

Transforming Tradition



# Transforming Tradition

Cultural Essays in Honour of Mukund Lath

Edited by

Monika Horstmann



PRAKRIT BHARATI ACADEMY

Jaipur

ADITYA PRAKASHAN

New Delhi



© Editor / Authors

First Published 2013

*Prakrit Bharati Pushpa - 320*

ISBN 978-93-81571-20-0

*Published by*

PRAKRIT BHARATI ACADEMY,

Jaipur

&

ADITYA PRAKASHAN,

2/18 Ansari Road,

New Delhi – 110 002.

email: [contact@adityapublishing.com](mailto:contact@adityapublishing.com)

website: [www.adityapublishing.com](http://www.adityapublishing.com)

## **Transforming Tradition**

Cultural Essays in Honour of Mukund Lath

Edited by  
Monika Horstmann



## Contents

Note on Contributors .....	vi
Acknowledgements .....	vii
Monika Horstmann	
Introduction.....	1
Lawrence A. Babb	
Religion, Culture, and the Evolution of Jaipur's Gemstone Industry .....	5
Winand M. Callewaert	
An Unknown <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> from Rajasthan: The <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> of Mehojī .....	21
Gita Dharampal-Frick	
Provincializing History: Engaging with the Oeuvre of the Historian and Political Thinker Dharampal .....	25
Monika Horstmann	
Caturdās's <i>Bhāṣā</i> Version of the Eleventh Book of the <i>Bhāgavatapurāṇa</i> ....	47
Shail Mayaram	
Rethinking Axiality: Why the Transcendence–Immanence Binary Does not Work for India .....	63
Daniel Raveh	
A Short Improvisation on Time, Transcendence, and Self-Identity.....	73
Lloyd I. Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph	
<i>Epilogue</i> – Engaging Subjective Knowledge: Learning from Amar Singh's Narratives of and by the Self .....	87
Chandramani Singh	
उन्नीसवीं शती के कतिपय हिन्दी-उर्दू संकलन-साहित्य की अमूल्य निधि/ Some 19th-Century Collections of Hindi-Urdu Poetry: A Priceless Treasure .....	109
Mukund Lath	
Poems .....	123
Index .....	135



## Note on Contributors

LAWRENCE ALAN BABB is Professor Emeritus of Asian Languages and Civilizations and Professor Emeritus of Anthropology, Amherst College, MA.

WINAND M. CALLEWAERT is Professor Emeritus at the Department of Oriental Studies of Katholieke Universiteit de Leuven, Belgium.

GITA DHARAMPAL-FRICK is Professor of South Asian History at the South Asia Institute, Heidelberg University, Germany.

MONIKA HORSTMANN retired as Professor of Modern South Asian Studies (Languages and Literatures) from Heidelberg University, Germany.

SHAIL MAYARAM is Professor at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi.

DANIEL RAVEH is Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, Tel Aviv University.

LLOYD I. RUDOLPH is Professor Emeritus at the Department of Political Science, University of Chicago.

SUSANNE HOEBER RUDOLPH is Professor Emerita at the Department of Political Science, University of Chicago.

CHANDRAMANI SINGH is Director (Archives) at the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, The City Palace, Jaipur.

## Acknowledgements

The editor gratefully acknowledges the enthusiasm with which the contributors to this volume responded to the idea of offering Mukund Lath this slim volume as a token of their gratitude for his intellectual companionship. She is especially grateful to D.R. Mehta, who from Mukundji's beginnings in Jaipur has taken interest in his work and, through Prākṛt Bhāratī Samsthān, has had a share in promoting it. He suggested that Mukundji himself should be represented in the volume by poetry reflecting his deep concern for the preservation of an inhabitable culture.

The support of Alan Babb, Surendra Bothra of Prākṛt Bhāratī Samsthān, and Aditya Goel of Aditya Prakashan is recorded with gratitude.



## Introduction

As a scholar of Sanskrit, a musician and musicologist, a connoisseur and collector of art, a poet and independent thinker, Mukund Lath reflects what in Indian aesthetics is called *pratibhā*. The word describes the faculty of aesthetic perception shared by the poet or artist with the connoisseur. On his seventy-fifth birthday, colleagues and friends symbolically acknowledged what they received from him, from his *pratibhā* and inspiration. For most of the contributors, he has been a pilot on their own explorations in the world of Indian thought.

Mukundji was born on 9 October 1937 in a business family in Kolkata. In 1951 he passed Senior Cambridge from St. James School, Kolkata. In 1956 he graduated with Honours in English from Delhi University. His proficiency in Sanskrit and Prakrit, Hindi, Bengali, Urdu, Rajasthani and Gujarati took him far afield in the realm of literature. From 1951 and simultaneously with his academic interests, he pursued the study of music and was trained as a vocalist. His teachers were the singers Pandit Maniram and Ramesh Chakravarti, a disciple of Nasiruddin Khan Dagar. He proceeded with these studies under Pandit Jasraj. In the period of learning from him, he travelled with Pandit Jasraj to different parts of the country and walked through the Uttarakhand Himalayas on foot, in this way exposed to an intense musical education by performing music and imbibing various live musical traditions. Concerts with his teacher also took him to many places elsewhere in India.

In 1965, Mukundji did his post-graduation in Sanskrit, with a First Division from Jadavpur University, Kolkata. From 1966 to 1968 he was Research Assistant in the Indian Section of the International Institute of Comparative Music Studies and Documentation in West Berlin, directed by Alain Daniélou, an indologist famed as a pioneer in the field of Indian music studies. The fruit of this research was his Ph.D. thesis entitled “A Study of *Dattilam*”, devoted to an ancient text on music and submitted in 1973 to the Department of Sanskrit of Delhi University. In the same year, Lath joined the Department of History and Indian Culture, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur as Research Associate (a post equivalent to that of Lecturer) and was subsequently promoted to the position of Reader. He was also associated with the Centre for Jain Studies of the same university. His position involved both teaching and research covering the broad spectrum of ancient Indian education, literature and philosophy, Jain history and music culture as well as history of religion. His research focus lay mainly on music and music culture in the Indian past and the ways in which this tradition was transformed (for collected writings on this topic, see Lath 1998). In 1976 he was awarded a Ph.D. for his work on *Dattilam* (published in 1978).

Simultaneously with his engagement with India’s musical tradition, Lath brought out a new English translation of the Prakrit *Kalpasūtra*, a hagiography of Mahāvīra,



the historical founder of Jainism, and a source text for our knowledge of early Jain monasticism (1977). In the same year he started work on *Ardhakathānaka*, the autobiography written in Hindi verse by Banārsīdās, who was born during the reign of Akbar and wrote his work during the regnal period of Shahjahan in the 17th century. This book (1981) became seminal for our understanding of the Indian intellectual history of the period, particularly of the Jain merchant milieu, the debates on an interiorized reformed Digambar religion conducted in this, and the perception of intellectuals of themselves.

In 1979, Lath visited Japan at the invitation of the Japan Foundation in order to study the present state of traditional Japanese music and the new national trends in the field. In the earlier part of the 1980s a good part of his research and teaching was conducted abroad. In 1981/82 he was Guest Professor at the Department of Oriental Studies, University of Leuven, Belgium. Here he collaborated with Winand Callewaert on a text-critical study of the Hindi songs of the medieval poet Nāmdev (published 1989). This work implies an attempt to reach back with a computer-aided method to the oldest corpus of the songs attributed to Nāmdev as they were preserved in the most ancient available manuscripts. The book has an English translation of the songs and an elaborate introduction also discussing the oral musical tradition within which the songs were transmitted. The form in which the songs are available today is a result of this musical transmission. In 1984, Lath was again Visiting Fellow at Leuven for four months, and in the trinity term of 1985 he pursued his research and gave lectures on Indian aesthetics and classical music at the Institute of Oriental Studies of Oxford University, made presentations in Cambridge and Bonn, and, finally, attended the Eighth Rostrum for Asian Music, Ulan Bator, Mongolia.

The latter part of the 1980s featured a continuous engagement with the issue of the relationship between thought and music. In 1986, Lath first presented his ideas in the Alauddin Khan Lectures at Ustad Alauddin Khan Academy of Music in Bhopal. The lecture series was entitled "Music and Reflection". In 1990, he developed his thoughts on this topic further in his Vatsalanidhi Lectures in Delhi. This intense, enduring engagement with the topic took shape in the book *Saṅgīt evam cintan* (1992), which in 2000 won him the Śaṅkar Puraskār for the year 1999 and in 2003 the Nareś Mehtā Vāṅmay Puraskār of the Madhya Pradesh Pracār Samiti.

In the summer term of 1991, Lath was Professorial Fellow at the University at Bamberg, Germany and also attended the International Bhakti Conference in Paris. In the year 1995 he joined the project "History of Indian Science, Philosophy and Culture" of the Indian Council of Philosophical Research under Prof. D.P. Chattopadhyaya as chairman. This provided him a platform for his inquiry into the history of reflection on the arts in India. In 1999, he presented aspects of this in his Jerusalem Lectures in Indian Civilization entitled "The Logos of Music" and "Music as Logos", organized by the Hebrew University and the Rothschild Foundation. In 2002 he delivered a series of three lectures on the history, aesthetics and theory of Indian music at the Sackler Museum of Art, Boston, Mass., organized by Meru

Foundation in association with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

Mukundji's life-long achievements were acknowledged in 2008 by the Sangeet Natak Akademi Award for his scholarship in music, and in 2010 by the Padma Śrī of the Government of India for his contribution to the Field of Arts. In 2011 the Government of India awarded him the rank of Fellow of the Sangeet Natak Akademi (Akademi Ratna).

Mukundji has over many years pursued the theme of the transformation of Indian traditions, be it in a chronological perspective or in the perspective of shifting media, such as literature versus music or academic versus creative writing. How intrinsic this issue is to his thinking is demonstrated by his own poetry, which is the fruit of his engagement with tradition. In the background of his creative poetical writing looms a central question, namely, how precisely to grasp the novelty of his Hindi poetry inspired by classical texts in Sanskrit or Prakrit. His reflections on this issue allow us a glimpse into his aesthetic and intellectual laboratory. The alchemical process taking place there crystallizes into poetic gems such as those which form the conclusion of this volume (taken from *Tir rahī van kī gandh* of 2004). In these he emerges as a poet who genuinely transcends the ancient tradition, preserving the original in spirit while rendering it in a totally independent style and language; and in his theoretical reflections on this theme Lath presents himself as a foremost contemporary representative of a living and therefore ever-transforming Indian tradition. To let him have in this volume the final word—the word of poetry—is a way of paying our tribute to his creative genius. He speaks in melancholy poems, poems about devastation and the eerie ruins of urban culture destroyed by war. There are other forms of devastation besides war. One of these would be to slough off tradition rather than to face the challenge of engaging with it and thereby transforming it. Mukundji's oeuvre warns against this.



## Books by Mukund Lath

1977. Bhadrabāhu. *Kalpasūtra*. Śrīdaśāśrutaskandhāntargata-śrīparyuṣaṇākālpākhya viyīdh-varṇak-prācīn citrakalit evaṃ hindī-āṃglabhāṣānuvād sahit Bhadrabāhusvāmiviracit. English transl. by Mukund Lāṭh; ed. and Hindi commentary by Vinaysāgar; paintings introd. by Candramaṇi Simh (Prakrit Bharati Series, text 1) . Jaipur: Prakrit Bharati Sansthan. (2nd and 3rd eds. Mumbaī: Prakrit Bharati Academy, 1984 and 2006, respectively).
- 1978 *A Study of Dattilam : A Treatise on the Sacred Music of Ancient India*. New Delhi: Biblia Impex; distributed by Impex India, Delhi.
1981. *Half a Tale : A Study in the Interrelationship between Autobiography and History. The Ardhakathanaka*. Transl., introd. and annot. by Mukund Lath. Jaipur: Rajasthan Prakrit Bharati Sansthan (2nd ed. New Delhi: Rupa, 2005). 1984. See 1977.
1988. *Dattilam* (Kalāmūlaśāstra granthamālā 2). New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts and Motilal Banarsidass.
1989. *The Hindi Songs of Nāmdēv*, [ed., transl. and comm.] by Winand M. Callewaert and Mukund Lath (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 29). Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek and Motilal Banarsidass.
1991. *Svikāraṇ* [A selection of poems recreated in Hindi from the Sanskrit original, together with the author's own original poems.] New Delhi: National Publication House.
1992. *Samgīt evam cintan: darśan aur samskṛti kā samgīt-parak vimars*. Delhi: Prabhāt Prakāśan (2nd ed. Allahabad: Rākā Prakāśan for Darśan Pratiṣṭhān, Jaipur, 2007).
1998. *Transformation as Creation: Essays in the History, Aesthetics and Theory of Indian Music, Dance and Theatre* (Vol. I: *Essays in English*). New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
2004. *Tir rahī van kī gandh: Vākpatirāj kā prakṛtikāvya Mukund Lāṭh ke chandam meri*. Allahabad: Rākā Prakāśan for Prakṛt Bhāratī Akādāmī, Jaipur.
- 2004a. *Dharmasamkaṭ: kiṃ karma kim akarmeti kavayo'py atra mohitāḥ*. Allahabad: Rākā Prakāśan for Darśan Pratiṣṭhān, Jaipur.
2005. See 1981.
2006. See 1977.
2007. See 1992.
2009. *Kyā hai? Kyā nahīm hai?* Allahabad: Rākā Prakāśan for Darśan Pratiṣṭhān, Jaipur.
- 2009a. *Kram cetnā ke āyām*. Allahabad: Rākā Prakāśan for Darśan Pratiṣṭhān, Jaipur.
2013. *Anrahnī rahne do*. New Delhi: Rājkamal Prakāśan.

## Religion, Culture, and the Evolution of Jaipur's Gemstone Industry

Lawrence A. Babb

I was still much in the thrall of simplified ideas about Jain belief and life when I began my research in Jaipur in 1990. I had learned a lot from the books I had read, but not much about the Jains themselves, and it was only when I came to Jaipur (after a brief initial start in Ahmedabad) that my true enlightenment in matters Jain began. The foundation of my new education was, of course, my deepening familiarity (and friendship) with Jaipur's Jain community. But another crucial influence was my connection with Mukund Lath, who served as my faculty mentor in the Department of History and Indian Culture at the University of Rajasthan during my first period of research in Jaipur.

I could not have asked for a more rewarding academic connection. Not only was Mukund a source of the very best of intellectual companionship and excellent advice, but I also benefitted immensely from his scholarship. His English translation of the *Kalpasūtra* gave me a window of exceptional clarity into a text of key importance to Jaipur's Śvetāmbar Jains, but even more important to me was my encounter with his richly explained translation of Banārasī's *Ardhakathānaka*. In those pages I met an extraordinary and wonderful man. He was learned, gregarious, humorous, and joyful, and a man who knew well the pleasures of physical love. He was also a man of deep spiritual seriousness. His complexities were a radical challenge to the one-dimensional notions I had formed about Jainism's impact on character and behavior.

This is the spirit that informs the present essay. At issue is the impact of Jainism on economic behavior, a subject that seems particularly stereotype-prone, and my focus is Jaipur's famous lapidary industry. I first present a historical sketch of this industry and then develop some reflections—with specific reference to the theories of Max Weber—on the role Jainism played (and did not play) in its development. This industry has been historically dominated by Jains, and although there have been significant changes in the sociological makeup of the industry's ownership ranks in recent times, Jains remain at the core of Jaipur's gemstone elite. This being so, the industry represents an opportunity to examine the nature of the relationship between Jainism and business activity. Both scholarly and indigenous stereotypes proclaim Jainism to have a special affinity with the life of trade. The case of Jaipur's



gemstone industry, however, raises questions about this common belief and suggests that complex historical and cultural factors may be more important than religion in the relationship between Jains and business.

## Inception

When Maharaja Sawai Jai Singh II founded Jaipur in 1727, he encouraged a great variety of merchants, artisans, and other professional specialists to settle in his new city. In the turbulent eighteenth century, Jaipur was an excellent place of refuge for well-off traders. Its situation on an open plain was based on the concept—innovative, given the time and place—of a capital city as a physically accessible trading center, not a fortified redoubt, and open to maximum communications with the outside world (Sachdev and Tillotson 2002: 39). Jewelers were prominent among these immigrants, and Jai Singh's high regard for the jewelers who came to his new city is often spoken of with pride by the city's contemporary gemstone community as part of their shared heritage. Some of the jewelers and artisans had shifted from Amber, the old capital, but many came from much more distant points, such as Delhi, Agra, and even Varanasi.<sup>1</sup> One factor drawing merchants to the city was undoubtedly a desire to escape the uncertainties and chaos caused by the disintegration of the Mughal Empire, but equally important was the pull of the tremendous commercial opportunities offered by the new city as well as free land for residences and tax concessions offered to merchants by the state (Roy 1978: 52, 57–59).

But the jewelry business of Jaipur's early period was a far cry from the lapidary industry that made Jaipur famous in more recent times. The market for the kind of work that Jaipur jewelers were making and trading in those days, and for the precious stones that were utilized in such work, has been historically quite circumscribed in India. In Jaipur itself, gemstones found their principal buyers among regional and local elites, the royal families and their blue-blooded subordinates in the *thikanās*. The presence of *jāgirdārs* in the city itself provided such a market ready at hand, and by the nineteenth century well-off traders were becoming significant consumers of gems as well. Still, the Indian market was too limited to support a major gemstone manufacturing industry. That had to await the development of an overseas market.

This market was found in the second half of the nineteenth century, which is when Jaipur's lapidary industry—as we now know it—was born. At its heart was a precious form of beryl known as emerald. The industry's basic business model, which has prevailed from its inception to the present, was the import of raw materials from abroad—at first, emerald rough—the cutting and polishing of the stones by Jaipur artisans, and the export of the product to markets abroad, in those

1 For the story of one of these immigrant jeweler families, see Mukim 1992.

days almost entirely in Europe. The preconditions for such an industry's emergence were present in Jaipur already. Jaipur artisans were certainly working with gemstones of all kinds from the time of the city's inception. Furthermore, by the latter part of the nineteenth century the finishing of garnets from regionally obtained rough stone had become a Jaipur specialty, and this production was for export, not for domestic markets (*ibid.* 90, n. 29). However, the final package appears to have been put together by a single individual whose name was Banjilal Tholia.<sup>2</sup>

Banjilal's story is an excellent illustration of the principle that persons new to an activity are often the source of key innovations.<sup>3</sup> He belonged to the Khaṇḍelvā Jain caste (also known as Sarāvgīs) whose members are exclusively Digambar Jains.<sup>4</sup> His father was in the cloth business and a maker of small, drawstring purses of the sort used to store betel nuts and cardamoms. Normally, Banjilal would have followed his father into the cloth business, but according to a Tholia family tradition, he was sent out to apprentice as a jeweler because of an astrologer's prediction that he would flourish in this business.

