APPENDIX I

THE KULAJI OR GENEALOGICAL LITERATURE

1. THE KULAJI TEXTS

There is an extensive literature in Bengal known as *Kulaji* or *Kula-śāstra*. It deals with the history of the Brahmans and some other principal castes in Bengal in a general way, and also gives a detailed genealogical account of the notable families belonging to the different castes. We are not concerned here with the latter, except in so far as it throws light on the former, and shall confine our discussion to the general account of the different castes preserved in the *Kulajis*. As might be expected, the *Kulajis*, treating of the Brahmans, form the major and more important part of this literature, and the rest, so far at least as the general history is concerned, forms an insignificant and almost a subsidiary part.

Certain preliminary remarks on the available *Kulaji* texts are necessary in order to estimate their value and historical importance. The more well-known Brahmaṇa *Kulaji* texts are:

1. *Mahāvaṁśāvali* or *Miśra-grantha* by Dhruvānanda Miśra.
4. *Vārendra-kula-paṇjikā*, general name for a number of heterogeneous texts.
5. *Mela-paryāya-gaṇanā*.
7. *Kula-dīpikā* by Rāmānada Śarmā.
8. *Kula-chandrīkā*.
10. *Kulaṇḍava*.

Among these No. 1 is printed, and there are good grounds to refer its composition to the latter part of the fifteenth century A.D. The authors of Nos. 2 and 3 were certainly later, and have generally
been assumed to be junior contemporaries of Dhruvānanda, the author of No. 1, though there is no definite evidence in support of it. They may, therefore, be referred to the 16th or 17th century A.D.

Genuine manuscripts of texts Nos. 4 to 10 are difficult to obtain. Modern authors have quoted from these books without giving any account of the manuscripts used by them. No definite idea of their age can be formed and the authorship of some of them is in dispute. The author of No. 11 is said to be a contemporary of Lakshmanasena, but there is nothing to support this view, and to judge from the ms. of the work in the Dacca University Library, it cannot be regarded as a very old work.

No texts of Nos. 12, 13 and 14 were known until recent times. N. Vasu, who possessed the only known copies of Nos. 12 and 13, and used the former as the main authority in his voluminous work Vaṅgar Jātiya Itihāsa (“Social History of Bengal”), proclaimed No. 13 to belong to the twelfth century A.D., and regarded No. 12 as next in date, but the most authentic genealogical work composed in the thirteenth century A.D. The manuscripts of both were, however, very carefully guarded by him, and in spite of repeated demands, both private and public, were never produced for inspection by scholars. The manuscript of No 12, however, was found along with others purchased by the Dacca University after his death, and even a casual inspection is enough to convince anybody that it has no claim to be regarded as either an ancient text or a work of Hari Miśra.²¹⁹ The foundation on which the huge superstructure of social history was constructed by N. Vasu has thus been considerably weakened, if not totally shattered.

No. 14 is printed, but no definite account is given of the manuscript on which it is based. There are very good grounds for the general belief that the book is a modern compilation, palmed off on an ancient author, with a view to improving the status of certain classes of Brāhmaṇas. Definite instances are known of deliberate interpolation, omission and distortion of passages in Kulajī texts in order to remove the social stigma of some families or provide others with a superior status. Indeed these motives are naturally so strong in human beings, and in the absence of old genuine ms. or printed Kulajī texts, the means of achieving the ends comparatively is so easy, that there is nothing to be surprised at the fabrication of new texts and tampering with the old ones.
The facts stated above lead to the following general conclusions:

1. That there are no genuine and authentic Kulaji texts that can be dated before the latter half of the fifteenth century A.D.

2. That with one or two exceptions, the literature exists only in manuscripts, copies of which are difficult to secure.

3. That Kulaji texts have been tampered with in various ways, and there are good grounds to doubt the genuineness of many current texts which are attributed to ancient authors.

2. KING ĀDIŚŪRA AND ORIGIN OF BENGALI
     BRĀHMAṆAS AND KĀYASTHAS

There is one central theme in almost all the Kulajis which forms the pivot round which moves their entire conception of the social history of Bengal. It touches upon the origin of the Rājāhiya and Vārendra Brāhmaṇas who form the bulk of the Brahmī community in Bengal. All the Kulaji texts maintain that they were descended from five Brāhmaṇas who came to Bengal at the invitation of king Ādiśūra. The outline of the story is given below.

King Ādiśūra of Bengal requested the king of Kanauj (or Kolāṇcha) to send him five Brāhmaṇas, versed in the Vedas and Vedic sacrifices, for there were no such Brāhmaṇas in Bengal. As the latter refused, Ādiśūra declared war against him. To win an easy victory he decided to send to the battle seven hundred Brāhmaṇas of Bengal, seated on bulls, for an orthodox Brāhmaṇa, like the king of Kanauj, full of devotion to cows and Brāhmaṇas, would not kill them. The Brāhmaṇas of Bengal at first refused to ride on bulls as it violated the injunctions of the Śāstras. But Ādiśūra promised to free them from guilt when they returned from their expedition. As expected, the king of Kanauj desisted from fighting these Brāhmaṇa soldiers, and sent the five Brāhmaṇas asked for by Ādiśūra. These five Brāhmaṇas, equipped with bows and arrows, came on horseback to Bengal, accompanied by five attendants. Ādiśūra did not show proper respect to them on account of their military dress, whereupon the Brāhmaṇas threw the flower and herbs, with which they wanted to bless Ādiśūra, on a stump of wood, which immediately blossomed into a living tree. Ādiśūra, deeply impressed by this, begged for their pardon and gave them a proper reception. The Brāhmaṇas performed a sacrifice
and returned to Kanauj. But their kinsmen at home treated them as degraded on account of journey to Bengal, and asked them to perform penances. Thereupon the five Brāhmaṇas, with their wives and servants returned to Bengal, and Ādiśūra granted them five villages to live in.

Such is the story in brief outline, but the details vary in the different kulajis. As regards Ādiśūra, different genealogies of his family are given in different texts; he is referred to as the grandfather (mother’s father) of Vallālasena in some, and that of a remote ancestor of Vallālasena in others. He is said to be the ruler of Bengal and Orissa, but some authorities add Ānga, Kaliṅga, Kārnāṭa, Kerala, Kāmarūpa, Saurāśṭra, Magadha, Mālava and Gurjara to his dominions. Some say that the whole affair was peaceful, as Ādiśūra had married the daughter of the Kanauj king, while according to others he fought with him; and his capital, where he received the Brāhmaṇas, is placed by some at Gauḍa, and by others at Vikramapura. The reasons why the five Brāhmaṇas were brought by him are variously stated. Six different authorities put forward names of different religious ceremonies for the performance of which the Brāhmaṇas were requisitioned. According to a seventh account, the king of Kāśi (not Kanauj, as we have in the other texts), being asked by Ādiśūra to pay tribute refused to do so, and in reply tauntingly referred to Ādiśūra’s dominions as bereft of Brāhmaṇas and Vedic sacrifices, whereupon Ādiśūra defeated him in a battle and brought the five Brāhmaṇas. The date of this event is also variously put down as Śaka 654, 675, 804, 854, 864, 914, 954, 994 and 999, while three sets of names are given as those of the five Brāhmaṇas.

3. DIVISION OF THE BRĀMAṆAS INTO DIFFERENT SECTS

The seven hundred Brāhmaṇas who went to fight for Ādiśūra came to be known as Saptaśatī or Sāṭśatī. According to some they were descendants of Brāhmaṇas living on the bank of the Sarasvati river, who were brought to Bengal by the Andhra king Śudraka for performing a sacrifice, and settled in this country which till then had no Brāhmaṇas. According to others, these were people of low castes, but were recognised as Brāhmaṇas by Ādiśūra as a reward for their services. According to a third version, Vallālasena got a
boon from the goddess Chanḍī that within two praḥarās (six hours) he could make anybody he liked to be a Brāhmaṇa, and the king thereupon created seven hundred Brāhmaṇas who came to be known as Saptaśatī (seven hundred).

Some genealogical texts hold that all the Brāhmaṇas in Bengal, other than the Saptaśatī, were descended from the five Brāhmaṇas, brought by king Ādisūra, and according to Nirdosha-kula-pañjikā, the five sons of one of the five Brāhmaṇas were the progenitors of Rāḍhīya, Vārendra and Vaidika Pāśchātya and Dākshiṇātya sections of Bengal Brāhmaṇas. Other texts, however, give different accounts of the origin of these sections and we may next proceed to consider them.

(a) Rāḍhīya and Vārendra

There is a general agreement among the Kulajīs that all the Rāḍhīya and Vārendra Brāhmaṇas were descended from the five Brāhmaṇas brought by Ādisūra. But there are two main versions of the events that led to their division into these two sections.

According to the version current among the Rāḍhīyas, the descendants of the five Brāhmaṇas, settled in Bengal by Ādisūra, moved in the course of time to various parts, either on account of internal dissensions or under royal orders. Ultimately they were definitely classified by Vallālasena into Rāḍhīya or Vārendra according as they lived in Rāḍhā or Varendra at that time.

The version of the Vārendra Brāhmaṇas is quite different. Ādisūra, we are told, thought that if the Saptaśatī Brāhmaṇas of Rāḍhā gave their daughters in marriage to the five Brāhmaṇas settled in Gauḍa, the latter would have no inducement to return to Kanauj. The Saptaśatis, under royal command, married their daughters to these Brāhmaṇas who thereupon lived in Rāḍhā. When they died, their sons (by previous marriages), who were still in Kanauj, performed their Śrāddha ceremony, but the other Brāhmaṇas refused to take part in it. Humiliated at this they came to Ādisūra with their family. Not liking to live with their step-brothers in Rāḍhā they settled in Varendra, and came to be known as Vārendra, while the former were called Rāḍhīya.
(b) **Vaidika Brāhmaṇas**

Though small in number, the Vaidika Brāhmaṇas occupy an important position in Bengal, as the spiritual leaders (guru) of many Rādhīya and Varendra Brāhmaṇa families belong to this section.

The Vaidika Brāhmaṇas are divided into two classes, Dākshinātya and Pāschātya. It is said that on account of Muhammadan invasions, the study of Vedas declined in Northern India, but continued to flourish in the South. Hence some Brāhmaṇas versed in the Vedas came from the South and were welcomed by the Brāhmaṇas of Bengal. They settled here and came to be known as Dākshinātya Vaidika.

The origin of the Pāschātya Vaidika Brāhmaṇas is described as follows in their *Kulajis*: Śyāmalavarman, king of Gauḍa, married the daughter of the king of Kānya Kubja (or Kāśi, according to some version), and being desirous of performing some Vedic rites brought five Brāhmaṇas from his father-in-law’s dominions, as there was no Veda-knowing Brāhmaṇas in Bengal. After the performance of the rites, these Brāhmaṇas were granted villages and settled in Bengal.

