rage Hindu historian is compelled to swallow this *ex-parte* judgment in good grace. Obsessed as we are with the political supremacy of the west, we hesitate to analyse this criticism at all and the average Hindu dares not raise his voice against the uncharitable criticism on the part of the western critic. More lamentable is another tendency which impels Indian scholars to glorify the past history of their country by making an attempt to read European institutions into our system. During particular phases of Indian social and political evolution they are happy to find a parallelism and a similarity between the institutions of India and those of the west but beyond that when the Indian scholar finds any dissimilarity or divergence he finds himself at a loss to explain it as the result of different forces and factors operating in his own country. He straight on attempts to explain the diversities of Indian social and political life as something untoward and abnormal and hardly makes an attempt to explain their evolution as having been due to diversities in environment and the conflict of different racial elements. It has been the professed aim and objective of the writer to attempt a better and truer explanation of the diversities we meet in India and to interpret them as the result of those peculiar factors which invariably modify the course of political and social life under different environments. The value of environment as well as of the racial factor has received universal recognition to-day. Environment moulds life, and no one to-day dare deny its proper place in social evolution. The racial factor has also been given its proper place in life but while discussing

the political and social life in India these are entirely lost sight of and the judgment of the western critic comes first without an examination of the evidence at his disposal. Western ideas as well as western values guide us in our enquiry while out of fear and ridicule the true scientific method is entirely lost sight of.

In India, social evolution proceeded on a line entirely different from that of Europe. In the west, social life in its higher stage of development came to be associated with the idea of a social homogeneity based more or less on the principle of unity and equality within the communal structure. Inequalities and diversities existed more or less in all centres of life. These led to continual racial and social war within the fold of each community. This war ended in the political superiority of one section of the population which either obliterated or socially assimilated the conquered people. And even then there was no end to this racial war and the ideal of equality and homogeneity never became a reality. In Rome, the Romans remained a privileged race of rulers from which subject peoples extorted Roman citizenship as a result of a series of sanguinary social wars. Even at the end of these wars, the condition of the provincial was no more elevated than that of a slave. In Greece, there was the fiction of equality and social homogeneity, yet in each city-state the ruling community was only a governing minority dominating a more numerous population of aliens, *Metics* and slaves. Among the Jews, the chosen people of God there went on an eternal struggle with the Gentile and though for a time victorious Judaism attained a temporary ascen-

dency, the decline of the Jews reversed the whole state of affairs. The Jews themselves became a subject race while the hated Gentile and the foreigner became his master. The lot of the Jew during the long centuries following the dispersal of the race is too well known to be repeated here. Condemned to live in the *Ghettos* and liable to be plundered and slaughtered at will the Jew has ever since continued a deplorable existence and his present persecution in central Europe gives the lie to the European profession of justice and equality. In mediaeval and modern Europe, social homogeneity came to be attained as a result of sanguinary wars and revolutions in course of which was evolved the doctrine of equality from sheer political necessity. The rise of the nation-state, the value of the almost mechanised individual, solely guided by the interests of the state either for aggression or for self preservation, the importance attached to huge conscription armies where the uniform type of man, easily combines his energies all contributed to favour the acceptance of the ideal of equality. But political equality did not solve all the social questions and the true realisation of equality is yet to come as a result of further social evolution.

Furthermore, the profession of equality at home has not meant for the European peoples the grant of equality abroad. In their dealings with the coloured peoples and the aborigines in the African colonies we find an air of supremacy and a contempt for the conquered which is almost shocking. In almost all the extra-European settlements of the white races, the black, brown or red have practically disappeared and where they still exist, they

are absolutely deprived of political rights and are allowed to live only in arid districts where they enjoy some quasi-civic rights which have been conferred on them out of a sense of necessity.

In India, on the contrary, we had from the beginning such an amount of diversity in the racial factor that the ideal of homogeneity became something out of the question. The socio-ethnic difference between the Aryan and the Dravidian, between the Dravidian and the pre-Dravidian aborigines and between these aborigines and the paleolithic savages was so great that the idea of a homogeneus social structure could not be conceived at all. Race-prejudice which operated in the past and which operates so well even to-day in America, in South Africa, in recently conquered Abyssinia, and is so prominent in the dealings of the white peoples with the blacks, browns and yellows of the east and the south and which forms the key-note to the colonial policy of the white nations, asserted itself as one of the guiding factors in India. A war between the Ārya and the Dāsa took place in India as we know from the Vedic hymns. This continued for a considerable long period with terrible consequences for the defeated non-Aryans. But gradually, a better understanding developed and humanistic principles, respect for human life, a policy of tolerance for the creed and customs of others which have but only nominally made its appearance in Europe during the past century and which have as yet failed to make any real impression, operated in India from early times. As a result of this we find a tendency towards forming a social whole out of diverse and

conflicting elements. The Hindu wanted harmony in the midst of conflicting elements and a federative social organisation was the only thing which could grow in the country and thereby put an end to the other alternative of race-war and the extermination of the conquered. Such an organisation came into existence with hierarchical grades for diverse communities and with social duties and means of livelihood attached to each of them. In this way the principle of equality was sacrificed but in its place the lower orders received a guarantee for the protection of life and property and proper chances for the maintenance of life. This was, in short, the real explanation of what Europeans call caste system the prejudices and idiosyncracies associated with which call forth their sneer and perpetual ridicule.

The so-called caste system thus came into existence as the result of a long social evolution extending over millenniums. It has undoubtedly its defects The exclusiveness of the communities at the top, their tendency to repel the lower orders and their hankering for political power together with the consequent disunion did great harm to the social fabric of India. It stands even now in the way of that potent yet aggressive type of social organisation called nationalism. But with all these, it was a practical and workable solution of a great problem which has gone on throughout history and is still going on all over the world, namely, the war of races and the sanguinary conflict of peoples always ending with the obliteration of the weak and the uncivilised. It allowed the weaker races the right to live and to contribute to the

social whole of which they came to form a part, though it subordinated some of their interests to those of others. The ideal of equality has been the watch-word of European thinkers but, in practice, this profession of equality has failed to solve the fundamental problem. The Hindu may be accused of prejudices and superstitions, of hatred and abhorence but he can never be arraigned on a charge of wilful extermination of the conquered aborigines, as has been the case in lands settled by the white races in course of the last three centuries.* And this is proved by the evidence of the history in India. The most primitive races still survive here and still thrive with a vigorous and virile existence; whereas in the lands colonised by the white races they have all been wiped out of existence. Their relics have found place in the museums, where they evoke merely an antiquarian interest and prove the truth of the law of survival of the fittest.

In course of time the two higher castes, the Kṣatriyas and the Brahmins became prominent in the sphere of social life. The Kṣatriya attained power and position by his superiority in the exercise of arms with which he subjugated the rest of the community. The Brahmin gained the highest social position, by his intellectual superiority,

* Such has been the case throughout the whole of the lands colonised by the white races in course of the last three centuries. America, North and South, was once densely populated by the Indian reds. But now the red race has been practically wiped out of existence in the north though several tribes survive in the south. The Australian Bushmen are disappearing fast, while the last surviving Tasman died a few years ago. The Maories of New Zeland have been reduced to a few thousands, while in Newfoundland and many of the Pacific Islands, the original races have all passed out of existence.

his mastery of the sciences and the arts as well as by his ministration to the spiritual needs of people. The rest of society was divided into two broad compartments, one devoting itself to the production and distribution of the necessaries of life, while the rest either engaged in production itself or made labour its chief means of livelihood. Social harmony and balance was attained by vesting with social pre-eminence the Brāhmana devoted to intellectual pursuits and wedded to a life of poverty. Thus puting an end to the domination of the Kṣatriya based on the successful exercise of physical force or of the Vaisya deriving importance from his capitalist tyranny. The evils of capitalism engaged the attention of the builders of society as well as of the law-givers from very ealry times. Even the Vedic hymns give us a picture of the evils arising out of unequal distribution and the tyranny of capitalists.

