes in agreement with Kauṭalya, 325
Megasthenes Question, 298
Megasthenes und Kautilya, 227, 254-255, 261-272, 278, 300, 325
Meghadūta, 419
Meiji era in Japan, 592
Melting-pot of races, 145
Memoirs of Prince Salim, 541
Merchants, extolled, 436, protection of, 587
Mercury in Hindu metallurgy, 256
Metabolism in Hindu society, 499, 599
Metallurgy of the Hindus, 228, 321
Metals in Hindu literature, 437
Metaphysics and religion over-emphasized by Max Müller, 351
Milindapanha, 164
Militarism in Vedic India, 127-129
Military literature, 525-528
Mīmāmsā, 619
Mirat-i-Ahmadi, 531
Misinterpretations of Hindu thought by traditional indologists, 634-637
Missionaries under challenge, 621
Mitākṣarā, 192, 407, 409, 412, 433, 521, 617, 627, 628, 651
Mitra-Miśa, as a peer of Rāmdās, 557, *vs.* Nilakaṇṭha, 549, 558
Model City, 247, 539, 542
Modern, Indian languages and positivism, 469, political philosophy not anticipated by Hindus and Europeans, 660
Modernism, in the Peshwa's Diaries, 600-602, of Mitra-Miśra, 549
Moghul-Mārāthā weakness, 589-592
Mohenjo Daro, 63, 67, 116-118, 124-647
Mokaddemah, 542
Mokṣa, 5, 632, 650
Mongol domination in Europe, 645
Monism, a fallacy of orientalists 35, 40
Monopolies in the *Arthaśāstra*, 339
Morality in *Rig Veda*, 158
Morals and Manners, in Brihaspati, 419-420, in *Nītivākyāmrita*, 423, 424, in Vaiśampāyana, 526, of the conventional standard, 483
Moslem, Asia under Hindu positivism, 459-464, Bengal 482-483, defective as Hindu, 591-592, expansion, 88, 96, influence on Mārāthās, 505, *milieu* and the Purāṇas, 477, 478, *vis-à-vis* Mārāthā, 565
Moslemized Hindu, 506
Mother Goddess, 63, 494
Mother India in Tagore, 492-493
Mudrārākṣasa, 216, 291, 308
Multiracial culture in Vedic India, 122-124, 131-135
Mussalmans Hinduized, 466
Mysore Review, 213, 221, 232, 238

N

Nal Daman, 543
Nandisūtra, 211, 299, 308
Nanking, an Indian centre in China, 393
Napoleons of India ignored by traditional indologists, 636
Nārada Smriti, 326, 371, 521
Nāradiya Dharmaśāstra, 447
Nationalism and historical research, 280-281

Nationality, principles absent in East and West, 90, question, 510
Naukādhipati, 607
Nāvaśāstram, 441
Nazi, Germany not anticipated by Frederick the Great, 659, legislation, 342, regime, 332, 348, state, 331
Neo—, absolutism, 659, Confucianism through Hindu culture, 458, Tantrism, 494
New, categories in Hindu politics, 564, 673, 576, Deal, 329, era for Hindu culture, 623, indology, 27-29, 36-40, 40-49, 274-290, sociology, 657
New Testament, 396
Nibandha, 169, 405, 409, 414, 426, 555, 557, 581, 606, 629
Nibelungenlied, 323
Nikāyas, 166, 173, 248, 255
Nirukta, 142
Nirṇaya Sindhu, 616
Nirvāṇa, 176
Nīti, 172, 217-219, 336, 355, 366, 373, 374, 414, 418, 605
Nīti und Mudrārākṣasa, 218
Nitikautilya, 311
Nitimayūkha, 546-549, in "formal" sociology, 657
Nītiprakāśikā, 525-529, 657
Nītipraya, 448
Nītiśāstra, 52-56, 102, 107, 114-115, 156, 381, 382, 401, 430, 498, 512, 529, 546, 578, 584, 587, 593-599, 601, 605, Persianized, 536, in *Daftar* literature, 601
Nītivākyāmrita, 75, 212, 308, 377, 420-425, 432, in "analytical" sociology, 657
No magic, no ritual, 198
Non-, Indian ideals, 317, Kauṭalyan hand in the *Arthaśāstra*, 354, Sākyan thought, 187, Vedic *Upaniṣad*, 148
Note sur le droit et la caste en Inde 644
Nyāya, 634