Nobody can fail to detect in the above the chief elements in the Ādiśūra story, and the parallelism extends even to the wide diversity of details in respect of each element. Thus we have different ancestries of Śyāmalavarman, different reasons for bringing the Brāhmaṇas from Kanaūj or Kāśi, different names of the original Brāhmaṇas, the miracle of dead tree coming to life in similar circumstances, and lastly, the humiliation of the Brāhmaṇas on their return to Kanaūj (or Kāśi) as the cause of their return and final settlement in Bengal. To make matters worse, opinions differ in this case even as to the number of the Brāhmaṇas who originally came to Bengal. On the other hand, there is a fair agreement about the date of the event, viz., 1001 Śaka (=1079 A.D.) which enables us to identify the king in question with Sāmalavarman (v. supra p. 209).

It may be mentioned here that a different account of the origin of the Vaidika Brāhmaṇas, alleged to be written in 1582 Śaka (=1660 A.D.) by one Rāghavendra, has been quoted by N. Vasu. According to this the Vaidika Brāhmaṇas were originally settled on the Sarasvatī river. Having learnt by astrological calculations of
the impending invasions by the Yavanas, they dispersed in different directions, and one Gaṅgāgati came to Bengal and settled in Koṭālipāḍā. His patron was king Harivarman. Other Vaidika Brāhmaṇas followed Gaṅgāgati to Bengal and thus grew the Vaidika community.

(c) Śākadvīpi Brāhmaṇas

There is a class of Brāhmaṇas in Bengal known as Graha-vipra, who are said to have migrated from Śākadvīpa. There are two sections among them known as Rāḍhiya and Nadiyā Vaṅga Samāja.

According to Śākala-dvīpikā, a Kulajī of the Rāḍhiya class, as quoted by N. Vasu, there were eight sages in Śākadvīpa whose descendants made a special study of planets (graha) and were known as Graha-vipra. The mythical bird Garuḍa brought eight of them to India who settled in Madhyadeśa. Ten descendants of these eight came to Gauḍa and were known as Gauḍiya Graha-vipra. Judging from the number of generations mentioned in the Kulajī, the migration into Bengal appears to have taken place not more than five centuries ago.

According to Kulajī of Nadiyā Vaṅga Samāja, twelve Brāhmaṇas living on the bank of the Sarayū river were brought by king Śaṅkha to Gauḍa in order to cure himself of a disease by offering sacrifices to the planets (graha-yajña). At the request of the king they settled in Gauḍa and were known as Graha-vipra. They were settled in Rāḍhā and Vaṅga and were divided into several sections according to their places of residence.

The Kulajī of the Vārendra Śākadvīpi Brāhmaṇas repeat the above account. It is probable, therefore, that the Vārendra and the Nadiyā Brāhmaṇas of the Graha-vipra class had a common origin.

(d) Kulīnism

According to the Rāḍhiya Kulajī, the descendants of the five Brāhmaṇas brought by Ādiśūra numbered fifty-nine during the reign of his grandson Kshitiśūra. To each of them this king gave a village for residence, and hence originated the gāmī of the Rāḍhiya Brāhmaṇas. In other words, each Brāhmaṇa and his descendants
were known by the name of the village in which they lived—which became their gāmi (belonging to a village) and later developed into surname. For example, the residents of Mukhaṭi village had Mukhaṭi gāmi, and had the surname Mukhaṭi or Mukh-opādhyāya, by the addition of upādhyāya (teacher) to the village name. The other well-known titles Bandy-opādhyāya and Chaṭṭ-opādhyāya originated in the same way. The Vārendra Brāhmaṇas also had one hundred gāmis. As usual, the Kulajis differ about the number of these gāmis and their names. A list of all the gāmis is given in App. II. King Dharāśīra, the son of Kshitiśīra, made further innovation by dividing the Rādhiya Brāhmaṇas of fifty-nine gāmis into three grades, viz., Mukhyā-kulīna, Gauṇa-kulīna and Śrotiya.

The Vārendra Kulajis, on the other hand, regard Vallālasena as the founder of Kulīnism. According to Vāchaspati Miśra, the king laid down nine virtues as the criterion, and assigned the rank of Kulīna to those Brāhmaṇas who possessed all of them. Those who possessed eight or seven of them were called, respectively, Siddha-śrotiya and Sādhyā-śrotiya, and the remaining Brāhmaṇas were called Kashṭa-śrotiya.

There is, however, nothing in older Kulajis to indicate that Kulīnism was based on such a test. Various silly stories are told about the motive of Vallālasena in creating the Kulīnas, and the rough and ready method he adopted in selecting them. The Kulajis are, however, unanimous—rather a rare thing—that the rank of Kulīna was personal and the distinction was conferred on only 16 (or 19). Besides, Vallāla placed all these Kulīnas in the same grade and they could marry daughters of non-Kulīnas. It was Lākṣmaṇasaṇa who deviated from both these practices, and made the system a complex one, by introducing, among the Rādhiya Brāhmaṇas, restrictions of marriage and classification of the Kulīnas into different grades according to their faithful observance of the marriage rules. This process of periodical classification is known as samikaraṇa, the first two of which are said to have taken place during the reign of Lākṣmaṇasaṇa, and the next four in that of Danujamādhava (v. supra p. 277). Dhruvānanda refers to 117 samikaraṇas up to his time. Abstruse philosophical ideas were also introduced into the system of Kulīnism during the reign of Lākṣmaṇasaṇa. But there was still one saving grace. Kulīnism had not yet become a hereditary rank.
King Ādiśūra is the pivot round which the genealogical accounts move. No positive evidence has yet been obtained of his existence, but we have undoubted references to a Śūra family ruling in Western Bengal in the eleventh century (v. supra pp. 134, 148, 224). Ādiśūra may or may not be an historical person, but it is wrong to assert dogmatically that he was a myth, and to reject the whole testimony of the Kulajis on that ground alone.

On the other hand, if we consider the date and the unreliable nature of the modern Kulaji texts, we can hardly accept their accounts as historical without corroborative evidence. Such evidence is available in respect of the existence of gāmī as well as of the broad divisions of the Brāhmaṇas into Rādhīyas and Vārendras, and possibly also Vaidikas and Graha-vipras, in the Hindu period, as already noted above. Further, in several instances, the genealogies of particular families as given in the Kulajis seem to be corroborated by literary and epigraphic evidence.

As against all these there is a volume of evidence of both positive and negative character, which discredits the story of the Kulajis. The account of the two great Brāhmaṇa families given in the Bādal Pillar inscription (supra p. 111) and that of Bhatṭa Bhavadeva (supra p. 210) prove the existence of Brāhmaṇas in Bengal in the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries A.D. who, according to the Kulajis, must have been descended from the Brāhmaṇas brought by Ādiśūra. This becomes impossible if Ādiśūra lived in the eleventh century A.D., as is rendered probable both by the dates supplied by most of the Kulajis and the fact that all the epigraphic evidences refer the royal Śūra family in Bengal to that century. On the other hand, if Ādiśūra lived at the beginning of the eighth century A.D., the earliest date assigned to him in the Kulajis, it is not a little surprising that the two families are not mentioned in the Kulajis, though the founder of one of them could not have been removed by more than one or two generations from the five Brāhmaṇas of Kanauj, or that these families do not refer to their exalted Kanauj origin. That the account of the origin of certain gāmis, as given in the Kulajis, is incompatible with what the author of Chhāndoga-pariśiṣṭa-prakāśa says of his own family, has been admitted by N. Vasu himself, the great champion of Kulajis. Rai Bahadur R. P. Chanda has demonstrated that the Kulaji account
of the Vārenda Brāhmaṇas and the origin of the Karaṇja-gāmi was unknown up to the end of the fifteenth century A.D.²²² Besides, although we have references to a large number of Brāhmaṇas in the Sena land-grants of the period after Vallālasena, not one of them has been referred to as Kulīna. If the rank were really bestowed in consideration of personal merits on a very few, it is not a little surprising that eminent Brāhmaṇas like Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa, Vallāla’s own guru, and Halāyudha, (and also Bhavadeva, his grandfather, and Kedāramiśra, assuming that Kulīnism was introduced in the ninth century by Ādiśūra’s grandson), were not thought fit for an honour which was only reserved for persons whose names are not known outside the pages of the Kulajis.

But the most potent argument against the Kulaji story is that it involves the absurd assumption that while the descendants of five Brāhmaṇas multiplied to millions in course of less than thousand years, the large number of Brāhmaṇas, orginally settled in Bengal before the 8th century A.D., and the hosts of immigrants to whom reference is made in inscriptions (supra p. 427) practically vanished from the soil without leaving any trace.

While, therefore, we may freely admit that the Kulajis contain a kernel of historical truth about the social condition of the Brāhmaṇas in the closing centuries of the Hindu period, their story with all its details can by no means be regarded as of any historical value. The close similarity in the general theme, viz., the origin of different classes of Brāhmaṇas from one or more individuals imported from outside by a king, bears on it the stamp of popular fancy, which is evident also in many other details.

The same conclusion may be drawn from the Kulaji accounts of the Vaidyas, Kāyasthas and other castes which belong to the same type as those of the Brāhmaṇas and cannot certainly be regarded as of greater historical value. Two of the well-known Kulajis of the Vaidyas, viz., Kavi-kayṭṭahāra by Rāmakanta and Chandraprabhā by Bharata Mallika are dated, respectively, in 1653 and 1675 A.D. No authentic Kulaji of the other castes of a prior date is known. The Vaidya Kulajis claim Ādiśūra and Vallālasena to be Vaidyas. This view is supported by some Brāhmaṇa Kulajis, but opposed by those of the Kāyasthas. The general view in all the Kulajis is that the five attendants of the five Brāhmaṇas brought by Ādiśūra were the progenitors of the high-class Kāyasthas in Bengal. The Vaidyas and Kāyasthas (and some other castes) have also similar stories of
the origin of Kulinism among them. How far these can be regarded as historical may be gathered from what has been said above about the Kulajis in general and the origin of the Vaidyas and Kāyasthas in particular.

A consideration of all the available facts leads to the conclusion that the Kulajī story owes its origin to an attempt in the fifteenth or sixteenth century A.D. to trace the beginnings of the social divisions which existed at that time to the early period to which the Hindus naturally looked back as their golden age. The attempt was a sign as well as a symptom of the national reawakening that we notice in other spheres of life among the Hindus in the fifteenth century, and may be compared, and regarded as a supplement, to the work of Raghunandana in respect of social usages, manners and customs.

The very poor knowledge that the Bengalis of the 15th and 16th centuries possessed about the political history of their country in pre-Muhammadan times does not encourage the belief that they had any correct idea of the social history of the same period. Of course, some individual families might have preserved more or less genuine accounts of their ancestors reaching back to the Hindu period, but the accuracy of these could not be tested, and they would touch only incidentally upon the general history of society in old times. For a general view of the social history they had to rely partly on these family stories without discrimination, and partly on the current traditions about social and political history, readjusting the two and filling in the gaps by means of an imaginative reconstruction. This seems to be the genesis of the elaborate but varying accounts of the Kulajī literature discussed above.