Class War Averted:—While this broad division into castes did much to solve the racial question the evils of class war were, to some extent mitigated by the creation of economic compartments within the caste groups and entrusting each one of these with a peculiar function and means of livelihood. Many of the castes and sub-castes were organised on the model of self-sufficient guilds in which the members enjoyed a position fairly compatible with their existence as individuals. Thus, each caste-group could maintain itself against the tyranny of others and at the same time maintain the economic prosperity of the country. Even to-day when the great revolution in industry has taken away the chance of existence from many

of the caste-groups they are still struggling against the modern conditions. Unemployment and destitution was checked and at the same time the guilds and unions within the caste groups protected themselves by their associations.

The creation of a capitalistic aristocracy of optimates recruited from the rich men of all communities was also checked by allowing and preserving the accumulated wealth to remain in the different compartments. Hence a purely capitalistic domination which became a source of great social evil in most ancient communities was averted.

Timocracy Checked:—From time to time, adjustments and modifications were introduced with a view to putting a stop to the evils of unequal distribution or the evils arising out of capitalistic tyranny. A denunciation of cappitalistic exploitation of the poor, unrestricted usury, or the cornering of food-stuffs soon made itself the key-note to the social policy of the lawgivers of the Dharmasūtra period, and it is also curious to note that unlike Greece, Rome and many other ancient societies timocracy never became an accepted principle in Indian society. Never was the position of an individual determined in society or in political life by the amount of wealth possessed by him. On the contrary, as is well known to all students of Indian culture, the possession of wealth was the lowest of social criterion or value, the highest place being given to learning and intellectual eminence.*

* Compare Manu Samhitā—II. 136

वित्तं बन्धुर्वयः कर्म विद्या भवति पञ्चमी ।
एतानि मान्यस्थानानि गरीयो यद्यदुत्तरम् ॥

Caste organisation not rigid

The earliest social arrangements or the oldest assignments of economic functions, did not last long, but were modified in course of time. Invaders and emigrants from outside were admitted into the fold of the Hindu social syetem. Even the aboriginal people as well as outcastes were gradually assigned a place in society and had their status elevated out of necessity. The rules of endogamy or exogamy were not so rigid and thus there was an easy periodic self-adjustment which satisfied the changing requirements of society. Occupations were changed without difficulty and the vigor of social life was not obstructed. But this did not last long and the epochs preceding the Muslim conquest as well as the period of Muslim domination saw the continuous working of these reactionary tendencies which culminated in the narrownig down of the intellectual outlook, debasement of the spiritual ideal and the introduction of stagnation and rigidity in social matters. The conception of the semi-rigid Varnas was displaced by that of air-tight caste-compartments which split up Indian society into a vast total of narrow communal groups existing only for themselves and utterly oblivious of the interests of that whole to which they belonged and to whose normal life they were to devote their energies. In the face of foreign invaders who menaced not only the political existence of the Indians but tried to subvert their social system, the desire for self-preservation, brought in a staunch belief in the past. The old flexibility disappeared and disintegration set in. As stated already, difference in occupation, religion or domicile led to the ramification of this high total of caste

groups. As the members of the different caste looked to their own narrow interests, this caste spirit well nigh led to the disintegration of Indian society.

Absence of equality

In this type of social adjustment, the idea of equality was evidently absent or perhaps it was not a necessary factor at all, since there was the law of *Karma* which explained the causes of inequality—inequalities of birth, inequalities of social privilege, inequalities of economic prosperity and, last of all, in the amount of happiness enjoyed by different individuals. The belief in *Karma* and rebirth has been one of the psychological factors in the history of Indian culture. For, if personal ambitions, class hatred and other factors did not fail to contribute to social unrest, wars and revolutions, the masses as a whole remained content with their social lot and in the midst of the turmoils and vicissitudes which disturbed the peace of the country such a contentment was a great boon to the people of India.

But it had its peculiar quota of evils. Society in India tended towards a neutral equlibrium and socio-economic

* Here something requires to be said about the idea of equality in India. Like Leibnitz, our Indian thinkers from the days of the Vedic hymns became more familiar with the absolute want of equality in nature, rather than with the contrary idea (which occasionally finds expression in the writings of a few religious writers). The Vedic seer clearly notes the inequality in nature and explains it rather beautifully—"the calves of the same mother differ in milk-bearing capacity—the fingers of a man's hand are not equal" (R. V. X. 11.) What impressed him most was that there existed a similarity in the desires and aspirations of men but as men or the circumstances in which they lived differed materially, their desires varied in quality and in quantity. So all Indian thinkers pleaded for equity, which was their watchword.

life to a sort of static sufficiency divested of movements or upheavals of classes. The result has been that in the midst of the vicissitudes of fortune, India while she retained her outward prosperity, lost to a great extent the impulse for progress. Consequently, she became weakened and during certain periods, the spirit of advancement or progress was nullified altogether.

The Individual in Society :—

As stated already the compartmental division of the community came to be strengthened by the assignment of social duties and means of livelihood. Each community or class with its peculiar duties assigned, contributed to the normal working and welfare of the whole system, each functioning as the limbs of a living organism. Society depended upon the co-operation of the classes and its happiness as well as that of each of these limbs depended upon the normal working of these latter. In a primitive but progressing society this type of organisation did much to prevent the growing class war and the domination of accumulated capital or the rise of a capitalistic aristocracy. For the government and the proper working of the class-limb, regulative authority was vested partly in the individuals, above him in the family and higher up in the class or the caste-group. The customs and conventions of each received proper social

In Europe, the theory of equality gained ground from political necessity and from the fact that as it was difficult to measure the potentialities of men, equality in the absence of a standard for measuring potentiality was a rough method of appraising the value of individuals.

recognition and contributed to social solidarity. A certain amount of autonomy was thus vested in the different limbs of the social whole.

Forming part of the autonomous limb, the individual was to devote his attention to his own self-realisation, consistent with the welfare of the whole of which he formed a part, namely, preservation of life, acquisition of the means for self-preservation and the advancement of the family interest, propagation of the family without detriment to the other members of the community, enjoyment of acquisitions and devotion to higher intellectual and spiritual pursuits. These aims, summed up as the *Puruṣārthas* or *Caturvargas*, defined the social and intellectual limits of the individual. The individual was looked upon by the law-givers as the primary unit and basis of social life, the foundation of material welfare and the soul of organised existence. As the well-being of society depended on his activity and co-operation, and the maintenance of the social order, the highest emphasis was laid upon it and the maintenance of this order was regarded or looked upon the primary function of the rulers of society.

Subject to limitations, the individual enjoyed a requisite amount of freedom to mould his own destinies and to work out his salvation. But this freedom was not unrestricted and was far from the modern concept of liberty. The Hindu was obsessed with the idea of a 'natural' order and could not think of any material aberration from the accepted canon and conventions of life. In his eyes, the freedom enjoyed by the individuals was merely the free-

dom of movement compatible with the normal working of the social order and vested in him along with his social functions and duties.

The greatest possible emphasis was laid upon the individual and in India the individual received a higher recognition than in any primitive or mediaeval society. The concept of the individual and his rights was subjective and not objective. The individual in India was not a mere means but an end in himself. The maker of his own destiny, solely responsible for the merits and demerits of his own in this life and in that beyond, he was an end in himself. Almost all the great teachers made the greatest efforts to have the individuals perfected. The governmental organisations guaranteed his life and promoted his earthly interests. Subject to the social regulations, he was to make efforts for the fruition of his moral, intellectual and spiritual aims. Moral duties and spiritual obligations other than those enforced by the state were assigned to him. He was to contribute his social, moral and spiritual quota to the well-being of humanity in general by attaining mental and moral discipline, by procreating and maintaining a family, and spiritually by carrying on the sacred studies.