O

O rois, vous êtes des dieux, 562
Oceana, 56
Officials in Maurya India, 286
Old masters in Hindu culture, 205-208
Oriental positivism, 40
Origin, of castes not indicated in *Puruṣa-Sūkta*, 135-138, of dynasties, 104
Origine du nom de China, 319
Oriyā texts on architecture, 476
Orphans as co-sharers of royal revenue, 405, 430, 521
Ottoman Turks in Europe, 646
Oxford History of India, 238

P

Pādapavivakṣā, 438
Padāvalī, 485
Pāla Kingdom, 81
Pāli canon, secular elements in, 164
Pāli literature, 177-180
Panchasiddhāntikā, 462
Panchatantra, 212, 215, 299, 308, 368
Panchāyet, 628
Pandit-Statesmen in India, 255, 256, 291, 302, 309, 321, 328
Paradise Lost, 480
Parāsara Samhitā, 522-525
Parāsara Smriti, 94
Pariar extolled, 471, 472
Paribbājakas, 174
Pariṣats, 185
Pariśiṣṭaparvan, 215
Parties in Kauṭalyalogy, 358, 359
Pāṭaliputra not mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra*, 265
Patanjali in Moslem Asia, 462
Patriarcha, 562
Paṭṭhapāda Sutta, 174
Pax Sārvabhaumica, 95, 395, 574
Pearl fishing in the *Arthaśāstra*, 316
Pedagogy of the Hindus, 8
Pensées, 562

Pensiero e Azione nell' India antica, 230
Pentarchy in India, 93
Persian translations of Sanskrit works, 468, 543
Persianized *Nitiśāstra*, 536
"Philosopher-King" 586
Philosophical elements in the *Arthaśāstra*, 235, 247, 251, 293, 304
Philosophie Positive, 11
Philosophy and Political Economy, 631
Philosophy, in politics, 598, Indian and Western 637, *vs.* history in the *Arthaśāstra*, 251
Physical sciences, 195
Pious wishes and *Realpolitik*, 251
Piṭakas, 177-180, 363, *vis-à-vis Upaniṣads* and *Darśanas* 163
Planwirtschaft in the *Arthaśāstra*, 333
Planned economy, in the *Arthaśāstra* 329, old and new, 343
Pluralism, in Hindu thought, 636-638, in sociology, 635, 636, 637, 649, 650, of Brihaspati, 418
Pluralistic universe in Indian culture 189
Poison literature in Moslem Asia, 460
Political, and legal ideas of Rammohun, 624-630, deliverers, 494-496, philosophy in the *Arthaśāstra*, renaissance among Hindus, 99, thought of the Hindus, 415-436
Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus 20, 21, 40, 160, 246, 247, 339
Political Philosophies Since 1905, 119
Political Science Quarterly, 245
Political science renovated, by Rāmachandrapant, 588, by Rāmdās, 564, 573, 576
Political theories, of Abul Fazl 529-545, of the Hindus, 513-609 of the Jainas, 420-425, 430-432
Politics, expanded by Chitnis, 608-609, in the *Vedas*, 126, of Asoka, 176, of Industrial Revolutions, 658-660, of jurists, 429-430, secular in Hindu culture, 46, 47, 48, universal and relative, 658-660
Politik, 595
Politique, 562
Poor people as co-sharers of royal revenues, 405, 430, 521
Population, 145
Positive, background of Hindu sociology, 361, sciences in the *Kalpataru*, 195
Positivism, defined, 10-12, eternal in Hindu culture, 5-10, 608, in modern Indian literature, 469, in Oriya thought, 476, in Śākyan thought, 168, in six types of documents, 400-403, of Abul Fazl, 545, of Rammohun, 620, of the Dāsabodha, 500, of the Hindus down to the nineteenth century, 580, renovated by Mārāthās, 564
Prag-Hūnaka, 315
Prajñāpāramitā, 453
Prakrit texts, 367
Prāṇaka, 315
Pratimālakṣaṇa, 444
Pravālakam alakandakam, 316
Primitive races, their contributions, 112-114
Prince, 247, 640, 641
Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology, 649
Private Law, 370, 371, in the *Arthaśāstra*, 326
Precursori di Niccolo Mchiavelli in India ed in Grecia 231, 640
Préhistoire Orientale, 75
Pre-Maurya milieu of the *Arthaśāstra*, 232, 238, 287, 303
Pre-war Kautalyalogy, 358
Pretentions of Brāhmaṇas, 176
Pro-Hindu propaganda of Akbar, 542
Problem of variations in Hindu polity, 336-338
Progress promoted by Mārāthās, 582
Property in Hindu law, 625, 626
Prussia and Mahārāṣtra, 563
Psyche's Task, 198