The man to whom he was apprenticed was named Suganchand Saubhagchand Jargad, a major jeweler of the period who is generally credited with the training of a number of distinguished jewelers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Banjilal's inclusion among Suganchand's disciples was highly unusual. Suganchand was a Śvetāmbar Jain belonging to the Śrīmāl caste, and in those days Jaipur's jewelry business was almost entirely in the hands of Śvetāmbar Jains, particularly Śrīmāls. Banjilal was a Digambar Jain, and Digambers were absent (or nearly so) from the jewelry business at that time. That Banjilal was able to become Suganchand's apprentice appears to have been a fortuitous byproduct of a friendship between Suganchand and Banjilal's paternal uncle and also the fact that the Tholia house was situated conveniently nearby.

His training, which began at the age of ten, was undoubtedly a purely conventional jeweler's education of the period, which means that it had nothing whatsoever to do with finishing emeralds from rough. The reason for this was simply that there was no emerald rough available in India at that time. He began his own independent business at the age of thirteen, which was also when the first of his two marriages occurred. His father was not well off, but his father's younger brother—probably Suganchand's friend just mentioned—was a prosperous cloth merchant who had no son. Although he did not actually adopt Banjilal (a common practice in such cases), he handed over the bulk of his wealth to his nephew in order to stake him in a business.

2 I have not applied diacritics to the names of individuals in the gemstone business. The reason is that these are almost all names that have become extremely familiar in English in the spellings I have given. These spellings are used in the names of firms (as seen on shop signs, letterheads, and advertisements) and in many other contexts.

3 The following account of Banjilal's family background and start in the emerald business is based on oral history as related to me by family members.

4 On the background of Jain and non-Jain trading castes in Jaipur, see Babb 2004.



Banjilal began manufacturing emeralds as a result of a contact in Calcutta. The jewelry business took him frequently to Calcutta, and he had developed a close relationship there with a Calcutta Jeweler named Umrav Singh. Umrav, who was probably acting as his broker, belonged to the Śrīmāl caste, and it is likely that he had caste or family connections with the jewelry community of Jaipur, which was his link with Banjilal. In any case, Umrav introduced Banjilal to the owner of a then prominent Calcutta-based agency house called Kilburn and Company.<sup>5</sup> This firm traded between India and Europe in a wide variety of items, and they were Indian agents for a London-based firm specializing in diamond brokerage called Pittar, Levenson & Company. The latter, in turn, possessed mining rights of some kind in Colombia, which has historically been a major source of emeralds. How the idea originated is unknown and probably unknowable, but as a result of this contact, and through the agency of Kilburn and Company, Pittar, Levenson & Company began to send emerald rough to Banjilal and to receive his product in London on consignment.

A rough idea of the chronology of this relationship is provided by copies of some of Banjilal's business correspondence—dating from October 31, 1897 to September 17, 1900—recently unearthed by an alert member of the Tholia family, Mr. Sudeep Tholia. From these materials it is clear that by the late 1890s, Banjilal's manufacturing business had become very big indeed, and it seems likely that by this time it had been functioning for decades. Extrapolating backward on the basis of the average number of invoices per year in the years covered by the correspondence, Sudeep Tholia believes that Banjilal's emerald manufacturing began in the early 1870s, a reasonable deduction.

By the time of Banjilal's death in 1929, he had long been the leading jeweler of Jaipur and had become a legendary figure. Pittar, Levenson & Company had given him access to London, but at a later stage (when exactly is unclear) he developed a relationship with a Paris-based figure in the international jewelry trade named Victor Rosenthal. As a result of this relationship, Rosenthal became interested in emeralds, and actually spent six months in Jaipur learning the emerald business from Banjilal. Rosenthal was a link into the Paris jewelry market, and in the end Banjilal exported to Britain, France, the United States, and many other countries. Something of a transitional figure in the business, he was also jeweler to some of India's most prominent royal families.

One of his most notable achievements was his founding of the Jaipur Jewellers Association in 1927, which he created to provide a trustworthy weight certification service, and as an organization to settle disputes and represent the business

<sup>5</sup> Agency houses were partnership businesses through which private trade was mostly conducted in the British India of this period. In Radhe Shyam Rungta's words, they "...combined all sorts of diversified operations, such as ship-building, house owning, farming, banking, bill broking, insurance, etc." They were "the characteristic units of private British trade" and possessed immense capital resources (1970: 5-6).

corporately to the kingdom (*Journal* 2008: 18). An organization of some kind was especially needed to contest a tax levied on the jewelry business by the guardian of young Man Singh II after the death of Maharaja Madho Singh in 1922, a fight that was ultimately successful (M. C. Jain 1988: 1:26-27). He first formed an industry *pañcāyat* that met at a temple in Johari Bazar. He was its president and a jeweler named Kesricand Bindayaka (also a Digambar Jain) was its *mantrī* (secretary). In 1927 the State recognized it as the Jaipur Jewellers Association.

Banjilal had five sons, all of whom remained in a partnership in the emerald business after his death. Of the five, however, it was Sundarlal, born in 1893 and the middle son of the five, who had the greatest impact on the emerald business. As was his father, he was an expert on every aspect of emerald manufacturing, and ultimately acquired the sobriquet "The Emerald King." Sundarlal's empire dissolved after his death in 1965, although the family continued in the business in separate branches.

## Transmission

When Banjilal Tholia began to cut and polish emeralds for a European market he became an extremely wealthy man, and inevitably others began to take up the same business. They possibly also obtained Colombian rough from Kilburn and Company, at least at first. By the turn of the century there were many others in the business, and by the 1920s the emerald industry had entered an era of consolidation. New sources of rough provided a major boost. Some rough was available from the Swat and Panjshir Valleys, and workable deposits were also discovered in the Gravelotte district of NE Transvaal in 1927 at what later became known as the Somerset Mine. The rough was of high quality, and the umbrella of the British Empire made it easy for it to find its way from South Africa to India and Jaipur.

In these early years, the industry acquired the basic characteristics that it was to retain until the end of the twentieth century. Something resembling a factory system took shape. Jewelers had probably always brought artisans to their houses to work on specific projects. Now, however, there was an escalation of scale. Some manufacturers brought dozens of artisans to their houses to work under their supervision in a rationalized system of production that moved through a series of stages, from rough stone to finished product. The industry's export orientation resulted in a departure from the older craft culture that was the original training ground of Jaipur's gemstone artisans. The older culture emphasized beads, cabochons, and carved pieces, and placed primary emphasis on producing items of large size and heavy weight. In direct response to European tastes, the industry now became focused on the production of lighter, faceted stones.

The result was a blend of old and new. The basic business expertise and lapidary skills upon which the industry depended were indigenous, and the fact that they were in place in Jaipur made it possible for the industry to develop there. To that



extent, it was old. But the industry itself was very different from the older jewelry business out of which it grew. It was organized differently and produced a different product, and—given its sources of raw materials and markets—it was profoundly cosmopolitan in a way the older jewelry business never was. Long before the term had been invented by Theodore Levitt in 1983, Jaipur's emerald industry was well and truly "globalized," and has retained that character ever since.

But although the Tholias were at one level the most inside of the new industry's insiders, they did not constitute one of its growing points. Some of the new families in the industry came from the old jewelry business; others came from outside the profession and the city. The truly curious thing, however, is that for the most part they did not come from the Tholias' own Digambar Jain community. Rather, most of them were Śvetāmbar Jains belonging to the Śrīmāl and Osvāl castes. It was this group, not the Digambers, who emerged as the true core of the group that became the city's emerald elite. When we consider the key role Banjilal Tholia played in the industry's birth, this is quite surprising.

In reflecting on this point, we must begin by noting that the divide between Jaipur's Śvetāmbar and Digambar Jains is deep indeed, with both religious and social dimensions. On the religious side, the fact that both communities are Jain matters little. Although their belief systems are basically the same (a point to which we return later), Śvetāmbar and Digambar Jains practice Jainism largely in separation from each other. On the social side, the barrier of caste endogamy radically separates the Digambers from the culturally similar and intermarrying (in recent times) Osvāls and Śrīmāls, who are together the core of Jaipur's Śvetāmbar community. The result is that even when business ties connect them, the Śvetāmbers and Digambers live in different social worlds.

In light of these differences, we might suppose that it would be difficult for the new tradecraft to migrate across the Digambar/Śvetāmbar barrier. We must remember that Banjilal's initial contact with the jewelry business was largely the result of an accidental convergence of friendship and neighborhood proximity that enabled him to become Suganchand Jargad's apprentice. Given this, we might expect to find that the new emerald business remained and expanded in Banjilal's Digambar community, not in the Śvetāmbar community. And yet this is the exact opposite of what actually happened. How is this to be explained?

The easiest part of this puzzle to solve is accounting for the movement of the tradecraft from Banjilal to Śvetāmbar Jains. It is true that the social gulf is wide, and there can be no doubt of Banjilal's Digambar credentials, for by all accounts he was a deeply orthoprax Jain. Still, he was in an unusual position vis-à-vis the Śvetāmbar/Digambar divide, and ideally situated to be a bridge between the two groups. In social and religious matters he was a Digambar Jain, but in business matters, he was strongly networked within the Śvetāmbar jewelry community. As we know, he was socialized into the business by a Śrīmāl Śvetāmbar Jain, and his fellow apprentices would have all or mostly been drawn from the Śvetāmbar community. As we shall

see anon, one "classmate" in particular played a crucial role in the jump of the emerald business into the Śvetāmbar community.

That said, we still need to explain what factors might have encouraged the spread of the business among Śvetāmbers and discouraged its spread among Digambers. To address this issue, we must begin by noting a significant difference between the caste cultures of Jaipur's Śvetāmbar and Digambar Jains. Jaipur's two most important Śvetāmbar castes are the Śrīmāls and the Osvāls. These are true trading castes with strong business traditions and also strong jewelry traditions, especially among Jaipur's Śrīmāls. As we know, the overwhelming majority of Jaipur's Digambar Jains belong to the Khaṇḍelvāl Jain caste. In Jaipur, this caste has been far more prominent in service than in business, and lacks the strong business traditions and firm foundation in the commercial life of the city and region enjoyed by the Śrīmāls and Osvāls. This certainly helps us understand why the emerald business might fare better among Śvetāmbers than Digambers in Jaipur.

But there was another factor. Part of the business culture of Jaipur's Śvetāmbar Jain castes is a tradition of apprenticeship, the same one from which Banjilal himself had earlier benefitted, and this provided a ready means for the social transmission of the emerald business among Śvetāmbar Jains. Apprenticeship within families is probably as old as the jewelry business itself, and although I know of no direct evidence that extra-familial apprenticeship was practiced prior to Banjilal's era, I strongly suspect that it was. In any case, by the early twentieth century, and probably earlier, extra-familial apprenticeship was fully institutionalized within the Śvetāmbar community. The relationship between teacher and apprentice in this system was much more than merely pedagogical; it was rich in cultural content and drew from ancient Indic religious traditions for its basic paradigm. The teacher was called *guru* and the apprentice was called *celā*, a term that combines the meanings of pupil and disciple. In the Indic religious world, religious knowledge and spiritual authority are transmitted within lines of pupillary succession, known as *guru paramparās* on the model of unilineal descent. Precisely such a *guru paramparā*, now vastly ramified, exists in Jaipur's gemstone industry, and it can be directly traced back as far as Banjilal's own teacher, Suganchand Jargad.

But despite the importance of Banjilal's role in the inception of the business, he did not become a link in this lineage. Rather, the most important figure in the subsequent transmission of the new emerald business was a man associated with him in business named Ratanlal Phophaliya. Born in 1862 (he died in 1935), Ratanlal was a Śrīmāl who belonged to an old Jaipur jewelry family that had been in the city from its beginnings (on the family, see Bhaṇḍārī et al. 1934: 169–70). He had also had been trained by Suganchand Jargad, and this was probably the foundation of his relationship with Banjilal. The exact character of their business link is unclear from oral accounts that I have elicited from either family, but a written account (Mukim 1972: 22) characterizes Ratanlal as Banjilal's *sāthī*, his "associate." Ratanlal was hugely rich and a powerful figure in Jaipur's emerging emerald elite. He was state jeweler (*rāj jauhrī*), which meant, among other things, that he acted as broker in



palace purchases of jewelry from other jewelers. So great was his status that (according to local legend) he was invited to join the king's *darbār* as a courtier, but had to decline the honor because he was too corpulent to do the bowing that such an appointment would require.

Ratanlal had many apprentices. How many is uncertain, but members of his family tell me they have encountered his picture on the shop walls of descendants of his students in such disparate places as Kolkata, Mumbai, and Gwalior. Many of his students became historically important jewelers in their own right, and to the best of my knowledge his most influential former apprentices were almost entirely Śvetāmbar Jains belonging to the Osvāl and Śrīmāl castes. It was largely through Ratanlal's students that the emerald manufacturing pioneered by Banjilal Tholia diffused outward, and this was mostly within the Śvetāmbar community. The main conduits were Ratanlal's two most illustrious students: Rajroop Tank, a Śrīmāl, and Suganchand Chordia, a Sthānakvāsī Osvāl. Their businesses were to become educational epicenters of the gemstone manufacturing business until the late twentieth century, and apprenticeship with them was to become the means by which many of elite members (and, in Rajroop's case, also many non-elite members) of at least two generations of gemstone manufacturers and traders were socialized in the business.

On the Digambar side, the apprenticeship avenue for the diffusion of business tradecraft seems never to have been quite viable. Banjilal had apprentices to be sure. They are said to have been more or less equally divided between Śvetāmbar and Digambar, and at least one became a major Digambar player in the business. Banjilal's most important disciples, however, were his own sons, of whom Sundarlal became the most successful. Sundarlal himself did not, as far as I know, have any apprentices apart from his own sons. Thus, to the extent that there was an apprenticeship pattern, it seems to have tended to be an in-family pattern, and it was never strong enough to allow it to be a conduit for the spread of the emerald business in the wider Digambar community. The tradition of apprenticeship belonged to a trading-caste way of life that was—at least in Jaipur—more characteristic of Osvāls and Śrīmāls than of Khaṇḍelvāl Jains.

Illustrative of the difference is the fact that three of the historically most prominent Digambar families in the twentieth-century gemstone business, all Khaṇḍelvāl Jains, came into the business through the entryway of service, not through apprenticeship. Two of these individuals, both of whom entered the business in the early twentieth century and were in mutual partnership for many years, were originally officials in the royal treasury who left service and took up jewelry and gemstone trading in the early twentieth century and shifted to manufacturing in the 1940s.<sup>6</sup> It was clearly their contact with the jewelry community by virtue of their official positions that made this career shift possible, contact that

enabled them to develop networks in the business that could be utilized as a way of edging in. The third of these Digambar families, extremely prominent in the business currently, consists of the sons of a journalist who was the paid secretary of the Jaipur Jewellers Association from 1958 to 1973 and whose position made possible an entrée into the business.

## Jainism

I suggest that the difference in the extent to which these two Jain communities adopted and socially transmitted the new emerald business places the alleged special relationship between Jainism and the life of trade in a new perspective. There is certainly no question that Jainism has a special relationship with the gemstone business in Jaipur. Jains have dominated the industry historically, and although their ascendancy has been challenged by other groups in recent decades, they continue to be pillars of the industry's ownership class. But what is the actual nature of this relationship? It is to this issue that we now turn.

Pursuing such questions inevitably brings us to the doorstep of the great social theorist, Max Weber. In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Weber famously argued that one of the factors (not the only one) underlying the rise of rational capitalism in the West was an ascetic form of Protestantism (of which Calvinism was his favorite example). The "ethic" of ascetic Protestantism generated the "spirit" of rational capitalism by bringing ascetic discipline out of the monastery and into the lives of men and women in the world, and by focusing anxiety about salvation in such a way that its alleviation could only come from success in worldly endeavors, especially economic endeavors. In *The Religion of India*, he suggested that although the preconditions for industrial capitalism were present in India, its development was inhibited by religious traditions that encouraged the "traditionalism" that Weber saw as the enemy of rational capitalism.

But Jainism was different; it was a partial exception, Weber thought, to the more general Indian pattern (1958b: 200–204). He noted the prominence of Jains in trade, and suggested that, in a manner reminiscent of ascetic Protestantism, Jainism did not forbid the acquisition of wealth but instead powerfully discouraged attachment to wealth or any enjoyment of it. Moreover, the systematic character of Jain life, with its many proscriptions and strong emphasis on all forms of self-control, favored the accumulation of wealth, just as it did among the Puritans. Nevertheless, Weber also said that the Jain way of life and manner of conducting trade was far from fully rationalized in the Protestant-ethic sense. Jains were traders because of the "ritualistic" (and thus irrational) doctrine of *ahimsā*, which pushed Jains out of occupations involving any violence to living things and into trade, and the manner in which they conducted their businesses was shaped by a variety of ritual prohibitions

<sup>6</sup> One of these families went bankrupt in the late 1950s. The other is successfully pursuing the jewelry business today.



such as restrictions on travel. In the end, Jainism was largely absorbed by the surrounding culture of Hinduism and caste.<sup>7</sup>

The issue of Weber's thesis as it relates to Jainism has been picked up by others and I believe pushed beyond Weber's own somewhat modest suggestions. In a book in which he compares Jainism with Quakerism in a Weberian frame of reference, Balwant Navaskar (1971) argues that Jainism is indeed analogous to ascetic Protestantism, and in so arguing he places great weight on Weber's notion that Jainism allows wealth to be pursued but forbids attachment to it. Somewhat better informed about both Weber and Jainism is the analysis of T. Mohanadoss (1996), who points both to similarities and differences between Protestant and Jain beliefs and practices, and indicates factors other than Jainism that might have encouraged Jains' success in trade. He concludes, however, that although other factors were certainly involved, Jainism had the effect of encouraging a "systematized way of life leading to a rationalization of economic activity" in a manner analogous to Weber's Protestant ethic (ibid.:88).

Although both of these authors believe themselves to be supporting Weber's argument, I think they both misunderstand what Weber had to say about Jainism, at least to some extent. As I read *The Religion of India*, he never actually maintained that Jainism was an Indic equivalent of ascetic Protestantism. In their conviction that he did, neither Navaskar nor Mohanadoss has fully taken into account Weber's own caveats about the ritualistic and irrational aspects of Jain life and economic behavior. Furthermore, neither author seems to have fully understood that Weber never said that Jainism generated anything resembling the intense soteriological anxiety that was at the root of what he saw as ascetic Protestantism's singular role in the creation of the spirit of rational capitalism. The adequacy of Weber's understanding of Jainism is certainly questionable, although I think it was remarkably good considering the nature of the sources at his hand, but we must not put words in his mouth.

However, even if Weber never actually argued that Jainism was an Indic form of Calvinism, we may still ask whether there is any reason to believe that this might be so. On this point, I suggest that there is little evidence to support the idea that Jainism influences economic behavior in the way Weber believed ascetic Protestantism once did. It is true that, in a Jain frame of reference, business success can be seen as a sign of moral worthiness in the present or past births, but the karmic equation is deeply susceptible to ritual interference, which—according to Weber—is precisely what ascetic Protestantism disallows. It is also true that asceticism is a fundamental Jain value. But although asceticism certainly colors Jain lay life, the most systematic application of ascetic values to the regulation of life remains—as in Catholicism in the West—largely (though not exclusively) a monastic project.