Beyond these duties, partly self-incurred, and partly imposed on him by the social convention the individual was free. No king, no state was to demarcate or demonstrate or dictate to him his mode of existence, his aesthetic sense or the path of his spiritual progress, by laying down his religious creed and forcing him to accept it by punishing its violation. And, this is remarkable in a country where the people were not only religious but

also assigned a high place to the spiritual element in life. Such was the social outlook with regard to the individual, and this was rather peculiar to India.

Women:—In the peculiar socio-economic system the position of women was very high—perhaps higher than that enjoyed by the fair sex elsewhere in the ancient and mediaeval world. In the Vedic age, women were equals of their brethren, for we find them carrying on higher intellectual pursuits, participating equally in sacrifices along with their husbands and exercising supremacy in their households. India excepted, no other country in the ancient world assigned to women so high a place in social and intellectual life.

This continued uptil the latest days of the Vedic and Epic period and even during the age which saw the composition of the canonical literature of the Buddhists. But after that, there was a reaction which was ushered in by the premature mass movements of the suceeding period and the evil effects as well as the unsocial tendencies of Monachism, which well-nigh assailed the foundations of social existence or the peace and happiness of conjugal life.

The reaction led to a constant harping on the evils of women's freedom and the consequences arising out of it. Women came to be looked down upon as naturally deficient in intellectual powers and also liable to be swayed by evil examples. Hence laws were made to retain them under tutelage and they lost many of their social rights—e.g. the freedom to carry on intellectual pursuits or the right to own property in their own right. Perhaps during the age of re-

action, the Greco-Roman ideal of perpetual tutelage of women strengthened the social sentiments which are reflected in the pages of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra and other later condifications (See *Supra* II pp. 129.)

Yet many of the vestiges of their rights and privileges remained. Women continued to hold property in their own right and there was hardly any bar to their holding the regal office or the exercise of regal functions and duties, as have been pointed out already.

The State:—Existing side by side with this social organisation and exercising almost co-existant functions with it and absorbing as well as regulating the energies of the community came the state organisation.

A comprehensive definition of the state is lacking in the older records, but Kauṭilya seems to emphasise the human element in it ("पुरुषवद्धि राज्यं अपुरुषा गौर्वन्ध्येव किं दुहीत") and following him all Hindu lawgivers assign the greatest importance to this personal element in it. In their eyes, the state comprised a territory inhabited by a community with the object of maintaining life and property with a view to pave the way for the fruition of man's material objectives. The Hindu concept of the state was rather very wide though it lacked the technical precision or definition imposed by modern writers. As the social outlook was very comprehensive and society did not stand for a narrow and homogeneous structure, the early concept of the Rāṭ was wide and all-embracing. It lacked the narrowness of the city-state or the limitations of religion and custom, and overstepped from the beginning the limits of a conquering tribe or a victorious clan. The object of the

state, as we have pointed out already, and as we shall discuss later on in detail, was primarily to pave the way for human self-realisation in the material or the socio-economic sphere.

One of the salient features of this Rāṭ was the erection of a disciplinary organisation vested with powers of chastisement so as to keep the individuals and communities free from aberrations within and disturbances from without. Its functions were primarily social and economic and secondarily political, if we are permited to use that word.

This original Rāṭ concept was later on masked by subsequent ideas and developments relating to the Rāstra but it retained some of its underlying principles to the last.

Economic Aspect Emphasised :—The maintenance of the socio-economic fabric was the primary duty predominating in the concept of Rāṭ. The individual living in society was an end in himself and the object of the governmental organisation was primarily to guarantee a free scope for the fruition of his material desires and as this was dependant on the maintenance of order, the power of checking evils or punishing wrongs came to be associated with it. In the oldest hymns, the ruler is called upon not only to protect life and property or to encourage agriculture and the handicrafts which were the chief means for the gaining of livelihood on the part of the people but also to guarantee life and prosperity to them. As time went the political authority became more potent but these economic considerations received greater attention as is to be

seen in the ideals and objectives of the teachers who devoted themselves to the study of Artha Veda of which the Arthaśāstras formed a school.

Economic duties absorbed the major attention of the head of the state machinery and in India we find that the greatest attention was devoted not only to the active promotion of agriculture and industry but also to the suppression of capitalism. This being the dominating idea, the Indian people were not slow to arrive at equitable adjustments of social profits. The claims of the labourers received recognition in very early times and the schedule of customary profits which we find recorded in the Arthaśāstra as well as in the Epic, testifies to the high social wisdom of the Indians.

They were not content merely with granting equitable profits to the workman but were determined in their opposition to cornering and capitalism. Usury came to be condemned even before the age of the Dharma-Sūtras while in the Arthaśāstra we have not only a condemnation of capitalism but the promulgation of a drastic code for the suppression of profiteering on the part of the capitalist who took the earliest opportunity of exploiting the poorer sections for the further enrichment of himself. The regulation of prices and profits, the control of the commodity market and the punishment of the greedy merchant who was looked upon as a 'burglar in disguise,' testify to the peculiar ideals of the race. In the rest of the ancient as well as mediaeval world, timocracy came to be the basis of political power. But in India mere possession of wealth never gave a place of honour to an individual.

The condemnation of capitalism was not the peculiar ideal of ancient India. The plea of social solidarity remained predominant in the country, the life of the individual was considered as something sacred and rulers were enjoined upon to see that no one lost life on account of poverty or want of food. From the earliest times, we find kings building alms-houses, keeping stock of corn for times of distress and taking emergency measures for the protection of life in times of famine and scarcity. The king's duties lay not merely in chastising the wrongdoers but also in finding sustenance for his subjects. That was the essence of *Pālana*. The Smṛitis eulogise in the highest terms a king who performed these duties properly while the distress of a king's subjects was regarded as the result of the king's own sinfulness. In the Mahābhārata, such a king is condemned to a life in hell while the prosperity of a king's subjects was an indication of his future welfare in Heaven.

The peculiar Indian ideals of social solidarity not only made it incumbent on a ruler to do his utmost for the safety and prosperity of his subjects but also emphasised active duties of assistance on all the individual members of the community. From the Vedas downwards munificence is praised while niggardliness was a sin which paved the way to hell. The later Smṛitis carry these ideas further. They denounce a man who spends too much on himself, as a thief who robs other people of their share of social profits and some of these go so far as to promulgate the doctrine that morally speaking a man has not the right to enjoy or amass any-

thing beyond that which is absolutely necessary for him.* Almost ultra-socialistic as these passages appear to be, they may not be taken very seriously. But this type of idealism influenced the codes which were in acceptance in the country and we have more than one passage that a man commiting theft of foodstuffs for the preservation of his life was not to be regarded as a wrongdoer at all.†

Many of the ideas which were evolved in more ancient times found expression in the writings of Kautilya, the greatest exponent of the Hindu theory of government. His socio-economic aim have been discussed by many modern writers. He stands for an economically self-sufficient state capable of maintaining its population and governed by a ruler who, by his ownership of the great national sources of wealth, was to confer the maximum of material benefits upon his subjects. Many of the items included

* Innumerable are such passages in the Smṛitis and Purāṇas. We quote a few of them—

यावद्भ्रियेत जठरं तावत् स्वत्वं हि देहिनाम् ।
अधिकं योऽभिमन्येत स स्तेनो दण्डमर्हति ॥

The ideas are very old. The meaning of *Anna* (food) is significant. *Anna* or food unless given to others will eat away the householder. See also Bṛhadāraṇyaka (I. 5. 2) where we find the passage एकमस्य साधारणमितीदमेवास्य तत् साधारणमन्नं यदिदमद्यते See also commentary on the passage (cf. अप्रदायैभ्यो यो भुङ्क्ते स्तेन एव सः ।)

† See Manu VII—341

द्विजोऽध्वगः क्षीणवृत्तिर्द्वौ वित्तु द्वे च मूलके ।
आददानः परक्षेत्रात् न दण्डं दातुमर्हति ॥

See also Parāśara Mādhavya (A. S. Edition P 304) Three verses quoted are significant. A man starving for three days can take as much as would enable him to satisfy his hunger without being punishable for theft.

among the duties of the king show clearly the extent of welfare which the people expected of their ruler. The Arthaśāstra code gives the lie to the modern writers who denounce the weakness of the Indian in his political genius and show the author of the Arthaśāstra to have been a man of universal genius, who could think for all times and ages and for all stages of society and who could anticipate the problems which are before the statesmen and rulers of our times. His plea for social solidarity was remarkable for he did not confine himself to the hide-bound traditions of an unprogressive social existence. He admitted many sections of the aborigines into the folds of Hindu society and went so far as to break the chain of the slave while his great contemporary in the Hellenic world was justifying slavery as a divine institution.