In conclusion, it may be mentioned that anthropometric tests are definitely against the view that the Brāhmaṇas or Kāyasthas of Bengal are descended from those of Kānyakubja.
APPENDIX II

GĀMIS OF THE RĀDHĪYA AND VĀRENDRA BRAHMĀNAS

The Kulaṣis mention fifty-six gāmis of the Rādhīya Brähmanas and one hundred gāmis of the Vārendra Brähmanas under five gotras.

RĀDHĪYA GĀMIS


Sāvarṇa gotra (12)—Gaṅguli, Kuṇḍa, Siddhala, Dāyi, Nandī, Vāli, Ghanṭēśvarī, Pāli, Puṁsika, Siyāri, Šāṅḷēśvarī, Nāyāri.

Vatsya gotra (11)—Mahintyā, Ghoshala, Pūtitaṇḍa, Pūrvagrāmi, Pippalāi, Chautkhanḍi, Kaṇjilāla, Dīghala, Simbulāla, Kaṅjāri, Vāpuli.277

VĀRENDRA GĀMIS

Śāṇḍilya gotra (14)—Rudravāgchi, Lāheḍi, Sādhuvāgchi, Champaṭi, Nandanaṇḍi, Kāmendra, Sīharī, Taḷṭoyālaviṭī, Matsyāṭi, Champa, Suvarṇa, Tōṭaka, Pushāṇa, Beluṇi.

Bharadvāja gotra (22)—Bhādaḍa, Lāḍuli, Jhāmala (Jhampaṭi), Āturthi, Rāi, Ratnāvali, Ucchharakhi, Gochhhasi, Bāla, Śākṭi, Śim-bivahāla, Sariyāla, Kṣetragrāmi, Dadhiyāla, Pūṭi, Kāchaṭi, Nandi-grāmi, Gogrāmi, Nikhaṭi, Pippali, Śṛṅgakhorjāra, Gosvājambi.

Kāśyapa gotra (18)—Maitra, Bhāḍuṇi, Kāraṇja, Bālayashṭi, Modhagrāmi, Balihāri, Moyāli, Kirala, Bījakuṇja, Śaragrāmi, Saḥagrāmi, Kaṭīgrāmi, Madhyāgrāmi, Maṭhagrāmi, Gaṅgagrāmi, Belagrāmi, Chamagrāmi, Ārukoṭi.

Sāvarṇa gotra (19)—Śimdiyāḷa, Pākaḷi, Dadhi, Śṛṅgī, Meda-dī, Undhuṇi, Dhandhuṇi, Taṭoyāra, Setu, Naṅgrāmi, Nedhuṇi,
Kapālī, Tuṭṭari, Paṁchavaṭi Nikaṭi, Samudra, Ketugrāmi, Yaśo-grāmi, Śītali.

Vātsyya gotra (24)—Sānnyāla, Bhīmakāli, Bhaṭṭasālī, Kāmakāli, Kuḷamuṇi, Bhāḍiyāla, Laksha, Jāmarukhī, Śimalī, Dhosāli, Tānuri, Vatsagrāmi Deūli, Nidrāli, Kukkuṭī, Boḷhagrāmi, Śruta-vatī, Akshagrāmi, Sāhari, Kāligrāmi, Kalihaya, Paundrakāli, Kālindī, Chaturvandī.\(^{228}\)

Names of some of these gāṇis are found in the records of the pre-Muslim period. Ārtihara’s son Sarvaṇanda, the author of \(\text{Tikā-sarasva}\), describes himself as Vandyaghaṭiṇa.\(^{229}\) The Kulajis mention Atiṣṭāra as belonging to Vandyaghaṭiṇa gāṇi.\(^{230}\) Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva’s mother was the ‘daughter of a Vandyaghaṭiṇa Brāhmaṇa’.\(^{231}\) Bhavadeva and the donee of the Belāva copper plate, both belonging to the Sāvarṇa gotra, were residents of the village Siddhala in Uttara-Rājha.\(^{232}\) A Brāhmaṇa of Tataka in Varendri settled in Vikramapura in the Dacca district.\(^{233}\) Halāyudha, the chief judge in the court of Lakṣmaṇasena, connects his mother with Gochchhāṣaṇḍī.\(^{234}\) The Saduki-karṇāmṛta of Śrīdharaḍāsa mentions Karaṇḍī, Tailapāṭī, Bhaṭṭasāli, Śakaṭī and Ratnāvalī (Ratnāvali ?).\(^{235}\) The Ādāvāṭī copper-plate refers to Dinqi gāṇī, Pāli gāṇī, Seu gāṇī, Māsachāṭaka, Mūla, Smaṇḍāyi, Puti, Mahāntiyāḍā, and Karaṇja-grāmi.\(^{236}\) Names of the villages Matsyāvasa, in North Bengal, and Bhūriśreshṭhī and Pūrvagrāma in Rājha are known from early records.\(^{237}\) Nārāyaṇa, in his Chhāṇḍogya-pariśiṣṭha-prakāśa mentions that Kāṇjivillī, Tālavāṭī, in Uttara-Rājha, Chaturthakhaṇḍa, Vāpaḍalā and Hijjalavana were seats of his family (kulaṣṭhāṇa).\(^{238}\) Śrīnivāsa, the court-poet of Lakṣmaṇasena, belonged to Mahintāpani-vamsa.\(^{239}\) Aniruddha-bhaṭṭa, the preceptor of Vallālasena, was Chāmpāhitī or Chāmpāhaṭṭīya.\(^{240}\) Jīmūtavāhana calls himself Pāribhadriya.\(^{241}\)

All these names of places in their usual or abbreviated forms are referred to as gāṇis of the Rājhiṇī and Vārendra Brāhmaṇas in the Kulajis.
APPENDIX III

FUNERAL RITES AND CEREMONIES

After death the dead body was cremated, unless the age of the deceased was less than two years. An idea of the method of cremation can be had from a perusal of Aniruddha-bhaṭṭa's Piṭri-dayitā (pp. 74-84) and Hāralatā (pp. 119-192). In these works the method of cremation, as prevalent among the Sāmavedī Brāhmaṇas of those days, is described as follows:

When the dying person's condition became hopeless, and he exhibited signs of the approach of death, he was taken out of the house in which he was lying, and laid down on the ground, with his head turned towards the south. The place, at which he was laid, was already besmeared with cow-dung and strewn over with blades of kuśa, the tips of which were turned towards the south. In this position he was made to give to a Brāhmaṇa a piece of gold, a piece of silver, a piece of land of the measurement of a go-charma (cow-hide), a lamp, a copper vessel filled with sesamum and covered with two pieces of cloth, and a black cow, of which the horns were covered with gold, the hoofs with silver, and the back with copper, and which was furnished with a milking vessel of bell-metal covered with two pieces of cloth. All these gifts, except the last one, were made with the object of getting rid of sins committed in this life and attaining heaven, but the last one was intended to enable him, after death, to cross the river Vaitaraṇī which is supposed to run by the dreadful gate of Yama's residence. The Brāhmaṇa recipient had to mutter the Śāvitrī before receiving the gifts which were followed by the offer of dakshiṇā (fee).

After death, the dead body was besmeared with clarified butter and bathed with water. While thus bathing, the person, who bathed it, had to think of holy places, mountains, rivers and seas. The dead body was then stripped of all its garments and dressed with a piece of sacred cloth, an upper garment and a sacred thread, besmeared with sandal-paste and other scents, and adorned with flowers. A piece of gold was placed in each of the seven places, viz., two ears, two nostrils, two eyes and the mouth. The dead body was then covered with a sacred cloth and taken by the deceased person's sons,
or blood-relations on his father's side, or kinsmen, or by other Brāhmaṇas, to the burning ground which was generally situated on the bank of a river, or near water. While the dead body was thus carried, one of the accompanying persons carried the fire with which the dead body was to be cremated. This fire was ārauta, smārta, or laukika (common) according as the deceased maintained the ārauta or the smārta fire, or maintained no fire at all. Another person took some rice in an unannealed vessel. Half of this rice was poured out on the way, and the remaining half was taken to the burning ground. After reaching the burning ground they selected a suitable place, besmeared it with cow-dung, drew a line there, and placed on this line some blades of kuśa, on which the agni-dātā (i.e., the person entitled to set fire to the dead body) offered to the deceased, after the method of offering pīṇās, the rice brought there with the dead body. Then the agni-dātā took his bath and made, with the help of others, a large pile of wood, on which the dead body was placed on its back with its head turned towards the south. The implements of sacrifice, such as the ladle, the winnowing-basket, two pieces of fire-producing wood (araṇī), the mortar and the pestle, etc., which the deceased used in life were also placed on different parts of the body. In placing the dead body on the funeral pile care was taken to see that it was furnished with cloths and a sacred thread and was not naked. Next, the agni-dātā took the fire in his hand turned round the dead body by keeping it to the right, placed his right knee on the ground near the head of the dead body, and, after citing the mantra “asmāt tvam=abhijātost” (thou art born from him) etc., set fire to the pile, without tears or fear, at the place where there was the head. When the body was mostly consumed by fire and only a very small part of it remained, it was covered with burning charcoals and buried underground. After the burning was over, the members of the party gave the clothes of the deceased to the Chaṇḍālas and others who lived in the cemetery, took their bath, and offered libations of water to the deceased. They then changed their clothes, sipped water, and sat on a grassy spot outside the village. Those, who were older or more venerable among them, were to allay grief (śokāpanodana) by referring to the transitoriness of all things on earth and the inevitability of death, and by pointing out, with examples, how the tears shed in grief by the deceased person's relations and others cause great distress to him and bring him down from heaven. If the dead body was burnt out by day-time,
they were not to enter the village before the night-fall, and if it was burnt at night, they were to wait till day dawned. After entering the village, they sat outside the house until the agni-dātā, being followed by one of the members of the party with a club in his hand, brought water from a neighbouring pool, cooked rice with it and offered the balls of rice in the prescribed manner to the deceased at the gate of the house. They then bit three leaves of nimba, and, after washing their feet and sipping water, touched the durvā-sprouts, a samī tree, fire, water, cow-dung, a bull, and a he-goat. They touched their own heads and all other limbs with ghee and grains of white mustard, stepped on pieces of stone and iron, and entered their houses.

If a person died when away from home, his body was brought home and burnt in the above manner. If his body was not available, his bones were brought, soaked with ghee, covered with wool, and burnt in the same way along with his implements of sacrifice. In the absence of bones, an effigy was made with leaves of śara (reed) and palāśā, covered with an antelope-skin, tied with a woolen thread, besmeared with water mixed with finely powdered barley, and burnt.