Public law, 370, 371, in Śrikara, 405
Pure races non-existent, 145
Puruṣamedha, 141
Purāṇas, 45, 64, 241, 387, 401, and secularism, 374, in Mitra-Miśra, 549, 558, in Moslem Asia, 461, *vis-à-vis* Rammohun, 619

Q

Quest-ce que l'Esprit Français? 568

R

Race-cult of Hitler, 333
Race-wars in Vedic India, 128
Racial Basis of Civilization, 145
Racial ups and downs, 111-112
Rādhā-Kriṣṇa songs, 480, 485-488
Raghunandana as political philosopher, 613
Raghuvaṁśa, 216, 239, 308, 362, 512, 599, in positivism, 13
Rājadharma, 283, 296, 410
Rājadharmakaustubha, 617
Rājadharma-prakaraṇa, 522-525
Rājamānasollāsa, 547
Rājanīti (Mārāthi), 577-589, 595, 600, 602-609, in "formal" sociology, 657
Rājanīti-Kalpataru, 429, 514
Rājanīti Kāmadhenu, 429, 519
Rājanītiprakāśa, 549-560, 599, 616, 659
Rājanītiprakāśikā, 527
Rājanītiratnākara, 405, 407, 409, 414, 513-522
Rājanīti Ratnākara, in "formal" sociology, 657
Rājarṣi, 586
Rājaśekhara Vilāśam, 81
Rāja-vyavāhara-koṣa, 508
Rajputs, 85, 92, 99, 498
Rajyam avibhājyam, 406
Rāmachandrapant as peer of Fichte, 584-585
Rāmāyaṇa, 64, 66, 241, 318, 350, 376, 388, 396, 402, 445, 446, 449, 469, 483, 501
Rāmdās, as precursor of Herder and Fichte, 577, as renovator of political science, 575, 576, his utopia of *Ānanda-vana-bhūvana*, 502
Rammohun, as exponent of Hindu positivism, 622, his appreciation of the *Purāṇas* and *Tantras*, 619 *vis-à-vis* Raghunandana, 615, 625
Rāṣtrakūtas, 80
Rationalism, in Buddhist thought, 174, of Abul Faẓl, 545, of Raghunandana, 615
Ratnalakṣaṇa, 477
Ratnamālā, 415, 609
Ratnaparīkṣā, 437
Rāyakaraṇa, 564
Rebirth of Kauṭalyan science, 609
Recht und Sitte, 201, 226, 229
Reden an die Deutsche Nation, 24, 172
Regionalism, 57
Relativities in Hindu culture, 661,664
Relativity of Kauṭalya, 337 ,
Reliability of Megasthenes questioned, 261
Religions of China, 198
Religionssoziologie, 479
Remaking of man in Śākyan teachings, 170-173
Renaissance political ideals, 301
Republic of Plato, 659, and Śākyan teachings, 164-166
Republics of the Hindus, 70
Residus sociaux, 663
Revenues of the state, 405
Revolutions in class and race, 111
Revue de Synthèse Historique, 246
Rig Veda, 65, 66, 119-120, 131-133, 278, 399
Rise of the Maratha Power, 100
Risi, 369, 394, 395
Ritualliteratur, 202, 207
Rivista Italiana di Sociologia, 230
Roman public finance, 345
Roman Twelve Tables, 336
Romanticism and indology, 257
Rural democracy, 99