The Political Machinary

The perenninal social conflict as well as the ever increasing complexities of social life contributed to the strengthening of the authority of the chief who was entrusted with the duty of dispelling foreign enemies, of maintaining order within the community and who became later on the most important factor in the working of social life. At one time as stated already, he represented only the solidarity of the tribe and the unity of the body politic. Perpetual war and an alliance with the priesthood gradually elevated him to a position higher than that of the ordinary tribal leader. With the enlargement of the tribal territory and with the gradual elimination of the rivalry of his own kinsmen, the king's authority became

supreme and unquestioned. With the acceptance of the principle of hereditary succession, security of tenure was brought in . And as time went on, the idea of sovereignty, universal and indivisible, came to be evolved. The primitive Rāṭ, became identified with the Rājan and the king became the universal ruler of the tribe and the master of its territories as well as natural resourses, subject only to the customs and conventions which were deemed sacred and of which the moral guardianship came to be vested in the Purohita—the King's "alter-ego"—and the priesthood who preserved and transmitted from father to son the traditions and ideals of the tribe. As time went on, the regal authority was consolidated though occasional instances of irresponsibility continued to be checked by tyrannicide or social ostracism. The identification of the Rāṭ or the the Rāṣṭra with the sovereign authority of the Rājar led to the formation and the elaboration of the political concept of the state.

Monarchy extolled:—This monarchical state which was evolved in the Kuru-Pāñcāla region became the ideal of Hindu political thinkers. All other forms of Government namely, republican tribal states, democratic gaṇas as well as oligarchic confederations gradually disappeared. The wider Rāṣṭra idea undermined the narrow basis of clan rule and monarchy which put an end to class war or caste conflict and which paved the way to a lasting social adjustment in the midst of discords was welcomed on account of its maintenance of a stable social life not easily disturbed by class upheavals or clan rivalries.

The evolution of the idea of state in India was the result of a long and continuous process and its relation to the social structure was peculiar. While the social organisation busied itself with the maintenance of the social structure the formulation of the social will and the elaboration of the moral ideal, the political organisation devoted itself to the protection of society from outside attacks and the elimination of the conflict of classes or the violation of the social rule on tha part of the individual,—elements which were deterimental to man's safety and progress.

Theories of the origin of Society and Government:—

Almost all Indian accounts agree in attributing the origin of sovereignty or government to a contract. Man dictated by instinct or natural law must live in society in order to ensure his personal safety. Once society is established, conventions come into existence and the conduct of men are to be subjected to a regulative authority. For the observance of these, the necessity of a coercive power is felt as due to aberrations in human conduct, which, owing to the influences of desire or greed, make individuals or classes go against the common weal. Aberrations are produced by the obliteration of *Dharma* which, according to the Indian conception, is an objective reflection emanating from the *Rita* or primordial principle of moral order running through and through the universal system and evolving the right line of conduct in the individual man.

At one time this Dharma, according to most accounts, guided the actions of men, but as men became influenced by greed and vice, society was on the decay. To regulate

the normal working of the right principle Daṇḍanīti or the code of coercion was evolerd. It regulated human condult by awarding punishment for violation of the social canon and by conferring rewards upon the virtuous. It thus became the external bond, which in the absence of Dharma went to ensure the existence and progress of men in civil society. The right to award punishments was naturally vested in the state which guided the external relations of men.

The basic idea in the promulgation of Daṇḍanīti (or regulated violence) was primarily the maintenance of order and not the elaboration of freedom as with the modern Western thinkers. The working of this 'law meant an equitable opportunity granted to each member of the state by defining and safeguarding him and his relation to the whole. This concept of order was based on that which was supposed to run through the universal system.

Scope of State Action :—

The realisation of this order meant that the individual must have a free scope for the fruition of the aims of his life and that his life must be guaranteed and at the same time opportunities must be furnished so that he can bring his life to perfection. In the words of Fichte—"to live and let live" became, from the earliest times, the motto of the state. Hence the scope of the state action bacame from the material point of view fully comprehensive, and it included active help and encouragement to industries and the efforts of the individual by which he was to maintain himself. The regulation

of the arts of life, agriculture, trade and commerce all came within the sphere of the state action and this was from a very early period. Such ideas are present even in the inaugural hymns of the Vedic period and we have practical illustrations of this in the Jātakas, the Epics and the Purāṇas.

The state thus became something more than a police organisation. Its chief aim was the realisation on the part of its members of all possible benefit as far as the material aspect of life was concerned. The normal working of the whole social organism with its diverse elements came under its superintendence. Consequently, its activities was not confined to the bestowal of benefits on a particular class or section. It was conceived as a true commonwealth which stood for the happiness of all. Its government transcended all considerations of class rule or monopoly for a dominant majority as with thinkers of the modern age.

The State and morality :—

The intimate connection of the state with law and order give it a clear and close association with moral ideas. But there too the relation which subsisted was a peculiar one. The Hindus conceived of morality as something higher than a set of rules laid down by the political organisation guiding the external conduct of men and thereby ensuring their success in this world. Rather than this, they took into account the finer elements of consciousness in the individual discriminating between right and wrong and which exist apart from progress or

deterioration in this life. It was thus something which depended on the development of the inner man. The state could but control external actions, and could hardly establish a real moral standard.

But moral self-realisation was possible only in a state of freedom from the engrossing influence of the materialistic world. The state by maintaining order simply ensured the individual's freedom to realise it. Consequently, the state was the means, which paved the way for the development of morality rather than the supreme expression of morality or order as was the prevailing idea of the Greeks or as some of our Western idealists like Hegel would have it.

The State Not An End But A Means :—

The most important point for us thus is to note that the Indians regarded the state solely as a means, and never looked upon it as an end in itself. In this connection divergences existed in the past and exists even to-day between the Indian and the Western outlook. The Greek with his aesthetic concept of life, constantly thought of realising his ideals in an organisation, which could not only solve his ethical problems but also help him in realising his highest goal. The centre of the Greek culture was man, "Yet not man unqualified but the noble man—man aesthetically considered." With them the individual and the state stood in the closest possible relation. The state was the individual magnified, while the individual was "the state in miniature". Consequently the ideal state was the *summum bonum* of Greek

existence. Everything was merged into it,—the citizen's life, his social existence, and his political activity.

In India the state of affairs took a different turn. The Indian philosopher, like his Western brethren started with the individual, and it was to give him the highest amount of benefit that the state was conceived. But, the concept of life, as well as that of the individual was different from the beginning. In a society dominated by the idea of *karma* and rebirth, the life of the individual, was regarded as something more than an existence in the realistic world. It was intimately connected with something transcendental. It was nothing more than a mere phase in a greater and higher existence. Neither enjoyment nor sorrow in this life was its end. It had a higher spiritual purpose.

In man were detected elements of higher consciousness apart from his ordinary desires, his worldly needs and aspirations, the longings of his animal instincts and the frailties of his flesh. Such an analysis led to the concept of the *Caturvarga* (or the Puruṣārthas or the desires of the individuals) namely, Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. For the fruition of the first three which comprised the material objectives of human life a peculiar social and regulative arrangement was conceived. The individuals' life in society was regarded as a bundle of duties and aspirations. To perfect this life, a disciplinary training was given in its four stages and this was independent of the state. At the same time, the material aspect was also taken into consideration. For his life, the propagation of his race, and the attainment of his desires man must be

intimately related to the material world. The furtherence of this object became the aim of the political organisation.