7 In his otherwise excellent essay on Weber and India, David Gellner (1982) overplays somewhat Weber's emphasis on the analogy between Jainism and Protestantism by paying insufficient attention (in my reading) to Weber's acknowledgement of traditional elements in Jainism itself.

Indeed, one of the most important advances in modern Jain studies has been the realization, as demonstrated especially in the writings of John Cort (see e.g., Cort 2001), that although ascetic practice is an important element in lay Jain life, it coexists with an alternative emphasis on auspiciousness and worldly felicity.

There remains one other issue. It is often said—and this is a point echoed by Weber—that trade is religiously necessitated for Jains because the norm of nonviolence, rigorously applied, precludes most other ways of making a living. This formulation contains an important truth. Trade and nonviolent religious traditions do indeed have an affinity in India, a point I have explored in a book-length study (Babb 2004). It is a fact that traditional Hindu trading castes, whose religious traditions also stress non-violent, vegetarian lifestyles, tend to have the same commercial orientation as, to take the present case, the Jain *Osvāls* and *Śrīmāls*.

But if this is so, the link is not between Jainism, as a religious tradition, and the conduct of business. Rather, it is a link between business and a generic trader lifestyle, one shared by Hindus and Jains. It is true that Jain non-violence is more intense than that of non-Jain trading groups (extending, for example, the ban on the consumption of vegetables that grow underground) but it is hard to see what this level of intensity might have to do with success in trade. I believe that such stringent rules serve the social function of marking a boundary between religious communities that are otherwise culturally very similar. In the Indian context, diet quite frequently plays this role. Thus, the traders distinguish themselves as vegetarians from non-vegetarian groups, especially the *Rājput*s, the meat-eating and blood sport-pursuing martial aristocracy of the region. In this context, Jain vegetarianism marks Jains out from other traders as even more vegetarian than other vegetarians.

## History and Culture

Let us turn, then, from lofty theoretical abstractions to the more concrete question of what, if anything, the specific case of Jaipur's gemstone industry can actually tell us about how Jainism interacted with trade in a particular case. A good place to begin is with the history we have surveyed and an obvious question: Why did Jains come to dominate and flourish in the emerald business? Obviously, they were prominent at the start because they were already in the jewelry business, and jewelers were precisely those who possessed the gemstone knowledge and business skills necessary to make a go of cutting emeralds for export. Jains are not the only jewelers in India, but it so happens that *Śvetāmbar* Jains (mainly *Śrīmāls* at the beginning) dominated this business in Jaipur from the city's inception. They were thus preadapted to take advantage of the opportunity presented by the new industry, whereas other groups were not. It seems, then, that they first engaged with the industry not as Jains but as jewelers and businessmen who happen to have been well positioned in Jaipur to do so.



As the industry took root and expanded, many Jains who were *not* jewelers took it up. However, our sketch of the industry's history shows that *not all* Jains were able to take advantage of its possibilities. Rather, it was mainly Śvetāmbar Jains who did. To be sure there were Digambaras in the business—as we know, it was arguably founded by a Digambar Jain—but Digambaras were never able to move into the business in significant numbers. How, then, are we to understand this difference?

It cannot have much to do with Jainism, for both groups are Jain. We must remind ourselves that although the social barriers are high, there is little doctrinal difference between Digambar and Śvetāmbar brands of Jainism. Both traditions share the same cosmology, the same concept of eternally repetitive cosmic history, the same understanding of the role of Tīrthaṅkaras, the same distinctive theory of karmic matter, and the same concept of the soul's liberation from worldly bondage. The value systems of both traditions are identical, resting alike on the same twin foundations of non-violence and world renunciation. The dating of their ritual calendars is somewhat different, but actual ceremonial life of both traditions is much the same. The Śvetāmbar reform traditions (Sthānakvāsī and Terāpanthī) do not sanction the worship of images in temples, whereas all Digambar sects do, but there is much more to the ritual culture of Jainism than temple rites. Śvetāmbar and Digambar Jains alike venerate ascetics, engage in similar kinds of scripted and ritualized fasts, and observe the same dietary proscriptions.

From this perspective, all that divides the two traditions is a point of monastic discipline, namely whether mendicants do or do not wear clothing. This is in no sense a trivial difference, and it underlies other differences of great importance (such as views on women's capacity to achieve liberation, which the Digambaras deny).<sup>8</sup> But with all due respect to my Jain friends for whom the Śvetāmbar/Digambar divide looms as a major division, I suggest that this is a relatively minor difference from the standpoint of Jainism's fundamental values and teachings. To the contrary, the importance attached to this difference suggests to me that this is another example of a social boundary marker, in this case marking the line between two socio-religious communities that are, at the level of fundamental beliefs, very similar.

Given the common Jain background of these groups, Jaipur's gemstone industry therefore presents us with the opportunity to run something resembling a controlled experiment. Holding religion constant, what other factors might account for the different responses by Khaṇḍelvāl Jains and Osvāl and Śrīmāl Jains to the same business opportunity?

Our sketch of the business's history suggests that caste culture, not religion, made the difference. What the Digambar and Śvetāmbar Jains share is Jainism. What they do not share, at least in Jaipur, is a strong trading-caste culture. It must be remembered that although Jains are obviously prominent in Indian commerce, they are not the only trading communities in India. Furthermore, not all Jains are in trade. Jains are found in many other occupations, and apparently most of the Jains of

Karnataka are actually farmers (Sangave 1980: 259). As we know, while many of Jaipur's Digambar Jains are in business, the Khaṇḍelvāl Jain caste has been historically service-oriented in Jaipur, and I suggest that this meant that they generally lacked—as a community, with of course many exceptions—the business mindset, entrepreneurial savvy, and the financial and social resources that would have enabled them to take full advantage of new opportunities in the emerald industry. On the Śvetāmbar side, the strong initial foothold of the Śrīmāls in the jewelry business provided a point of relatively effortless transition into gemstone manufacturing, and the business orientation of other Śrīmāls and Osvāls and their social connections with the first comers made it easy for them to enter the growing industry. And the institution of apprenticeship (whether in-family or extrafamilial) provided a particularly effective mechanism for the social transmission of business and gemstone knowledge within and between these two castes.

The entrepreneurial zeal and business traditions and skills the Śrīmāls and Osvāls brought to the gemstone business are features of the shared culture of these two castes and have little to do with Jainism. Rather, they are—for the most part, certain specifics aside—well-known attributes of all western Indian trading castes. Some of these groups are Jain, some are Hindu, and some are mixed. These facts strongly suggest that it was as a community of traders, not as Jains, that Śvetāmbar Jains came to dominate Jaipur's lapidary industry.

By the twentieth century's end, the Śvetāmbar's grip on the industry had loosened and the elite ownership ranks were swelled by an influx of newcomers. Some were Muslims, but mostly the newcomers belonged to the region's traditional trading castes. Preeminent among them were members of the Khaṇḍelvāl Vaiśya caste, who are now a major factor in the industry. The Khaṇḍelvāl Vaiśyas are Hindus, and they have done extremely well in the industry, as indeed have other Hindus and some Muslims. With the industry's current religious and caste variegation in mind, and looking backwards in time to the industry's foundation, it is easy to imagine an alternative scenario in which, had they been positioned to do so, Hindu traders could have developed the industry as readily as the Śvetāmbar Jains did. That they *could* have done so is a matter of culture, not religion; that they *did not* is a matter of neither religion nor culture, but of history and the social landscape of premodern Jaipur.

### Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 6th International Conference on Rajasthan held in Jaipur on January 2 and 3, 2010, and I thank other conferees for helpful comments. The field research on which it is mainly based took place in Jaipur between August 2005 and January 2006. Those who have assisted me in my research are too numerous to be listed here, but four individuals deserve special mention. Surendra Bothara has been a source of constant support and excellent

<sup>8</sup> On gender differences and the Śvetāmbar/Digambar division, see Jaini 1991.



advice in all of my research in Jaipur. Subhash Bothra gave me many valuable insights into the workings of Jaipur's jewelry business, and Ashok Bothra was "my guide and companion" throughout the period of research. Despite his busy schedule as businessman and community leader, the late Rashmikant Durlabhji was always generous with his time and was one of the principal sources of my understanding of the industry. I owe special thanks to Sudeep Tholia who generously shared Banjilal Tholia's late-nineteenth-century correspondence with me. I would also like to thank Prof. R. K. Pant and the Department of History and Indian Culture, University of Rajasthan, for my institutional affiliation during the research period. The research was supported by a Senior Short-Term Fellowship from the American Institute of Indian Studies.

## References

- Babb, Lawrence A. 2004. *Alchemies of Violence: Myths of Identity and the Life of Trade in Western India*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bhaṅḍārī, S.R., with C.R. Bhaṅḍārī, K.L. Gupt, B.L. Sonī and B.R. Ratnāvāt. 1934. "Śrīmāl jāti kā itihās." Appendix to Vol. 2 of *Osvāl jāti kā itihās*. 2 Vols. Appendix on history of the Śrīmāls. Bhānpurā (Indore): Osvāl History Publishing House.
- Cort, John E. 2001. *Jains in the World: Religious Values and Ideology in India*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gellner, David. 1982. "Max Weber, Capitalism and the Religion of India." *Sociology* 16.4: 526-543.
- Jain, Kesharlal Ajmera, and Jawaharlal Jain (eds.). 1935. *The Jaipur Album or All About Jaipur*. Jaipur: The Rajasthan Directories Publishing House.
- Jain, Man Chand. 1988. "Gem and Jewellery Industry in India (With Special Reference to Rajasthan)." Ph.D. thesis, Dept. of Commerce, University of Rajasthan (Kota Open University, Kota).
- Jaini, Padmanabh. 1991. *Gender and Salvation: Jaina Debates on the Spiritual Liberation of Women*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Journal of Gem and Jewelry Industry* (Hindi Edition). 2008. "Ratn jagat ke kīrti stambh: Seth Banjilāl Tholiyā ." 46: 13-22.
- Lath, Mukund. 1981. *Half a Tale: A Study in the Interrelationship between Autobiography and History*. (The Ardhakathanaka transl., intr. and annotated by Mukund Lath). Jaipur: Rajasthan Prakrit Bharati Sansthan.
- . 1984. "English translation of Kalpasutra." In: Vinay Sāgar (ed. and Hindi transl.). *Kalpasutra: Eighth Chapter of the Daśārutaskandha of Bhadrabāhu with Hindi and English Versions and Coloured Reproductions of Original 16th Century Miniatures*. Jaipur: Prakrit Bharati.
- Mohanadoss, T. 1996. "Jains and Entrepreneurship." *Mankind Quarterly* 37.1: 77-91.
- Mukim, Basantlāl. 1972. "Itihās ke pṛṣṭhom meṁ hamārī kahānī." Special publication issued by Gem World in conjunction with the 1972 inauguration ceremony of the Jaipur Jewellers Association's new building, Janopyogī Bhavan: 18-25.
- Mukim, Basantlāl. 1992. *From the Pages of History*. Jaipur: Privately printed by the author.
- Nevaskar, Balwant. 1971. *Capitalists without Capitalism: The Jains of India and the Quakers of the West*. Westport (CT): Greenwood.
- Roy, Ashim Kumar. 1976. *History of the Jaipur City*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Sachdev, Vibhuti, and Giles Tillotson. 2002. *Building Jaipur: The Making of an Indian City*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Sangave, Vilas A. 1980. *Jaina Community: A Social Survey*. 2nd rev. ed. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
- Smedley, Roger Graham. 1995. "Auctioning the Dreams: Economy, Community and Philanthropy in a North Indian City." Ph.D. diss., London School of Economics.
- Weber, Max. 1958a. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- . 1958b. *The Religion of India: The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism*. Transl. and ed. by Hans. H. Gerth and Don Martindale. New York: The Free Press.



## An Unknown *Rāmāyaṇa* from Rajasthan: The *Rāmāyaṇa* of Mehojī

Winand M. Callewaert

If you have spent evenings and nights in temples in dry and hot Rajasthan, it is not difficult to imagine that there is a strong tradition of epic singing, bardic creativity and Bhakti in that dry land. The cooling effect of the night draws people together to listen and sing, and it should not amaze us that in Rajasthan too new forms were given to old stories. One such example is the *Rāmāyaṇa* by Mehojī (Maheshwari 1987). It is sung even today in many *rātri-jāgarans*.

I was introduced to the fascinating world of musical performance reflected in the manuscripts of the Bhakti tradition by Mukund Lath. The roots of Mukundji are in Rajasthan, where he returned after a childhood and youth spent in Bengal, luckily for Rajasthan and luckily for me. His presence in Rajasthan, and in Belgium for two periods in the 1980s, gave me the unique opportunity to learn about and pursue the issue of the musical performance as encoded in the manuscripts. This resulted in the edition, in collaboration with Mukundji, of the Hindi *pads* of Nāmdev.<sup>1</sup> If not for him, I may perhaps never have encountered the singers leaving the traces of their handling the *pads*, long before they were written down.

For more than a century Indological research has contributed immensely to a better understanding of Indian culture, with a mass of well-trained brains and plenty of enthusiasm. But it appears to me that there is now a growing unhealthy dominance of the “religious studies” approach, at the expense of text-based analytical scholarship. There are far too few people professionally engaged now in the study of Indian religion, especially Bhakti literature, who can handle its primary sources with any degree of competence.

It is only to be expected that many students will enter the subject through interest in religion rather than classical Indology, and it is desirable that they should be able to make this sort of move, but it is critical that it be understood that this transition into the study of Indian phenomena is of little value unless it takes place through a rigorous training in textual study. This is not just a matter of picking up a language or two. They must also feel the necessity of getting themselves into a position in which they are able to interpret an Indian text within its own cultural context.

The vast bulk of Indian literature was first sung for a long time. Since we have no recordings of the period, our only way to the original “sung” version is through a

---

1 [The Hindi *Padāvalī* of Nāmdev]. Nāmdev. *The Hindī Songs*. Crit. ed., transl. and annot. by Winand M. Callewaert and Mukund Lath (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 29). Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek; Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.



comparison of manuscripts now scattered all over India, often in remote villages. Since 1973 I had the opportunity to travel extensively all over Rajasthan, as well as to Delhi, Benares, Punjab, Pune and even Thanjavur. Every year I discovered new—often private—collections with ancient manuscript material, and along with my increasing databank of Bhakti literature on film grew also the conviction that the preservation of manuscripts and critical text-editions are a first priority for a student of Indian culture. The economic situation in India is such that the preservation of manuscripts is not the highest priority, although serious efforts are being made. Yet, thousands of manuscripts disappear every year, either through decay or lack of care, or because they are sold to tourists.

Steps have to be taken to avert the catastrophe already underway as the result of the neglect of the vast collections of manuscripts. If these collections are allowed to rot away unconserved and are not even microfilmed, there will soon be little left with which to study Indian contributions to the world.

The devoted scholar of Indian literature, the late Gopal Narayan Bahuraji, former librarian in the City Palace, Jaipur, told me years ago that the history of Indian literature would have to be rewritten if all the manuscripts in the City Palace collection could be properly studied and edited. In fact the greater part of India's literature survives only in manuscripts, and the part that has been edited has been edited uncritically in many cases, and on the basis of only a small number of the available manuscripts.

We should remember that classical Indology—that means the study of Sanskrit and Buddhist texts by non-Indians—started in the 19th century, and the only material available was what the British had brought from India and preserved in the India Office Library, London. Of course, we have walked a long way since then, but there are still hundreds of miles ahead of us, for the next 25 rebirths.

Mehojī created his *Rāmāyaṇa* some time before Tulsīdās (1532–1623 C.E.). His dates are pretty accurate, because his father Sekhojī was closely associated with Jāmbhojī (1450–1536), the founder of the Viṣṇoī *sampradāya*, in the Bikaner area. Mehojī died in 1544 and he has his *samādhi* in a tempel near Bikaner.

Obviously, there are no historical records available about Mehojī, but tradition says that he composed his *Rāmāyaṇa* and started to sing it in the temple, at the age of 35, that means around 1518 C.E.

As internal evidence for the creativity of Mehojī, I should mention that his name occurs in six verses in this *Rāmāyaṇa*. Prof. Maheshwari has made a meticulous study of the language of the Mehojī *Rāmāyaṇa* and he testifies that the language is 16th century Northern Rājasthānī. In this *Rāmāyaṇa* we also find the very first major poem of 261 *sākhīs* in Rājasthānī that deals with the theme of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* of Mehojī was clearly created to be sung. Several *rāgas* and *rāginīs* are mentioned, as was the custom in the circles of singers of Bhakti songs. We have 176 couplets in the *bhūvaro rāga*, 57 in the *suhab rāga*, 12 in *malār/jaitśrī*, 8 in *dhanāsarī*, 6 in *rāmgīri* and 2 in *gansau*.

Of course, Mehojī has generally followed the narrative of the Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa*, greatly reducing it, and there is no need here to repeat the story in detail. I should only point out that at times the poem is very much like a *līlā* performance, where one can imagine the reaction of the audience as one reads the text. I give only one example.

At one point in the narrative, Rāvaṇa has managed to take Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to the underworld (*pātāla*) and Hanumān is very worried because he does not know where to find his master. Eventually Hanumān makes his way to *pātāla* and—here one can see an audience looking at a person running around on a *līlā*-stage, or am I wrong?—so Hanumān makes his way to *pātāla* and he is lost because it all looks so strange to him there. But like a *deus ex machina* a help appears in the form of a person usually not mentioned in the traditional narrative. This helper is possibly a *dvārpāla* who tells Hanumān:

Tell me who you are and I will tell you  
where Rām is imprisoned. (*sākhī* 220)

A little earlier in the story, *sākhī* 111, it is Sugrīva to whom a special interference is attributed. When Rāma is totally confused because Sītā has disappeared, Sugrīva appears and consoles him. He says:

Oh Rām, why are you so sad, why do you lose courage?  
I shall immediately call the monkeys together,  
and give the order to search for Sītā.

This a slight diversion from the classical story and shows that Mehojī incorporated details which may have been current in folk-literature.

In my publications on Nirguṇa Bhakti literature in Rajasthan I have dwelt at length on the topic of musical repertoires and on the interaction between singers' traditions and singers' families.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* of Mehojī too is a nice example of how travelling singers spread the message of Bhakti. In the case of his *Rāmāyaṇa* narrative, we clearly see how specific details—in an after all short selection of items like Mehojī's—must have been borrowed from the repertoire of travelling bards and Bhaktas. Some of these items are not in the Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa*, but must have gained popularity in the area where Mehojī lived. They are found in other narratives too, as they are described in Father Camille Bulcke's *Rāmāyānā* (1950).

Let me enumerate only a few examples

1. In the Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa* and related narratives Kaikeyī receives her boon for nursing Daśaratha "on the battle-field or after his return from it". Mehojī simply mentions that Daśaratha was sick and that Kaikeyī took care of him.