S

Sabhāsad Bākhār, 599

Sacred Books of the East Series, 201, 649
Sacred Books of the Hindus Series, 220
Sachsenspiegel, 197
Sacrifices compel gods to submit, 369
Sadānirā River, 148
Saddharma Puṇḍarika, and the *New Testament*, 396
Sādhaṇā, 7
Sahamaraṇa, 614
Śailendra dynasty of Sumatra, 388
Śaiva-cum-Śāktaism, 664
Śaivism, 83
Śakti-yoga, 488, 489, 662, in Bengali culture, 482
Śakuntalā, 239, 278
Śākyan, institutions 167, laws, 173
Sales and purchases in Hindu literature, 612
Salus Populi, 230, 385, 640
Sāma Veda, 119, 120
Samāchāra Darpaṇa, 622
Samarāṅgaṇa Sūtradhāra, 440
Sambhāji-charita, 513
Saṃhitās, 121, 122
Sāṃkhya in Moslem Asia, 461, 462, 464
Sāṃkhya Kārikā, 50
Sāṃkhya-Vaiśeṣika, 634
Samrāts, 133, 155
Samūha, 653
Samyutta-Nikāya, 169
Sanskrit Buddhist texts, 182, 183, 189, 363-367
Sanskritizing achieved by Śivāji, 508-510
Saptāṃga, 204, 556, 576, 652
Saracen, culture under Hindu positivism, 459-464, domination in Europe, 645-647
Sarasvatī-vilāsa, 611
Sārvabhauma, 156, 395, 573, 574
Sasyānanda, 438
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 46, 150, 152, 156
Śaṭtriṃśanmata, 407
Saundarānanda, 309, 311
Schoolmaster, 52
Scientific sociology established, 619-622
Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques 246
Secular, elements in Pali literature, 159, laws of the Hindus, 295, laws of Nārada, 371, life in *Atharva Veda*, 126-127, origins of Hindu law, 196-203
Secularism, in Hindu culture, 290, of the *Arthaśāstra*, 639, of the Sikhs, 470
Secularization of indology, 160, 164, 323
Seir Mutaqherin, 531, 600
Seiyukai Party of Japan, 347
Sena Kingdom, 81
Sensatism, of India ignored by traditional indologists, 634, 635, *vis-à-vis* ideationalism in world-culture, 648-650
Sex-element in Hindu culture, 485-488
Shāhi dynasty, 89
Shipbuilding and navigation in Hindu literature, 441
Shortcomings, in Hindu positivism, 589-592, in Masson-Oursel's work, 48, of Indian Kautalyologists, 361
Shu King, 400
Siam Indianized, 444-445
Siāssat Nāmāh, 542
Siddhānta, 367, 368, 397
Sikhs, 96, 100, 470
Śikṣā-samuchchaya, 365, 366, 397
Śilpa, 439, 632
Śilparatna, 475
Śilpaśāstras, 377, 379, 380, 381, 387, 401, in Tibet, 388, 389
Sind, 89
Sindhind, 459
Siṅgālovāda Suttānta, 175
Sins of Hindus and Mussalmans, 590-592

Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, 254
Śiva-Bhārata, 511-513, 560, 598
Śiva-Chhatrapatichen Charitra, 599
Śiva Purāna, 196
Śiva-Śāsana, 449
Śivāji, and William of Orange, 561, as Hinduizer, 505-511, as peer of Frederick the Great, 563, as precursor of Herder and Fichte, 511
Śivarājapraśasti, 560
Slavery in India, 326
Smritis, 191-196, 370-371, 381, 403, 627
Smritichandrikā, 411
Smritikalpataru, 407, 410, 429
Smriti Kāmadhenu, 407, 521
Smriti Kaustubha, 617
Smriti-Nīti tradition in Rammohun, 630
Smriti-Ratnākara, 514, 610
Smriti-samgraha, 407
Smritiviveka, 404
Smriti literature and Kauṭalya, 324, 325
Snakes and poisons in Hindu science, 460
Social and Cultural Dynamics, 633-650
Social, award in the *Taittirīya Samhitā*, 139, conditions in 1000 A.C., 94, constants, 662, energism of the Bengali people, 485, ladders in Indian history, 104, mobility among Hindus, 499, processes in Indian history 101-114, stratification in the *Ain-i-Akbari*, 537
Social metabolism, 9, 87, 117, in East and West, 111
Social Mobility, 29, 34, 35, 633, 649
Social science injured by arrogance, 621,
Social service in Hindu culture, 412, 434
Socialism, in Hindu thought, 471-475, universal in statesmanship, 347
Socialismo Antico, 473
Socialistic doctrine of *amśitva*, 430, 521, of Śrīkara, 405-406
Society and state in Hindu politics, 351
Sociopolitical philosophy of Hitler in the interpretation of the *Arthaśāstra*, 333
Socio-religious festivities, 664
Sociological dualism acceptable, 23-27
Sociologists' errors *re* Hindu culture, 633-650
Sociology, contents of, 1-2, established on scientific lines, 619-623, in *Aganna Suttānta*, 175, in *Puruṣasūkta*, 135-138, of Hindu art, wrong and correct, 641-643, of Raghunandana, 611-615, of the Hindus, "analytical" or "formal", 235, 248, 654-657
Sociology of Revolution, 649
Sonadaṇḍa Sutta, 174
Sorokin, the acceptable and the fallacious in, 27-36, 633-634, 649, *vs.* Müller, Sénart and Weber, 36
Soviet Russia, 329, 346, not anticipated by previous despots, 659
Soziologie, 657
Śrīkara's socialism, 405-407
Śringāraśataka, 373
Staatsräson, 595
Staatsverwaltung im alten Indien, 324
State as maker of *dharma*, 424-425,
State monopolies in France, 345
State planning, 338
Statesmanship *vs.* scholarship in Kauṭalya, 291
Statics no less profound than dynamics, 662
Sthānamga, 189
Sthavirapallicharita, 211
Stoic philosophers, 394-396
Story-books and secularism, 374
Stratification, not rigid in Hindu society, 114
Struggle over Kauṭalya, 358-359
Strīdhana, 318

Studien zur Eigenart des indischen Denkens, 49, 206
Study in the Economic condition of Ancient India, 313
Subjection hated by Somadeva, 423
Śūdra, 145, 146, 150, dined with 94, in the *Puruṣa-Sūkta*, 138, in the *Taittiriya Saṁhitā*, 140, women married to Brāhmaṇa in the *Arthaśāstra*, 318
Śukraniti, 15-17, 56-58, 64, 155, 174, 202, 220, 276, 377, 378, 380, 382, 429, 507, 578, 607, 661
Sumatra, 388
Śūnya Purāṇa, 489
Śūnyatā, 176
"Superior races", 621
Supermen in Pali literature, 175
Surunga, 279, 283, 317
Sutra Kritāmga, 189
Sūtrālamkāra, 364
Sutta nipāta, 170
Sutta Piṭaka, 168, 173
Suttavibhamga, 173
Suttee, 614, 627
Svāmitva, 652, 653
Svapraśamsā, 307
Svargārohaṇa and socialism, 474
Swadeshi movement and Kauṭalya, 220
Swarajists and Kauṭalyalogy, 280
Swarājya, 577, 594
System der Allgemeinen Soziologie, 656

T

Taittiriya Saṁhitā, 129, 139, 150, 153
Tamil, humanism, 471, *Sangam*, 372
Tanjur, 312, 389, 452
Tantra, 50, 83, 420, 435, 448, *vis-à-vis* Rammohun, 619
Tantrākhyāyikā, 219, 254, 274, 308, 383
Tantrik paintings in Tibet, 455
Tāo, 132
Tarikh-i-Ibrahim, 499
Tartar domination in Europe, 91
Tathāgata, 187
Tathāgata guhya-sūtra, 366
Technologisches und Kulturgeschichtliches aus dem Arthaśāstra des Kauṭilya, 297
Technology in Hindu culture, 257-258
Telugu positivism, 471
Territorial concept in politics, 576-577
Tevijja Sutta, 174
Theoretical elements in the *Arthaśāstra*, 235, 247-251, in Hindu politics, 598
Tibet Indianized, 388-389, 451-456
Tibetan evidences on *Arthaśāstra*, 312
Tin (*trapu*), 298
Tirthamkara, 188, *milieu* of politics, 430
Todarānanda, 444, 611
Tönnies-Simmel-von Wiese group, 658
Topikārs in Mārāthā politics, 588, 589
Total society, 338, 339
Totalitarian state, 337
Toung-Pao, 319
Tractatus Politicus, 594
Traders from Europe, 588
Tradition of positivism in Rammohun, 622
Traditional indology, 49-51, 206, in Breloer, 351, in Masson-Oursel, 48, misleading the sociologists, 633-650
Traité de la Science des Finances, 345
Translation bureau in Tibet, 453
Trapu (tin), not zinc, 298
Trattato di Sociologia Generale, 23, 109
Travels of Marco Polo, 645
Tribonian, 333-335
Tripiṭaka, 50, 445
Triṣṭubh metre, 241, 318
Trivarga, 190, 208, 277, 295, 322

