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ABSTRACT

THE ŚŪDRĀṢĀṆIROMANI OF KRṢNA ŚEṢA: A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY MANUAL OF DHARMA FOR ŚŪDRAS

Theodore Benke
Ludo Rocher

From the fourteenth to the seventeenth century C.E., a śāstra of a new type on the topic of Śūdras was composed and circulated among Dharmaśāstrins. These śūradharma texts were primarily concerned with the ritual life of Śūdras—the rites, sacraments, and forms of religious knowledge to which they were entitled in śruti and smṛtī. But they also included expositions on the generation of Śūdra jātis according to the theory of varṇasaṅkara and descriptions of the ways of life and occupations of Śūdras. This is a study and translation of one of these texts, the Śūdrācāraśāmiromanī of Krṣṇa Śeṣa, among the most brilliant and eminent paṇḍits of late medieval Sanskrit, celebrated as both grammarian and poet. In the series of essays that accompany the translation, I analyze the text and piece together the fragmentary evidence for its date and authorship. Śūradharma texts were one response of the Brahmin intellectual elite to the challenges to traditional dharma and dominance arising from the changing socio-economic conditions of Sultanate and Mughal India. They represent a shift in Dharmashastric discourse from the ritual exclusion of Śūdras as the sign of their social subjection to fuller integration into the Brahmanical fold. As an effort to deepen the ritual regulation of low castes in a time of and caste instability and anxiety (the improved but precarious class position of many Śūdras) and social ferment (the Bhakti movements) they were adjunct to a more general reassessment of varṇa and the identity and place of Brahmins and Kṣatriyas. Śūradharma texts like the Śūdrācāraśāmiromanī preserve the Vedic privilege and ritual primacy of Brahmins while adjusting to the new realities of caste by the qualified inclusion of sat, i.e., “good” Śūdras as a new client base for ritual services. The Śūdrācāraśāmiromanī was composed in typical nibanda style, but in the form of a concise and comprehensive handbook for Brahmins to instruct and guide Śūdras in their daily ritual life.
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### Common Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Work or Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ĀD</td>
<td>Āpastambha Dharmaśūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGS</td>
<td>Āśvalāyana Gṛhyāṇaśūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Āṅgiras Smṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap</td>
<td>Aparārka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Baudhāyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhP</td>
<td>Bhaviṣya Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BmP</td>
<td>Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Bhāgavata Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrP</td>
<td>Brahma Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brh</td>
<td>Bṛhaspati Smṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Brahma Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Catalogus Catalogorum, Aufrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Devala Smṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Devī Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Gautama Dharmaśūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDS</td>
<td>History of Dharmaśāstra, Kane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KgS</td>
<td>Kātyāyana Gṛhyāṇaśūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Kūrma Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KV</td>
<td>Kaṁsavadha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Liṅga Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Manusmṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Mahābhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBh</td>
<td>Mahābhāṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Matsya Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mit</td>
<td>Mitakṣarā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MkP</td>
<td>Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Nārada Smṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Nārada Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>New Catalogus Catalogorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NsP</td>
<td>Nārasītiḥa Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Padma Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Padacandrīkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>Pārijāṭharaṇacampū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKC</td>
<td>Prakṛtacandrīkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKP</td>
<td>Prakṛyākaumudīprakāśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Parāśara Smṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>Rg Veda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Śaṅkha Smṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAI</td>
<td>Śūdras in Ancient India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Śūdrācariśromaṇī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚB</td>
<td>Śātapatha Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Śmṛticandrīkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Śūdrakamalākara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKVT</td>
<td>Śūdrakṛtyaśicāraṇatattva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SkP</td>
<td>Skanda Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Śaṁtiparvan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Śphoṭatattva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SvP</td>
<td>Śiva Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Taittirīya Samhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vasiṣṭha Dharmaśūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VaP</td>
<td>Vāyu Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VdP</td>
<td>Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VmP</td>
<td>Vāmana Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VsP</td>
<td>Viṣṇu Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>Viṣṇu Smṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VyS</td>
<td>Vyāsa Smṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yājñavalkya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS</td>
<td>Yama Smṛti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transliteration of Devanāgarī Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>अ</th>
<th>ए</th>
<th>ऐ</th>
<th>क</th>
<th>क</th>
<th>ख</th>
<th>च</th>
<th>छ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>ऑ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>झ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>च</td>
<td>छ</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>ञ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ट</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>ड</td>
<td>ढ</td>
<td>ण</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>थ</td>
<td>द</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>म</td>
<td>म</td>
<td>श</td>
<td>ष</td>
<td>ष</td>
<td>ष</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anusvāra: ṁ
Visarga: ḍ
Introduction

From the fourteenth to the seventeenth century, śāstras of a new type dealing with the dharma of Śūdras were composed. These texts were primarily concerned with the ritual life of Śūdras: the sacrifices, sacraments, and devotional practices to which they were entitled. They also included discussions of the origins of Śūdra jātis according to the theory of varnasāṅkara and descriptions of their ways of making a living.

The outpouring of works on śūradharma in this late medieval period appears to be unprecedented. R. S. Sharma called it “a spate of books.” J. Duncan M. Derrett, the great scholar of Hindu Law, remarked that Śūdras had become “a favorite topic of the latter days of the śāstra.” The lives of lower caste Indians seems to have become a matter of some concern in Brahmin scholarship at this time.

To date only two of these texts have been edited and published: the Śūdrakamalākara of Kamalākara-bhaṭṭa and the Śūdracāraśīromani of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. The Śūdracāraśīromani, or what appears to be the author’s own title, the Satśūdracāraśīromani, “The Gem Treatise of Good Śūdra Conduct,” is one of the best specimens of this new genre of śūradharma, and in the estimation of its editor, N. S. Khiste, “although concise, a profound summa on the subject.” I have translated the Śūdracāraśīromani (hereafter SAS) and in a series of essays analyzed its contents and sifted the evidence for its date, author, and patron.

Apart from Ananya Vajpeyi’s dissertation, these Śūdra texts remain entirely unstudied. Vajpeyi takes the archive

3 The Śūdrakamalākara has been translated into Marathi in Śūdrakamalākara, ed. Javaji Dadaji (1880), Sanskrit and Marathi, 4th edition (Mumbai: Nirmayasagara Press, 1928).
4 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa calls his work the Satsūdracāraśīromani on pages 32, 78, and 221 in a set of verses repeated at the end of sections and at the conclusion.

It was for Pilājī the illustrious, the son of Keśavadāsa, a treasury of blessings to the good, cynosure of the learned, that the preceding enquiry into caste was made in the Gemstone of Good Śūdra Conduct by Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa.