Death was followed by a period of impurity, which was determined by various factors, such as the nature of relation of the persons with the deceased, their occupation, their caste, their performance or non-performance of śrauta or smārta rites, the caste, age, or character of the deceased, etc. During this period the persons undergoing impurity were required to avoid all kinds of physical comfort such as sitting on fashionable seats, use of bedsteads, etc., and become strict vegetarians. The sons of the deceased were to avoid salt for ten or twelve days according to capacity. They were not allowed to use any metallic utensil, and had to bear in their hands a piece of iron or a small weapon of the same metal for three days. During the period of impurity, or, in case of incapacity, on the first, third, seventh and ninth days, the sons of the deceased invited, for the benefit of the departed soul, their blood-relations on their father’s side to bathe and dine with them. From the second day they offered balls of rice, or barley-meal (saktu), or fruits, to the deceased according to the prescriptions of the Smṛitis. On the fourth day, water for bath and cow’s milk for drink were offered to the deceased in the evening in two earthen pots which were then suspended in the air during the night and thrown into water in the
morning. This practice might be repeated for nine nights more for
greater benefit to the departed soul.

On the second or third day the bones of the deceased were
collected from the burning ground, placed in an earthen pot which
was furnished with a cover and tied round with a piece of thread,
and buried underground in a sacred place. These bones were taken
out and thrown into the Bhāgirathī in opportune times.

In case of death of children aged less than two years, the dead
body was adorned by the relatives with ornaments, flowers, scents,
garlands etc., placed in an earthen pot, and buried underground in
a sacred place outside the village. No fire, no libations of water, and
no collection of bones was necessary in such cases, and the relatives
were advised not to entertain any grief.

Persons eligible for setting fire to the dead body were the
following:—the eldest of the living sons, or wife, or daughter, or
younger brother, or elder brother, or father, or paternal uncle, or
grandfather, or maternal uncle, or mother’s father, etc.—in the case
of males: and son, or daughter, or co-wife’s son, or husband, or
son’s wife, or brother, etc.—in the case of females.

The method of cremation, followed by the Rigvedī and
Agnihotri Yajurvedī Brāhmaṇas, differed from the above methods
in a few minor points only.

Śūdras were allowed to touch neither the dead bodies of
Brāhmaṇas nor the fire with which these bodies were to be cremated.
But if none of the higher castes was available to carry the dead
body of a Brāhmaṇa to the cremation ground, the Śūdras might take
it there. In case of incapacity of Brāhmaṇas, the Śūdras might carry
fuel to the burning ground, but they were not allowed to prepare
the funeral pile.

In the case of Śūdras no removal from the house was compulsory
even at the time of death. They might be kept indoors even when
they breathed their last. But, as in the case of the other higher
castes, all the earthen wares of the house were to be thrown away,
after the dead body had been removed to the burning ground. As
the Śūdras had no śrauta fire to maintain, the method of cremation
was necessarily simpler in their case.
APPENDIX IV

DATE AND PROVENANCE OF THE BRIHAD-DHARMA PURĀṆA AND BRAHMA-VAIVARTA PURĀṆA

I. Brihad-dharma Purana

"Only two editions of this Upapurāṇa have hitherto been printed, viz., the Vaṅgavāsī edition printed in Bengali characters and the ASB ed. printed in Devanāgarī. These two editions differ in readings in numerous cases. Their corresponding chapters are the following:

Vaṅga. ed.                        ASB ed.
Pūrva-khaṇḍa, chaps. 1-30 — chaps. 1-30 (called Pūrva-khaṇḍa)  
Madhya-khaṇḍa, chaps. 1-30 — chaps. 31-60 (called Madhya-khaṇḍa)  
Uttara-khaṇḍa, chaps. 1-14 — Uttara-khaṇḍa, chaps. 1-14  
,, chaps. 15-21 — (omitted)

Chaps. 15-21 of the Uttara-khaṇḍa of the Vaṅga. ed., which are wanting in the ASB ed., must not be taken as spurious. They occur in almost all the Mss. of the Brihad-dharma Purāṇa. Moreover, the final chapter of the ASB ed. (which is the same as chap. 14 of the Uttara-khaṇḍa of the Vaṅga. ed.) clearly shows that it is not the concluding chapter of this Upapurāṇa. It does not contain a single word on the praise of this work, nor does it mention Sūta who is the main reporter. On the whole, this chapter (14) shows no sign of conclusion of the work."²⁴²

The importance of the Brihad-dharma Purāṇa as a source material for the social history of Bengal towards the end of the Hindu rule has been stressed above (pp. 417 ff.) It is necessary, therefore, to discuss in some detail the date of the work and the locality in which it was written. As far back as 1943, the assumption was made, with some degree of hesitation, that it was composed in Bengal not later than the 13th or 14th century A.D.²⁴³ Since then the question has been thoroughly discussed by Dr. R. C. Hazra, perhaps the greatest living authority on the Upapurāṇas, to which category
this text belongs. A summary of his views is given below as far as possible in his own words.343

In this work there are numerous evidences which point to Bengal as the place of its origin. These evidences are as follows:

(i) In Bṛihad-dharma. III. 13 there is a list of ‘thirty-six (mixed) castes with a few additional ones’ (ṣaṭṭriṁsaṁjñātayaḥ...śādhikāḥ...) which are all non-Brahmin and include the name of Vaidya; and in Bṛihad-dharma III. 14 these ‘thirty-six castes’ have been called ‘Śūdras’, and their vocations have been given. In these two chapters the Brahmins also have been divided into two main classes, viz., Śrotriya and Paśita. It is to be noted that the tradition of ‘thirty-six castes’ (cchatriś jāti) is very popular in Bengal, that all the castes (including Gaṅaka) mentioned in Bṛihad-dharma. III. 13-14, still exist only in Bengal and follow the same professions as mentioned in the Bṛihad-dharma, that Vaidya, as a caste, is found in no other province than Bengal, and that even at the present day non-Brahmin castes of Bengal are called Śūdras.

(ii) Bṛihad-dharma. III. 1.23-24 prescribe the following surnames to be used by the members of the different castes:
(a) ‘Deva-ārman’ for Brahmins, (b) ‘Rāya’ and ‘Varman’ for Kṣatriyās, (c) ‘Dhana’ (i.e., words indicative of wealth) for Vaiśyas, (d) ‘Dāsa’ for Śūdras, (e) ‘Devi’ for females belonging to the Brahmin and Kṣatriya castes and (f) ‘Dāsi’ for females of the Vaiśya and Śūdra castes. These surnames, especially ‘Devi’ and Dāsi, are still used in Bengal.

(iii) The Bṛihad-dharma uses the word ‘mā’ in the sense of ‘mother’, and the word ‘bhagnī’ in the sense of ‘sister’ (bhagini).

(iv) Some Sanskrit words and verbal roots have been used in the Bṛihad-dharma in such peculiar senses as are found attributed to them in Bengali, viz.,
(a) the root ‘vas’ in the sense of ‘sitting’, and the phrase ‘mukhe jagāda’ for ‘mukhena jagāda’,
(b) the word ‘svikārā’ in the sense of ‘promise’,
(c) the word ‘vīlakṣaṇa’ in the sense of ‘sufficient’,
(d) the word ‘kṣhati’ in the sense of ‘loss’,
(e) the word ‘dvarā’ in the sense of ‘with’ or ‘by’,
(f) the word ‘nikaṭa’ in the sense of ‘to’ or ‘near’,
(g) the word ‘he’ in place of ‘bho’, and
(h) the word ‘pārita’ used in the sense of ‘capable of being done’ but without any word ending in the suffix ‘tum’.
(v) The form of goddess Kālī and the method of her worship with ‘Mālasī’ songs, as described in Brīhad-dharma I. 23, is peculiar to Bengal (and also perhaps to Assam).

(vi) The method of the autumnal worship of Durgā, as given in Brīhad-dharma I. 22, is followed in Bengal. It includes certain rites which are peculiar only to Mithilā, Bengal and Kāmarūpa.

(x) Among the names of the principal holy places situated on the banks of the Gaṅgā from Gaṅgā-dvāra to Gaṅgā-sāgara-saṅgama, mention is made of Prayāga, Vārānasī, the confluence of the Gaṅgā with the Padmāvatī, and Trivenī where the Sarasvatī and the Yamunā become separate from the Gaṅgā, in the same order as given above. Hence the Padmāvatī must be identical with the river Padmā, and Trivenī with Muktavēni near Hughli in Bengal.

These references to the Padmāvatī, and the course of the Gaṅgā show how greatly the author of the Brīhad-dharma tried to identify the river Hughli with the Gaṅgā and to pass the Padmā as a sacred river.

(xii) In Bengal, the use of paddy and Dūrvā grass in blessing on ceremonial occasions has become a custom with women; and this custom has been referred to in Brīhad-dharma, III. 17, wherein gopīs are found to bless the new-born Kṛishṇa with paddy and Dūrvā grass.

(xiv) The text refers to many stories peculiar to Bengal only and are almost the same as those given in the Chaṇḍī-Maṅgala Kāvyas in Bengal.

(xv) The influence of Jayadeva’s Gītā-govinda is clearly discernible on the style, metre and spirit of the song (on Kṛishṇa-līlā at Vṛindāvana) which is given in Brīhad-dharma. II.14. 88ff.

(xvi) Brīhad-dharma III. 5. 48 contains direction about the sequence in which different kinds of food are to be eaten; and this sequence is followed in Bengal even at the present day.

(xvii) The Brīhad-dharma contains some of the Sanskrit proverbs which are still very popular in Bengal.

(xviii) In Brīhad-dharma III. 5. 44-46 Brahmins are allowed to eat particular kinds of fish except on some particular days. It is to be noted that it is only some Nibandha-writers of Bengal (such as Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa, Śrīnātha Āchārya-čhudāmaṇi and others) who allow the Brahmins to eat fish under certain restrictions (p. 457).

(xix) From an examination of the names of the trees, plants and flowers mentioned in the Brīhad-dharma, Jogesh Chandra Roy
thinks that the author of this Upapurāṇa lived in the eastern part of the district of Burdwan.

(xx) Of the mahāptithas created by the fall of the different parts of Sati’s body, the Brīhad-dharma (I.14) mentions only three, viz., Kāmarūpa, Vakrēśvara (in the district of Birbhum), and Ujjayinī (modern Mangalkot in Burdwan district) of which the last two belong to Western Bengal.

(xxi) Almost all the Mss. of the Brīhad-dharma, hitherto discovered, belong to Bengal and are written in Bengali script.

(xxii) The peculiar method of composition called chauntrīśā, which is so favourite with the vernacular poets of Bengal, is found in Brīhad-dharma, II. 20. 134-171 (in which more than 250 names of Gaṅgā have been arranged according to the alphabetical order of their initial letters, viz., ka to ksha, a to au and am and ah. It is to be noted that in this arrangement ksh has been regarded as a separate varṇa.

The above evidences are perhaps sufficient to show that the author of the Brīhad-dharma Purāṇa was an inhabitant of Bengal.

As regards the date of composition Dr. Hazra observes: “Among the standards of measurement of weight it mentions ‘seraka’ (modern ser) which was introduced by the Muhammadans; and in verses 88ff. of chap. 14 of its Madhyakhaṇḍa it clearly betrays the influence of Jayadeva’s Gītā-govinda. It knows the spread and tyranny of the Yavanas (Muhammadans) in Bengal. Hence the date of this work cannot be placed earlier than 1200 A.D.”