2. When Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa leave Ayodhyā, Mehojī tells us that Bharata is in the city and he accompanies them to the boundary of Ayodhyā.
3. Sītā is said to marry Rāma “on the way to the forest”.
4. When Hanumān has to return to Laṅkā, it is usually a *muni* or a *ṛṣi* who encourages him. In Mehojī’s narrative it is an old woman. And, taking a giant jump to return to Laṅkā, Hanumān encounters many adventures before he reaches his goal.
5. In Mehojī’s *Rāmāyaṇa* we read that it is Hanumān himself who reveals that the only way to destroy him is to put fire to his tail. This is also found in the *Ānanda-Rāmāyaṇa* (reference in Bulcke 1950: 515).
6. We read also that Rāvaṇa’s sister, Vārāhī, talks to a traveller and enquires about the situation in Laṅkā and in her family. She complains that earlier they were one hundred and eight sisters.
7. In Vālmīki’s narrative the final battle in Laṅkā is fought between Rāma and Rāvaṇa, and Rāvaṇa is killed. In the Rajasthani version of Mehojī Rāvaṇa is killed by Lakṣmaṇa. Just before that Rāvaṇa sends his chiefs to Lakṣmaṇa to beg for mercy.

I should like to conclude this short introduction to the *Rāmāyaṇa* by Mehojī with a quote of his last *sākhī*:

All the merit you gain by going to 68 *īrthas*  
does not equal listening carefully to the story of Ram.

## References

- Bulcke, Camille. 1950. *Rāmkaṭhā : utpatti aur vikās* [by] Phādar Kāmil Bulke (6th rev. ed. 1999). Prayāg: Hindī Pariṣad, Prayāg Viśvavidyālay.
- Maheshwari, Hiralal. 1987. *The Rāmāyaṇa of Mehojī*. Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

## Provincializing History: Engaging with the Oeuvre of the Historian and Political Thinker Dharampal<sup>1</sup>

Gita Dharampal-Frick

### I

As one of the seminal products of Enlightenment reasoning, the academic discipline of History has been ideationally and structurally implicated with the establishment of Western hegemony. Cognizant of this state of affairs and of its repercussions for India’s relationship with its own past, Shri Dharampal (1922–2006), a provocative Gandhian thinker, engaged in substantive archival research about 18th- and 19th-century Indian constellations, the results of which have initiated a radical contestation of conventional truths, thereby instigating an attempt to “provincialize” or delegitimize the historical master narrative relating to the colonial past. Besides reappraising a selection of his publications, such as *Indian Science and Technology in the Eighteenth Century* (1971), *Civil Disobedience and Indian Tradition* (1971a) and *The Beautiful Tree* (1983), this essay, in tracing the genesis of Shri Dharampal’s historical research, simultaneously discusses the intellectual as well as the political implications of his oeuvre for initiating further research into remapping the past with a view to accordingly reshape contemporary Indian society and polity.

### II

Originating from Kandhala, a small town in the Muzaffarnagar district of Western Uttar Pradesh, but having been educated in Lahore, Dharampal belonged to a generation of young Indians, who were deeply inspired by Mahatma Gandhi’s propagation of *swaraj*. Responding to Gandhi’s call for individual *satyāgraha* in 1940, he joined the freedom movement, thereby abandoning his B.Sc. studies in Physics, and became actively involved in the Quit India movement, initiated in August 1942. After a short term of imprisonment, his nationalist fervour was channelled in the direction of Gandhi’s constructive programme which involved strengthening the decentralised social, political and economic village organisation. Intent on regenerating India’s rural population, Dharampal became associated in 1944 with Mirabeen (the British born disciple of Gandhi) in a village development

<sup>1</sup> Engaging with the oeuvre of one’s father in the public sphere, albeit a difficult task, is essential given the crucial significance of Shri Dharampal’s research; moreover, knowing that his strivings were close to the heart of our jubilarian, this short personal essay is dedicated to him.



project near Rishikesh. His participation in this experiment in community revitalisation was temporarily interrupted by portentous political developments, for during the Partition upheaval, in 1947-48, he was put in charge of the Congress Socialist Party centre for the rehabilitation of refugees coming from Pakistan. Working in the make-shift camps on the outskirts of Delhi, he came in close contact with Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya and Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, as well as with numerous younger friends, such as L.C. Jain, in Delhi; subsequently in 1948, he functioned as a founding member of the Indian Cooperative Union.

Figuring prominently in these various activities was his endeavour to sustain Indian community structures, both rural and urban, be it through social, political or economic means, for he was convinced about the central role of the community in the ongoing nation-building enterprise. Yet eschewing any chauvinistic parochialism, but rather in search of communitarian initiatives in the global arena which could serve as a model for Indian rural reconstruction, he decided at the end of 1948 to go and study the much acclaimed kibbutzim experimental system in Israel. However, due to the partial closure of the Suez Canal, he had to reschedule his sea voyage via England. There, as chance would have it, in an educational and agricultural reconstruction programme in post-war rural Devonshire, Dharampal met and decided to marry Phyllis, a cultured and altruistically oriented English lady who shared his commitment to rural reconstruction. Paradoxical as this marital union may have appeared in the historical context of Indian Independence from the British Raj, the avant-garde pioneering spirit of this intercultural couple does underscore in exemplary fashion the immense attraction exercised by the mutually shared humanistic-communitarian visions which not only transcended nation-state boundaries but also challenged conventional norms. Yet, alongside and perhaps superseding these universalistic aspirations, a strong sense of commitment to the cause of Indian rural regeneration instigated Dharampal to travel back to India with his acquiescing young bride. Choosing the overland route with the intention of visiting Israel, he was eventually able to become familiarised with the organisation of the oldest kibbutz, Degania Alif, set up by Russian Jews, only to realise that their highly regulated communitarian life-style would not function as an appropriate blueprint suitable to Indian conditions which, as he articulated, were defined by divergent social and cultural constellations. Understanding their historical configurations was to constitute a primary incentive and focus of his subsequent research which was to take concrete shape a decade and half later.

However, in 1950, having gained valuable insights from observing and comparing, temporally parallel but culturally and politically distinct endeavours in societal reconstruction in Britain, Israel and independent India, Dharampal, being consequently cognitively better equipped, felt the urgent need to resume his work with Mirabeau. Above all, he was convinced that "ordinary" Indians were as capable and innovative as their European or Middle-Eastern counterparts; yet due to colonial subjugation and exploitation, having lost all personal initiative, they had been reduced to their present state of poverty and destitution. Hence, summoning the

support of a group of dedicated social workers, Dharampal, propelled by idealistic zeal, set about constructing the community village of Bapugram near Rishikesh, constituted of about fifty resourceless agricultural families. However, after many years of strenuous and often frustrating work (due partially to the lack of creative dynamism emanating from the artificially created community whose structures were not organic), Dharampal became increasingly disillusioned by the futility of this idealistic experiment in village development which, moreover, seemed to have no impact on the post-Independence mainstream that was mesmerised by the Nehruvian industrialisation agenda.

Yet despite his decision to leave Bapugram in 1954, Dharampal continued to be preoccupied with India's rural regeneration. So after a three year interlude in London where he joined his wife and two small children, from 1958 until 1964, based in Delhi with his family again, he pursued endeavours in this field, more intensely, (with the aim of impacting upon policy-making to attenuate the dichotomy between "Bharat" and "India") in his capacity as General Secretary of the Association of Voluntary Agencies for Rural Development (AVARD). Founded in 1958 by Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya, AVARD, as the first Non-Government Organisation (NGO) in independent India, played an exemplary path-breaking role, presided over by Jayaprakash Narayan (known as JP), with whom Dharampal developed a very close relationship of mutual respect and appreciation. His appointment at AVARD facilitated his becoming familiarised with pan-Indian rural conditions as well as with the (mal-) functioning of institutional frameworks. Dharampal's critical reflections about misconceived governmental planning and development projects were articulated with stringent precision in leading articles to the AVARD Newsletter (later renamed "Voluntary Action") where, to cite one example, when writing in the context of the Lok Sabha debates on the draft of the Third Plan, he castigated the status-quo view as follows:

[...] the people for whom we plan and weave our dreams are seldom anywhere in the picture. More often they are just labourers, wage-earners, with little sense of participation or adventure in the India we plan to reconstruct. The reasons for such apathy are perhaps very deep, somewhere very near the soul of India. Yet that soul has to awaken, before we proceed from dams and steel plants to the flowering of the human being, of the Indian we have deemed to be ignorant, of the people of India whom we describe as "teeming millions" equating them with ant-heaps. Such awakening, however, is not impossible—Gandhiji did it against heavier odds. All of us in a way are heir to Gandhiji, what we lack is proportion and humility.<sup>2</sup>

2 "A Surfeit of Planning: Where are the People?" AVARD Newsletter, New Delhi, July-August 1960, republished in: Dharampal 2003: 129-131, quoted phrase on p.130. Intent on influencing political opinion, Dharampal sent this article to all members of the Lok Sabha. It also reached E.F. Schuhmacher who used parts of it in a lecture delivered in 1962 at the Gokhale Institute of



In an attempt to comprehend the immediate causes for the disoriented functioning of Indian state and society, he began meticulously examining the proceedings of the Indian Constituent Assembly (1946–1949), and published a cogent monograph in 1962 relating to the discussion on the subject of *Panchayat Raj as the Basis of Indian Polity*<sup>3</sup> which highlighted the failure of the Constitution to incorporate indigenous administrative and political structures. Yet Dharampal's political intervention in public affairs was soon to take on a more assertive form when, in November 1962, incensed by the debacle of the Indo-Chinese war, he wrote an open letter to the members of the Lok Sabha calling for Jawaharlal Nehru's resignation on moral grounds. For this castigatory act, Dharampal (along with two friends, Narendra Datta and Roop Narayan, who were co-signatories of the letter) was arrested and imprisoned in Tihar jail, but released after some months due to the intervention of Lal Bahadur Shastri, the then Home-Minister, and Jayaprakash Narayan. Besides underscoring Dharampal's impetuously forthright nature, his provocatively critical stance succeeded in sparking off a public debate, partially carried out in the press, about issues of fundamental importance in the political arena, such as the need for patriotism (as distinct from nationalism), the deconstruction of the personality cult around political figures, in particular Nehru, and the importance of freedom of expression in a democracy.

His sincere patriotic commitment coupled with an unswerving talent for striking a sensitive chord in public discourse was exhibited time and again. The cogency of his arguments as well as his search towards fathoming "the soul of India" (as he phrased it), however, were to receive more historical depth as a result of archival research carried out in the Tamil Nadu State archives, when, as Director of Study and Research of the All India Panchayat Parishad (1963–1965), he produced a detailed examination of the Madras panchayat system.<sup>4</sup> In this pioneering study, not only is the destruction of an indigenous panchayat-based polity underscored (this disruption being attributed to the colonial land revenue system introduced at the beginning of the 19th century, compounded with systematic political and bureaucratic intervention), but also the latter's replacement, towards the end of the 19th century, by a colonially defined bureaucratic apparatus which remained out of synch with the real needs of local communities. That this dysfunctional system was maintained even after Independence, more or less unchanged, despite its debilitating influence, constituted, according to Dharampal, one of the main causes for the highly detrimental disjuncture between the need for self-empowerment of the grass-roots (as propagated by Gandhi) and Nehruvian centralised statist planning.

Economics and Politics, Pune.

3 *An Exploration into the Proceedings of the Constituent Assembly*. New Delhi: AVARD, 1962.

4 Later published as Dharampal 1972, vol. II.

### III

Having become fleetingly cognizant about remnants of pre-colonial structures,<sup>5</sup> which were indicative of well-functioning societal mechanisms for maintaining a largely beneficial social and economic equilibrium among diverse local communities, Dharampal was increasingly convinced about the urgent need for an objective understanding regarding the detailed functioning of Indian society before the onslaught of colonial rule. Not only was he deeply sceptical about conventionally held assumptions concerning the pervasive destitution at the eve of the British conquest, but—perhaps even more crucially—he was seriously concerned about the repercussions these assumed degenerate conditions in the recent past had in the policy-making of modern India, a discordantly detrimental state of affairs which he formulated lucidly as follows:

This picture usually implied that our village folk and their ancestors had wallowed in misery for a thousand or more years; that they had been terribly oppressed and tyrannised by rulers as well as their social and religious customs since time immemorial; and that all this had mostly left them dumb, or misguided victims of superstition and prejudice. From this we assumed that what we had to deal with was like a blank slate on which we, the architects of the new India, could write, or imprint, what we wished. We seldom thought that these people had any memories, thoughts, preferences, or priorities of their own; and even when we conceded that they might have had some of these, we dismissed these as irrelevant. And when we failed in writing on what we assumed to be a blank slate, or in giving such writing any permanence, we felt unhappy and more often angry with these countrymen of ours [...].<sup>6</sup>

Recalcitrantly not accepting the modernist developmental notion of a "blank slate", he adamantly considered "a more exact knowledge of the past" to be "a necessary foundation for future development".<sup>7</sup>

5 Such as the *bees-biswas panchayat* (= village council of 20 parts) which was still (in the early 1960s) partially operative in some villages of Rajasthan, as well as the organisation of Tamil rural communities as *samudayam* villages in which individual shares in the cultivable land were redistributed periodically (a practice known as *Kareiyeeedu*) in order to maintain a degree of equity of livelihood among all members of the village community; according to local reports, *samudayam* villages had still been in existence in the 1930s; and British revenue surveys from the late 18th century mentioned that 30% of all villages in the Thanjavur district were of the *samudayam* type.

6 Extract from Dharampal: "Some aspects of earlier Indian society and polity and their relevance to the present", a series of three lectures delivered on 4th–6th January 1986, Pune, cited here from *Essays on Tradition, Recovery and Freedom*, vol. V of Dharampal 2007 (repr. of the 1st ed. 2000): 6.

7 Quoted extracts from an unpublished note written in July 1965.



Yet given that historical sources in Indian languages relating to the pre- or early colonial period were relatively inaccessible, and having fortuitously become briefly familiarized in the Tamil Nadu State archives with some insightful British colonial records, Dharampal, from the mid 1960s, living in London for family reasons, decided to embark single-handedly on an exploration of British-Indian archival material, based on documents emanating from the first commissioned surveys of the East India Company, lodged in various depositories spread over the British Isles; the principal ones he consulted were the India Office Library and Records and the British Library in London, the Bodleian in Oxford, the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh, including important collections in the libraries of the universities of Leeds, Nottingham, Sheffield and Manchester. This extensive archival record, indeed, constitutes one of the positive inheritances of colonial rule; admittedly, though a lot of this material would also be in various Indian national and state archives, it is unfortunately less accessible there.

When reviewing Dharampal's pioneering historical research, we need to evaluate this against the background of historical studies in the period of the 1960s itself, in India and the West, when the analytical studies and innovative theories to be developed by Hayden White, Michel de Certeau, Michel Foucault, Ranajit Guha or others of the Subaltern school (just to name a few great minds that revolutionized historical scholarship) were still in the making, yet to influence the intellectual sphere. What's more, not being an historian by training, nor for that matter a scholar belonging to academia, Dharampal, as he himself formulated it, "launched on a programme of somewhat laymanish archival research"<sup>8</sup> to discover or rather re-map the lie of the land in pre- and early colonial India. Admittedly, his search was inspired by Gandhi's conviction about the basic viability of Indian society and culture, coupled with an intuitive appreciation for the seminal role and function of history with regard to its impact and significance for the understanding of a society's past, and in particular for the pre-colonial past of a colonized society such as India's. Partially influenced by the Indian concept of *itihāsa* with regard to its didactic function, and viewing history as a record or narrative description of past events,<sup>9</sup> Dharampal considered it his role as an historian-in-the-making to reveal how Indian society functioned at the eve of the British conquest and "to show what actually happened". Thereby, he intended to contest the conventional but hegemonic image propagated by 19th century colonial historiography. The paradoxical irony of the matter is that he attempted to achieve this contestatory "subversive" goal by painstakingly deconstructing the official documents dating from the 17th century

8 Quoted from a small brochure by Dharampal (1998: 9).

9 Indeed he understood *itihāsa* not as mere historical legend, but more so as the narrative of what happened, which is strikingly similar to the Rankean explanation of history [Geschichte] as a narration of what happened, "wie es eigentlich gewesen ist". Thereby he was perhaps attempting to dissolve the asymmetrical distinction between *itihāsa* and the modern enterprise of History.

onwards, generated by the British themselves in the process of their reconnaissance and subsequent conquest of the subcontinent. Moreover, realizing that during the extended stages of colonization (from 1600 until 1947) a heterogeneity of reports had been generated, and intent on tracing the shifts in the British perspective on India, he soon discovered that the records of the early years of British administration in India were the most revealing and, hence, began to "treat the mid-18th century [...] as a sort of benchmark point for the understanding of Indian society and polity".<sup>10</sup> The wealth of first-hand accounts by zealous British officials striving to gain a foot-hold in the recently acquired territory (commencing in Bengal, and quickly proceeding through the south to the west and the rest of the subcontinent) contained not only detailed descriptions regarding the functioning arrangements of regional polities, but also empirical data on the political, economic and ideological strategies used to counter and undermine indigenous institutions. By critically "revising" this historical documentation, and allowing the sources themselves to speak, he was in a way engaging in an archaeology of knowledge (*à la* Foucault), uncovering a wealth of astounding material that had been discarded, or disregarded, in the construction of later hegemonic colonial historiography.

Given the revolutionary portent of the discoveries made by Dharampal's expedition into the not-so-distant past—of a functioning and relatively prosperous society—belying the hitherto propagated images of pre-British India as a poor disorganized country, lacking in political, economic and social vitality, and in view of their political significance for the present, he felt the urgent need to communicate to his contemporaries back home the findings made during this temporal voyage back in time: "What I learnt from day to day" he writes in one of his essays, "I tried to share with some friends in India including Sri Annasaheb Sahasrabuddhe, Sri R.K. Patil, Sri Ram Swarup and Sri Jayaprakash Narayan."<sup>11</sup> The thrill of excitement he experienced through his archival findings can still be sensed in his writings written 30 years later. The history of 18th-century India was being remapped: a new territory was unfolding before his eyes, descriptions of which were also sent to Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia who quoted from them in a Lok Sabha discussion in the spring of 1967, relating to law and order and its colonial heritage, in particular with regard to the revamping of the Delhi police which could be equated to Lord Ellenborough's reorganization of the Indian army in 1857.

Appreciative of the political insights that could be drawn from his findings, including their applicability as caustic criticism of contemporary undemocratic developments, and encouraged by his friends' enthusiastic support, Dharampal pursued his archival mission with renewed zeal. With meticulous precision and scholarly integrity he ploughed through thousands upon thousands of pages of British documents, getting Xerox copies made, and otherwise copying the historical sources word for word in long hand, and then back home typing them out on a small Olivetti

10 "Some aspects of earlier Indian society and polity", op. cit., p.12.