5 Ananya Vajpeyi. “Politics of Complicity, Poetics of Contempt: A History of the Śūdra in Maharashtra, 1650-1950 CE.” Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2004. R. S. Sharma touches on them in Śūdras in Ancient India: A Social History of the Lower Order Down to circa AD 600. Delhi: 1958, 307. Sheldon Pollock directed Vajpeyi’s dissertation which made a start on remedying the fact that “there exists an array of texts treating of śūradharma (e.g., Śūdracāraśīromani of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Śūdrakṛtyātattva of Raghunandana Bhaṭṭācāryya, Śūdrakamalākara, etc.), which to my knowledge have received no systematic (or other) analysis.” “Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power Beyond the Raj,” in Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Per-
of šūdradharma texts as the starting point for her real interest: a study of the discourse on Šūdras as a “poetics of contempt” and its revisions from the consecration of Śivājī as a “Šūdra king” to Jotirao Phule and B. R. Ambedkar. It seemed that it might be a useful contribution to translate one of these texts and see what is in it and what it might be able to tell us about the lives of working-caste people in the sixteenth century, or, more precisely, what Brahmin opinion on the subject may have been.

In Dharmashastric discourse, the religious is the language into which all other concerns are translated. Therefore, we find in the Šūdrācāraśīromāṇi a discussion of the lives of Šūdras and the regulation of caste, marriage, reproduction, and livelihoods within the paradigm of ritual. I have attempted to read this ritual discourse for clues to the social history of caste in the late Sultanate/early Mughal period and its changing dynamics. As documents for the emergence of modern Hinduism, the Hinduism encountered by the West, such early texts on caste and ritual by Indians themselves are a corrective to the notion, shared by Brahmins and some western scholars, of their unchanging and ahistoric nature.6

Susan Bayly locates the emergence of a caste-centric cultural order formalized around Dumontian ritual purity in the period 1700-1830, aptly calling it the “Brahman Raj.” In the interregnum between the Mughals and the Raj, Brahmins were able to assert their power. But she also believes that the spread of caste-like norms and values was occurring even earlier, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Caste, Society, and Politics in India from the Eighteenth Century to the Modern Age. The New Cambridge History of India: IV, 3, pp 64-96. Contra the “Cambridge revisionists,” who downplay the impact of colonialism, Nicholas Dirks regards caste in its modern form as reconstructed through the discourse, administration, and policy of the colonial state, as a reinvented tradition that selectively fixed aspects of Indian society, preeminently caste, as its essence. Caste served colonial rule by making religion ascendant over politics and history. But the process of Brahmanization or Sanskritization of the sub-continent had been going on already for a millennium prior to its Westernization. A highly developed discourse on varṇa was already current. Brahmanical caste ritual had begun filling the vacuums of royal power left during the Sultanate and Mughal periods, a process only drastically accelerated by the colonial decapitation of kingship of which Dirks speaks. Ronald Inden also stresses the effect of political decapitation in depoliticizing Indian culture and leaving religious tradition standing as the dominant institution. Indian Brahmin elites had every reason of ideology, property, and prestige to collaborate with colonial rule in the construction of the image of a timeless India and an apolitical dharma. That had been their aim since Sankara, Ramānuja, and Manu before them. There was, consequently, a complicity of interests in promoting a neo-traditionalism or neo-Brahmanism. The British capitalized on this in a way the Muslims had not. One might observe, however, that the protective sealing up of Dharma within its own traditions under Muslim rule was in its own way as important as what happened under British administration.

Dirks recognizes that this is so, observing that “under colonialism, caste was appropriated, and in many respects reinvented.” Dirks (1990: 61). However, one often has the sense when reading post-colonialists that the antecedents of caste, especially as they develop during the preceding era of Muslim rule, are not given their full weight. In the final analysis, the differences between the pre- and post-colonial features of caste are a matter of emphasis. C. A. Bayly agrees that social relations and modes of thought and belief, which had consolidated themselves in the later years of Mughal India, continued to develop under British rule. These were inflected by the military and financial needs of the colonial state, developments in the world economy, and the adaptation and resistance of the Indians themselves. C. A. Bayly, Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire, 169.

Caste had been evolving since the pre-Buddhist era. The SAS is the product of one epoch in its mutation, the colonial model of caste another. What is true of British rule is that it gave caste dharma an unprecedented primacy both ideologically and institu-

---

6 The trend of recent post-colonial scholarship has been to see the emergence of a pan-Indian caste system as the result of colonialism, but recognizing that important precursors were put into place during the Mughal period by the more thorough penetration of the lower castes by Brahmanical ritual. If nothing else, the SAS shows that a more textually explicit integration of Šūdras into the ritual system was part of a process of consolidating the Brahmanical order that was well underway before European colonization, what Pollock calls “Deep Orientalism,” and Srinivas “Sanskritization.”
Texts with a special focus on Śūdras were the culmination of a long process of enlarging and spelling out the religious rights and duties of Śūdras that had been going on since the Gupta era and the advent of Vaiṣṇavism with its drive to bring the lower castes within the Brahmanical fold. In that respect, they are nothing new. The shastric precedents in the relaxation of punitive rigor began much earlier with smṛtikāras such as Yājñavalkya and the Mahābhārata. Indeed, as will be discussed, the SAS harks back to an earlier phase of “liberalization” in the Gupta period. The point of view of the Śūdrācāraśiromani emerges through the nibandha procedure of citing these earlier smṛtis. Indeed, half of the text consists of such citations.

From one point of view, these new Śūdra texts can be seen as an accommodation in Dharmaśāstra to late medieval social conditions by expanding the ritual rights of Śūdras; from another, they were a highly conservative step in the further Brahmanization of lower castes, the fuller integration of Śūdras, antyajas, and Ādivāsīs within the caste order. In fact, the former is the means to the latter. To speak of “rights” being granted to Śūdras, as does R. S. Sharma, may be anachronistic in a sixteenth century context. Nonetheless, a certain relaxation and spirit of inclusion is detectable in the SAS, but within a context of more deeply rooted shastric regulation and ritualization of the lives of Śūdras.

Śūdras were dealt with in the Dharmasūtras, but were not the subject of independent treatises until late medieval times. If such texts existed earlier, they have been lost without trace. Śūdras are given short shrift in the Dharmasūtras and Dharmaśāstras. Regulations for Śūdras, as the varṇa mandated to serve the twice-born, are strictly subsidiary. Manu’s treatment is notoriously marginalizing; he is uninterested, not to say paranoiac, about the lower orders, and is entirely preoccupied with Brahmin priestly interests and their relations to political power. Dharmaśāstra had been engaged since the post-Mauryan era in promoting a Brahmanical restoration and subordinated the welfare of Śūdras to varṇāśramadharma. As a discourse by and for Brahmins, the ruling subject position of Dharmaśāstra texts is the Brahmin foremost and, secondarily, the three upper varṇas. This is still true of the SAS, mainly with regard to the maintenance of Vedic privilege, but the fourth varṇa is now more fully admitted into the space of Brāhmaṇa ritual life.