The state thus was not, and cannot be regarded from the Indian standpoint as an end in itself but was a means to a greater end—namely man's self-realisation and his attainment of salvation.

Forces in the evolution of the state and religion :—

The influence of the transcendental idea and the principle of morality in Indian life makes the average Western observer think that the Indian state ideal has been moulded entirely by the religious ideas of the people. Outwardly, religion seems to have exercised an overwhelming influence. A closer examination, however, reveals that with the exception of the early Vedic and the Brāhmaṇic period, the influence of religion on the development of the Indian state has been very small. In that early age the influence of religion was immense; the *Purohita* acted as the *alter-ego* of the king. He was ragarded as the *Rāṣṭra-Gopa*. The king, too, offered oblations on behalf of the community. Later on, however, religion did not play an active part. Its service was entirely passive.

Even this statement may appear paradoxical, especially when we meet with the maze of rituals and the vast array of ceremonials, the mass of formulæ, the continuance of the Purohita's office and the preponderance of the Brahmin in the council of the king.

Yet careful enquiry bears out the truth of the remark. Nowhere in the history of Indian culture we find

a similar conception of religion as is to be found in the west or in the Semitic countries. We in India never had nor still have, a religion in the sense in which it is used in the west. We have only our social system which holds together different communities professing their belief in one common moral standard and in some common philosophical tenets. This social system was at once too narrow in many points and too catholic. The supposed preponderating influence of religion appears to be almost nil. The Indian mind freed itself early from the shackles of dogma. No attempt was ever made to set down hard and fast rules for the religious observances of the people. Philosophic toleration came in along with the ever-increasing insight into ethical and moral considerations. Religion lost very early its primitive character as a bond of union. Higher speculations as regards the cosmical world as well as the quality of the soul undermined a fanatical partisanship of dogma and ceremonial. The state too lost its real connection with religion even at the earliest phases of its growth. What remained was but an outer garb of ceremonial and it was allowed to exist, partly because we have in the Indian mind a veneration for the past and a love for the traditional customs of our forefathers.

The state never became a theocracy—Owing to this lack of an intimate relation between religion and the state, the latter could never take a theocratic turn. It was never thought that the state should come forward and prescribe rules for the religious instruction of the people. A man's religion or his belief was not taken into consideration in determining his place in the *body-politic*. There was hard-

ly any room for that, since the Risis themselves differed in their philosophical tenets and the great philosophical systems manifested divergences on vital points. All this emancipated the state from the influence of religion. Ecclesiastical supremacy as conceived in the West was denied to the head of the state. As a result of this we have in India hardly any wars about religion, no crusades, no inquisitions—no religious animosity, no feeling of hatred for followers of other religion, and India became a refuge for men whose religion had led them to be persecuted in their own lands.

Nature and Limits of the functions of the state :—

So much for the characteristics of the state. We may now make up for the deficiency caused by the lack of definition of the state. In our view the state may be regarded as the highest political organisation for the well-being of

* *Conflict of Ideals*—The above concept of the state was the product of conflicting ideals. A deeper enquiry would convince us that not only there was a conflict of opinions due to differences in viewing the problems of life from different aspects, but that two ideals—and those of two races—were in conflict, e.g., the ideals of the Brahmin and that of the Kṣatriya, the two races, who by their co-operation and also by their conflicts did so much to evolve the various aspects of Indian culture. Closely connected, the two races had contributed to the glories of India. The latter stood for dominion and expansion—the former for systematisation and order. The one thought for the community as a whole, the other for the individual. The one stood for collectivism, the other for individual effort; the one for obedience, the other for self-realisation; the one for the will, the other for reason. Out of this struggle emerged the peculiar concept of state and of its duties and functions. The Kṣattriya ruler yearned for his sovereignity "indivisible and absolute;" while the priest contended for the total emancipation of society from politics. Out of this came out this harmonious compromise.

the community, so far as the material aspect of life was concerned. The Indian mind, so prolific and original in many directions, displayed its originality in its conception of the state. That institution never came to signify the highest form of existence or the most perfect machinery for the mental and moral elevation of man. The aim and object of Indian culture was to evolve the highest types of humanity and to enable the individual to attain his own ends namely the fruition of the four objectives Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. They did not circumscribe the scope of its action, nor limit the exercise of its sovereign powers simly to police work; nor did they invest the state with powers too extensive to deal with the individual as it liked. They saw clearly the sphere to which its actions mights safely be delegated, without circumscribing the scope of action of man's superior nature, and in this the state was allowed a free exercise of its authority. In all other spheres, the activity of the state was circumscribed. In one sphere they allowed the state free activity, while in the other the individual was allowed free play. A clear distinction was made between the two. Man was regarded both as a means and also an end. In the first instance, man must look to the well-being of society, would help others and be helped in helping himself. Herein he came under the full scope of the state activity. His maintenance, his opportunity for self-realisation, protection of his life and property—everything was delegated to the care of the state but beyond this, the jurisdiction of the state came to an end. In matters of higher development, the state had

had nothing to do. The individual was fully emancipated. The rights of the state, were, again conceived as being far from absolute. They were limited and thought to be merely arising out of contract. Political idealism did not carry its concept to that logical fineness which we find in the state-concept of the Westerners, both ancient and modern. To the westerner, the state remains even to this day the highest institution which the genius of a man could devise—a thing which would bestow the highest benefit on man. But to the Indian the state has never signified this idea. It was, as we have seen, a means to a great end. It never became with them the highest God on earth.

Influence of Social and Spiritual instincts of the Race

Thus we see that in the development of the state, the peculiar ideals of India spritual and secular, contributed their quota. The safety of the individual and his material prosperity were its chief concern. In conceiving the state, moreover, they pre-supposed the existence of fundamental institutions and organic laws and these could not be disturbed. The social ideal too, was regarded as sacred. The state could not meddle with these and society was left with a certain amount of autonomy to evolve its own working. Each section or group worked for its own. Absolute equality never became a political necessity. The sole aim of life-was never identified with the desire for the settlement of equal benefits in the material sphere.

This latter circumstance has indeed stood in the path of progress in the modern sense of the word. But judged by effects, the state as conceived by Indians had many re-

deeming features. Of these the most important were its wide scope of action and the absence of rigidity.

The Indian state had a scope of action which was not narrow. It would admit within itself men of all castes and creeds irrespective or their origin, customs or religion. Foreign elements with diverse religious and social ideas came and settled in India and thus added to her strength. In the days of India's political greatness the state presented to the world this high and noble ideal.

Greek Ideal Contrasted

Herein it bears a great contrast with the Greek ideal of state. The fine idealism of Greek culture confined the state within the limits of the city—nay—to the governing element of that small community. The ideal was rigid—it could not expand. Greece for ever remained divided into narrow and isolated communities; the ideals of humanity were to her confined to the city and hardly had any room for expansion. Such an ideal continued to exist till the last days of her existence and when the genius of the semi-barbarian Macedonian attempted the expansion of the Hellenes, the Helleneic ideal lost itself in the midst of the barbarians whom it had vanquished and felled to the ground.

The only redeeming feature of this narrow ideal was its tendency towards the strengthening of the bonds of solidarity among the members of this small community. In India, such a solidarity was indeed lacking. The widest possible divergences were allowed to exist among the communities; mutual rivalries too, existed but there was

hardly any attempt to bring all the sections to a common rigid standard. Rather than have unity the Indian delighted in diversity. The craving was for a harmony in the midst of differences. Yet her ideals were nobler and higher. There was no lack indeed of that narrow patriotism, nor were there no germs of a narrow nationalistic ideal, which made her people often look upon outsiders with contempt and suspicion; but there ever was the presence of the human and cosmopolitan ideal, which we can not find elsewhere—not even in civilised Europe—until we come to the middle of the last century or the dawn of the present.

These two characteristics are worthy of note. They give us not only an insight into the Indian ideas of state, but throw some light on the chief ideals which influenced politics.