This is supported by many references to the Mlechchhas and Yavanas in III. 6.89; 19.16; 19.43; 20.15.

But in III.3. 2, the Kshatriya Kings are advised to have darpa (pride) to collect war materials, and to make all kinds of preparations for self-defence.

From a study of these references Dr. Hazra concludes: “It is clear that at the time of composition of the Brīhad-dharma Purāṇa the Muhammadans spread in Bengal but could not bring the whole province under their power, that the insult of defeat at the hands of these aliens was still fresh in the mind of the people, and that there were Hindu monarchs who were expected by the people to drive out these undesirable elements and become the saviours of the Hindus and the Hindu religion.

“Hence it is highly probable that the Brīhad-dharma Purāṇa was composed in the latter half of the thirteenth century A.D. Jogesh
Chandra Roy thinks that it was composed a little after the thirteenth century.245

"We have already seen that chaps. 15-21 of the Uttarakhanda of the Vaṅga, ed. are not spurious. Among the remaining chapters also there is none which seems to have been added later. Hence the above general date of the Bṛihad dharma Purāṇa can safely be taken to be that of all its chapters."246

II. Brahma-vaiśvarta Purāṇa

Dr. Hazra thinks that the genuine Brahma-vaiśvarta Purāṇa is lost and the current work of that name is a spurious work of later date.247 But he regards it as a work of Bengal which, in its present form, "cannot be dated earlier than the tenth century A.D."248 At the same time he points out that almost all the chapters of Skandha IX of the Devī-bhāgavata have been taken from the Prakṛiti-Khaṇḍa of the present Brahma-vaiśvarta Purāṇa, and as the Devī-bhāgavata "must have preceded Śrīdhara Svāmin and others by a few centuries, it cannot be dated later than 1200 A.D."249 It would, therefore, follow that the present text of the Brahma-vaiśvarta Purāṇa must have been composed between 1000 and 1200 A.D.

In an earlier work, published in 1940, Dr. Hazra expressed the following view about the date of the Brahma-vaiśvarta Purāṇa.

"A perusal of the Brahma-vaiśvarta Purāṇa shows that it is one of the latest of the extant Purānic works. Jogesh Chandra Roy has carefully examined the Purāṇa and come to the conclusion that it was first composed most probably in the 8th century A.D. From about the 10th century it began to be changed by the interfering hands of the Bengal authors who recast it to its present form and contents in the sixteenth century. In spite of this late recast, there are portions which have been retained from an earlier form of the Purāṇa.

"The above view of J. C. Roy is supported by the quotations made by the Nibandha-writers from a 'Brahma-vaiśvarta Purāṇa.'250
Footnotes

1 Cf. Chapter II, specially, p. 29.
3 *Mbh*, I, 104, II. 51, xiv. 29; *Vishnu* P. iv. 8. I; *Matsya* P. 48. 24 ff; *Manu*, x. 44.
4 For the ethnographical significance of this, cf. R. P. Chanda, *Indo-Aryan Races*, p. 43.
5 In the *Mahābhūrata* (I. 216) Arjuna is said to have visited the holy places in Aṅga, Vaṅga and Kaliṅga, and made gifts to the Brāhmaṇas of those places. Vātsyāyana, in his *Kāmasūtra* (V. 6, 38, 41), refers to Brāhmaṇas of Gauḍa and Vaṅga.
7 Cf. *IHQ*, XVI. 689
8 Risley, *op. cit.* 1. xv ff.
9 *a* This is the Saṅkara theory. The other explanation is afforded by the Vṛātya theory which explains the origin of castes from the sons of the twice-born who became vṛātyas (fallen from their caste) for not fulfilling the sacred duties (Cf. *Manu* x. 20 ff). For an account of the ‘Vṛātya and Saṅkara theories of caste’ cf. *JASB*. 1902, p. 149. A detailed exposition of the system is given by Kane in his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II. Ch. II.
10 Kane, *op. cit.* 58.
11 Inter-caste marriages may, of course, give rise to additional castes, in a general way (Risley, *op. cit.* p. xxxvii).
12 Edited in Bibliotheca Indica Series. Its *Uttara-khaṇḍa* containing only Chapters i-xiv will be referred to as Part II, and the other portion as Part I. for Chapters xv-xxi of Part III cf. the Vangavāsi Edition. Cf. Appendix IV.
13 For example Kane, who has dealt exhaustively with this kind of literature, does not refer to it. A good account of the text is given in ‘Upapurāṇa’ II, pp. 396-466.
14 II. xiii-xiv All the subsequent references to the mixed castes are to be found in these two chapters.
15 The reference to Vēṇa as having caused a confusion of the castes in *Manu* IX. 67, is explained in a different way by the commentators.
16 For a slightly different account, cf *Upapurāṇa*, II, pp. 437-440.
17 In Ch. xiii the name ‘Gāndhikā-vaṇīk’ occurs in the list of Uttama Saṅkaras; but in Ch. xiv, in which the vocations of some of the mixed castes are given, we find simply ‘Vaṇīk,’ and its profession is mentioned as ‘gandhavikrāya’ (sale of spices, scents and incense). Hence no question can be raised against their identity. As the name ‘Gāndhikā-vaṇīk’ is more expressive and helps us to distinguish the members of this caste from the Svaṅga-vaṇīks we have preferred this name to the simple title ‘Vaṇīk.’
18 The reading ‘Taulika’ occurs in II. xiii, 39; but in II. xiv. 64 the reading ‘Tailika’ is found. Even in the latter case Ms. C reads ‘Taulika,’ as the footnote shows. In the Vaṅgavāsi edition the reading ‘Tailika’ occurs in both the chapters.
The words 'Tailika and 'Tailakāraka' (No. 26 in the list) being synonymous, we have preferred the reading 'Taulika.'

The vocation of Sūta is not clearly specified but is stated simply in the line 'dāse ku kṛṣṭi-karmāṇi sūte ras-upayogirām.' Hence Sūta here means most probably a carpenter (who helps the cultivator by manufacturing the implements of cultivation) rather than a charioteer or a bard. So Sūta seems to be the same as Sūtradhāra (carpenter) mentioned in the Brahma-vaivarta Puraṇa (r. x. 33). The mention of Dīvāra and Jālika (both fishermen) as two distinct castes encourages us to suppose that the Sūta and Takshan (No. 21 in the list) also were distinct castes among the carpenters.

The line stating the profession of Tāmbūti is missing in the Bibl. Ind. edition of the Bhīṣad-dharma Puraṇa but occurs in the Vaṅgavāsī edition.

'Kānaka-vaṇīk,' mentioned in ii. xiv. 68 where the vocations of some of the castes already mentioned in Ch. xiii have been given, must be regarded to be the same as 'Svaraṇa-vaṇīk,' the word 'kānaka' being an adjective formed from 'kanaka' (gold) and there being no mention of 'Svarṇa-vaṇīk' in Ch. xiv. The Vaṅgavāsī edition wrongly reads 'kalika' for 'kānaka.'

The Vaṅgavāsī edition reads 'Śāvaka.'

The Vaṅgavāsī edition has 'Grīhi' for 'Malegrahi.'

The reading 'Ghaṭṭajīvī' ('for Ghattajīvī'), which occurs in the Bibl. Ind. edition, is supported by only one ms., viz. ms. A. The Vaṅgavāsī edition reads 'Ghaṭṭajīvī.'

The 'Mala' caste, mentioned in ii. xiii. 51, seems to be the same as 'Malla' (which is one of the antyaja castes), because 'Mala' has been mentioned there as an instance of antyajas along with Chāṇḍāla (sacānḍāla-malādayāḥ).

The Vaṅgavāsī edition reads 'Matta' for 'Malla.' Malla may refer to Māle (Māl, Maler, Māl Pahāria), a tribe of the Rājmahal Hills. Russell regards it as an isolated branch of the Śavaras. (The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India, iv. 153).

But practically these principles have not been strictly followed in making the classification. For example, the Chāṇḍāla, born of a Śūdra father and Brāhmaṇa mother, has been classed with the antyajas, and among the antyajas there are some, born of Madhyama Saṅkara males and Vaiśya or Śūdra females.

No mention of Vādaka is found in the Vaṅgavāsī edition.


The same phenomena are observed in the evolution of the caste-system all over India. Cf. G. S. Ghurye, Caste and Race in India (1932), 91 ff.

Edited by Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, Part I, Brahma-khaṇḍa Ch. x. vv. 16-21, 90-137.

That the list of Sat-śūdras in the Brahma-vaivarta Puraṇa is not exhaustive seems to follow from i. x. 18.

The origin of the 'Nava-sāyakas,' a caste-group peculiar to Bengal, may perhaps be traced to these nine castes with a common traditional origin.
Some of the mixed castes mentioned in the *Brahma-vaiyarta* Purāṇa are not included here. But even the long list in the Purāṇa is not exhaustive, for after the enumeration of the names of mixed castes the Purāṇa states: "The mixed castes are innumerable; who can mention their names or number?" (ii. x. 122).

It is to be noted that, unlike the *Brāhmadharma* Purāṇa, the *Brahma-vaiyarta* Purāṇa distinguishes Vaidya from Ambaśṭha, who is separately mentioned as born of a Vaiśya mother by a twice born (*i.e.*, Brahmin father).

Views on the relative superiority of the existing castes vary widely, and it is not our intention to express any opinion on the present social condition. Our object is merely to give a very broad review of the present for the sake of comparison with the past. Lest any one’s susceptibilities are wounded, it may be added that the description of the present condition is based on Dr. J. N. Bhattacharya’s *Hindu Castes and Sects*, and we do not hold ourselves responsible for any opinion expressed by him.

See p. 431.

These have been discussed later in connection with Karaṇas and Vaidyas.


Kane, *op. cit.* 52 ff. 447 ff.


*PRP.* 90. It is to be observed also that marriage with a lower caste (including āśūtra) is not included in the list of forbidden marriages, entailing a penance, given by Bhavadeva on p. 117.

*DB.* Ch. xi. 47-48; Colebrooke’s tr. 197-99.


*PRP.* 51 ff.

Ibid. 118.

Ibid. 58 ff.


Cf. Inss. No. B. 2, 30, 40, 50, 92; *EI.* XIII. 292; *IB.* 24, 67, 157. Kolaṇcha and Krodaṇchi or Krodaṇja may be identical. It is frequently mentioned in inscriptions and genealogical works (cf. *IC.* II. 358). Chandavāra may be identified with Chandwār near Etawa in U. P., well-known in Muhammadan history (*IB.* 151). Muktaḥastu is referred to in three grants of the Paramāra king Arjunavarman, and the Mandhata Plates of his successor Devapāla dated 1225 A.D (*EI.* IX. 107; D. C. Ganguly, *History of the Paramāra Dynasty*, 201) as the home of the Brāhmaṇa donees, but cannot be identified. Hastipada may be identified with the village of the same name, mentioned in the Kudopali Grant of the Somavamiś ruler of Kosala as the place from which one of the donees had immigrated (*EI.* IV. 254 ff.).