*nominally through the implementations of state, law, and scholarship. The colonial regime appropriated the Dharmaśastraic discourse of caste as the master plan of Indian society with the collaboration of Brahmin elites, who were situated in a traditional sociology of knowledge of their own and a social order to a degree long shaped by it. The Brahmanical view of caste was itself as constructed and invented as the British one and supplied its textual basis. The colonial conception and institution of caste was only the latest layer in a long process of sedimentation. As documentation of the religious life of Śūdras as it was seen in late Dharmaśāstra, the SAS shows the effort invested in enclosing everyone within the caste body.*

7 Sharma, 1980, 246-313.
Śūdras as the laboring and service varna were the majority of the population in all periods of Indian history. They constituted the working classes that made everything work, and socially demeaned, disenfranchised, voiceless, and invisible, as all working classes have largely been throughout history, were of interest to elite discourse mainly as objects of control, fear, and loathing. The Purāṇas devote considerable attention to their spiritual welfare, but remain fearful of them and regard their worldly success and ambition as signs of the degeneration of the Kaliyuga. In the late medieval period, they are given a more systematic and somewhat more sympathetic treatment. But they remain the voiceless subaltern objects of a dominant discourse. In the Bhakti movements, they began to speak for themselves.

The profusion of smṛtīnibandhas about Śūdras may be simply a consequence of the greater volume of scholarly and literary production in the late medieval period. Nibandhakāras were collecting, collating, and digesting all previous views on Śūdras. More scholars were writing, copying, and commenting on more texts, and more texts are preserved from this period. Hindu kingdoms such as Vijayanagara sponsored state scholarship on an almost “industrial” scale. In other words, it was part-and-parcel of the scholasticism that has long been decried as typical of Sanskrit in this period. That may be so, but the new attention to Śūdras and the change in attitude indicate that other concerns were at work as well. The three higher varnas were not the subject of similar separate treatises—the duties and privileges of dvījas were the main matter of all earlier Dharmaśāstra. The mere fact of finding it necessary to lay down systematically the religious duties and conduct of Śūdras strongly suggests that this had now become a significant issue. At the very least, they tell us what elite opinion considered fit and proper for low castes people at this time.

We have references to at least 49 texts. Next to nothing is known about most of them. Some appear to be nibandhas, the characteristic form of late medieval Dharmaśāstra. Some are handbooks (paddhati). Some are sections of larger digests and compendia. Many digests such as Lakṣmīdhara’s Kṛtyakalpataru contained extensive sections on

---

9 The latest reckoning puts the population at the death of Akbar around 145 million, 80% of whom were rural peasants and villagers. Shireen Moosvi, The Economy of the Mughal Empire, c. 1595: A Statistical Study (Delhi, 1987), 395-406. In colonial censuses like that of 1881, 75-80% of Hindus were classified as Śūdras.

10 Nibandhas are not bhāyas, śūkas, or vṛttis on entire individual dharmaśūtras or dharmaśāstras, but digests and compendia of extracts from them and pauranic sources on a particular topic such as adoption or inheritance, collected with a view to adjudicating their conflicts and establishing a position on some point of dharma consistent with its supposed unity. Some of them are really encyclopedic summas of every aspect of dharma: Lakṣmīdhara’s Kṛtyakalpataru (12th c.), Mitramiśra’s Vīramitrodaya (17th c.), and Raghunandana’s Smṛtitattva (16th c.), which contains a short chapter on Śūdras. The line between commentary and nibandha is not sharp. They both employ the same critical methods to the same end of harmonization. Some commentaries like those of Aparārka and Vījñāneśvara (Mitākṣarā) on Yaśñavalkya are as voluminous as nibandhas.
śūdradhharma. The seven available texts discuss standard topics (the origin of the Śūdra jātis through caste mixing or varṇasāṅkara, occupations and livelihoods, entitlement to Vedic education), but are primarily concerned with the ritual duties and rights of Śūdras.

From the twelfth and continuing up into the eighteenth century C.E., we see the elaboration of a vast and complex corpus of commentarial literature explicating the Dharmasūtras and Dharmaśāstras. The commentarial literature in Sanskrit in the late medieval, pre-colonial, and early colonial periods is still largely unexplored, regarded as derivative and scholastic. Nevertheless, it was precisely these compendiums of commentary and criticism that condensed and formalized two millennia of Sanskrit into a classical tradition. As Romila Thapar, Sheldon Pollock, and others have remarked, this enormous body of literature has yet to be analyzed in terms of its own historical context and the intellectual, religious, and social influences and requirements inflecting it.

It is no coincidence that comprehensive digests of law made their appearance with the arrival of the Muslim Turks and Afghans or that low castes now became a special concern. Confronted with the Other of a totalizing, unassimilating faith, Hinduism became aware of itself as a coherent tradition. Hindu kings commissioned these massive monuments of law and scholarship to reinforce Dharma. The need to defend the Dharma led Brahmin nibandhakāras to assemble the texts of the whole tradition and tighten up the rules for all varṇas. Thus, the renewed focus on Śūdras.

Dharmaśāstras are normative texts. As Patrick Olivelle has observed, “they tell people what to do—they do not tell us what people actually did.” Prescriptive rather than descriptive, they cannot be read uncritically. A start can be made by first trying to understand how they functioned socially and discursively. If caste is the social unconscious of Hindu society, varṇa theory as framed and constructed in Dharmaśāstra was its imaginaire culturel. As ideology, it both represented and reproduced the social relations in which people lived their lives.

---

11 Four complete dharmasūtras, attached to different Vedic schools, have survived: Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vaśiṣṭha, themselves the product of a long and rich tradition of discourse and debate. A quartet of Dharmaśāstras has likewise been preserved in their entirety: the most famous, Manu, Yājñavalkya, Nārada, and Parāśara, together with commentaries such as Bhāruci’s Vivarana on Manu and Vijñānesvara’s Mitākṣara on Yājñavalkya, as well as other fragments, collections of minor texts, epic/pauranic interpolations, and odd composites such as the Viṣṇusmrī.


13 These social relations were sorted out through “caste struggle,” a displaced and religiously mystified form of class competition. Following Berreman, I see this competition as the attempt to bring ascribed caste status into line with claimed status structurally relative to others’ claims and ascriptions. Gerald Berreman, “The Brahmanical View of Caste,” Contributions to Indian Sociology, New Series 5 (Vikas Publications, 1971): 16-23.

Claude Meillassoux sees caste as “no more than an ideological screen which hid social reality by scattering social di-visions along the whole length of a formal hierarchy, and submerging exploitative relations among them. “Are there Castes in India?”
ply a “sociological fiction.” Moreover, Dharmaśāstra was, arguably, always and principally about the place and role of Brahmans.