India in decay has forgotten her past. She is now the butt of ridicule with the Westerner, who denies her a place in the history of the political development, mocks her pacificism and scoffs at her tenacity to the past.

Yet history will prove that in India arose those political ideals which looked more to humanity than to the solidarity of the narrow social group. Here it was that conscience was freed from dogmas. Here it was that oppressed nationalities found refuge from time immemorial. Here it was that men could live side by side inspite of differences; here it was again that the germs of cosmopolitan ideals first manifested themselves—ideals for which the thinkers of our own civilised modern age are sighing in vain.

Type of State Organisation and Government

With such a social organisation and with such a peculiar conception of state authority the tendency was towards a stable equilibrium in social life. The authority of the king, which had increased from the earliest times to to the Maurya period, was devoted to the performance of those duties which were calculated to put an end to class war and the conflicts between different groups. The economic policy of the state was directed towards the grant of equitable opportunities to the different sections of the community. This nullification of class war, though it could not be regarded as having been of ideal perfection led to the elimination of perennial strifes which characterised social life in the city states of Greece or that during the early phases of the development of Republican Rome. Politics in its original narrow sense did not develop within the Indian social frame, and even during the complex stages of evolution, class-war or timocratic evolution, never characterised life in India. To counteract it, the functions of the state or rather the functions of the king and the governmental organisation, became very comprehensive and embraced all the different activities connected with the material existence. But within the framework of the governmental organisation or rather along with it, society retained an autonomy and a sort of parallel existence which still characterises Hindu social life. This independence and autonomy, though it could not be regarded as having been of ideal perfection helped the Hindus much to maintain themselves inspite of the loss of

political independence occasioned by the Muslim conquest of India.

The autonomy granted to society and its quasi-independent existence did not stand in the way of progressive evolutioin or retard the adaptability of the Indian people to changed circumstances. Conservation and self-preservation was attained partly through the agency of religion and the aristocratic social organisation. Violent changes could not be introduced all on a sudden and the will of the multitude was never recognised as being the most pre-eminent social force, as in the Western countries. This had its drawbacks but the non-recognition of this popular will as the potent force in all social movements did much to preserve the individuality and the culture of the race. Compared and contrasted with the political theories which gained ground in Europe in the last two centuries, there was much that stood in the way of the individual and his supposed political rights. Whether this was worthy of universal condemnation is yet to be seen. Political experiments in the west have not yet ended and new economic factors introduced by scientific inventions adding to man's power of exploiting nature and to the potentialities of the individual are still operating. Democracy today is an accepted principle but democracies have now been found to be incapable of solving all the problems of man. The conception of man's primary rights is being seriously challanged everywhere. The liberty of the individual which was the war-cry in all revolutions is proving to be nothing more than a myth. Everywhere democracy is giving place to dictatorship and dictators

while professing to be the agents of popular will are doing their best to make themselves more autocratic than the autocrats whose authority they have subverted.

Germs of Nationalism :—

Nationalism in its modern sense did not exist in India nor in the rest of the world. But we have vague ideas of a common socio-political group deriving strength and solidarity from the unity of the race and the adoption of the same language, manners and customs. These ideas are found first in the Arthaśāstra but owing to the weakness of the political power, the constant changes of allegiance, the ever-varying boundaries of the state—they failed to take root in the soil. But as pointed out already, the different provinces in India tended towards becoming quasi-national units. (Supra II pp. 181-3). The muslim conquest brought a new consciousness in opposition to the invaders.

In course of the war against the Muslim rulers national sentiments and consciousness arose in the different parts of India, namely, in Mahārāṣṭrā, in the Punjab, in the South and in Rājputāna, and this has already been pointed out.

Under British rule the horizon of political aspirations has cleared and national consciousness has grown in all the parts of India. This militates to some extent against the old Pan-Indian idea, but still it is a force which will go a long way to the political regeneration of India.

Epilogue

Thus far the author has attempted a brief survey of the political life and aspriations of a race which has in the midst of many vicissitudes managed to preserve its individuality and lives yet to bridge the vast gulf between that hoary antiquity which saw the dawn of its culture and the modern age of science and progress that has revolutionised the very outlook of human existence and thoroughly reshuffled the social life of mankind.

Of all the ancient civilisations, that of India still subsists and with all her political deterioration she can offer still to the new world the Gospel of social peace, religious toleration and political harmony in the midst of almost insuperable differences. In the domain of politics proper she can still offer the ideal of a paternal state, looking to the material welfare of all classes of its subjects and extending its protection to peoples of different creed or culture—a state which looks to the adjustment of the claims of labour in opposition to the exploitation of capital, rising high above the conflict of classes or the arrogance of party groups.

The culture of India is very old but its prolonged existence has not exhausted her intellectual vitality, her energy or productivity in the material sphere of life. Even to-day India is producing some of the finest specimens of humanity taking their rank with the best representatives of the West in the domain of science, philosophy, literature, law

and politics. This shows that neither the race nor its genius is exhausted.

India has yet a furture, and with a little reshuffling of her social structure and a reorganisation of her rightful forces she will be ere long on the way to gain her rightful place in the society of nations.

For the present her social and political outlook is not so clear as any believer in her destiny would expect. Suffering from the evil consequences of economic ruin, social disintegration and the conflict of classes there are very few signs of her ever increasing social solidarity. To add to these, there are disruptive tendencies within the fold of her social life, heightened by the outbreak of communal conflicts between the great communities inhabiting her. This last has been the result of the nullification of the rapprochement between the two great communities in India as well as of the forcing of the religious question into the domain of politics.

But let us hope that all these disrupting tendencies will cease to operate and that the present conflicts will end in a closer understanding and that those prejudices and vagaries characteristic of our present-day rural life giving rise to political narrowness and social intolerance will cease to exist. Then the vision of a greater and re-united India will come before the eyes of her people.

With a view to regenerate India the different sections of her people must give up their narraow angle of vision and unite for a common national purpose. In solving her problems they must be actuated by the dynamic western ideal of progress and social expansion. But we must not

entirey loose sight of the principles which had in the past contributed much to the evolution of India's social and political life. Mere imitation of the West will not solve her problems but will bring instead the catastrophe of a communal war and perennial racial hatred. But a policy of harmony and social co-operation evolved out of the best traditions of the past will lead us to the path of consolidation and progress.

In the midst of conflicts and turmoils, there is still hope. Perhaps the long expected federation of the peoples and provinces of India into a great commonwealth will be a reality, though for the present under the aegis of the suzerain power.

Once united in a common purpose, India will march ahead and throw off the shackles of past prejudices and present impediments. She will take her place in the front rank of nations and contribute her quota to the peace and progress of humanity.

INDEX TO PART II

Q

R

For the preparation of this index, I am indebted to two of my pupils Srijut Manindra Nath Bagchi M. A., and Nirmal Chandra Sinha M. A., and I thank them for the service they have rendered me.

BIBLIOGRAPHY—WITH ABBREVIATIONS.

In this a list of the more important books cited or referred to in the work is given. Abbreviations of the names of books repeatedly referred to are also given.