11 Dharampal 1998: 9.



type-writer (in those antediluvian days without digital cameras, laptops and scanning). This constituted the beginning of his own archival collection that was to amount to ca. 40,000 sheets of precious documents, a large amount of which is still waiting to be closely analyzed.<sup>12</sup> So consumed was Dharampal by the burning desire to know every inch of this territory of the past, that day after day, despite many adversities (including lack of funds), he would commune 10 to 12 hours at a stretch with his archival treasures. The routine of his life was determined by the opening hours of the libraries and archives. His regular absence from the family home led his younger daughter to state one day in kindergarten that her father was 100 years old, for he was a resident of the British Museum!

#### IV

But what did this life of research actually produce? Broadly speaking, the archival collection assembled over a decade and a half was tripartite in perspective: Firstly, it contained documents (in particular, commissioned surveys) dating mainly from the late 17th century up to the middle of the 19th century relating to descriptions of different regions of India, its physical landscape, the manners of its people, their public life, festivals, cultural and educational institutions, the nature and extent of agricultural and industrial production, of sciences and technologies. In short, this diverse documentary material mapped out the cultural, social and political history of the subcontinent in the pre- and early colonial period. Secondly, reams of official correspondence between authorities in Britain and India (with detailed instructions, sometimes controversial enough to be profusely debated) delineated the instrumentalities and modalities for the preparation and the consolidation of the British conquest of India, in which sufficient evidence is to be found of the long arm of the British state from the 17th century onwards—a fact which was emphasized by Dharampal over and over again; for, from his reading of the archival records, the East India Company, empowered from the very outset in 1600 by royal charter, was acting in accordance with instructions from Britain, and from the middle of 18th century was carrying out orders of the British government, exemplified concretely by Act of Parliament from 1784 onwards, after the establishment of the statist Board of Control.<sup>13</sup> The official records, labeled the Board's collection (of correspondence

<sup>12</sup> Stored away in cupboards of the Gandhi Seva Sangh library in Sevagram, I would like to see this valuable archival collection transformed into a research library, in the very near future. Simultaneously, large sections have been digitized so that this historical material, once catalogued and indexed, can be more readily accessible to interested researchers.

<sup>13</sup> In 1784 the British parliament passed an act, which constituted a Board of Commissioners for the Affairs of India (commonly referred to as the Board of Control) with a British cabinet minister as its president. Initially the British Prime Minister was also a member of this Board. For most of its 74 years of existence (1784–1858), the Board had six members, all of them British privy councillors, out of whom three were cabinet ministers. It was this Board, which governed India from 1784 to 1858 when a British Secretary of State for India replaced it and

between the directors of the East India Company and the Commissioners of the Board of Control, including reports, instructions, etc.), contained details about the process of subordination and control of its rulers, of the recruitment for the army, and of the establishment of a government apparatus whose structure and function continued more or less unchanged after Independence. Thirdly, the documentation comprises statistical data with regard to economic policies and measures, including protracted deliberations about the amount of land revenue, the manner in which it was levied, with information also about numerous other taxes and levies, such as those on beggars, which were introduced more as disciplining measures for controlling and harassing the population; related to this domain are extensive documents underscoring the crucial need for and the heavy reliance on forced labour, in particular for the construction of railways and roads, as well as on the supply of bullock-carts and bullocks for the transportation of the British army and administrative personnel. Fourthly, this material is supplemented with insightful evidence of continued Indian resistance which took various forms throughout the period of colonial rule. Fifthly, there is a select collection of documents concerned with indological research which highlights the rationale behind such research, initiated by Warren Hastings, the first Governor General in 1784. Lastly, a sizeable set of documents, beginning in the first decade of the 19th century, provides intricate details of British government policy concerning the Christianization of India which was initiated in 1813 after lengthy parliamentary debates.

This in a nut-shell constituted the basic contents of Dharampal's efforts at remapping Indian history from the 17th into the 20th century, and thereby contesting or provincializing the hitherto historical master narrative. Only some of the material has become known to the public through three pioneering books which have now become classics within the framework of the recent ongoing reappraisal of the early modern period. The topics of these publications were determined both by the wealth of archival material on the subject, as well as being dictated by urgent concerns of the post-Independence period: His first two books, both published in 1971, on *Indian Science and Technology in the 18th Century*<sup>14</sup> and *Civil Disobedience and Indian Tradition*<sup>15</sup> created quite a stir. The first title comprises a discerning selection of

India began to be formally considered by Britain as a part of the British Empire. During the 74 years (1784–1858), while the East India Company (EIC) prepared the initial drafts of all the instructions to be sent to India—in any of the governmental departments either at the Presidency levels or at the all-India level—the Board of Control in every single case was responsible for the finalization and approval of each and every instruction. Yet the instructions, though finalized and approved by the Board, were, however, formally conveyed to the British Presidency governments in India under the signatures of the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and some twenty members of the Court of Directors of the EIC. In a way the job of this Court was similar to the job of a under-secretary to the Government of India today, who ordinarily conveys all governmental orders and instructions under his own signature, in the name of the President of India.

<sup>14</sup> With the subtitle *Some contemporary European accounts* (Dharampal 1971).

<sup>15</sup> *With some early nineteenth century documents* (Dharampal 1971a).



British primary documents dating from the 18th and early 19th century relating to applied sciences and technologies as observed in various regions of the subcontinent. In his discursively argued and informative introduction, whilst contextualizing the historical sources, Dharampal also explains his choice of the time-frame 1720 until 1820 as follows:

Practically all European scientific and technological accounts relating to the sciences and technologies of non-European countries (including the ones reproduced here) are an outcome of the seventeenth and eighteenth century European quest for useful knowledge in these fields. [...] It is in this context of widening horizons as well as the urgent need (partly resulting from constant warfare in which Europeans were engaged during the greater part of the eighteenth century) for materials and processes that accounts like most of the ones presented here were written and submitted by individual Europeans to their respective patrons. It is thus in the European writings of the period (i.e. from 1720 to 1820) that one discovers the European observed details about non-European science and technology as well as about the societies, institutions, customs and laws of various parts of the non-European world. Before this period the European ability to comprehend this new world was limited; and after about 1820 the knowledge and institutions of the non-European world also began to have much less usefulness to the problems of Europe. Further, by the 1820s, most parts of the non-European world are no longer themselves. Their institutions, sciences and technologies are not what they were 50 or 100 years earlier and have met the same fate as their political systems and sovereignty. By the 1820s or so, most of the non-European world had become, at least in European theory and most history texts, if not actually in practice, backward and barbarian....<sup>16</sup>

Indeed, by focusing on 18th and early 19th century British reports on Indian scientific and technological achievements, Dharampal initiated a process of delegitimizing the master narrative of the rise of the West—a new intellectual perspective in the 1960s which was only to acquire more widespread currency a few decades later. His incisive insights about the (often inadequate) modalities and yet far-reaching repercussions of European intellectual and political interactions with the Indian subcontinent underscore their deleterious impact for the latter, resulting from this process of “entanglement” which in recent and ongoing transcultural studies has gained such academic prominence.

Of the 17 documents presented in this book, six deal with science (focusing on complex astronomical calculations, appreciative evaluations of the observatory in Benares and on achievements in algebra, such as the binomial theorem). The eleven documents in the longer section devoted to technology describe a wide variety of implements and practices observed in different parts of India, among which figure

16 Dharampal 1971: xxvii ff.

prominently the practice of smallpox inoculation in Bengal as well as the familiarity with plastic surgery in Western India; the use of the drill-plough and other sophisticated agricultural implements including irrigation techniques; detailed descriptions of iron- and steel-making in various parts of India; the technique of ice-making in Allahabad and Calcutta, that of mortar production in Madras, and of widespread paper-making from *san* plants. Accompanying many of these detailed accounts (intended for a British scientific readership and sometimes even for parliamentary committees) are intricate diagrams illustrative of the exact construction of the observed apparatus, a fact which would seem indicative of the latter's subsequent appropriation and further development in accordance with British industrial requirements at the turn of the 19th century. Although the compactness and simplicity of fabrication, as of the mobile iron and steel furnaces (numbering up to 10,000 with each producing 20 tons annually) or the ingenious drill-ploughs, may have appeared crude to some British observers, Dharampal contests this impression by maintaining that the inherent simplicity

[...] was in fact due to social and political maturity as well as arising from an understanding of the principles and processes involved. Instead of being crude, the processes and tools of eighteenth century India appear to have developed from a great deal of sophistication in theory and an acute sense of the aesthetic.<sup>17</sup>

Indeed, his ulterior aim in publishing this documentary evidence of the relatively high level of Indian scientific and technological achievements in the 18th century was to initiate a paradigm shift in India's modernizing agenda, whereby the still existing indigenous expertise should be taken seriously into consideration in order to stimulate innovation and creativity (inspired by the grassroots) in the ongoing developmental enterprise. Although high-profile seminars were held, no concrete action was taken, and even the formulated decision of founding an institute, which would have enabled more extensive research to be done and could have led to an Indian pendant of Joseph Needham's multi-volume oeuvre on China, was unfortunately never brought to fruition. Nonetheless, Dharampal's book did have another lease of life a decade later when it inspired young IIT scientists from the PPST group<sup>18</sup> to engage in innovative *swadeshi* research into indigenous scientific and technological practices.

Dharampal's second, slimmer book on *Civil Disobedience and Indian Tradition* is equally significant, albeit in a different manner, and yet has not received due recognition until today. Basically it foregrounds the Indian embeddedness of Gandhian *satyāgraha*, and thereby constitutes a strong refutation (supported by historical empirical evidence) of conventional views maintaining that Gandhi had

17 Dharampal 1971: lxiii.

18 An acronym for the *Patriot and People-oriented Science and Technology* group of enterprising young scientists, founded in the late 1970s.



either appropriated this non-violent technique of protest from Western luminaries such as Thoreau or Tolstoy, or that he had invented it himself, and that consequently ordinary Indians possessed no fundamental understanding of the philosophical and organizational principles governing *satyāgraha*. Focusing on British administrative reports of a major non-violent protest against the imposition of a house-tax in Varanasi and neighbouring regions which was organized and carried out extensively between 1810 and 1811, Dharampal's intention was to thereby exemplify how socio-political and cultural expressions of popular assertions, explicitly aiming to safeguard the interests of the governed, were simultaneously attempting to redress the balance of power between the rulers and the ruled. Moreover, as documented in the British reports, this testified to the fact that traditionally the "consent of the governed" constituted an integral element validating the political authority's legitimacy which, in itself, underscored that the moral right to use state power was, or ought to be, derived from the people over whom power was exercised. And in the negative scenario, the right to protest or to enact a revolution formed part of this quasi social-contract theory, according to which people were entitled to legitimately instigate resistance if the government misused its authority in acting against their interests. As averred by Dharampal, such assertions of legitimate rights were recognized as such by pre-colonial political authorities themselves, besides being shared and enacted by the community at large, and were influenced by prevalent and mutually acknowledged religious and ethical-philosophical conceptions of justice and societal well-being. The basically non-violent nature of the documented protests in Varanasi, which are described as being meticulously organized, exhibiting political skill, testified not only to the peoples' self-assurance in their own legitimate cause and its strength, but also to the traditional relationship of mutuality and trust between the rulers and the ruled. As becomes apparent from a close reading of the documents, the colonial intervention changed the "rules of the game" of negotiating political asymmetries of power, on the one hand, by illegalizing such traditionally exercised "trials of strength", and on the other, by redefining relationships between social groups and, more importantly, by foregrounding the starkly rigid asymmetry between colonial authority and the colonized populace.

Highlighting the discrepant views concerning the appropriate relationship between state and society as expressed, on the one hand, by the protesting inhabitants of Varanasi who considered that the legitimacy of their demands should be acknowledged and, on the other hand, by the British administrators who demanded obedience and submission to their authority, being intent on establishing "law and order", constitutes the crucial contribution of this volume with regard not only to gaining a better understanding of India's recent past, but also with significant political implications of relevance to the present. Concerned with the need both to acknowledge the legitimate rights of the Indian populace as well as to facilitate their active participation in national politics, Dharampal formulates the fundamental political message of the book at the end of his insightful and informative introduction as follows:

It is suggested that non-cooperation and civil disobedience are integral to the healthy functioning and even to the security of a free and democratic society. In a way, they are even more crucial than stratified courts of law; the present forms of periodic local, state-level or national elections, or the rather stilted and constrained debates and considerations in such elected bodies. Instead of being hostile and inimical those who resort to non-cooperation and civil disobedience against callousness, authoritarianism and injustice are the protectors of their state and societies. Without them, a society will end up at best into some mechanical ritual or more often into tyranny leading to anarchy and armed insurrection.<sup>19</sup>

In 1983, Dharampal's third major book *The Beautiful Tree: Indigenous Indian Education in the 18th Century*,<sup>20</sup> perhaps the most well-known of his publications, provided evidence of the widespread prevalence in the late 18th- and early 19th-century India of educational institutions, teaching a sophisticated curriculum, with daily school attendance by children, especially those belonging to *sudra* communities, and in some areas, with Muslim girls being quite well represented. This data was a real eye-opener for the reappraisal of the historical tradition of education in India. Indeed, the findings conclusively refute the hitherto widely accepted assumption that before the British raj, education in India was the sole preserve of the twice-born castes, if not exclusively of the Brahmins. Ironically, this undemocratic and unequal social prioritization became the state of affairs only after the establishment of English medium schools towards the end of the 19th century, a skewed situation which persists in large measure in contemporary India.

Dharampal's research into the field of indigenous education was instigated by the following statement made by Mahatma Gandhi during a speech at the Royal Institute of International Affairs in 1931:

I say without fear of my figures being challenged successfully, that today India is more illiterate than it was fifty or a hundred years ago, and so is Burma, because the British administrators, when they came to India, instead of taking hold of things as they were, began to root them out. They scratched the soil and began to look at the root, and left the root like that, and the beautiful tree perished.<sup>21</sup>

Subsequently, Sir Philip Hartog, former vice-chancellor of Dacca University and chairman of the auxiliary committee of the Indian Statutory Commission, contested this claim and requested written evidence which Gandhi (being preoccupied with the Independence struggle in 1930s and 1940s) was unable to provide to the former's satisfaction. Dharampal's book, deriving its title *The Beautiful Tree* from Gandhi's

19 Dharampal 1971: lxi.

20 New Delhi: Biblia Impex Private Limited, 1983; repr. Coimbatore: Keerthi Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1995.

21 Quoted in Dharampal 1983: vi.



graphic description and in providing such statistical proof to substantiate Gandhi's statement, can also be seen as a delayed response to Sir Hartog's query.

The substantial documentary evidence contained in the book originates from various administrative sources, namely official surveys of indigenous education in the Presidencies of Madras (1822–26, commissioned by Governor Sir Thomas Munro), Bengal (1835–38, known as the William Adam's Report), and in the Punjab (1849–1882, penned by G.W. Leitner),<sup>22</sup> including reports from Malabar by a Carmelite missionary, Fra Paolino da Bartolomeo, in 1796 referring among other matters to the famous monitorial system as well as by Alexander Walker in 1820 on traditional practices in education and on the wide prevalence of literary learning. However, the fact that the conclusive statistical data of relatively widespread relatively "liberal" education in village elementary schools and institutions of higher learning enjoyed by large sections of the population<sup>23</sup> refers to periods several decades after the conquest of these regions, leads one to assume that the level of education provided must have been higher before the advent of British rule. Such an assumption is substantiated by the collector of Bellary who graphically describes the state of decay into which the schools had fallen because of their neglect by the British administration and as a consequence of the "gradual but general impoverishment of the country".<sup>24</sup> Yet despite this noticeable degeneration, acclamatory statements such as Governor Munro's estimation in 1826 (on the basis of the extensive surveys received from the diverse districts of the Madras presidency) that "the portion of the male population who receive school education to be nearer to one-third than one-fourth of the whole"<sup>25</sup> need to be understood against the backdrop of the comparatively low level of contemporary British education, about which Dharampal, in his extensive introduction, provides a critically discerning overview. In averring by reference to statistical data relating to the British Isles that "school education, especially elementary education at the people's level, was rather an uncommon commodity till around 1800,"<sup>26</sup> Dharampal, whilst tracing the subsequent novel development of publicly institutionalized school education in the first

22 Though these official surveys had all been published, and extracts of Munro's survey were even available in the House of Common Papers of 1831–32, it is astounding that their factual portent was not heeded by previous scholars concerned with the history of Indian education.

23 The Madras Presidency survey (1822–1826) gives concrete statistical data stating that 11,575 schools and 1,094 colleges were still in existence with the number of students being 157,195 and 5,431 respectively. Further that sudras and castes below them formed 70%–80% of the total students in Tamil-speaking areas, 62% in Oriya areas, 54% in Malayalam areas, and 35% in Telugu areas. In Malabar, 1,222 Muslim girls as compared to 3,196 Muslim boys attended school; the representative curriculum taught comprised, besides the three R's, also disciplines such as literature, astronomy, law and sciences; data extracted from Dharampal 1983: 5–255.

24 Report of the Collector, Bellary to the Board of Revenue, 17.8.1823, *ibid.*: 182.

25 *Ibid.*: 248. This estimation was made after taking into consideration the sizeable number of upper castes boys being taught at home, over and above the statistical data providing evidence that one fourth of all boys between the ages of 5 and 10 years were attending village schools.

26 *Ibid.*: 6.

half of 19th century Britain, thereby underscores the rationale behind British administrators' avid interest in reporting about prevalent Indian schools, including the reasons for their being impressed by their findings<sup>27</sup> despite the observable decline.

Admittedly, the primary objective governing this study was to dispel the all-too pervasive myth about India having received the boon of education from the British as part of their civilizing mission, but simultaneously, the politically contestatory nature of his intervention with a view to overhauling the contemporary pedagogic system is succinctly formulated in a concluding paragraph of the book's introduction as follows:

What India had in the sphere of education two centuries ago and the factors which led to its decay and replacement are indeed a part of history. Even if the former could be brought back to life, in the context of today, or of the immediate future, many aspects of it would no longer be apposite. Yet what exists today has little relevance either. An understanding of what existed and of the processes which created the irrelevance India has today, in time, could however help devise what best suits India's requirements and the ethos of its people.<sup>28</sup>

This clarion-call has subsequently instigated many to rethink the definition and content of present-day education, as equipping children to be able to more fully participate in and work towards the well-being of their local communities and regions, rather than for alienating them from their environments through semi-Westernized schooling or producing (mostly unemployable) graduates for a job-market, determined by the globalized economy.

## V

*Tout ensemble*, these three pioneering publications (constituting only part of Dharampal's endeavour to delegitimize conventional History)<sup>29</sup> represent historiographical documents par excellence in which the reader is confronted with the

27 According to the W. Adams Report, there were 100,000 schools in Bengal and Bihar in the 1830s, and in the Madras Presidency in the early 1820s, according to Governor Munro, there was "a school in every village", *ibid.*: 73.

28 *Ibid.*: 79.