Dharmaśāstras were not monoliths of law cut into stone, though that might have been the ideal. They never had the force of positive law or legislation, but were learned recommendation, bearing the aura of sacred authority, made, in the first place, to the faithful following the path of Dharma and, secondarily, to advisors in caste disputes. Even in this last respect, “they agree only moderately with the way of the world and are more respected than obeyed.” Indeed, one has the sense that what is prohibited was often the negative of the actual state of affairs, or at least an index to what was feared and in need of control. The social was always exceeding the power of Brahmans to contain it within the ideological frames of varnāśramadharma. The relation of Dharmaśāstra to social realities is mantric, one might say, rather than mirroring; it was striving to bring about a state of reality, not describe one.

Nor do Dharmaśāstras present a flat and uniform code of conduct. They are full of divergent views and criticism of predecessors. The SAS is typical in this regard, collating alternative views. Moreover, the canons of Mīmāṁsā interpretation, ostensibly applied to reconcile conflicting texts and establish the true sense, were in practice used to reach original conclusions that met the needs of differing times and communities.

The problem in reading these texts is that the reverence for scriptural tradition in Dharmaśāstra and the canons of shastric argument entail that the point of view of the nibandhakāra is often implied rather than plainly asserted. His view is expressed through the selection of excerpts from śruti, smṛti, and Purāṇas, and the pūrvapakṣas, arguments, and alternative views he cites. This is characteristic of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa: he rarely states a viewpoint or position of his own, he argues toward it indirectly, letting it emerge from the sources he cites.

Far from the rigid and unchanging picture of caste, which still lingers on in common belief, political and economic conditions were continually reshuffling the makeup and interrelationships of the groups of people defined as Śūdra, Vaiśya, or Kṣatriya in Brahmanical discourse. The social status of Śūdras varies enormously from region to region and period to period. As we pass from Vedic pastoralism through the Mauryan empire, the age of the Guptas, the medieval agrarian kingdoms, Sultanate military feudalism, Mughal bureaucratic-patrimonial empire to the administration of the Raj, the composition of the Śūdra varṇa mutates through complex successions and combinations.

---

of conquered tribes, unfree labor, peasants, Ādivāsīs, waged labor, religious sectaries, artisans, high status landowners, kings, and ruling families. In every period, some Śūdras prosper and attain social and political power.\textsuperscript{16}

Dharmaśāstra had two responses to caste instability and change, deployed simultaneously: reactively to deplore it all as the disorders of the Kaliyuga while quietly and flexibly allowing varṇa to accommodate the realignment of ascribed caste with actual social power. Śūradharma texts were adaptations to the high status of some Śūdras with what might be characterized as a new marketing strategy of ritual inclusion for their cultural capital (e.g., the sacred aura of the Vedas and the ritual charisma of Brahmins). The varṇa ideal of Dharmaśāstra could not be substantially altered—its value and use lay, after all, in its sacred sanction as eternal, immutable truth. Instead, exegetical tweaking, limiting the disqualifications enshrined in Dharmaśāstra, and supplementation with non-Vedic Agamic and customary rites were resorted to.

The Orientalist picture of stasis is not absolutely wrong, but it was the varṇa concept of the “Śūdra” in Dharmaśāstra that remained a constant. Brahmanical culture held itself to be the custodian of transhistorical, transcendentally valid Dharma—stasis was the goal.\textsuperscript{17} Dharmaśāstra was an inward-looking and conservative paradigm, not meant to reflect social realities. For this reason, skepticism has prevailed that Dharmaśāstras ever produced texts that were adapted to contemporary circumstances. Following in the footsteps of Robert Lingat, J. Duncan M. Derrett, and Richard Lariviere, who are more positive that it did so, I have tried to read the SAS as a document shaped by the socio-economic and religious changes of the Sultanate and Mughal periods.\textsuperscript{18}

Clearly, the Bhakti movement was a major factor stimulating accommodation. The fourteenth to sixteenth centuries were the great age of devotional movements inspired by Vallabha, Rāmānanda, Nānak, Chaitanya, Kabīr, and Tulsīdās. Brahmanism absorbed and domesticated the fervor of popular Bhakti revivalism (13th to 17th c.) that

\textsuperscript{16} R. S. Sharma’s Śūdras in Ancient India (1980) is the only in-depth history devoted to Śūdras; but it only goes up to 600 A.D. A full study of the subsequent history of Śūdras remains to be written.

\textsuperscript{17} Sheldon Pollock has some illuminating things to say about uneven temporalities; the alternating views of the stasis, dynamism, and “ahistoricity” of pre-colonial India found respectively in imperial, post-independence, and post-colonial discourses; and the “new” orientation of Sanskrit scholarship in the last centuries before colonialism in his “New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-Century India.” \textit{Indian Economic and Social History Review}, 38, 1, 3-31. Pollock had been doing some of the most stimulating work on the Sanskrit “cosmopolis” during its glorious sunset in these undeservedly neglected pre-colonial centuries.

\textsuperscript{18} Ultimately, what was happening to Śūdras in the subcontinent is connected with the dynamics of the whole world system as the subcontinent was drawn into the turbulence of the emerging capitalist world system. See Immanuel Wallerstein, \textit{The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century} (New York: Academic Press, 1974). My intent is not, however, to reduce ritual to political economy. Caste in the subcontinent is a system of ritually regulated administration of the political economy, unique in its scale and complexity; ritual purity cannot be treated simply as an ideological screen. Religion and economy were not separated to the degree that they had become for the secularizing colonizers.
flowed from the south to the north, cutting across caste divisions. As did Buddhism, Jainism, Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, and Tantrism before it, some streams of Bhakti carried a strong charge of protest and resistance to *caste*. Bhakti, with its populist and egalitarian devotionalism, opened new forms of ritual participation to them, or denied its efficacy altogether, emphasizing the personal relationship between devotee and deity. Many of the *sants* and *bhakta* preachers and poets were from Śūdra backgrounds who rejected or disregarded caste distinctions and garnered wide appeal among socially and spiritually aspiring tradesmen and artisans in town and peasant landowners in the countryside. Brahmins responded with concession and reform, co-opting these new forms of belief and practice, mitigating the old disqualifications, and bringing the disaffected more fully into ritual. Loving devotion to the deity and the humble submission were recuperable as a way of reconciling Śūdras to Brahmanism. Śūdradharm contributed to the emergence of popular Hinduism by spreading a homogeneous and accessible form of ritual practice among the lower castes. The Brahman elite had their own interest in extending the reach and purchase of ritual administration more deeply into the lives of working caste people, an interest that also, not coincidently, met the needs of upwardly mobile Śūdra families and prominent political figures of Śūdra origin.