There is great controversy about the location of ‘Tarkāri, within the limits of Śrāvasti,’ the Brāhmaṇas from which place, according to Silimpr Ins. (*EI.* XIII. 283), settled in the village of Bālagrama in Varendrā. Tarkāri was a famous settlement of the Brāhmaṇas and Karaṇas, and is referred to as Tarkāri, Tarkārika, Tarkāra, Takkāra, Tarkāri, Takārikā, etc. in a large number of inscriptions (*EI.* I. 336, III. 348, 353, IX. 107; *IA* xvii. 118,
XVI. 204, 208). Dr. R.G. Basak, while editing the Silimpur inscription, concluded from the expression *Sakaṭi-vyavadhānavān* that Bālagrama was separated from Tarkaṇḍi by the (river) Sakaṭī. This places Śrāvasti in North Bengal. In support of his suggestion Dr. Basak points out that some of the Purāṇas locate Śrāvastipura in Gauḍa. Mr. J. C. Ghosh (*IA*. 1931, pp. 14 ff. and *IC*. II 358-59) and Rao Bhabadur K. N. Dikshit (*EI*. XXIII. 103) agree with Dr. Basak's view. They point out in support of it that two inscriptions from Assam place Kṛoḍaṇcā and Vaigrāma in Śravathi or Śrāvasti, and Vaigrāma is identical with the village of Bāgram in the Bogra district. Mr. N. G. Majumdar (*IA*. 1919, pp. 208 ff.) opposes this view and identifies Śrāvasti with the well-known city in Āvadh. He thinks that *Sakaṭi-vyavadhānavān* may be taken to mean that Bālagrama was bounded by Sakaṭī. Monier-Williams gives the meaning of *vyavadhāna* as 'separate', "divide", *etc*. In our opinion the verse in question means that Bālagrama was divided by the (river) Sakaṭī. Attention may be drawn to the verse 6 of the Silimpur inscription, which mentions about the eastern division (*pūrva-khandā* of Bālagrama. An inscription from Orissa (*IA*. XVII. 121) places the village Ṭakkārīṅkā in the Madhyadēsa. More than three quarters of a century intervened between the two inscriptions from Assam, referred to above. śrāvasti, in which the village Kṛoḍaṇcā was situated, as has been mentioned in one of these inscriptions, may be referring to the famous Śrāvasti in Madhyadēsa. On the whole, it is more reasonable to place Tarkaṇḍi in Śrāvasti in Āvadh.

47 The existence of the Rāḍhiya, Vārendra and Vaidika Brāhmaṇas in Bengal before the close of the Hindu period is proved by a passage in Ḥalāyudha's *Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva* (*infra*, p. 430). Classification, according to localities, into Rāḍhiya, Vārendra, Vaṅgaja *etc.* is found also among other castes such as Kāyastha, Vaidya, Bārui *etc*.

48 Ādāvāḍī *cp.* of Daśarathadeva (C. 20). See also App. II.

49 For full discussion cf. App. I. The same view is maintained by R. P. Chanda after elaborate discussion (*Indo-Aryan Races*, Ch. v).

50 *JASB*. N.S. XII. 295 ; *EI*. XXIII, 105 ; XXII. 137, 165.

51 Madra Museum Plates of Jāṭilavaran (IA. 1893, p. 74)


53 This shows that the descendants of the five Brāhmaṇas, brought from Kānauj, according to the Kulajī story, for their knowledge of the Vedas, were also as ignorant of the Vedas as those resident in Bengal, referred to by the Kulajīs.

54 An inscription (*EI*. II. 330) from Govindapur, in the Gaya district, Bihar, dated S. 1059 = *A.D. 1137*, states that the Maga Brāhmaṇas, who sprang
from the sun’s own body, were brought to India from Śākadvipa by Ṛāmba. The first of these Maṇa Brāhmaṇas was Bharadvāja, whose family had a hundred branches. In one of them were born two brothers Manoratha and Daśaratha, who were induced to accept service under Varṇamāna, king of Magadha. Manoratha’s son Gaṅgādhara, a counsellor and friend of the king Rudramāna of Magadha, composed this record. Gaṅgādhara married a daughter of Jayapāṇi, an official of the king of Gauḍa. It proves that a family in Bengal was socially related to the Śākadvipa Brāhmaṇas in the first half of the twelfth century A.D.

54 The inclusion of Purohita and Maṇa-Purohita in the list of officials in the land grants of the Kamboja, Varman, and Sena kings is very significant.

55 IB. 8-9 ; 67.

56 Ānuḷīśa (C. 9) v. 10 (IB. 86, 89-90) refers to gift of myriads of excellent villages consisting of lands excessively growing paddy. Cf. also Bhowal (C. 12) of Lakshmanasena and other inscriptions of the Senas.

57 v. 23 (IB. 48. 54)

58 These are the dynasties to which Śilabhadra and Lokanātha belonged (supra pp. 78-79).

59 PRP. 60.

60 IB. 29.

61 Cf. the passage from Brīhad-dharma Purāṇa (11. xiv. 75) referred to above.

62 J. N. Bhattacharya, op. cit. 125.

63 Egg-Cat. v. 974 ff.

64 RC., Kavi-praśasti, v. 3,

65 Cf. Kane, op. cit. 74.

66 The Karanika and Kāyastha are distinguished in the Gurmāha (C. 34) where the Mahāmantri is called Karanika and the Mahākṣapatalikā, a Kāyastha.

67 Kāyasthaḥ syāl-liṅkaraḥ Karanaḥ=kshara-jīvanāḥ lekhako=kshara-chuṅchus=cha.

68 Jalhaṇa, who wrote two copper-plate grants of Gāhaḍavāla king Govinda- chandra, describes himself as Kāyastha in one (EI. IV. 104) and Karanik- odgato in another (EI. VIII. 153). In the Ajaygarh Rock inscription of the Chandella king Bhojavaran (EI. I. 330) Karana and Kāyastha are used as interchangeable terms (e.g. the descendants of Vāstu are called Karana in v. 4 and Kāyastha in v. 7).

69 According to Dr. J. N. Bhattacharya, there is a Karana clan of Kāyasthas in North Bihar, and the Uttara-Rājdhya Kāyasthas of Bengal claim to be Karanas (op. cit. 188-89). Cf. Russell, op. cit. III. 418. The Karana caste in C.P. and Orissa traces its descent from Chitragupta like the Kāyasthas in Bengal (ibid. 343).

70 Kane, op. cit. 76-77. A Karanika Brāhmaṇa is referred to in the Dhod (Udaipur State, Rājputāna) inscription, dated A.D. 1171 (Bhandarkar’s List, No. 350). A Brāhmaṇa donee of the Nidhanpur of Bhāskaravarman (7th cent. A.D.) is called ‘nyāya-Karṇika’ (EI. XII. 75). Two Brāhmaṇa
donees in an inscription at Madura, dated 1586 A.D., are called Karaṇikya and Karaṇika (El. XII. 167; donees Nos. 118, 120).

71 El. XVIII. 251. The writer of the Gurmhā cī, (Bhandarkar’s List, No. 34), dated 870 A.D., is called Mahākshapalalika Kāyastha. But whether the Kāyastha here refers to a caste cannot be definitely settled.

72 El. XII. 61.

73 Proc. ASB. 1880 (p. 78). The inscription was found at Bodh-Gayā and refers to the guru of the king of Kāśi.

74 El. XII. 46.

75 Ibid. XIX. 50.

76 Ibid. I. 332.

77 Kame, op. cit. 76

78 Udayasundari-kathā. GOS., p. 11.

79 Beal-Records. II. 267.

80 El. XXIV. 101 ff. The portion containing the account is mutilated, and so the account cannot be fully understood. The editor of the inscription has summarised all the important points in his introductory remarks (pp. 108-109). As he has pointed out, v. 34 seems to refer to the Kāyasthas as ‘dvijas,’ though, on account of the mutilation of the record, it is not clear how this was reconciled with their Śūdra origin stated in vv. 36-38.

81 JASB. VI. 882.

82 Pag Sam Jon Zang, ed. S. C. Das, Introd., p iii. On p. v there is reference to a Kāyastha-vṛiddha.

83 Śrīdharā wrote Nyāya-kandalī, a commentary on Padartha-dharma-samgraha by Pratapadāsa. He states that he was a resident of Bhūrisṛesṭhi, in Dakshinā-Rādhā, and wrote this book at the request of Pāṇḍudāsa, foremost of the Kāyastha race, in Śaka 913—A.D. 991 (Kasi ed. p. 269), Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, in order to establish the existence of Kāyastha clan in Bengal in the pre-Muslim period, refers to the above passage of Nyāya-kandalī (IA. 1932, p. 50). It does not, however, necessarily follow from the statement in Nyāya-kandalī that Pāṇḍudāsa of the Kāyastha race was an inhabitant of Bengal, or that the book was written in Bengal, though this appears to be the most plausible view.

84 IA. LXI. 48 ; N. Vasu, Kāyasther Varna-nirṇaya, p. 184 ; J. C. Ghosh in IHQ. VI. 60 ff.

85 EP. Ind. IX. 102. The writer of the record is referred to as Vejravarman of the Vaidya family (Vaidyānvaya)

86 These inscriptions are:

i. The Velvikuḍī Grant of Neḍunjaḍaiyaṇ) Year 3 (c. 765-815) (El. XVII. 291-309).


III. Annamalai inscriptions of Māraṇjaḍaiyaṇ, dated in Kali Era 3871 (=769-70 A.D.) (El. VIII. 317-321).

They all belong to the reign of one and the same Pāṇḍya king (for the identity, cf. El. XVII. 295) and refer to several Vaidya chiefs who occupied high offices in the State. One of them, referred to as the crest-jewel of the
Vaidyakas (Vaidykāsikhā-maṃś) in No. 1, and simply as Vaidya in No. 3, was a great general, the prime minister (uttara-mantrin), and great favourite of the king. As regards another great feudal chief, who was probably the younger brother of the first (EI. XVII. 296), it is said (No. 3) that his birth had conferred splendour on the Vaidya race (Vaidya-kula) of Vaṅgalaṇḍai which was famous for (skill in playing) musical instruments, singing and music. Another chief, Maṅgalarāja Madhuratara (perhaps identical with the first), an āśāṃpati of the grants, is called a Vaidya, and a master of the Sāstras, a poet and orator. The expression Vaidyā-kula undoubtedly indicates a social group whose members are also referred to as simply Vaidya or Vaidyaka. We are indebted for these references to Dr. H.C. Ray-chaudhuri.