The Rig-veda—(R. V.)
The Atharva veda—(A.V.)
Vājasaneyi Samhitā—(Vaj-Sam)
Yajurveda—(Yaj.-Sam)
The Mahā-parinivbbāna sūtta—Trans. Rhys Davids; Dialogues of the Buddha.
The Dhammapada—P. T. S. London (D. P.).
The Milinda-pañha—(Trenckner; (London).
The Mahā bodhi Vamsa. P. T. S.
Mahāvamsa. (Geiger, London). Turnour
Divyāvadāna. (Cowell; Cambridge)
The Jātakas. (Jāt.)—Fausboll; Trans. Ed. Cowell.
The Jātakamālā.—Trans Speyer.
Aśvaghoṣa's Buddhacarita. (Lüders).
,, Saundarānanda. (A. S. B. Bib. Indica).
Catuḥśatikā of Āryadeva. —A. S. Bengal.
Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad. (Ānandāśrama, Poona).
Āpastamba Dharmasūtra. (Bom. S.S.)
Vaśistha Dharmasūtra. (Va. Dh. Su.) Bom. S. S).
Gautama Dharmasūtra. (Mysore S. S.)
The Mahābhārata. (M. B.) Bengal Edition.
Arthāśāstra of Kauṭilya. (Mysore Edition; Dr. Shamasastry
Do ,, Translation by Same).
Vātsyāyana Kāmasūtra. (Text. Bombay Edition).
The Kāmandaka Nitisāra. (Travancore, Ed. Ganapati Sastri).
Somadeva's Nītivākyāmṛta. (Granthamāla, Bombay)
The Yukti-kalpataru of Bhoja. (Calcutta Edition, Ed. Dr. N. Law)
The Rājanīti Prakāśa. (Benares Edition).
The Manu Samhitā. (Ed. Jolly).
Yājñavalkya Samhitā. Bombay. N. S. Edition.
Visnu Smṛti—Asiatic Society of Bengal; (Trans Jolly. S. B. E).
Nārada Smṛti (Jolly; A.S.B. Calcutta).
Brhaspati Smṛti. (Trns. S. B E). Anandāsrama S. S. Poona
Kātyāyana-mata saṅgraha. (By the author; Cal. University).
Śukra Nīti. (Bengal Ed. J. Vidyāsagara).
Viramitrodaya. (Benares S.S. Edition).
Vivāda-ratnākara. (A .S. Bengal).
Smṛti-candrika. (Mysore Edition).
Mitākṣarā by Vijñāneśvara. Bombay Edition.
Harṣa-carita by Bāṇa. N. Sangar Edition Bombay Trans. Thomas and Cowell.
Kādamvarī. by Bāṇa. Bom. S.S; Trans. Redding London;
Works of Kālidasa, Bengal and Bombay Editions.

Bhāsa—(Trivadrum; Ganapati Sastri).
The Kirātājrīunyam of Bhāravi.
(J. Vidyāsagar, Calcutta)
Mṛcchakaṭika of Śūdraka.
(Calcuta & N. S. Edition Bombay).
Mudrā-rākṣasa—B. Goswami; Calcutta.
Kathā-sarit-sāgara. By Somdeva.
Bombay. N. S. Edition.
Kṣemendra's Bṛhat-kathā-mañjari.
Do Bhārata-mañjari and
Do Rāmāyana-mañjarī.
N. S. Press. Bombay.
The Cāṇakya-sūtras—(Text. in Kau.
Ar. Śāstra—Edition II.)
The Bṛhaspati Sūtras (Ed. Thomas
Punjab. S. S.)
The Pañcatantra—Bom. S. S.
The Tantrākhāyika—Ed. Hertel.
The Hitopadeśa—B. S. S. also Cal. Ed.
The Purāṇas. (especially Viṣṇu, Vāyu,
Matsya, Kūrma and Bhāgavata)—
Bengal Editions.
The Rājatarangiṇī of Kalhana.
Text. and Trans. by Stein (R. T).
Uvasagdasao.—Ed. Hoernle.
Nirayavali Sūtra.
Uttarādhyāna Sūtra.
Edition—Carpentier, Trans.
Jacobi—S. B. E.
Dynasties of the Kali Age (Pargiter).
Early History of India (V. Smith).
Aśoka (V. Smith).
Hindu Polity (K. P. Jayaswal).
Early History of the Deccan (E. H. D)
(Sir. R. G. Bhandarkar).
Historical Sketches of Ancient Deccan.
by S. T. Aiyar.
Ancient India.
by Dr. Krishnaswami Aiyanger.
Indica—(Megasthenes).
Invasion of India by Alexander
(Arrian).
Periplus of the Erytherean Sea
(Schoff).
History of the Deccan
(Jouveau Dubreuil).
History of the Pallavas (Gopalan).
Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts
(J. F. Fleet; D. K. D).
Mysore and Koorg (Rice).
Gurjara Pratiharas
Dr. R. C. Majumder.
History of Bengal (Dr. R. C. Majunder)
(Dacca)
Rajasthan—Col. Todd.
India Old and New—W. Hopkins.
Local Govt. in Ancient India.
—Dr. R. K, Mookerjee.
Political History of Ancient India
Dr. H.C. Rai-chaudhuri., Calcutta.
Hindu Revenue Administration
—Dr. U. N. Ghosal.
Mediaeval Hindu India—(M. H. I).
—C. V. Vaidya.
Land Laws of Bengal—Late Justice
Sarada Ch. Mitra, M.A., B.L.
Catalogue of Gupta Coins—Allan.
Indian Antiquary (Ind. Ant).
Epigraphia Indica (E. I.).
Journal of the Bihar and Orissa
Research Society (J. B. O. R. S).
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
(J. R. A. S).
Gupta Inscriptions by Fleet. (G. I.).
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
Bombay Branch (J.B.B.R.A.S).
Inscriptions of Bengal
—N. G. Majumdar.
Indian Historical Quarterly. (I. H. Q).
South Indian Inscriptions (S. I. I.)
Hultzsch.
Kielhorn's List of Inscriptions.
Lüder's List of Inscriptions.
Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

It is unfortunate that a large number of mieprints especially in connection with diacritical marks has crept into the book. So, this list of important errors is here appended. Some additional informations and notes also find place in this list. For some of the corrections in the notes added to pages 150-162 I am indeebted to Dr. Dinesh Chandra Sarkar M.A. Ph D. of the P. G. staff.

P. 9, Line, 20. The Sophytes—was the name of a king or a nomarch ruling over a tribe of people east of the Jhelum. Greek writers like Curtius speak of the wisdom and the peculiar institutions of the people. The Sophytes coins bear the head of a king and the figure of a cock on the reverse. The late Dr. Jayaswal was inclined to take the Sophytes "as a republican area with a republican institutions." (Hindu Polity pp. 65-66). The author regards them as a monarchical state. Perhaps the political condition of the Sophytes was in a state of transition.

P. 13, L. 17. Read—Aria in place of Asia.

P. 16, bottom. There is an unfortunate omission of the words "uplift of the people were."

P. 17. That Northern India was split up after the decline of the Mauryas into a large number of monarchical or tribal states is proved by the evidence of the numerous coins which were issued by the local authorities in various parts of Northern India. Some of these might have been issued by the Suṅgas who were the most powerful dynasty after the Mauryas. But there can be no doubt from the numismatic data that the idea of paramountcy declined after the downfall of the Mauryas. The all-India character of the punch-marked coins would justify the attribution of many of of them to the Mauryas. The author's notice has been drawn to this by Mr. Jitendra Nath Banerji M.A. of the Post-graduate Teaching Staff.

P. 97, L. 4. Read—divisions or spheres in place of the word *littorals*—which is inappropriate here.

P. 103, N. 2. Mr. Harit Krishna Dev, M.A., has tried to prove that the tradition of the Vikrama Era being founded by a King Vikrama or Vikramāditya of Malwa is borne out by ephigraphic testimony. The era was founded by the Sātavāhāna King Gautamiputra Sātakarni who, according to the author was the original of the traditional Vikramāditya. The Nasik eulogy

contains the word "Vara-vāhana-vikrama." For H. K. Dev's paper, see—Zeitschrift fur Indologie und Iranistik: Leipzig 1922. pp. 255 ff.

P. 118. Foot Note. In connection with the Kāyasthas (about which the views of Kumar Asim Krisna Dev Bahadur has been quoted) it is significant to note that Citragupta, the traditional ancestor of the Kāyasthas, is described as wearing flowing robes and boots (after the persian model?). For this the author is indebted to his colleague Mr. Jitendra Nath Banerjee M.A., of the Post-graduate Teaching Staff.