The story of Śivājī and Gāgabhāṭṭa illustrates the issues around varṇa status in the most spectacular, high profile way. Śivājī was and is a controversial subject. Was he a Śūdra, a Kṣatriya, or a Maratha to whom such Brahmanical distinctions were only politically useful? In his recasting as a Kṣatriya, he is emblematic of something more common—the relative and contestable nature of attributions of caste status. 19 Śivājī had the power and authority to choose his varṇa status. For those with the social leverage, caste status was renegotiable. 20

We have a vivid picture of Gāgabhāṭṭa because of his connection with Śivājī. He invented a Rajput genealogy for him and revived archaic Vedic rituals for his coronation as king in 1674. 21 Gāgabhāṭṭa, alias of Viśveśvara Bhaṭṭa (c. 1620-1700), was the author of a text on Śūdras, the *Śūdradharmoddyota*. He also wrote about Kāyatras, also of uncertain and controversial varṇa status. The Bhaṭṭas were a distinguished family of Brahmin pāṇḍits from Paṭhan in the Deccan, who lived in Benares. They maintained a close liaison with affairs back home in Mahārāṣṭra. At this

---

19 The structural relationality of caste was one of Louis Dumont’s most important discoveries, but he ends up reconfirming the eternal nature of the Hindu as *homo hierarchicus*. See Berreman for a stringent critique of Dumont’s severing of ritual status from social power. Berreman, Gerald. “The Brahmanical View of Caste.” 16-23.

20 The anthropologist M. N. Srinivas has many relevant things to say about caste mobility and the misfit between varṇa and jāti in pre-modern India in this regard. See the essays on mobility, hierarchy, and Sanskritization in The Cohesive Role of Sanskritization, 1989, “Varṇa and Caste” in Caste in Modern India and Other Essays, 1962, and Social Change in Modern India, pp. 10f.

21 Vajpeyi’s excavation of Gāgabhāṭṭa’s Maharashtrian political background is one of the useful achievements of her dissertation. Gāgā wrote the Śīvarājaśasti and Śrīśivarājābhisekapravaya for Śivājī’s coronation.
time, Brahmin councils in Benares acted as a kind of supreme court, a “super-regionally recognized center of juridical authority,” where cases of caste dispute from all around India were referred on appeal. The Bhaṭṭa family appear to have had a special interest in such matters perhaps only because we know so much more comparatively about them. Kamalākara, Gāgābhaṭṭa’s uncle, had also written about Śūdras in his Śūdrakamalākara (c.1610-1640), which became the most well-known and authoritative work on the subject.

The Śeṣas were another family of esteemed śāstrīs and jurists involved in caste disputes in Benares. Like the Bhaṭṭas, the Śeṣas were Deccanis that had settled and achieved eminence as jurists and scholars in Benares. Both families had an active interest in śūdradharma, which leads Vajpeyi to propose that Benares was the center for a new and unprecedented engagement with śūdradharma, and that it represented, if not a pronounced movement of thought, a significant new tendency in the intellectual life of Kāśi.

It seems possible, then, to suggest that the existence of a scholarly milieu in Banaras, climaxing in the 17th century, where the conversation between Sanskrit intellectuals on śūdradharma was on going, and writers producing new nibandhas on this subject worked within a rich context rather than in isolation. Vajpeyi connects shastric production in Benares directly to political and social discords in Mahārāṣṭra. Caste disputes presented for adjudication to the jurists of Benares and the dharmic controversies provoked by them made śūdradharma a live intellectual topic at this time. The new interest in the dharma of Śūdras was not merely a scholastic exercise, but a reaction to what was happening outside their shady courtyards and gardens. More broadly, the interest in Śūdras was part of a larger crisis of varṇa, prompting a reassessment by Brahmins not only of the social/ritual status of Śūdras, but the status and livelihoods of Brahmins and the role and power of Kṣatriyas.

I find this all attractive, but difficult to demonstrate given the highly traditionalist character of Dharmaśāstra. Without more a detailed biography than we have for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, one cannot tie the contents of the SAS to anything outside it in any but the most general way. It does not have the appearance of responding to pressing current needs

---

22 Quoted in Vajpeyi, 23.
24 Vajpeyi 22-23.
26 Now the best examination of Brahmins at this time is Rosalind O’Hanlon and Christopher Minkowski, “What makes people whom they are? Pandit networks and the problem of livelihoods in early modern Western India,” Indian Economic and Social History Review 45 (2008): 381-416.
as do Gāgābhaṭṭa’s works on Śivājī’s kingship, but seems to be the culmination of a longer trend in Dharmaśāstra of enlarging the ritual rights of Śūdras.

Until recently, late Sanskrit was regarded as a period of decline and arid scholasticism, like the cultural dead ends of Alexandrianism or Byzantinism. Now, it is seen as a golden age of learning and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa as one of its most brilliant figures. This, of course, may have something to do with academics staking out new fields. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was famous and influential as a grammarian and wrote poetical works on the life of Lord Kṛṣṇa at the high tide of Bhakti. As a councilor and Dharmaśāstrī (if we accept his authorship of the SAS), he was engaged in the controversies of the day. The most celebrated member of a distinguished family of pañḍits, his versatility is representative of an age when Sanskrit remained the language of high culture and scholarship much as Latin did in Europe right up to the seventeenth century.
2

Śūradharma Texts

By trawling through Kane (1974: 1122-23) and Aufrech’t’s Catalogus Catalogorum (1891: I.659-60; 1896: II. 157, 164; III. 137), Ananya Vajpeyi (2004: 21), descriptive catalogues for collections in Baroda, Mysore, Vāraṇasī, and Dharbhanga and notices of Sanskrit manuscripts I have netted the names of 49 texts dealing with śūradharma in the three centuries from 1360-1660. A thorough search would no doubt turn up quite a few more. About 30 of these are listed in Kane. 1 Often Śūdra texts are hidden in larger compendia or encyclopedias. Most begin with the word “Śūdra,” but one can assume a good number do not flag their subject matter in the title, as the Smrtikaumudi and Ācāracandrika do not. So, there are probably many more that will escape detection until their contents are inspected. But I think my list must comprise the most important This may be a “spate of books,” indicating a new interest in the subject of śūradharma, but is still but a tiny fraction of the enormous mass of Dharmaśāstra manuscripts.