88 At least we have not been able to trace it. The passage is quoted in Jāti-tattva-vāridhi and Viśvakosha. It may be summarised as follows: ‘Once a Vaiśya girl offered a drink to sage Gālava who was very thirsty. The sage gave her a boon that she would have a son who would purify the family. The girl then told the sage that she was unmarried. The sage took her to the hermitage. The other sages held that the words of Gālava must be honoured, and Dhanvantari, the divine physician, would be born of her. So they put a child made of Kuśa grass on the lap of the girl with the recitation of Vedic mantras, and infused life into it. Thus a boy was created. He was called Vaidya, as he was born from Veda, and also Ambaśṭha because he was born on the lap or fixed in the family of ambā (mother). He was taught medical sciences by the sage and was called Amṛtāchārya (Umesh Chandra Gupta, Jāti-tattva-vāridhi, t 36; Viśvakosha. s.v., Vaidya-jāti).

89 The Uṣanas also distinguishes Ambaśṭha from Vaidyaka.

90 Upapurāṇa, II, 441-2

91 Bharata Mallika, the famous Vaidya author of Chandra-prabhā and Bhāṭi-tīkā, who lived in the 17th century A.D., calls himself a Vaidya and Ambaśṭha, and has quoted in the former work three passages from Vyāsa, Agnivesa, and Saṅkha Smṛritis to prove the identity of the two. Whether these passages are genuine or not (the passages from Saṅkha, e.g., does not occur in the printed text), they indicate the view current in his age.

92 J. N. Bhattacharya, op. cit. 188. Russell, op cit. iii. 417.

93 Kane, op. cit. 91 (s. v. Māhishya).

94 Pick, Sociale Gliederung. 302.

95 Gautama (rv. 20); Yājñavalkya (t. 92); Kane, op. cit. 91.

96 The account of the present condition of the Kaivartas or Māhishyas is based on Dr. J. N. Bhattacharya’s Hindu Castes and Sects (pp. 279-281) and the Report submitted by Mr. J. S. Sen, a Deputy Magistrate, dated Dacca, 13th July, 1907, to the Government of Bengal. Both of these are quoted with approval in Māhishya-vīrtit by Basanta Kumar Ray (4th Edition, Dacca 1322 b.s.), a book written with a view to explain the origin and importance of the Māhishya community. We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions quoted.

97 The Brīhad-dharma Purāṇa, as noted above, includes the caste ‘Dāsa’ (cultivator) as an uttama-saṅkara and Dhīvara (fisherman) as madhyama-
sāṅkara. These two might refer to the two sections of the Māhishyas or Kaivartas who are not otherwise mentioned in the text. (Cf. Ḥalāyudha’s lexicography on the Kaivartas.)

These have been discussed above. Their language represents the oldest specimen of Bengali. They were probably composed between 950 and 1200 A.D. (pp. 392-94).

BGD. 19, 32.
Ibid. 43.
Ibid. 60, 73.
v. 8 (IB. 72, 77)

Paharpur, 64-65, Pl. xlIX. Dikshit takes the figures to be Śabaras, but it is better to regard them as representatives of wild tribes like Savaras, Pulindas, Bhilas, Kirātas etc. who are known, from literature, to have lived in the forest regions in Bengal or on its border. Cf. Ch. xv.

Upapurāṇas ii. 430, 448.

The description of these ceremonies as well as of the kuśaṇḍikā is based upon the ms. of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva’s Karmāṇuṣṭhāna-paddhati in the Dacca University Library (ms. No. 502). The performance of the homas, etc. and the payment of fees to priests, being constant features in these ceremonies, will not be repeated in the descriptions.

A darbha-piṇḍali is formed when two blades of kuśa, each of the length of a pradeśa, are tied in the middle with another piece of kuśa blade of the same length.

For an idea of the branches of knowledge regarded as important in ancient times one might compare the list of subjects in which Bhavadeva is said to have been efficient (IB. 34, 39) and also the list of works drawn upon by Sarvāṇanda in his Tīkā-sarvasva. The Brāhmaṇas referred to in the Pāla records are said to be proficient in Vedānta, Pada-vākya, Pramāṇa, Mīmāṁsā, Tarka, andVyākaraṇa.

Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa also refers to the lack of Vedic study (Pitṛ-dayitā, p. 8).

Cf. GL. 83.

For Kāntideva, cf. supra p. 130. His father is said to have been efficient in subhāṣita, Rāmayāṇa, Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas.

DB. p. 21.

KV. 427.

Dacca University ms No. M 27/40/2B (number in valuation list). This is a complete but undated ms. consisting of fols. 1-3, and written in Bengali characters. It begins with the words “atha Bhavadeviya-Sambandha-vivekah,” and ends with the colophon “iti Kāla-vadabhī (? Bāla-valabhī)-bujanga-śīrṣa-Bhavadeva-Bhaṭṭa-virachitaḥ Sambandha-vivekah samāptaḥ.” Though both in the beginning and in the colophon the work is called Sambandha-viveka, and its authorship is clearly ascribed to Bhavadeva, the fact that some of the references, made in the later Śrīmān Nibandhas, to Bhavadeva’s Sambandha-viveka are not found in the above mentioned ms., tends to show that our ms. contains only a summary of the original work.

See Sambandha-viveka, fol. 3a.

For similar injunction cf. PRP. 117.
King Sāmalavarman had quite a large number of wives (IB. 23); Bhava-
deva's father had two wives (IB. 37).

DB. 83.
118 Cf. Kṣāmabandha-viveka, fol. 2b; also DB. 79, 96.
119 Fols. 10a-27b.
120 The dowry of the bridegroom is referred to in the Charyā-padas (BDG. 33).
121 Gifts were made to the bride in this bridal procession (DB. 80).
122 Unimportant details have been left out of the account of the marriage
   ceremony given in the text.
123 The Charyā-padas refer to various musical instruments which were played
   when the bridegroom proceeded to the bride’s house. These were palaha,
   mādal, karanda, kasālā and dundubhi (BDG. 33; DUS. IV. No. II 28-29;
   JL. XXX. 41-42).
124 KV. 412, 102, 294, 417, 413
125 RC. III. 35.
126 KV. 514; also Kālikā Purāṇa (Venkaṭeswara Press ed.) 61, 21-22. For
   KV, cf. supra p. 368. Regarding the date and provenance of the present
127 See KV. 514; Kālikā Purāṇa 61, 21-22. It is difficult to believe that the
   action hinted by the line ‘bhaga-liṅga-kriyābhiṣ = cha kriṣayeyur=alam
   janāḥ’ was actually practised by the people on this occasion.
128 KV. 470.
129 KV. 294 ff.
130 DB. 43, 127.
131 KV. 403-4. For a more detailed description of this festival, see Śrīnāthā-
   chārya-chuḍāmanī’s Kṛitya-tattvārṇava (Dacca University ms. No. 4630),
   fols. 70a, 71b.
132 KV. 470.
133 Kṛitya-tattvārṇava, fols. 71b-72b.
134 KV. 403. See also Kṛitya-tattvārṇava, fol. 68a-b.
135 KV. 405-6.
136 KV. 325, 494-95, 409, 106. 292-93, 400, 422, 418, 333, 265, 278, 351. See
   also Kṛitya-tattvārṇava, 72b-73a.
137 The meaning of the Charyā-padas (supra pp. 392-4) is not always clear.
   Dr. M. Shahidulla published an article in Nalārāja (a Bengali journal)
   quoting many passages referred to in this chapter with an indication as to
   their meaning, and subsequently published the texts with translations (DUS.
   IV. No. II. 1-87). Dr. P. C. Bagchi’s interpretation is occasionally differ-
   ent (JL. XXX. 1-156).
138 Beal-Records. II. 194-204.
140 Mitāksharā, Nirṇayasāgara edition, p. 257.
141 This will be evident from PRP. Also cf. Bṛhad-dharma Purāṇa, Part II,
   Chs. 2-6, summarised in Hazra, Upapurāṇas II. 429-33
142 Kāmasūtra, VI. 5. 33.
143 Supra p. 357.
144 Kāmasūtra, V. 6. 41.
Love-letters written by women are referred to in Pavana-dīṣṭa (v. 40).

Cf. pp. 464-5, and also Brahma-vaiivarta Purāṇa (Brahma-khaṇḍa x. 166-70)

Prakṛiti-khaṇḍa, lxi. 79.

DB. p. 85.

Ibid. 105.

PRP. 69; Brīhad-dharma Purāṇa, ii. 8. 11.

PRP. 67-68.

Govindānanda, in his Varsha-kaumudi (p. 216) condemns the view of Śrīnāthāchārya.

KV. 379.

PRP. 67.

Ibid. 66.

SPP. 1326, p. 86 f.n., 103.

BGD. 12.

PRP. 66 ff.

Ibid. 59, 66.

Ibid. 65.

BGD. 44.

PRP. 66 ff.

The detailed account given above is based on Food and Drink in Ancient Bengal by Taponath Chakravarty.

BGD. 7; JL. XXX. 6. According to Dr. Shahidullah's interpretation (op. cit. 5) the wine was fermented by a thin bark.

PRP. 40 ff.

Taponath Chakravarty, op. cit, pp. 48, 14-5.

Mc. Crindle, Ancient India, Ed. by R. C. Majumdar, Fragment XXVII (p. 69)

I-ting, 40.

Upapurāṇas ii. 431.


Cf. plates of illustrations in Ch. xv.

The upper scarf of the women was worn in different fashions; cf. Pavana-dīṣṭa v. 35; Āryā-saptāsatī. II. 5. I; Bhatt-Cat. Pl. ii, xxv. lxii (a).

Cf. Bhatta-Cat. Pl. xiv.

DB. 148.

Paharpur. Pl. xix a, b, d.

Ibid. Pl. xxxiv (a).

Paharpur. Pl. li (b). The Charyā-padas refer to naked Kāpālis. They besmeared their body with ashes, held khaṭvāṅga in one hand and damaṟu on the other, wore garlands, kuniṇḍaḷas and anklets, and tied a bell on their leg (BGD. 19. 21).


Paharpur. Pl. xxviii. xxix (a.)

For bead-necklaces, cf. Ibid. Pl. lxii.

Ibid. Pl. xxxiv (a).

According to Rājatarāṅgini (iv. 422) the dancing and music in the Kārtikeya temple at Pundravardhana, which followed the rules of Bharata, were enjoyed by Jayanta who himself knew the literature on this subject (Bharatāṇugam-ālakṣyā nritya-gūḍādi-śāstravit).

RC. iii. 35-37
Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva's Ins. v. 30 (IB. 35, 41)
For dancing, cf. Paharpur. Pl. xxxiv (a), xxxix (c), xl. (c), xliii (d) ; for musical instrument, cf. ibid. Pl. li.
Pavana-duṭa, vv. 33. 38.
Paharpur. Pl. xxviii (b), xlii (e).
Cf. go-rathya in the second Grant of Dharmāditya (Ins. No. A. 21).
Cf. classical accounts of four-horsed chariots maintained by the king of the Prasoi and the Ganganidai (supra, p. 30)
DB. 148
A caparisoned horse is represented in Paharpur, Pl. liii (f).
Elephants as a military force in Bengal are referred to in classical accounts of the Ganganidai, and in Indian literature and inscriptions. For literature on elephants written in Bengal, cf. supra p. 353. For sculptural representations, cf. Paharpur, Pl. liii (a).