P. 115, N. 12. Pulakeśi II ruled from C. 611-642 A.D. and not upto 633 A.D.

P. 151, N. 15. Dr. Vincent Smith & not Sir Vincent Smith.

P. 153, N. 18. The date of the capture of Herat by Yakub—l-Lais, the Saffarid, is A. H. 256 or about 870 A.D.

P. 154, N. 20. Bhoja's date is 836-882 A. D. and Mahendra-pāla's 893-907. A.D. North Bengal was probably included in the kingdom of the Pratihāras at the time of Mahendra-pāla I, as is known from the recently discovered Paharpur Inscription.

P. 156. N. 22. The capital city of the Chālukyas, namely, Kalyāṇi was founded by Someśvara I—(1042-1068 A.D.)

P. 159. N. 29. The khajuraho Inscription of Dhanga dated 954 refers to Vināyaka-pāla as his overlord. A later Candella record shows that Dhanga defeated the Partihāra king during the later years of his reign and obtained Sāmrājya.

P. 161. N. 28. The last prince of the house of Sultan Mahmud, namely Khusru II, reigned till 1186. In 1191 he was sent to Ghor and put to death about 1205.

P. 161. N. 29. Pṛthvirājā Chāhamāna was defeated by Shahabuddin Ghori in 1192 A. D.

P. 162. N. 31. The Khairha grant of Yasaḥ-karṇa, dated in the Kalacuri year 823 (A. D. 1073) proves that Karṇa must have died before that date.

P, 163. N. 34. The Machhlishahar Inscription of Jayaaccandra's son Hariscandra and the Belkhara Inscription of a feudatary of the Gāhaḍavālas both dated in V. S. 1253 (1196-97 A.D.) prove that the whole of Jayaccandra's kingdoom was not annexed by Shahabuddin Md. in 1193.

P. 164. N. 37. Vīra Ballāla III. was crowned on 31st January 1192 A. D,

P. 164. N. 28. The Materu Inscription of Prolarāja shows that he ascended the throne sometime before S. 1042, or 1120 A. D.

P. 165. N. 39. According to a Vizagapattam record Ananta-varman Codaganga ascended the throne in 1078 A. D. An Arasavalli Inscrip-

tion belongs to his 72nd year while another is dated in his 73rd year. (S. 1069 and 1070). He therefore ruled upto the year 1147. A.D.

P. 117. L. 5-6. For the sack of Kanauj by Indra III see the Cambay plates of Govinda IV. (E. I. vol. VII. pp. 36).

P. 186. L. 11. also P. 192. } Read Kalacūrya in place of Kalacurya.

P. 190. The Sena emblem was the figure of Sadā-śiva.

P. 192. Read in the footnote the verse from the Bhoja-Prabandha.

स्नाता तिष्ठति कुन्तलेश्वरसुता वारोऽङ्गराजस्वसुः ।
द्यूतैर्जिता कमलया देवीप्रसाद्याधुना ॥
इत्यन्तःपुरसुन्दरीजनगणे न्यायाधिकंध्यायता ।
देवेनाप्रतिपत्ति मूढ़मनसा द्विताः स्थितं नाड़िकाः ॥

Vātsyāyana speaks of the functions of the Vāsaka-pāli and of Vāsaka-sajjā.

P. 196. L. 27. Read within bracket R. T. V. verses 432-435 and not pp.

P. 198. L. 7. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar's paper on Chandragupta II and Rāmagupta has been published in the Malavya Commemoration Volume.

P. 202. L. 9. and P. 203. } Read Koṭā Devī in place of Koṭadevī.

P. 202. ,, 27. The reference regarding the Kashmīr king Bṛhaspati is wrong. It should be R. T. IV. 672-687.

,, ,, 28. The reference should be R. T. IV. 710-711.

,, ,, 29. Read caṅkuṇa in place of camkuma.

P. 204. It is warthy of note that the Hindu lawgivers laid down the maxim that the throne should never remain vacant.

P. 208. L. 26. Read Kuvalayā-pīḍa and not Kuvalayāditya.

P. 209. L. 27. Reference should be R. T. V. 266-277.

P. 212. L. 7. Read Mudrādhyakṣa.

P. 215. L. 20-23. Read the pannaya tax; also read Melvaṭṭeya Vaddaravelu; also read perjunka in place of peajunka. See Fleet. D. K. D. pp. 449-451).

P. 216. L. 11. Read Bāhattara always.

P. 218. L. 1. For Phalguna's recall see R. T. VI. 198-214.

L. 2. Vijja was exiled and his brothers and friends imprisoned. King Harṣa put two of his father's ministers to death.

P. 219. L. 18. Read Āgrahārika in place of Agrahārika-

P. 220. L. 1. Read Dāṇḍika in place of Daṇḍika.

P. 430. L. 4. Read National in place of rightful.

SOME OPINIONS AND REVIEWS OF PART I

Dr. A. B. Keith—Edinburgh.

The effort to connect the development of polity with the evolution of theory is valuable and important, and you have collected and set out lucidly a large number of interesting facts. There is no doubt that even in its incomplete shape the appearance of your book is fully justified, and that it presents something not included even in the many useful books on Hindu Polity which we already have.

Dr. E. J. Rapson—Cambridge.

You have collected and arranged the available evidence with great care and your discussion of the bearing of this evidence is fair and well-informed. I shall find your book most useful for reference.

Dr. L. Finot—Toulon, France.

I appreciate particulalarly in your treatment of the matter, the excellent selection of texts and the sound appreciation of their meaning and value. It is cetainly an excellent contribution to the study of a topic beset with difficulties.

Dr. F. O. Schrader—Germany.

On opening your book I was struck by the soberness of your method and having perused a few chapters I may say already that the book is an extraordinary and admirable one.

Dr. L. D. Barnett—London.

I have read your book with interest and care. There is much in it with which I fully agree and.....I fully appreciate the merit of your book.

Dr. F. W. Thomas—Oxford.

Clearly, Mr. Banerjee is dealing with the subject in a comprehensive way and presents the evidence in its full amplitude. He does not fail to show that he has views of his own for which he is prepared to contend. Hope that the subsequent parts of the treatise will be equally well-done.

Dr. Julius Jolly—Wurzburg.

The author shows himself learned both in Sanskrit literature and the views of modern scholars. His criticisms are well substantiated and his style is clear and lucid.

Dr. Sten Konow—Oslo, Norway.

I hvae read your book with interest and I much appreciate your perspicuous and elegent style and your clear argumentation.

Dr. R. K. Mookerjee—Lucknow.

I have gone through Mr. Narayan Chandra Banerjee's 'Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories' and found it to represent the same level of scolarship as marks his others works. His acquaintance with the source in its original gives a freshness and fidelity which is not found in other works. His work marks Mr. Banerjee out as one of best interpreters of early Indian institutions.

Dr. Ganga Nath Jha—Allahabad.

your books are judiciously planned and carefully executed. Please accept my hearty congratulations on your handling of a subject, the study of which is still in its infancy.

Forward.

Without exaggeration, it can be said that the book is one of the best on the subject. The author develops his arguments point by point with a happy sense of discrimination. His knowledge of world-history enables him to draw fitting parallels from extra-Indian sources. Written in a lucid style, free alike from pedantry and from cheap popular clap-trap, the book should please the lay reader and satisfy the technical scholar.

Journal of Indian History.

Professor Banerjee is a good sanskrit scholar and is the author of a number of interesting works. His work is full of interest and will profitably pay persual.

The Asiatic Review—London.

The author has done his work with great care and his frequent quotations from the classics will assist the scholar and the student in verifying his arguments.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society—London.

The work is one of distinct merit. Mr. Banerjee has handled his difficult themes with an ability and sobriety that deserve recognition (Barnett).

The Mind—London.

The author has done an important service in emphasising the transcendental ideal as influencing political thought.....and is probably the first to do so in this field. He has also rightly combated the theory held by many writers that in India kingship was regarded as a divine institution. On these points, the book suggests a new line of investigation and clears away many misconceptions. The writer is well acquainted with Sanskrit and can handle texts properly. We hope Mr. Banerjee will carry his investigations further in the proposed second volume.