1. Āśūdrācāraśiromani of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa
2. Śūdrakamalakara of Kamaḷakarabhaṭṭa
3. Śūradharmoddhota of Gāgaḥaṭṭa
4. Śūdrakṛtyavikaranaṭottva of Raghunandana
5. Śūdrācāracintāmaṇi of Vācaspatimisira
6. Ācāracandrika
7. Śūdrāppadhatti or Śūdradharapadhatti
8. Śūdrāṭopatti
9. Śūdrakarmavṛtti
10. Śūdrācārasamgraha or Saccūdrāhnika
11. Śūdraśrṇṭi
12. Śūdrāṅgācāra
13. Śūdrāṅgācārasāra of Yādavendra Śarman
14. Śūdrakṛtya of Lālakahādur
15. Śūdraśānti
16. Smṛtikaumudi of Viśveśvarabhaṭṭa
17. Śūdrapadhatti of Apiṭa
18. Śūdrapadhatti of Gopāla
19. Śūdrakuladīpikā of Rāmānandaśarman
20. Śūdrasamṛaka
21. Śūdrācārasaṅgraha of Navarasaundaryabhāṭṭa
22. Śūdrācāraśiromani of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa
23. Śūdrakamalakara of Kamaḷakarabhaṭṭa
24. Śūradharmoddhota of Gāgaḥaṭṭa
25. Śūdrakṛtyavikaranaṭottva of Raghunandana
26. Śūdrācāracintāmaṇi of Vācaspatimisira
27. Ācāracandrika
28. Śūradharanirnāṇya
29. Śūdrāṅhikānaka
30. Śūdrasaurśkraptapratimāsamśedha
31. Śūdratapaṇa
32. Śūdratorakriyāprayoga
33. Śūdravāṣṭusānti
34. Śūdrāṇām ekādaśāhprayoga
35. Śūdrasamskaraniṁśaya
36. Śūdraśrāddhapadhatti
37. Śūdrasthāṅkalakaprayoga or Agnimukha
38. Śūdraśrāddhapravaya
39. Śūdrapadhatti of Śaṅkaraśaṅkara
40. Śūdrāsāṭkarmacandrika
41. Śūdrasamskaradīpikā of Gopālabhaṭṭa
42. Śūdraśānti
43. Śūdraśaṅkara
44. Śūdrāṇām ekoddiṣṭāvidha
45. Śūdraviveka of Rāmaśaṅkara
46. Śūdrapadhatti of Kṛṣṇarāja
47. Saccūdrasatkarmaniraṇa
48. Śūdrācārapadhatti of Rāmadattaḥakkura

1 Kane takes śūroṭpatti and śūdrakarmavṛtti as names of texts from which Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is quoting. Śūdroṭpatti on page 2 of the SAS is better understood as part of the phrase, “First, on the origin of the Śūdras śrutī states,” which introduces his discussion of the genesis of the Śūdra varṇa by quoting from the “Puruṣa Sukta,” (RV 10.90). The same, I suspect, is the case for a reference to a supposed Śūdrakarmavṛtti.
22. Śūdrāhnīkācāra of Śrīgarbha
23. Śūdrapaṇīcāsaṁśāvakāvidhi of Kaśyapa
24. Śūdrācāra
25. Śūdrasatkarmacandrikā
26. Śūdrapaṇīcāsaṁśākrapravaya
27. Śūdravivāhapadhatti of Śivarāma Rāvala

The authors, provenance, patrons, or contents of most of these texts are unknown, as is how many of them are still extant and available a hundred years after they were catalogued by Theodor Aufrecht and others. Of the existing manuscripts, only three have been edited and printed: Raghunandana’s Śūdrakṛtya-vicāraṇatattva, Krṣṇa Ṣeṣa’s Śūdrācāraśīromaṇi, and Kamalākara’s Śūdrakamalākara. The ultimate project would be to collect all the manuscripts, edit, and translate them, and do a comparative study of the Śūdra texts.

Prior to the fourteenth century, Śūdras were only dealt with incidentally, and mostly unsympathetically, in Dharmasūtras and śāstras prescribing the duties of the four varṇas. From the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries, we see the production of many nibandhas devoted solely to them. But as Sharma pointed out, this was the cresting of a wave that had been moving forward since the Gupta era 300-600 CE.

The process by which the religious rights of the Śūdras were enlarged and they were brought firmly within the ambit of the brāhmanical way of life seems to have reached its culmination in late medieval time. Between the fourteenth and the seventeenth century, we have a spate of books dealing with the contents and the manner of the rituals to be performed by the Śūdras.2

The freshet of scholarly treatises on Śūdras was partly an effect of the greater production of manuscripts in the late medieval, early modern period and the larger volume of book trade. Nevertheless, the subject had clearly become of particular concern to elite opinion because of the shifting social conditions of caste. The confluence of these two circumstances accounts for the large number of texts on Śūdras from this era.

A Descriptive Catalogue of Śūdra Texts and MSS

A brief review of some of the Śūdra texts in the compilation, omitting 28-49 as merely titles about which nothing further is known.


2 Sharma, 305.
2. Śūdrakamalākara (SK) of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa. See appendix for a comparison with the SAS. Also called Śūrdra-
harmatattva or Śūrdharmastattvaprakāśa, the SK is the most widely known and cited treatise on the duties and reli-
gious observances of Śūdras. It is the only śūrdharmā text translated, apart from my own translation into English of
the SAS, in this case into Marathi by Javaji Dadaji, ed. Bombay: Nirmayasagara Press, 1928. The grandson of
Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, brother of Dinakara, and uncle of Gāgābhaṭṭa, Kamalākara was one of the most eminent and pro-
lific members of the famous Bhaṭṭa family. Hailing from Paṭhan, they were one of the most prominent of the Ma-
harashtrian scholarly families, who, like the Śeṣas, presided over the intellectual life of Kāśi for generations. With
vast erudition Kamalākara produced works in almost every field of śāstra—Nyāya, Vāyākaraṇa, Mimāṁsā, Ve-
dānta—and on every topic of Dharmaśāstra; 22 works in all, 12 on Dharmaśāstra he tells us. Kane dates Ka-
malākara’s floriūt to 1610-1640 C.E.3
The Śūdrakamalākara seems to have been one of the ten books comprising a massive digest called the Dhar-
matattva on the topics of vratā, dāna, karmaṇa, śānti, pūrta, ācāra, vyavahāra, prayāścitta, śūrdharmā, and
śūrdharmā. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish Kamalākara’s works from those of his father Nārāyaṇa and his cousin
Nilakaṇṭha since shared material and collaborative production was common in a kind of family enterprise. Some-
thing similar seems to be the case with Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and his father Nṛśimha’s Govindārṇava.
The voluminous Nirmayasindhu, an early work, is Kamalākara’s best know and was completed in 1612 C.E. In
three paricchedas are discussed the proper time for various religious observances, vrata, sam-skrāpas, sapīṇḍa,
consecration of images, auspicious times (muhūrtas) for sowing etc., buying cattle and horses etc., śrāddha, āśauna,
rūtes for the dead, rūtes for satī (Kamalākara’s own mother was a satī), and saṁnyāsa.

3. Śūrdharmamoddyota of Viśveśvarabhaṭṭa, aka Gāgābhaṭṭa.