29 Another important publication, belonging to a later date and also contesting hegemonic assumptions, is Dharampal and T.M. Mukundan 2002. Besides providing historical British documentary evidence about the genesis of mass cow-slaughter under British auspices, this volume presents extensive documentary material about one of the most significant resistance movements in India against kine-killing by the British during the years 1880–1894. By highlighting the support given by some prominent Muslims during phases of this mass protest as well as by emphasizing the crucial fact that it was the British and not the Muslims who were the main consumers of beef, Dharampal is able to dispel one of the deep-seated myths perpetuated in the interest of reinforcing divisive colonial strategies.



original official British sources describing crucial societal achievements in the different regions of 18th and early 19th century India. Hence, the factuality of the picture that emerges appears even more convincing, for, presumably, a British administrator would scarcely have had a rational reason for exaggerating positive features of Indian society. Yet these British reports, according to Dharampal (who was for ever self-critically reflective), also had certain draw-backs, since the topics that were being written about had not only been selected in accordance with the interests of the British observers (who would have been influenced by various concerns, political, cultural or scientific), but also, more significantly, the specific emphasis or interpretation given to the objects described would have been determined by the socio-cultural background of the writer, if not by contingent political factors of the immediate context. Hence, not only would inadvertently (or often, advertently) misinterpretations or distortions have crept into the descriptions, but also the matters selected for description would not have represented the total picture of a functioning society. To attain this, Dharampal, besides endeavouring to discursively present a radically critical and innovative overview of the momentous developments from the 18th into the 20th centuries in his many essays, lectures and newspaper articles,<sup>30</sup> nonetheless, insisted that a concerted effort was needed to have recourse to indigenous regional testimonies from varying sources, written, oral and inscriptional. As possible repositories of valuable historical data he suggested that researchers consult the annals of religious and cultural centres, the libraries of royal or aristocratic families, the records of banking and merchant families, registrars and account-keepers as well as village records and histories (as preserved in the Rajasthan State Archives at Bikaner with which he was familiar). These and varied documents from many other sources would contain essential data that could corroborate or amend and supplement the British testimony to subsequently provide a more holistic understanding of India's recent past and the functioning of its society. In view of this crucial desideratum, he emphasized—without any pretence of modesty—that his work constituted just a beginning, and that his findings should serve to instigate and inspire others to focus on and investigate the wealth of historical material lying at their doorstep. This is what he surmised 30 years ago, and he has been proven correct, now that the National Manuscript Mission has located thousands, if not millions of manuscripts throughout India. That means that there exist a multitude of documents in Indian regional locations just waiting to be researched into by hundreds of budding grass-root social historians, or Indian Le Roy Laduries, whose contribution he considered essential towards developing a more differentiated sense of cultural identity.

From another perspective, one of Dharampal's underlying aims in pursuing his historical research (as I understand it from frequent conversations with him) was to indulge in a sort of hermeneutics of historical knowledge—let me spell out what this

30 Some of which have been published in Dharampal, *Essays on Tradition, Recovery and Freedom*, vol. V of Dharampal 2007 (repr. of the 1st ed. 2000); as well as in Dharampal 2003.

entailed for him: Having provided sufficient evidence of the advanced level of Indian achievements in the various fields of science, technology, education, social and political organization, he considered it, firstly, necessary to investigate the causes and mechanisms by which not only this knowledge had been discarded and then fallen into oblivion, but also the relevant institutions had concomitantly become defunct; to obtain any viable understanding would, according to him, entail in-depth research into socio-economic, political and ideological impinging factors after the advent of colonial rule. Secondly, intent on evaluating impartially the social-historical significance of his findings, he opined that this would not necessarily be obtained by juxtaposing India in competitive comparison to Europe; that is, rather than merely emphasizing that India produced better steel, practised more sophisticated medicine, provided better education for its children before the onset of colonial rule, either than its counterparts in contemporary Europe, or 50 to 100 years later on the subcontinent itself; it would, contrastively, be more worthwhile to investigate how the attainment of this level had been possible, by becoming familiarized with the complex societal, economic and cultural mechanisms that had facilitated these accomplishments. This would entail doing detailed research into the functioning of Indian localities and their communities, their socio-economic infrastructure and instrumentalities. His own insights gained from a close analysis of early British-Indian historical documentation seemed to indicate that Indian society and polity in the 18th century was defined not so much by categories of hierarchy and political asymmetries, but rather by ones of mutual relationships that may have also been of a competitive nature, but not of a suppressive subjugating one; as for the categories of hierarchy and political asymmetries, he considered these factors had become accentuated as a result of the British-Indian encounter. The data collected from the Chingleput district of Tamil Nadu,<sup>31</sup> a project initiated by him in the 1980s, would constitute a paradigmatic case-study for such research into understanding the structure and functioning of Indian localities and their communities.

Thirdly, Dharampal wanted to trace how certain elements from this corpus of knowledge were appropriated, refined and integrated into the early modern British or European scientific and cultural institutions, a process which he considered was nothing unique but rather quite representative of the continual flow of knowledge (appropriated or exchanged) between the cultures of the world. Hence, on the one hand, he considered it essential to evaluate and comprehend the sociological as well

31 This refers to an extensive commissioned survey of about 2,000 villages carried out by a British engineer, Thomas Barnard, based on data collected during a five-year period (1762–1767) soon after the area around Madras came under direct British control. Since this survey is supplemented by detailed Tamil palm-leaf records, it contains a wealth of information not only on agriculture production and the variety of crop cultivation, but also on the very elaborate distributive system, the diversity of demographic and professional composition and the variety of ecological habitats. The research project is being pursued extensively by two of Dharampal's close associates, Dr. M.D. Srinivas and Dr. J.K. Bajaj.



as the psychological-cognitive portent of intercultural flows and appropriations of knowledge in which all societies of the world were participating. On the other hand, however, though he would not have been inclined to establish an exclusive right of cultural ownership on specific technologies and sciences, he did consider it important, without being chauvinistic, to study and be aware of their cultural embeddedness, for as he stated:

Every civilisation has to do its own learning and in its own way. The knowledge of what others did can only serve as one pointer amongst many. Similar understanding can be initiated in many other long neglected technologies and industries. It should not be surprising if at least some of them (with minor modifications here and there) prove to be as productive and cost-efficient as the new technologies which we have borrowed from modern world industries.<sup>32</sup>

In a fourth step, he attempted to understand the multifarious ways in which the fabric of Indian society had been shattered, and more significantly, to highlight the often subtle and surreptitious means by which Indian minds had been ideologically colonized under the impact of British rule. His objective here again was not necessarily to apportion blame to British administrators, but rather to unravel the ensconced logic of colonial operations. In historical retrospect, there was no point in being moralistic about the damage done, but rather, it was necessary to deconstruct the whole process and rationale behind the colonial endeavour, a challenging task that could be embarked upon by studying the vast collections of the Board of Control (documents, catalogued by him with great care—lying in Sevagram waiting to be researched into) which itemize the dismantling and remodeling that this process involved. Yet, according to his understanding of developments elsewhere and his ability to discern and highlight structural linkages in the global arena, the British-Indian experience was by no means exceptional, for he perceived similar operations at work, for instance in the British Isles and in North America.<sup>33</sup> Nonetheless, the impact of the colonial enterprise he considered, in like manner to Gandhi, entirely destructive to the Indian society, not only because of the

32 Extract from "Indigenous Indian technological talent and the need for its mobilisation", a lecture delivered at the Birla Industrial and Technological Museum, Calcutta, 4.10.1986, quoted from *Essays on Tradition, Recovery and Freedom*, in: Dharampal 2007 (5): 66.

33 "Most of what Britain did in India was not basically very different from what the British State had done in Britain since about the Norman Conquest of England in the 11th century, and which it more or less continued till after 1800. [...] the same was attempted by England in Ireland from about the 16th century; or experimented upon in North America in the 16th-17th-18th centuries; and the same was continued by the successors of British power in the fast expanding territories of the USA in the late 18th and the 19th centuries." Quoted from "Some aspects of earlier Indian polity and society and their relevance to the present", a series of three lectures delivered in Pune in January 1986, published in *Essays on Tradition, Recovery and Freedom*, *ibid.*: 15.

exploitative factor involved, but also because it was defined by categories alien to or at odds with the Indian cultural ethos.

What the component parts of this Indian cultural ethos are (and in which manner they are at odds with modern conceptions) are spelt out in his slim volume on *Bharatiya Chitta, Manas and Kala*.<sup>34</sup> By underscoring the Indian traditional conceptions of time and space as well as of the relative insignificance of man, his knowledge and his crafts in the scheme of creation, Dharampal aimed to underscore the intellectual and spiritual sustenance derived from a world-view that was defined by a totally different logic to the one operative in the modern one. Thereby, however, he did not intend to extract India from the modern world, but rather his aim was to instill Indians with self-confidence, and the self-assurance that their world-view was valuable, and that it could perhaps influence world agendas. For, according to his understanding, modernity or post-modernity was neither static nor everlasting, for that matter. Moreover, in a more philosophical vein, he averred that the ways of the world were governed by a logic, unfathomable to men. Yet, simultaneously, in a more practical affirmative tone, he concluded with the following reassuring prospect:

To redefine our seekings and aspirations, our ways of thought and action, in a form that is appropriate and effective in today's world may not be too hard a task after all. Such re-assertions and re-definitions of civilisational thrust are not uncommon in world history. For every civilization, there comes a time when the people of that civilization have to remind themselves of their fundamental civilisational consciousness and their understanding of the universe and of Time. From the basis of that recollection of the past, they then define the path for their future. Many civilizations of the world have undergone such self-appraisal and self-renewal at different times. In our long history, many times we must have engaged in this recollection and re-assertion of the *chitta* and *kala* of India. We need to undertake such an exploration into ourselves again.<sup>35</sup>

Combined with this culturally and intellectually reinvigorating historical perspective, providing the reassurance that India could or would reassert itself, once it had understood and come to terms with its own cultural moorings, Dharampal's exhortation also comprised a socio-political thrust, as expressed many a time in public fora: Rather than "walking in the grooves laid down by the west, while dreaming day-dreams that our time will come one day",<sup>36</sup> he contended that a

34 Dharampal 1991; English translation (with a preface and glossary) by Jitendra Bajaj, published as *Bharatiya Chitta, Manas and Kala*, Centre for Policy Studies, Madras 1993 (Dharampal 1993).

35 *Ibid.*, cited from the reprint in: Dharampal: *Essays on Tradition, Recovery and Freedom*, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

36 Cited from the lecture entitled "Some aspects of earlier Indian society and polity and their relevance to the present" (1986), *op. cit.*, p. 44.



systematic intellectual effort needed to be undertaken to evolve viable indigenous models of social, economic and political organization in tune with contemporary realities so that an organic linkage between society and polity based on sounder indigenous foundations could be established.<sup>37</sup> Towards the end of his life, broadening his horizons and transcending the shores of the subcontinent, he initiated a research project on the maritime world of the Indian Ocean to investigate the shared historical cultural links within Asia, with the ultimate aim of reviving past intimate Indian contacts with countries of South East and East Asia. This he envisaged as an essential and urgent enterprise he hoped many would enthusiastically take up, and given the surge of Asian maritime studies during the last decade, it seems his initiative is bearing fruit.

*Summa summarum*, not only did Dharampal, in provincializing and delegitimizing the historical master narrative, thereby remap a few centuries of Indian history as well as retrace old seascapes, but he also attempted to design blueprints for societal renewal and chart out a course of research for the next few decades, or more, depending on the productive pace we manage to maintain.

## References

- Dharampal. 1971. *Indian Science and Technology in the Eighteenth Century. Some Contemporary European Accounts*. Delhi: Impex India.
- Dharampal. 1971a. *Civil Disobedience and Indian Tradition with Some Early Nineteenth Century Documents*. Varanasi: Sarva Seva Sangh Prakashan.
- Dharampal. 1972. *The Madras Panchayat System: A General Assessment*. 2 vols. Delhi: Impex India.
- Dharampal. 1983. *The Beautiful Tree. Indigenous Indian Education in the Eighteenth Century*. Delhi: Impex India.
- Dharampal. 1991. *Bhāratīy citta, mānas va kāl* (Hindi). Chennai: Pushpa Prakashan Patna and Centre for Policy Studies.
- Dharampal. 1993. *Bharatiya Chitta, Manas and Kala*. English transl. [of Dharampal 1991] with a preface and glossary by Jitendra Bajaj. Madras: Centre for Policy Studies.
- Dharampal. 1998. *India before British Rule and the Basis for India's Resurgence*. Wardha: Gandhi Seva Sangh.
- Dharampal. 2003. *Rediscovering India. Collection of Essays and Speeches (1956–1998)*. Mussoorie: SIDH.

37 More concretely and inclusively, he urged the following: "Our essential task is to bring the innovative and technological skills of our people, those who professed them for millennia and till at least 1800, back to the rebuilding of our primary economy and industry. We have ignored this so far. Instead, we have tried to create a new economy and industry to which the primary economy has been subordinated." Cited from the lecture on "Indigenous Indian technological talent and the need for its mobilization" (1986), op. cit., p. 63.

- Dharampal. 2007. *Collected Writings*. 5 vols. Mapusa (Goa): Other India Press & SIDH. Repr. of the 1st ed. 2000.
- Dharampal and T.M. Mukundan. 2002. *The British Origin of Cow-Slaughter in India with Some British Documents on the Anti-Kine-Killing Movement 1880–1894*. Mussoorie: Society for Integrated Development of Himalayas.



## Caturdās's *Bhāṣā* Version of the Eleventh Book of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*

Monika Horstmann

In February 1985 I sat in the audience of Haridāsī, a Dādūpanthī *mahāmaṇḍaleśvar* and acclaimed orator, when he held a sermon at the Dādūpanthī annual festival at the Dādūpanth's headquarters at Naraina (Jaipur district, Rajasthan). Quite in the beginning of his sermon, Haridāsī quoted from the third chapter of the eleventh book of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, though not from the Sanskrit but from a *bhāṣā* version.<sup>1</sup> At that time, I was unable to identify his source, and later I lost sight of the matter. In 2009, like several times prior to this during the twenty-five years since Mukund Lath had first given me permission to consult his manuscript collection, I browsed through his manuscripts and got attracted to a *guṭkā* (bound compilation) produced in VS 1738/CE 1682. The compilation consists of three texts, on which more information will be given presently. As I started reading the second of these, I quickly realized that this was the text from which Haridāsī had recited a fairly long passage. The author of the text was Caturdās, a disciple of Santdās, whom the author mentions in the beginning of his work (1.1) and in the colophon concluding the final chapter 31 which reads,

संबत सोलासै बांगवा । ज्येष्ठ सुकल षष्ठी कुजदिवा ।  
संतदास गुरु आज्ञा दीन्हीं । चतुरदास यह भाषा कीन्हीं ॥ ६० ॥  
परमज्ञान परगट कह्यौ मम घट हूँ निजदेव ।  
ते मेरे नित उर बसै संतदास गुरदेव ॥ ६१ ॥

In the year VS 1692, on the the 6th day of the bright half of Jyeshṭha, on a Tuesday,

on request of Guru Santdās, Caturdās made this *bhāṣā* version. (60)

My God himself, present in my body, revealed to me the highest wisdom, may the divine guru Santdās always reside in my heart. (61)

This gives us the author's own name, the name of his guru Santdās, and May 6, 1635 as the date of the composition.

As I read, Haridāsī's recitation resounded as it were in my memory. I photographed the text, and as I examined its status, it turned out that it once enjoyed great popularity, for a good number of manuscripts of it are available. Gopal Narayan Bahura (1976: 180), for example, records 11 manuscripts, all of them undated; in the manuscript collection of the Dādūpanth at Naraina it has been

1 For an analysis of this sermon, see Thiel-Horstmann 1989.



preserved in 15 manuscripts, most of them complete, a few of them incomplete.<sup>2</sup> Apart from the vernacular version of the eleventh book of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, Caturdās wrote at least the following works, manuscripts of which are also preserved in Naraina: *Śrīmadbhagavadgītā saṅkī* (no. 319), *Arjungītā* (ibid.), a commentary (*ṭīkā*) on the *Hastāmālakastotra* ascribed to Śaṅkara (no. 482), a *bhāṣā* version of Viṣṇupurīś commentary of the *Bhaktiratnāvalī* (no. 486). The last-mentioned text was composed in VS 1690, that is two years prior to his version of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. In the colophon of the work he is identified as an author belonging to eastern Marwar.

Caturdās's vernacular version of the eleventh book of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* has been edited three times. The first edition was published by the Venkateśvar Steam Press. (date?) and was not available to me, the second was edited by Prabhākar Bhānūdās Māṇḍe in 1967, and the third, finally, was edited by Cetandās Svāmī in 2007. Cetandās Svāmī based his edition on the manuscript in the possession of Haridāsī, who as a child had learnt the text by heart from his guru Caidāsī. This edition, for which no bibliographic reference is available, came to me in 2010 as a gift from Dādūpanthī in Naraina. In the same year, I attended a religious function in the Dādūpanthī *maṭh* Sukhrām Bābājī kī Poh near Kuchera (Nagaur district, Rajasthan), where I also met Haridāsī and had a chance to talk to him about my recent engagement with Caturdās's work. He confirmed the popularity and merit of this, which, according to him, every listener could understand straightforwardly.

Caturdās is regarded as a Dādūpanthī author. This identification can be traced to later versions of Rāghavdās's *Bhaktīmāl* with the commentary by another Caturdās, a name-sake of the 17th-century Caturdās, with whom we are concerned here. The *Bhaktīmāl* was composed in VS 1717/CE 1760, while Caturdās wrote his commentary in 1800.<sup>3</sup> A later, expanded recension of the *Bhaktīmāl* with Caturdās's commentary, was edited diplomatically by Svāmī Nārāyaṇdās (Rāghavdās n.d. [VS 2023]) on the basis of ten manuscripts dating between VS 1840 and VS 1936. In this, Caturdās appears as the disciple of Santdās Mārū Galtān (also: Galtānī):

दादू दीन दयालु के, सन्तदास गलतान ॥  
अग्रवाल कुल जन्म, सही जन मारू संज्ञा ।  
रच्यो फतेपुर धाम, प्राण हरि के रंग्या ॥  
कडखो कियो रसाल, अडखंभ गाये दादू ।  
एकादश आवली, टिप्पणी करी सुस्वादू ॥  
शिष चतुरदास अरु भीखजन, बालकराम सुजान ।  
दादू दीन दयालु के, संतदास गलतान ॥<sup>4</sup>

2 Simhal 2004: nos. 319, 347, 348, 421, 433, 461, 482, 486, 529, 542, 544, 595, 596, 597, and 599.

3 See the editor Agarcand Nāhtā's introduction (Rāghavdās 1965: "da" and "ṣa").

4 Rāghavdās n.d. [VS 2023]: 753, *chappay* 610.

Santdās Galtān was a disciple of Dādū Dīndayālu.

Born in an Agravāl family and a genuine devotee, he was called Mārū, in Fatehpur he built a house, his life was steeped in the colour of Hari, he composed the tasty *Karakho*, in which Dādū is praised as standing upright like a pillar,

he wrote the tasty commentary *Ekadaśāvalī*,

his disciples were Caturdās, Bhīkhjan and the astute Bālākram.