BGD. 30. The original text has karaha which Dr. Shahidullah translates as camel (DUS. IV. No. ii. 26). But karaha (= karabha) may mean a young elephant ; cf. also JL. XXX. 38.
Cf. Raghuvamśa. iv. 36 where the Vahgas are referred to as nau-sādhana-dyātān which indicates the skill of the people in the use of boats for all purposes including war (cf. supra pp. 316, 344-5).

BGD. 16, 24, 26, 27, 58, 59, 73 ; JL. XXX. 28-30. The use of the wheels (chakra) is not quite apparent. For further references to boats and harbours cf. Ins. Nos. A. 17-21.
RC. ii. vv. 5-28.
RC. iii vv. 29-31.
Pavana-duṭa, vv. 36 ff.
I-tsing, 40. See pp. 459-60.
Edilpur C.F. v. 9 (IB. 122, 127), which is repeated in the records of Viśvarūpasena.
Kāmasūtra, v. 6, 38, 41.

The verses of Brihaspati are quoted in Smṛiti-chandrikā of Devaṇabhāṭṭa (Mysore ed.) i. p. 25, and Vyavahāra-mayūkha of Bhaṭṭa Nīlakarṇṭha (ed. P. V. Kane), p. 7.
118 DB. 149. The institution of slavery can be traced in Bengal from a very early period. It is referred to in Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra (v. 6.38). The slaves were regarded as absolute property of a person and were inherited by his successors. It is laid down in the DB. (p. 7) that if there is a single female slave inherited by more than one, she must serve, in turn, the different owners, during specific periods, according to number of shares held by each.

118 Deopārā Ins., v. 30 (IB. 49,55). Bhavadeva’s Ins., v. 30 (IB. 35,41).

114 Pavana-dāta, v. 28. The ‘deva-vāra-vanitā’ of Rāmāvatī, capital of Rāmapāla, mentioned in the Rāmācharita (iii. 37), probably also refers to Devadāsis.

118 Nothing more strikingly illustrates the very low standard of sexual morality of the time than the description of these courtesans. Dhoyi calls them vāra-rāmān, but does not hesitate to add that they made one feel as if the goddess Lakshmī had come down on earth (to attend her lord, the god Murāri). According to the Ins. of Bhavadeva (B. 90), “the hundred damsels (given to Vishnu) restored to life, as it were, the god of love... and were the prison-houses of the passionate, and the meeting-hall of Music, Dalliance and Beauty.” These leave no doubt that the sensual dominated the religious aspect of the institution of Devadāsis.

118 The following remarks of Dr. R. L. Mitra about a certain Tantric text, though perhaps not quite accurate or just, are very relevant to this question. “The professed object is devotion of the highest kind, but in working it out, theories are indulged in and practices enjoined which are at once the most revolting and horrible that human depravity could think of. The work is reckoned to be the sacred scripture of millions of intelligent beings” (Nepalese Buddhist Literature, p. 261). In spite of all that can be reasonably said in extenuation of Tantric literature (v. supra pp. 379-80), its degrading effect on society can hardly be doubted. Even in important and widely popular Hindu religious festivals such as Durgotsava, Kāmahotsava, etc. (supra pp. 452-3) the sacred texts emphasise certain features which cannot be uttered or written without violating rules of decency according to modern ideas.


118 For the origin of the common name Vaṅgāla (from which are derived the modern Vāṅglā, Vāṅgāli, and European Bengala, Bengal, Bengali), see supra p. 11 and IHQ. XVI. 225 ff.

118 This has been fully discussed by Dr. R. C. Majumdar (Bhāratavarsha, Jivaśhā 1348 B.S., p. 698).

119 The existence of gāхи does not necessarily mean a corroboration of the Kulajit story, as a whole, about its origin. The fact that Saptarṣiṭ Brāhmaṇas have also their gāhi goes against the assumption in the Kulajis that the system originated with the grant of villages to the five Brāhmaṇas and their descendants. That the details of this gāhi system as given in the Kulajis have been proved to be wrong in specific instances will be shown later. For a detailed account of the gāhis see App. ii.
Epigraphic evidence shows that these Brāmaṇas also settled in Vaṅga, outside the limits of Rādhā and Varendra, even during the Hindu period (EI. XVII. 356).

According to Kulajis, Nārāyaṇa, grandson of Chhandaḍa (Ś. 654) of Vāṣya gotra, flourished in Rādhā in the latter half of the eighth century A.D. (VII. 142). An inscription from Orissa relates that Govindaśarman, son of Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa of the Vāṣya gotra, an emigrant from Uttra-Rādhā, received grant of land in (Gaṅga Era) 308 = c. A.D. 808 (EI. xxiii 74). One may be inclined to identify Nārāyaṇa of the Kulajis with Nārāyaṇa of the inscription.

The Kulajis mention the name of Atihara of the Vandyaghaṭṭa gaṇi, who was a contemporary of Vallaśasena (VII. 40). Sarvānanda, who wrote Tīkā-sarvasva in 1159 A.D., states that his father was Ārthihara of Vandyaghaṭṭ. It is very likely that Atihara is identical with Ārthihara of the Tīkā-sarvasva.

The Kulajis further relate that Atihara’s father was Pitho, and his grandfather was Aniruddha. His brother Dharmānśu’s sons were Devala, Vāmana, and Kuvera, who were contemporaries of Lakṣmanasena. All of them belonged to the Sāṇḍilya gotra. The donee of the Saktipur Grant of Lakṣmanasena is Kuvera of the Sāṇḍilya gotra, whose father was Ananta, grandfather was Prithviḍhara, and great-grandfather was Aniruddha. (EI. XXI. 215). Kuvera of the Kulajis may be identified with Kuvera of the inscription, if we regard Dharmānśu as the second name of Ananta, and Pitho, a contracted form of Prithviḍhara.

Govardhanāchārya, the author of the Ārjū-saptasati flourished in the court of the Senas (v. 39). His father was Nilāmbara and his brother was Balabhadra. It is known from the Kulajis that Utsāha’s sons, Govardhanāchārya and Bala were contemporaries of Lakṣmanasena. (VII. I. 142.154). Pandit Lāl Mohan Vidyānidihi in his Sāṁbandha-nirṇaya (p. 504) takes Nilāmbara as the other name of Utsāha. He does not, however, give the source of this information. It may be argued that Govardhanāchārya of the Ārjū-saptasati is identical with Govardhanāchārya of the Kulajis.

Cf. R. C. Majumdar, “An Indigenous History of Bengal” (Proc. of the Indian Historical Records Commission, XVI. 59 ff.).

It would be a tedious task to give detailed reference to the statements made in this Appendix. In addition to the Kulajis texts in the following works in Bengali may be consulted for supplying the necessary data.

(b) Mahimāchandra Majumdar, Gāude Brāhmaṇa (1st. ed. 1889, 2nd. ed. 1900).
(c) Nagendranath Vasu, Vaṅger Jātiya Itihāsa.
(d) Kālīpada Bhaṭṭāchārya, Rādhīya Brāhmaṇa-kulatattva (1934).
(e) Umesh Chandra Gupta, Jāti-tattva-vāridhi, the second part being known as Vattāla-moha-mudgara.

For criticism of the historical value of the Kulajis, cf. Chanda, Indo-Aryan.
Races, Ch. v and a series of five articles entitled ‘Vaṅghya Kulaśāstrer Aitihāsik Mūlyā’ by Dr. R. C. Majumdar (published in Bhāratavarsha, in 1346 B.S. Kārtika-Phālgun). The authorities for most of the statements made in this Appendix and a fuller discussion of many points briefly treated here will be found in these articles.

This will be evident from what has been said above on pp. 18-19.

VI. Pt. i. 116. 126; Pr. ii. 21. The Rādhya Brāhmaṇas had originally fifty-six gāhīs. Later on three more were added to them. The list given above, which follows Vāchaspatimisra, contains the names of fifty-nine gāhīs. The so-called Kārikā of Hari Misra gives the list of fifty-six gāhīs. Boktyāla and Jhikrādī of the Śāndilya gotra, and Hijala of the Vātsyya gotra, as mentioned by the Kārikā, do not find place in the list of Vāchaspati. Kulakuli, Kayaḍī or Koyāri, Bhatṭa, Puṇsika, Dīghala, and Ākāsa gāhīs, referred to by Vāchaspatimisra, are not mentioned in the Kārikā. According to some, Dīghala, Puṇsika, and Bhatṭa are the three new gāhīs, which were added to the list of fifty-six.

VI. Pt. ii. 21.

TSS.

VI. Pt. i. 140.

IB. III. 33.

Ibid. 33, 21.


Bhāratavarsha, Pausha 1332 p. 78; IB. 181.

El. XV. 301. Cf. Matēyāśī gāhī; Śrīdharaś Nyāya-kandali. JAHRS. IV. 158-162.

India Office Cat. (Vol. I, Pt. I, No. 450); Dacca University ms. No. 4092. Cf. Chauktakaṇṭi Bāpula or Bapuli gāhīs.

Adhuta-sāgara; IA. 1922, p. 47 cf. Mahintyā gāhī,

JASB. 1912, 343. Cf. Champāṭi gāhī. The donee of the Manahali Grant of Madanapāla is Vāteśvara, son of Śaunaka, grandson of Prājapati, and great-grandson of Vatsa. They belonged to Kautsa gotra, and they had the pravaras of Śāndilya, Asita, and Devala. Vāteśvara was Champāhiṭṭya and a resident of Champāhiṭṭa (Champāhiṭṭyāya Champāhiṭṭa-vāstavyāya...)(GL. 154).

The Kautsa gotra has the pravaras of Āngirasa or Māndhātā, Āmbārisha, and Yauvaṃśa (VI. Pt. i. 46), and not Śāndilya, Asita, and Devala, which are the pravaras of the Śāndilya gotra (Ibid. 47). This anomaly cannot be explained. Champāṭi is a gāhī of the Śāndilya gotra of the Vārendra Brāhmaṇas. Vāteśvara was outside the society of the Rādhiya and Vārendra Brāhmaṇas, as he belonged to Kautsa gotra. But that he was closely related to Śāndilya gotra admits of no doubt. Some Saptāśat Brāhmaṇas are found belonging to Kautsa gotra (Ibid. p. 88). The Saptāśat have forty-two gāhīs, some of which are identical with those of Rādhiyas and Vārendras. But Champāṭi is not mentioned as one of them. It is obvious that Champāhiṭṭi was more than a place of residence to Vāteśvara. It was his gāhī or the seat of his family (kula-sthāna).
Cf. colophons of *KV*. Pāribhadra has been taken as equivalent to Pāri (hāla), which has given the name to a *gāhī* of the Rādhīya Brāhmaṇas (*KV*. Introduction, p. viii).

Upapurāṇa, II. pp. 396-7, f.n., 80.

*HB*. p. 567

Ibid, pp. 448-455.


*Upapurāṇa*, II. p. 461.

*Upapurāṇa*, I. p. 346.

*Upapurāṇa*, II. p. 343.

Ibid, p. 345.

Studies in the *Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, p. 166.