Manuscript deposited at the British Library. Mss no. 1652/2800 according to Eggeling, ed. Catalogue of
dated by Kane to c. 1620-1685 and by Vajpeyi to 1640-1700 C.E., and is the son of Dinakarabhaṭṭa, whose
digest, the Dinakaroddhyota, includes the Śūrdharmamoddyota and the Kāyasthadharmadipa (printed text at BORI
in Rājavādyānēś Gāgābhaṭṭi, ptd. K. T. Gupte, Poona, 1919, App. pp. 1-23). He also wrote a Kāyastha-paddhati,
Bombay, 1871-2. Gāgābhaṭṭa is perhaps best known for the works he composed for Śivāji’s abhiṣeka, the Śivarā-
japraśasti, and Śrīśivarājābhiṣekapravaya.

4. Śūrdrakṛtyavicāraṇatattva (SKVT) of Raghunandana Bhaṭṭacārya. Bengal. Dated by Kane to 1490-1570 CE and
roughly contemporary to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. SKVT is in vol. II of the Smṛitattva, ed. by Jivananda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta:
Narayana Yantra, 1895, pp. 633-36. Vide Kane 1974, vol. I, sec. 102. The second part is the Śūrdhānikā. Raghunan-
dana was the last great writer of the Bengali School of Dharmaśāstra and was honored with the name simply of
Śmūrta. The SKVT is included, as is often the case, as part of a larger digest, here as one of the 28 tattvas or sec-
tions of the encyclopedic Smṛitattva.
Raghunandana was a leading exponent of the view that in the Kaliyuga Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas had disappeared and
there were only two vartas, Brähmaṇa and Śūdra.4 This view endorsed his promotion of the worthy śūrdratva of
the new rising professional classes of physicians, lawyers, accountants, scribes, and civil servants in Bengal at this time,
viz., the Ambaḍhas, Vaidyas, and Kāyasthas who now with the Brahmins were the elite of Bengali society. In his
Śuddhitattva, Raghunandana classifies the Ambaḍhas and Kāyasthas as “good” Śūdras.5
The idea that there were only two vartas was close to the actuality, for Kṣatriyas had a diminished part in the
socio-historical development of eastern India after the Pāla and Sena eras and Muslim conquest. In the 16th
century, Hindu feudatories in Bengal called themselves Kāyasthas instead of Kṣatriyas. A two-caste system became the real-
ity not only in Bengal, but in Orissa, Assam, and Tamil Nadu as well. In many regions of India, the four-varṇa map-
ning was always sociologically inaccurate.
As a Vandyagṛhaṭṭa Brāhmaṇa jurist and intellectual, Raghunandana argued that Śūdras now filled the vacant
place of the Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas and merited a caste status commensurate with their high position in Bengali soci-
ety. In the shifting, up-and-down fortunes of caste, some high castes had sunk in social status. Kāyasthas may once

3 This précis draws mostly on Kane 1930, sec. 106, 432-437.
4 The passage from the Śuddhitattva stating this view is quoted in Origin and Growth of Caste in India, 83.
5 Dutt, Origin and Growth, 99-100.
have been degraded Brahmins, and sat-Śūdra Baṇīks, once Vaiśyas. Now upwardly mobile Śūdra Kāyathas, Ab-
baṣṭhas, and Vaidyas wanted an improved caste profile to match their social success. Rising Śūdra classes contested
their stigma and looked to Dharmaśāstrīs to rehabilitate them, improve the image of the Śūdra, and validate their
social dominance. This is a good example of the “caste struggle” always on going, but perhaps with extra intensity
in this period. Raghunananda, like Krṣṇa Śeṣa, was responding to social and political pressures to remove or lessen
the disqualifications and amend the rites/rights of Śūdras enshrined in Dharmaśāstra.

5. Śūdraacāracintāmaṇī of Vācaspati Miśra. Voluminous writer of nibandhas and most eminent jurist of the Mithilā
School (fl. 1450-1480 CE). He wrote many cintāmaṇi- and nirṇaya-suffixed texts on various topics of smṛti ritual
and legal procedure. The Śūdraacāracintāmaṇī is a digest of the religious duties of Śūdras and became a standard
work. In the colophon, he is described as the legal adviser of Mahārājādhiraja Harinārāyaṇa of the Kāmeśvara kings
of Mithilā. He also wrote an Ācāracintāmaṇī on the daily rites of Vājasaneyins, which are recommended for Śūdras
in other smṛtis. CC ms. L 2001. 8

of Śūdras” by Śrīnātha Acāryacādamani, author of the oldest commentary on Jīmūtavahana’s Dāyabhāga and
teacher of Raghunananda. Dated to c. 1475-1525.8

7. Śrīdharapaddhati. Alternatively entitled Śūdrippaddhati. A manual of ritual duties for Śūdra women by
Krṣṇaṭanaya Gopāla “Udāsa”; the patron is one Rāmadāsavijaya, the scribe Haridatta, the location Deuliyāgrāma,
and the date 1442 CE.9 CC ms. Rgb. 254 (fr.). This text gives Śūdras ten sanśkāras.

8. Śudrotpatti. CC ms. B. 3, 130. The mention in SAS 2 is probably not a text as Kane takes it to be, but simply the
phrase, “origin of the Śūdras.”

9. Śudrakarmaveṭti. Also probably not a text but a phrase in SAS 33 meaning “Śūdra duties and conduct.”

10. Śūdrācārasamgraha or Sacchūḍrācāra of Navarasasaundaryandra Bhaṭṭa. Catalogus Catalogorum, p. 650. Burnell
133a.


12. Śūdrāṅnikācāra of Śrīgarha, son of Sudhana Miśra. Palm leaf ms. dated śake 1462 (1540 CE). In the preface
to Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts XI, p. 14. Haraparasād Śaṭri makes the interesting remark that this text “is also
the remnant of another decayed school of Smṛti,” and is based on a work on the same subject by Keśava Miśra.
NSM 3, pp. 241, No. 2151.

13. Śūdrāṅnikācārasūra of Yādavendra Šarman, composed for Raghudeva, prince of Gauḍa, son of Vāsudeva.
NSM 2, 1, pp. 373-5 No. 371. Fol. 67, line six Benj. M. M. Haraparasād Śaṭri, Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts,


15. Śūdraśānti. On the manner in which a Šūdra should perform rites such as japa, homa, and ārīcana. MS. no. 3449
in A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras,
by M. Rāṅgācārya and Rao Bahadur, Vol. VII. Dharmaśāstra (Madras, 1909), p. 2588. The Śūdraśānti is catalogued

6 Kane 1930: I, section 98, 399-405; L. Rocher,
7 For more on Śrīnātha see L. Rocher for his edition and translation of the Vyavahāracintāmaṇi: A Digest of Hindu Legal Proce-
dure, Gentse Orientalistische Bijdragen (Gent, 1956).
8 See L. Rocher, Jīmūtavahana’s Dāyabhāga: The Hindu Law of Inheritance in Bengal (OUP, 2002), 15.
9 Vajpeyi, 21, n. 4. An example of a śūradharma text the contents of which may not be evident from the title since it does begin
with “Śūdra.”
together with the Śūdravastuśānti and Śūdrapeṇcasamskāra by the Catalogus Catalogorum as Madras 97, Government Oriental Office Library.