Santdās Galtān was a disciple of Dādū Dīndayālu.

Stanzas 653 and 654 of the same recension are devoted to Santdās's disciples Bālākram (653), and Caturdās and Bhīkhjan (654). No further details on Caturdās's life and work can be gleaned from the respective stanza. Sv. Maṅgaldās (1948) published some compositions of Bhīkhjan and Bālākram. Bhīkhjan does in fact mention Dādū in an enumeration of the great mythical and historical preceptors, Dādū standing last in that line. He acknowledges Santdās as his guru, whose line he does not explicitly trace back to Dādū.<sup>5</sup> Bālākram refers to Rāgho as his guru, to Sundar as his *satguru*, and to Dādū, from who he traces his spritual line.<sup>6</sup> This, indeed, points to Fatehpur, where Sundardās, descended from a merchant caste and patronised by merchants, resided. Santdās, too, was one of the several merchant caste disciples of Dādū. Fatehpur was a centre of these (Horstmann, forthcoming). Santdās's martial song (*kharako*) in praise of Dādū is published.<sup>7</sup> Rāghavdās mentions another composition by Santdās, the *Ekadaśāvalī*, a commentary on the eleventh book of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. This work has not yet been traced.

Caturdās writes in stanza 60 of his work that Santdās asked him to compose the text. This seems to be more than a respectful acknowledgement of his teacher, for Santdās, reported to have been engaged himself with the eleventh book of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, may well have encouraged Caturdās to write a *bhāṣā* version of it. It remains to be examined if the version by Caturdās is indebted to the composition of Santdās.

As for Caturdās, he identifies himself as a disciple of Santdās, but mentions Dādū nowhere. The text portions prefixed and suffixed to Caturdās's text by Cetandās Svāmī in his edition of 2007, in this perhaps following the manuscript at his disposal, are partly quotations from the *Dādūvāṇī* and partly other verses in the Dādūpanthī spirit. Caturdās's version of the eleventh *skandha* of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. In this partly exegetical translation, he speaks of Hari-Rām as the supreme being, identical with the human soul and the object of interior worship. This concept is well akin to the position taken by Dādū, but this can be said of the *nirguṇa* stance of a host of Sant authors. Caturdās, however, to judge from his adaptation of the

5 Maṅgaldās 1948: 2 (st. 5), 21 (st. 54). Maṅgaldās thought that Santdās was identical with Santdās Bare Hazāre.

6 Maṅgaldās 148: "ai".

7 Edited on the basis of a manuscript also from the collection of Mukund Lath by Thiel-Horstmann (1991).



*Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, seems to have cultivated a modified *nirguṇa* stance. According to this, the *saguna* stance prepares the *nirguṇa* stance, the latter forming the perfection of the former. This is a belief which is consonant with Nirañjanī faith, which reconciles *saguna* and *nirguṇa* stances by making the *saguna* the tangible instrument of devotion to the *nirguṇa* Hari-Rām. The Nirañjanī works have been transmitted continuously also by Dādūpanthīs which illustrates the blending of the two *sampradāyas*. The manuscript of 1682 points to the Nirañjanī direction. Its scribe was a monk, or so I suppose, whose name is unfortunately blotched out. What is readable is “servant of [God’s] servants”. He pays obeisance to Rām, which does not suggest more than his place in the wide spectrum of *bhaktas* who variously combined *saguna* and *nirguṇa* devotion or adhered more particularly to *nirguṇa bhakti*. The *guṭkā* consists of three texts, Caturdās’s text ranging second. The first six folios of the *guṭkā* are damaged and partly missing so that an invocation that may have stood at its opening is missing. The first text is *Mahābhārat-itihās-sār-samuccay*, consisting of 32 chapters and completed on fol. 97a. This work is by Tursīdās Nirañjanī (16th century), who was from Śerpurā in Rajasthan.<sup>8</sup> This first text is followed by Caturdās’s text which comprises 180 folios. The third text, *Dāsvidhān* (apparently unpublished), is again by Tursī. The *guṭkā* may therefore be attributed to the Nirañjanī milieu. The Ḍīdvāṇā lineage (*maṇḍal*) of the Nirañjanīs mentions a Caturdās, who was the third mahant in their line and died in VS 1694/CE 1636/37. This would tally with the date of the composition of the *Bhāṣā Ekādaś-skandh* (1635), but the name Caturdās occurs so often that no hypothesis can be built on it. Addressing the issue by examining the connection with Ḍīdvāṇā, however, may provide a clue: Disciples of Dādū lived in both Ḍīdvāṇā and Fatehpur. Noteworthy is Prāgdās Bihāṇī of Ḍīdvāṇā, a merchant caste disciple of Dādū, at whose *maṭh* Sundardās stayed for some time.<sup>9</sup> Prāgdās moved to Fatehpur in 1606, where Sundardās joined him, before or around 1625. Prāgdās had died in 1631 (VS 1688).<sup>10</sup> He was succeeded by Santdās, who died in 1643.<sup>11</sup> The settlement in Fatehpur was lavishly patronised by five Agravāl families.<sup>12</sup> The above-quoted stanza of Rāghavdās’s *Bhaktmāl* mentions that Santdās Mārū Galtān built a *dhām*, “house”, a term

appropriate for a religious institution, in Fatehpur. Santdās, the successor of Prāgdās, should therefore be identical with Santdās Mārū Galtān, the guru of Caturdās, the author of the *Bhāṣā Ekādaś-skandh*. Santdās was an Agravāl, and he thus fits perfectly into the web of monks of merchant caste origin and their merchant caste householder patrons. As for Caturdās’s silence about Dādū, an explanation would be that whereas his immediate disciples were oriented to Dādū, the Dādūpanth as a sect was at that time only emergent. Quite telling is the stance of Sundardās, the devout last disciple of Dādū and Caturdās’s contemporary and himself a member of the Fatehpur community of monks, who did not yet recognise a Dādūpanth, but spoke of a spiritual pedigree related through Dādū to the supreme self, a *parabrahma kī sampradāy*.<sup>13</sup> The same Sundardās seems to have kept some distance from the emerging Dādūpanth of Naraina, the place where Dādū had lived during the last few years of his life and where after his death his sons emerged as consecutive leaders. When Dādū died in 1603, he was succeeded by his elder son Garūbdās, who died in 1636, after which the lineage of Naraina was rocked by an almost endless struggle of claimants and conflicting factions. Against this, the disciples of Dādū in Fatehpur may have rather focused their attention on the affairs of their own community. To sum up, the facts recorded make Caturdās a disciple of Santdās Mārū Galtān of Fatehpur, whose lineage was connected with Ḍīdvāṇā through Prāgdās Bihāṇī. Nothing at this stage establishes the identity of Caturdās with the third mahant of the Ḍīdvāṇā Nirañjanīs. Caturdās popularity with the Nirañjanīs seems to be owed to his religious stance, which is largely consonant with theirs.

Caturdās’s text is of elegant simplicity. This however is a simplicity wrought from the careful study of the most widely acclaimed non-sectarian commentary on the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, Śrīdhara’s *ḥikā Bhāvārthadīpikā* (between 1350 and 1450).<sup>14</sup> This commentary informed also the other two *bhāṣā* versions, on which I have drawn further below for comparison. Like the authors compared, Caturdās himself does not mention this expressly, but straightforwardly declared that his aim was to write for the benefit of ordinary men (*lokahitāratha*, 1.2).

Māṇḍe, in the introduction to his edition of 1967, when discussing Caturdās’s achievements—according to Māṇḍe, largely missing—entertained an unfortunate bias. He based his edition on a manuscript from Sendūrvāṇā (Aurangabad district), hence from Maharashtra. Māṇḍe could not identify Caturdās’s provenance and rather took it for granted that the author must have had before him the model of Eknāth’s *Bhāgavat ekādaśī*, begun in Paithan in 1570 and completed in Banaras in 1573 (Tulpule 1979: 354). Without substantiating his judgment, he declared Eknāth’s work as a text conceived for an audience not yet familiar with the thoughts expressed in it, whereas according to him Caturdās’s work was meant to address an audience already familiar with the spiritual issues raised in the text. He then goes on pointing to poetic strategies not applied by Caturdās against the poetic achievements

13 See his *Guru-sampradāy* (Śarmā VS 1993: 195–202).

14 Rocher 1986: 149, following Gode 1949.

8 For the works of Tursī Nirañjanī, see Miśra VS 2029: 141; for his date, Maheshvari 1980: 119; for his origin from Śerpurā, a name of several places in Rajasthan, see McGregor 1984: 140, with reference to Satyanārāyaṇ Miśra 1974 in n. 33; Rāghavdās mentions Tursī in a list of Nirañjanīs and devotes a separate stanza to him which unfortunately does not give historical clues (Rāghavdās 1965: 202, *chapai* 429; 204, *indav* 437).

9 Callewaert 1988, *Dādū-janma-līlā* 12.22.

10 Inscription set in the wall of what came to be known as Sundar’s *maṭh* in Fatehpur commemorating his death on Kārttika b. 8, VS 1688, Wednesday (Mishra 1990: 114, no. 74). The date and the day of the week do not tally, for the 8th day of the dark half of the moon of that month was a Saturday. However, in VS 1689, that lunar day was a Wednesday.

11 He died on Māgha b. 5, VS 1696, a Friday, as is commemorated in an inscription set in the wall of Sundar’s *maṭh* in Fatehpur (Mishra 1990: 115–6, no. 77). This corresponds to January 13, 1643.

12 These were the Poddārs, Khejrvāls, Mors, Cāriyā and Budhiyās.



of Eknāth. For him, Caturdās's composition is so to say a rather roughly hewn stone as compared with the delicately chiselled perfect sculpture created by Eknāth. Seeing in Caturdās a dwarf rivalling with the giant Eknāth is a sure way to miss an understanding of Caturdās's project. There is no indication whatsoever that Caturdās knew of Eknāth's work at all. Caturdās's work is not a translation in the now common western sense of an exact word-by-word rendering of the original, but, as has been said, a reworking of it in the spirit of Śrīdhara Svāmī's commentary with the aim to authenticate Sant faith.

The eleventh book of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* is in many ways akin to the ascetic tradition, therefore fitting the views of a Sant monk. It targets quite different audiences than the tenth book, which appeals to other milieus, ranging from the courtly one over Vaiṣṇava theologians to folk audiences.

This essay cannot offer more than a glimpse of Caturdās's text. Only the 16 stanzas representing the rendering of the 11.2.45–55 of the Sanskrit *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* will be discussed and subsequently put in profile by comparing them with two other *bhāṣā* versions.<sup>15</sup>

#### Caturdās 2.61-78

Hari said:

Immobile, mobile, fine and gross, only one *prakṛti* is the root of all.

She is the basis for the one soul, this soul forms part [of the] formless. (61)

Both of them spring from Hari, in the end they are absorbed in Hari.

Also now, therefore, those who know Hari, will never take to the feeling of duality. (62)

The whole world is connected with the Lord like bubbles and waves with the sea.

He who has become steadfast, because he has understood this, is the supreme valorous devotee of Hari. (63)

He whose love of Hari is unwavering and for whom the company with the servants of Hari forms a regular observance,

#### *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 11.2.45-55

Hari said:

He who recognizes that the soul in all beings is Bhagavad and that the beings are in Bhagavad, who is the soul, is a supreme Bhagavata. (45)

He who shows love to the Lord, friendliness to his (the Lord's) dependents, compassion to the simple-minded, and lenience to the malicious, is

who has compassion for all beings, who understands in his heart that all are saved, (64)

who resigns himself, if people blame him, for he knows this to be their nature, who remains day and night coloured in the colour of Rām, this, my dear, is the middle-ranking devotee of Hari. (65)

He who conceives of Hari as residing in an image, who in mind, deed and speech takes to no one else, worships him, concentrates on his well-being, does not ask for anything and has a simple character, (66)

who, in the absence of a true guru, does not realise that Hari's devotees are Hari himself and therefore fails to worship them, but recognises that all souls belong to Hari, such a good person one calls a rudimentary devotee. (67)

Furthermore, call him a supreme devotee of Hari, to whom one gets attracted like to a touchstone. (68)

On seeing and touching him one's objectives are achieved, this kind of devotee of Hari wards off the suffering of existence. (69)

He in whose mind Kṛṣṇa dwells, who does not know of any other truth, who holds all that he speaks, hears and sees by virtue of his senses to be the *māyā*, (70)

He is the supreme devotee of Hari, a god-man, and therefore he finds God Nirañjana.

When a devotee reflects about the Supreme Self, he understands himself and is absorbed in happiness. (71)

He knows that birth and death are proper to the body; hunger and thirst, to those alive:

craving, to the intellect; and fear, to the mind. This characterises the supreme

a middle-ranking [Bhāgavata]. (46)

He who full of faith performs the worship of Hari only on his image, but not on the others who are his devotees, is known as a rudimentary devotee. (47)

He who uses his senses to avail himself of objects, but, free of hatred and delight, regards them as Viṣṇu's *māyā*, is a supreme Bhāgavata. (48)

He who by virtue of remembrance of Hari is not confused by the laws of life—birth and death, hunger, fear, desire and hardship which affect the body, senses, vitality, mind and thought—

<sup>15</sup> For the original portions, see the Appendix. For the text by Caturdās I have followed in principle the edition of Māṅḍe (Caturdās 1967), which is based on a single manuscript and thereby mistake-prone, but which I have collated with the manuscript of CE 1682 and the edition by Cetandās Svāmī of 2007 and corrected for a number of readings.



devotee of Hari. (72)

Deeds, lingering dispositions, and all desires, he has forgotten them and does not even know them by name, he resides in Vāsudeva. Such a person is called a supreme servant of Hari (73)

Who has forgotten about his caste, *varṇa*, family, deeds, what the world thinks proper, his station in life, who does not admit pride into his body, is called a supreme servant of Hari. (74)

He is not attached to any object, and in him there is no pride of his body, he regards all creatures alike, him one calls a supreme servant of Hari. (75)

The eight supernatural accomplishments and the happiness of the three worlds may come to him, but they never shake his mind, not for half a wink of the eye will he approach them, but takes refuge at the place of fearlessness, which is beyond qualities. (76)

How would his devotee let go of him, who is worshipped forever by Śiva, Brahmā and the other gods, who fix their body and mind on him and yet do not reach him? (77)

How can pain arise for him, whose thoughts are directed to the moon of Hari's foot?

Such a person is called a supreme devotee of Hari. In contact with him one reaches the supreme place. (78)

Hari does not abandon him even for a wink of the eye, for, tied by the rope of love, how could he run away?

Such a person is called a supreme servant of Hari, never give up company with him. (79)

, is a chief Bhāgavata. (49)

He in whose consciousness the seeds of deeds governed by desire do not sprout, whose only support is Vāsudeva, is a supreme Bhāgavata. (50)

He in whose body no pride is aroused by his [distinguished] birth, deeds, status in the social order, station of life or caste, is indeed dear to Hari. (51)

He who with regard to property does not distinguish between his or someone else's and does not think: "This is mine, this belongs to someone else," who treats all beings as alike and is peaceful, is indeed a supreme Bhāgavata. (52)

Never, not even for the sovereignty over the three worlds, does he, even for half a wink of the eye, unflinching in his remembrance, move away from the lotus-foot of Bhagavad, which gods and other beings seek. He is the foremost of the Vaiṣṇavas. (53)

Once pain is overcome by the moonlight streaming from Bhagavad's vigorous feet, limbs, footnails and jewelry, how can in the heart of his worshippers ever again prevail the heat of the sun, when, as it were, the moon has risen? (54)

If the helpless calls him by his name, Hari destroys his sins and does not leave his heart, for his lotus-foot is tied to him by the rope of love. Such one is called the chief of Bhāgavatas. (55)

The passage classifies and extols the three grades of Bhāgavatas. These grades form rather specific Vaiṣṇava concepts and have hardly a role to play for the Sants, who otherwise do not shun Vaiṣṇava terms, motifs and names of God. By the time of Caturdās, orthodox Vaiṣṇava theologians had debated the ritual competence and obligations assigned to those ranks. Such issues were relevant for Vaiṣṇavas practising iconic worship, but hardly for Sants who did not worship God in icons. Caturdās replaces the specific Vaiṣṇava terms by Sant ones, though he is not rigidly consistent. "Kṛṣṇa" and "Vāsudeva" are common enough in Sant usage, but "Bhāgavata" or "Vaiṣṇava" point to particular sectarian affiliations. "Bhāgavata", which is in fact retained in some places outside of this passage, as for example in 2.59 and 60, is substituted by "Harijan" or "Haridās". "Īśvara" and "Viṣṇu" are rendered by "Hari", and side by side with this "Rām" occurs, both names representing the most common Sant names of God. Also "Nirañjan", central to the *nirguṇa* stance, occurs. This is the first aspect of the translation strategy deployed to root the passage in the Sant concepts. Secondly, Caturdās's rendering of the passage is considerably longer than the Sanskrit original. This is not primarily due to the fact that the Sanskrit text is interspersed with a couple of stanzas composed in more ornate and longer metres than the *śloka*. Caturdās is rather governed by a didactic intent. He simplifies the style of the respective stanzas, but is found to expand these by adding examples to drive home to his audience the principles of his theology, as, for example, the stanzas corresponding to stanza 11.2.45 of the Sanskrit *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. Here the familiar imagery of the sea and its waves and bubbles serves to explain the monistic stance of the author, who wants to make himself understood by everyone in the audience. In the stanzas corresponding to the Sanskrit *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 11.2.46, Caturdās dwells on three principles of Sant religion: Hari, the company of his devotees, and compassion. The seed of this is indeed to be found in the Sanskrit passage, but Caturdās's Sant tenor is more explicit. The advice he gives is oriented to the practice of ideal behaviour. This is also the case in the adaptation of the next Sanskrit stanza, 11.2.47, where he also departs from the Sanskrit version. Whereas this has the rudimentary devotee disregard the worship of Hari's servants, such worship is positively enjoined by Caturdās; similarly in the four stanzas corresponding to 11.2.48 of the Sanskrit original. In his version of stanza 49, Caturdās brings to the attention of his audience the ambivalent state of the mind, *man*, which if disciplined is a means of realising the supreme, while it leads man astray if undisciplined and therefore prone to delusion. Caturdās's adaptation of 11.2.53 adds to the original the familiar trope of the eight yogic *siddhis*, which the true *yogīs* and, by implication, the Sants consider spectacular by-products of yogic practice, but which as strategems of frauds and in the perception of the credulous may obscure the ultimate aim of yoga, namely, the merging of man and supreme. In his rendering of stanzas 54 and 55, Caturdās sacrifices the ornate description of the lustre of Bhagavad's feet (54) and the touching reference to the wretch whose deliverance by Bhagavad testifies to his love and power (55).



On the whole, Caturdās tends to be more explicitly didactic than the original. When used for recitation and discourse based on the eleventh book of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, this would enable everyone in the audience to understand the principles of the faith the preacher wished to disseminate. The *bhāṣā* version was and has remained directly comprehensible to any audience, whereas the Sanskrit original always needed to be complemented by a vernacular exegesis, unless, of course, the recitation was performed with a *mantra*-like function.