Tuhfatul-Hind, 468
Turkish domination in Europe, 645
Twelve-month story, 481
Two Studies in the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭalya, 308

U

Ueber das Kauṭiliya śāstra, 215
Ueber das Wesen der altindischen Rechtsschriften, 196-203, 288, 294
Ueber die altpolitische Literatur Indiens und ihre Bearbeiter, 280
Ueber die Echtheit des Kauṭalya, 223, 298
United Bengal, 83
United Punjab, 97
Unity not more obvious in Europe than in India, 72-73
Universal elements in politics, 658-660
Upaniṣads, 121, 122, 190, 369, 400, in Persian, 468
Upapurāṇas, 401
Urpanchatantra, 217
Utopia, 56, 175, 247, of Rāmdās, 502-504
Uvasagadasāo, 367

V

Vahiramga-rājadharma, 524
Vaijayantī, 616
Vairāgya śataka, 373
Vaiśālākṣya, 382
Vaiṣṇava Padāvalī, 490
Vaiṣṇavism, 83
Vākāṭaka Empire, 78
Vālakrīdā, 404
Vande Mātaram, 494
Vaṇśāvalī, 85
Vardhana Empire, 79, 399
Varendra Research Society, 81
Variables and constants, 336-338
Variables in world-evolution, 658-666
Varṇa-saṃkaras, 473
Vārttā, 377, 378, 379, 404, 437, 632
Vārttāśāstras, 377, 401
Vasettha Sutta, 176
Vāstu, 632
Vāstuvidyā, 443
Vedas in Persian, 468
Vedānta, 619, in Bagdad, 460
Vedic, chronology, 119-122, 124-125, materialism 125-127
Vernacular secularism, 469
Viduranīti, 599
Vidyās, 195, 196, 245, 345, 379, 590
Vijayanagara Empire, 100, 321, 495, 497, 592
Vijigīṣu, 293, 309, 434, 573
Vikramādityas of Indian culture, 425
Vikramāṅkacharita, 409, 433
Vinaya, 53, and Roman jurisprudence, 396
Viramitrodaya, 550, 616
Virāṭaparva, 599
Vis., 141, 143, in Vedic India, 128-131
Viśākhadatta, 218
Viṣṇupurāṇa, 195, 211, 215, 396, 613, and socialism, 474
Viṣnudharmottara Purāṇa, 194, 380, 413, 442, 527, 548, 552
Viśvakarmaprakāśa, 442
Vivādabhaṅgārṇava, 618, 651
Vivādachintāmaṇi, 611
Vivādārṇavasetu, 618
von Weise *vis-à-vis* Sorokin, 657
Vrātyas, 105-108, 142, 145-148, 197, 229
Vṛikṣāyurveda, 378
Vyāsayogacharitam, 496
Vyavahāra mātrikā, 410

W

Wars, fair and unfair, 548
Welfare-state, 177, 338
Wells and tanks in Hindu literature, 477
Western Śaka Satrapy as the state of the *Arthaśāstra*, 315
"Whole view" overlooked by indologists and sociologists, 635, 636, 637, 649, 650

Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 219
Wirtschaftsethik, 18, 22
"Wise man" of Seneca, 395
Women in Hindu law, 625, 627
World-conqueror, 309, 496
World-contempt not universal in Hindu thought, 158
World-monarch, 175
World-ruler, 188
Worldly sciences, In India, 54

Y

Yājnavalkya Smriti, 283, 307, 308
Yajurveda, 141
Yantra-vidhāna, 441
Yi-King, 400
Yoga in Moslem Asia, 461, 464
Yoga-Sūtra, 50
Young India and Kauṭalyalogy, 280-281
Yugāvaṭāra, 560, 569
Yuktikalpataru, 174, 408, 425-429, in "formal" sociology, 657

Z

Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft, 275, 280, 297
Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 226, 241
Zinc 297
Zur Datierungsfrage, 277