The properties of Caturdās's version appear in sharper profile as they are compared with *bhāṣā* versions from the orthodox Vaiṣṇava milieu. Two of these may serve for demonstration. Both of them are informed by the commentary of Śrīdhara Svāmī. One is that by Brajkumvarī, "Brajdāsī" by her pen-name, the step-mother of Sāvantsingh ("Nāgrīdās") of Kīśangaṛh.<sup>16</sup> She translated the entire *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* in the seven years between 1749/50 and 1756/57 (VS 1806 and 1812). This undertaking represented the enlarged replica of the seven-day sacrifice of Parīkṣit in the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, and was conducted in the years of the succession struggle between Sāvantsingh and his younger brother Bahādursingh, which was aggravated by the involvement of the Marāṭhas. Brajdāsī was the disciple of the Nimbārka *mahant* Vṛndāvandev (d. 1740), a distinguished scholar and advisor also of Śavāī Jaisingh of Jaipur. One can only speculate how far Vṛndāvandev contributed to her project, though of course it was completed many years after his death. Brajdāsī is quite often closer to Śrīdhara than to the original text, or at least anxious to do justice to his exegesis. Her version has 19,375 stanzas against the ca. 18,000 stanzas of the Sanskrit original. The style of her translation is uneven. She sometimes exhibits little scruple to substitute convenient metrical fillers for key terms in a passage, but such banalities are balanced by the many, especially narrative, passages which testify to her skills. The text awaits careful examination and more serious assessment of the author's craft.

The second *bhāṣā* version adduced for comparison is that by Vaiṣṇavdās "Rasjānī", who composed his *Bhāṣābhāgavat* in CE 1750.<sup>17</sup> A member of the Gauḍīya sect and a grand-disciple of the well-known commentator of Nābhādās's *Bhaktmāl*, Priyādās, Rasjānī was an author of some distinction. Apart from his adaptation of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, his following Braj Bhāṣā works are known: a short Braj Bhāṣā version of Jayadeva's *Gītāgovinda*, a *Bhaktmālmāhātmya*, the *Bhaktirasbodhinī* commentary on Nābhādās's *Bhaktmāl*, and the *Bhaktiratnāvalī*. His rendering of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* is a gem for its unfailing clarity and stylistic elegance. As a conscientious poet, he expresses in conventional phrases his concern that there may be found flaws in his composition. In the colophon of his work he

makes obeisance to Caitanya, the great Gauḍīya teachers, and to Priyādās, who inspired him, to state towards the end,

Unfitting rhyme or an excessive mora are for the sake of meaning,  
for the sake of fitting rhyme or brevity, in some cases the meaning is just  
alluded to.

Unfitting rhyme is not a flaw, as may be seen from the practice of poets,  
especially deft is he who reads while reducing or adding morae  
In some places there are changes, assess them by their meaning,  
consider them as variant readings, and put the blame on me.

For neither Brajdāsī nor Rasjānī there arises the problem which was faced by Caturdās, who had to avoid terms and concepts going against his Sant stance. Brajdāsī renders the Sanskrit passage under review by 15 *caupāīs*, while Rasjānī translates it by 12 (unnumbered) *caupāīs*. The greater length of both *bhāṣā* passages is caused by the complexity of some of the Sanskrit stanzas. Brajdāsī renders 11.2.49 by two stanzas, and 11.2.54 in three lines. Rasjānī renders 11.2.49 and 53 each by three lines. The way in which they handle these stanzas reflects their respective stylistic competence.

#### *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*

He who by virtue of remembrance of Hari is not confused by the laws of life-birth and death, hunger, fear, desire and hardship which affect the body, senses, the animated, mind and thought-, is a chief Bhāgavata. (11.2.49)

#### *Brajdāsī*

Proper to the mind, intellect, senses, breath of life, and body are birth and death, thirst, sleep, hunger and fear, passion, enmity, and thirst. (11.2.60)  
He whom these do not confuse because he has gradually conquered his doubt by drawing support from righteous deeds, ... (11.2.61)

#### *Rasjānī*

Birth and death are laws of the body; hardship and fear, laws of the senses and mind; hunger indeed is a law of the animated, desire is called a law of the intellect. (11.2. unnumbered)  
If a servant of Hari is not confused by these, O King, he is a great Bhāgavata. (11.2. unnumbered)

Once pain is overcome by the moonlight streaming from the jewelry, which adorns the footnails of the toes of Bhagavad's vigorous feet, how can in the heart of his worshippers ever again

How can he, whose pain has subsided due to the power of the Lord's lotus-foot, ever again be scorched by the threefold pain? (11.2.67)  
He whose pain has gone will not be burnt by the sun.

Due to the moonlight streaming from Hari's footnails on his mind, his heavy pain is dispelled from his heart. Never again will there be pain in his heart, it is as if the moon has prevailed over

16 Brajdāsī 1996. For details on the author, her circumstances and her work, see the editor's introduction, pp. 1-120.

17 Rasjānī 2017, 2010. The information on the author is gleaned from the editor's introduction (Rasjānī 2017: 1-4).



prevail the heat of the sun,  
when, as it were, the  
moon has risen? (11.2.54)

Those who do not leave  
the feet where they have  
found refuge, ...  
(11.2.68ab)

the heat of the sun. (11.2.  
unnumbered)

In her rendering of the Sanskrit stanzas, Brajdāsī makes additions over and above the meaning of her source: *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 11.2.49 does not mention the righteous deeds recommended in her rendering; the pain of which *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 11.2.54 talks she renders a little pedantically as the threefold pain of life, and in her translation of the Sanskrit of 11.2.54d she misses the simile of the blazing sun conquered by the moon. Rasjānī adds nothing, but disentangles the long compounds of the Sanskrit stanza 11.2.49, in which the nouns in the first *dvandva* compound refer in respective sequential order to those of the second. He safeguards brevity by dropping the original's mentioning of remembrance of God as the remedy against confusion. Both Brajdāsī and Rasjānī sacrifice the detailed description of Hari's bejewelled feet. In a *bhāṣā* text a description of the kind given in the Sanskrit original may not have been easy to follow for an audience, unless, of course, this would have been complemented by exegesis.

All the three versions point to the usage they may have been put to. They were meant for an audience who would want to really follow the meaning of the text, also without complementary exegesis. The Sanskrit *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* is no such text. The way in which Haridāsī, the preacher mentioned in the beginning of this essay, performs the text of Caturdās may reflect how those *bhāṣā* versions were meant to be performed. Portions of them were recited, and later on elaborated on in his discourse. Mere recitation of lengthy passages would not have been attractive to an audience enjoying responding more or less actively to a religious discourse.

As for Caturdās, finally, he was a scholarly preacher who laid before his audience a text which he had strained through the filter of Sanskrit scholarship to clarify it for an audience that relied on oral instruction. Caturdās had set himself the task of conveying as much as possible of the original text without diverting his audience's attention from his particular Sant stance. This stance he strengthened by taking recourse to Śrīdhara Svāmī's commentary and current popular exegesis, familiar to his audience. Caturdās's "transcreativity" was honoured by the great popularity his text came to enjoy.

## Appendix

### Original texts

#### 1 Sanskrit Bhāgavatapurāṇa 11.2.45-55

हरिरुवाच ।

सर्वभूतेषु यः प्रश्येद् भगवद्भावमात्मनः ।

भूतानि भगवत्यात्मन्येषु भागवतोत्तमः ॥ ४५ ॥  
ईश्वरे तदधीनेषु बालिशेषु द्विषत्सु च ।  
प्रेममैत्रीकूपोपेक्षा यः करोति स मध्यमः ॥ ४६ ॥  
अर्चायामेव हरये पूजां यः श्रद्धयेहते ।  
न तद्भक्तेषु चान्येषु स भक्तः प्राकृतः स्मृतः ॥ ४७ ॥  
गृहीत्वापीन्द्रियैरथान् यो न द्वेष्टि न हृष्यति ।  
विष्णोर्मायामिदं पश्यन् स वै भागवतोत्तमः ॥ ४८ ॥  
देहेन्द्रियप्राणमनोधियां यो जन्माप्यक्षुद्रयतर्षकृच्छ्रैः ।  
ससारधर्मैरविमुह्यमानः स्मृत्या हरेर्भागवतप्रधानः ॥ ४९ ॥  
न कामकर्मबीजानां यस्य चेतसि संभवः ।  
वासुदेवैकनिलयः स वै भागवतोत्तमः ॥ ५० ॥  
न यस्य जन्मकर्मभ्यां न वर्णाश्रमजातिभिः ।  
सज्जतेऽस्मिन्नहंभावो देहे वै स हरेः प्रियः ॥ ५१ ॥  
न यस्य स्वः पर इति वित्तेष्व्वात्मनि वा भिदा ।  
सर्वभूतसमः शान्तः स वै भागवतोत्तमः ॥ ५२ ॥  
त्रिभुवनविभवहेतवेऽप्यकुण्ठस्मृतिरजितात्मसुरादिभिर्विमृग्यात् ।  
न चलति भगवत्पदारविन्दाल्लवनिमिषार्धमपि यः स वैष्णवाग्र्यः ॥ ५३ ॥  
भगवत् उरुविक्रमाङ्घ्रिशिखानखमणिचन्द्रिकया निरस्ततापे ।  
हृदि कथमुपसीदतां पुनः स प्रभवति चन्द्र इवोदितेऽर्कतापः ॥ ५४ ॥  
विसृजति हृदयं न यस्य साक्षाद्धरिवशाभिहितोऽप्यघौघनाशः ।  
प्रणयरशनया धृताङ्घ्रिपद्मः स भवति भागवतप्रधान उक्तः ॥ ५५ ॥

#### 2 Caturdās 2.61-78

हरिरुवाच ।  
थावर जंगम थूल । एकै प्रकृति सकल कौ मूला ।  
सो एक आतम के आधारा । सो आतमा अस निराकारा ॥ ६१ ॥  
हरि जी तैं उपजै ए दोई । अंत लीन हरि ही मैं होई ।  
तातैं अबहू हरि कौ जानैं । द्वैत भाव कबहू नहिं आनैं ॥ ६२ ॥  
ज्यौं सागर बुदबुदा तरंगा । यौं सब जगत जगतपति संग्गा ।  
या विध जानि भयो जो थीरा । सो हरिजन उत्तम है वीरा ॥ ६३ ॥  
जा कौं हरि सौं निहचल प्रेमा । अरु हरिजन संगति नितनेमा ।  
सब जीवनि परि करुना आनैं । सब ऊधरै हृदै यौं जानैं ॥ ६४ ॥  
जो कोई ता पर दोषहि ठानैं । तहां तजै कै ज्यौं त्यों बांनैं ।  
निसि दिन रहै रांम रंग राता । सो हरिजन मध्यम है ताता ॥ ६५ ॥  
जो मूरति मैं हरि कौं जानैं । मन क्रम वचन आन नहिं आनैं ।  
ता कौं पूजे हित चित लाई । कछु न मांगैं सहज सुभाई ॥ ६६ ॥  
पै हरिजन न भजाई हरि जानी । सतगुरु विना नहिं पहिचानी ।  
सब आतमान हरि के जानैं । सो प्राकृत जन साधु बषांनैं ॥ ६७ ॥  
बहुरि कहौं उत्तम हरि भक्त । जाहि परष हूजै आसक्त ।  
दरस परस तैं कारज सारै । ते हरिजन भव दुष निवारै ॥ ६८ ॥  
कृष्ण बसे जा कै मन मांही । और सत्य कछु जानैं नांहीं ।  
जो कछु कहै सुने अरु देषे । इन्द्रिय कृत माया सब लेषे ॥ ६९ ॥



सो हरिजन उत्तम नर देवा । ता तैं मिलै निरंजन देवा ।  
जा जन ब्रह्म विचार ज पायौ । आपु समाझि सुष मांहि समायौ ॥७०॥  
जनम रु मरन देह कै जानैं । क्षुधा तृषा कौ प्रानहि आनैं ।  
तृष्णा बुधि रु भय सो मन कौ । यह लछन उत्तम हरिजन कौ ॥७१॥  
कर्म वासना अरु सब कामां । तिन कौ भूलि न जानै नामां ।  
वासुदेव मैं कीन्है वास । सो कहिए उत्तम हरिदास ॥७२॥  
जिनके जाति वरन कुल धर्मा । लोक न वेद नही आसरमा ।  
भूली देह अभिमान न आवै । सो उत्तम हरिदास कहावै ॥७३॥  
किंसी वस्तु पर ममता नांही । अरु तन कौ अभिमान न मांही ।  
सब भूतन पर समता आनैं । सो उत्तम हरिदास बषानैं ॥७४॥  
अष्ट सिद्धि त्रिभुवन सुष आवै । परि जे कबहुं मन न डुलावै ।  
लव निमिषारथ तजै नही चरणां । गुनातीत निरभे पद सरनां ॥७५॥  
जाकौ शिव विरंचि अरु देवा । तन मन लाइ करै नित सेवा ।  
तेऊ जाके चरन न पावै । ताकौं जन क्यौं छुटकावै ॥७६॥  
हरि के चरन चंद्र चित जा कै । इहां ताप उठै क्यौं ता कै ।  
ऐसौ हरिजन उत्तम कहिये । ताके संग परम पद लहिये ॥७७॥  
जा कौं हरि जी निमिष न त्यागौ । प्रेम की डोर बंधि क्यौं भागौ ।  
सो कहिये उत्तम हरिदासा । कबहुं न तजिये हरि कौ पासा ॥७८॥

### 3 Brajdāsī 11.2.56-70

हरिरुवाच ।  
हरि रिष बोलै जे कोउ, उत्तम सुभगत कहांहि ।  
तैं हरि कौं जग मधि लषै, अरु सब जग हरि मांहि ॥५६॥  
ईस्वर साधु अग्यांनी अरि, इन्ह सब मैं समभाय ।  
क्रिपा उपैष्या रु मित्रता, ऐं राषै चित लाय ॥५७॥  
सौ निश्चै करि जानिये, मध्यम भगत निदान ।  
और भेद हम्ह कहत अब, सो सुनि नृप बुधिवांन ॥५८॥  
इक प्रतमांही की करै, पूजा प्रीत प्रभाय ।  
साधुन पूजे न सौ, प्राकृत भगत कहाय ॥५९॥  
इंद्री सौं देखै बिषै, हरष सोक जिहि नांहि ।  
जगहिं लषै प्रभु प्रकृति सौ, उत्तम भगत जु गनांहि ॥६०॥  
मन बिधि इंद्री प्रांन तन, जिन्हकौं जनम रु नास ।  
त्रिस्त्रां निद्रा भूष भय, राग द्रौह पुनि प्यास ॥६१॥  
क्रम सौं ऐं संसै मारि, कै धर्म कर्म निरधार ।  
जाकौं मौहित नहिं करै, कबहुं किहुं प्रकार ॥६२॥  
काम बीर्ज जाकै न है, धारै हरि कौ ध्यान ।  
नित प्रति प्रभु आख्य रहै, समझि भेद तत ग्यान ॥६३॥  
जनम करम बरनाश्रम रु, संपति ऊंची जात ।  
इन्हकौं जिहूँ अहं कृत न सौ, उत्तम भगत जु लषात ॥६४॥  
अपन परायौ द्वेष नहिं, जिन्हकै बिच संसार ।  
सब प्रांनिन सम लषै सौ, उत्तम भगतहिं सुदार ॥६५॥  
त्रिभुवनहुं कै काज जो, छिनक मात्रहुं चांहि ।

हरि पद तैं न्यारौ न है, भगवत भगत सु आंहि ॥६६॥  
प्रभु पद कंबल प्रताप सौं, मिट्यो हांहि जिहि ताप ।  
ताकौं लागै फेरि क्युं, त्रिविध ताप की धाप ॥६७॥  
रास निरत पद नष चंद्र, सौं सुसीतल सुभाय ।  
जिन्हकै संताप दूरि है, ताकौं रवि न सताय ॥६८॥  
इक पलहुं नहिं छोडि है, चरन सरन जिन्हि पाय ।  
त्रिभुवन विभव न चांहि है, बेखव उत्तम कहाय ॥६९॥  
हरि न तजै जाकौं हिदै, बंधे प्रेम की दांम ।  
कहियत उत्तम भगत सोइ, प्रकृति रहित अभिराम ॥७०॥

### 4 Rasjānī 11.2 (verses unnumbered)

हरिरुवाच ।  
अपनौ हरि में भाव जु आहि । सब ही मांहि जु देखै ताहि ॥  
सबको हरि में देखै सोई । अहो भागवत उत्तम सोई ॥  
हरि हरिजन सौं प्रेम मितार्ई । मूढनि पै पुनि कृपा सदाई ॥  
रिपु कौं मन में धरे न जोई । अहो भागवत मधिम सोई ॥  
प्रतिमा ही में श्रद्धा ठानै । हरि भक्तनि कौं नहिं सनमानै ॥  
औरन हू मानै नहिं जौ पै । भक्त नवीन जानीये तौ पै ॥  
विषै इन्द्रियनि हू करि गहै । पै ते बुरी भली नहिं कहै ॥  
हरि की माया जगत लखै जो । हे नृप महाभागवत है सो ॥  
जन्म मरन है धर्म सुतन के । श्रम भय धर्म सु इन्द्री मन के ॥  
भूख प्राण कौ धर्म सु सही । बुद्धि कौ धर्म सु तृष्णा कही ॥  
इन करि जौ हरिजन नहिं मोहै । हे नृप महाभागवत सो है ॥  
काम कर्म वासना कही जे । जिहि उर मांहि नाहि उलहे ते ॥  
वासुदेव ही आश्रै जाहि । कहीयै महाभागवत ताहि ॥  
उत्तम जन्म कर्म पुनि जात । इन अरि जौ नाहिन हुलसात ॥  
तन में करै अहंता नाही । सो है श्रेष्ठ वैष्णवनि मांही ॥  
पुनि जा जन के तन धन मांही । अपन पराई है कछु नांही ॥  
सब में सम पुनि संत सु आहि । महाभागवत कहिये ताहि ॥  
हे नृप हरि के चरण कमल जे । भक्त देवता हू दूढति ते ॥  
त्रिभुवन की सम्पति परिहरै । पै तिनतें तन कौ नहिं टरै ॥  
नित ही हरि कौ सुमिरनु जाहि । सोई महाभागवत आहि ॥  
हरि पद नख मन की उजियारी । ता करि ताप गए हिय भारी ॥  
पुनि हिय तपनि होत नहिं ऐसै । रवि की तपनि उयै ससि जैसे ॥  
नाम ही करि जो पापनि दहै । प्रेम सौं बंधि नित हिय में रहै ॥  
सो हरि जिह उर छांडे नाहीं । उत्तम वही वैष्णवनि मांही ॥

### References

Bahura, Gopal Narayan. 1976. *Literary Heritage of the Rulers of Amber and Jaipur*, with an index to the register of manuscripts in the Potikhana of Jaipur (I. Khasmohor Collection)