16. Smṛtikaumudi. Manuscript deposited at the British Library. MS. no. 1649/2515 in Eggeling ed. Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office: vol. I. Part III (1891), p. 524. There are several texts by this name. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is presumably quoting the Smṛtikaumudi composed by Viśveśvarabhaṭṭa for King Mandanapāla. This text is also referred to as the Śuḍradharmaḥbodhiṇī and the Śuḍrdharmotpaladhyotinī. Viśveśvarabhaṭṭa’s authorship of a commentary on the Mitākṣarā called Subhodini may have suggested the first title. Kane dates the literary activity of Mandanapāla and Viśveśvarabhaṭṭa to 1360-1390 CE.10 Madanapāla of the Taka family ruled Kath on the Jumna north of Delhi and was said to have emulated the fame of Bhoja as a great patron of Sanskrit learning. Viśveśvara seems to have been from the Dravida south and moved to northern India to become one of the leading authorities of the Benares School of Law. Benares śāstrins initiated the new study of Śūdras and it remained a special interest of that school.

After the introductory verses of the Smṛtikaumudi dedicated to Madanapāla, Viśveśvara says that since previous authors have discussed the dharmas of the three twice-born varṇas at length, but have not given the topic of Śūdras similar attention, he, therefore, would elucidate the dharma of the last varṇa. This suggests another reason for the appearance of Śūdra texts: the opening up of a new field of endeavor for ambitious Dharmāśāstrins to make a name in, a new vogue of intellectual fashion within the closed world of Dharmāśāstra.

Viśveśvara says that the Smṛtikaumudi is the “little sister” of his larger digest the Madanapāripāja. The work is divided into four kalolīsas and subdivided into kirāṇas (rays). The topics discussed are many of those dealt with in the SAS:

I. The two kinds of Śūdras: the kevalaśūdra or pure Śūdra and the mixed Śūdra, i.e. born by a Śūdra woman to a man of a higher caste. The more important distinction for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is between pious and dutiful sat Śūdras and asat Śūdras, rather than purity of caste.

II. The Śūdra’s eligibility for various rites and activities such as the study of the Vedas and Smṛtis; performance of the samāskāras (garbhādāna, nāmakaraṇa, etc.); twilight prayers (sandhyāvandana); keeping sacred fires; the Śūdras capacity for attaining knowledge of Brahman.

III. The different forms and rites of marriage, (kanyādāna, etc.); prohibited degrees of relationship (śāpiṇḍya); normal and emergency dharma of Śūdras, impurity (āśauca) for Śūdras; the śrāddhas for Śūdras; letting a bull loose in honor of the dead (vryotsarga).

IV. Śūdras’ daily observances: śauca, dantadhāvana, snāṇa, brahmayajña, tarpaṇa, vaiśvadeva, daily śrāddha, and bhojana.

17. Śūdrapaddhati of Apipāla. Palm-leaf codex in Bengali script on the duties of Śūdras. MS. copied in śake 1442, 1520 C.E. in Gauḍaḍeśa. Catalogus Catalogorum p. 659. MS. no. 1980 in MR. Haraparasād Śāstri, Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts, new series, p. 302. Apipāla states that he based his text on an earlier work by Somamā, showing how texts standardizing the religious duties of Śūdras were not new.

18. Śūdrapaddhati of Gopāla. A large work with a section called samskāradipikā giving the paṇcamaḥāyajña and ten samskāras to Śūdras: garbhādāna, pumsavāna, anavalobhāna, sīmantoṇnaya, jājakarma, nāmakaraṇa, nīskramaṇa, annaprāśana, cūḍākarma, and vivāha. Post 1640 CE.


22. Śūdrāhnikācāra of Śrīgarbha. Dated śake 1462, 1540-41 CE.

10 Kane, I, sec. 93, pp. 381-89.
23. Śūdrapañcasainśkāravidhi of Kaśyapa. CC p. 659, Oppert II, 4191.


25. Śūdrasatkarmacandrikā of Rāmānuja Yogī. On the ten saṅskāras conferred on sat-Śūdras who have become Śrī Vaiṣṇavas. MS. no. 3816 in A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, vol. VII. Dharmaśāstra...

26. Śūdrapañcasainśkāraprayoga. This is probably not a dharmaśāstra dealing with the pañcamahāyajñas or other five Vedic rites of passage, but a description of the dikṣā of a Śūdra into Śrī Vaiṣṇavism with the five saṅskāras of devotion to Hari: tapa, pundra, nama, mantra, and yaga. Mss. nos. 3813, 3814, and 3815 in A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, vol. VII. Dharmaśāstra.

27. Śūdravivāhapaddhati of Śivarāma Rāvala. MS. 1409 in Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Government Manuscripts Library, deposited at BORI, serial no. 36, Vol. VII, pt. 3, compiled by Har Datta Sharma (Pune: BORI, 1997). This is a handbook of marriage rites for Śūdras, which begins:

Reverence to Śrī Gaṇapati. Now a marriage manual. First of all betrothal. It is said in the bhāṣya of Harihara that when a Śūdra man marries a Śūdra woman, only the rite should be performed without Vedic mantras.

and ends:

He shall give a large donation to the Brāhmaṇas of various gotras for the performance of this rite, thereby pleasing the divinity of the rite. Thus is concluded the rule for this rite. A handbook for Śūdras for self-recitation in the scripture of the Lord.
The Author and Date of the SAS

I begin with the ritual lament of everyone who writes about even the most prominent figures in Indian cultural and intellectual history—the lack of information. That said, the case is somewhat better for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, since we have relatively quite a bit of information about him and the Śeṣa family from his own works, references to him in the works of descendants, students, and critics, and assorted documents—Brahmin council nirṇayapatras, lineage lists, and property titles. For most Indian writers, we have little or nothing at all. We may be better informed about him partly due to the larger volume of scholarly manuscript output in this period.1

Dating Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa

Not a few attempts have been made to piece together the evidence for the genealogy and date of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. Dates range from the 12th to the 18th centuries. Colebrooke made his father, Nṛsiṁha, a contemporary of Lakṣmīdhara, 2 while M. Krishnamachariar puts Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in the first half the 18th century.3 Both are clearly too far out. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṁsaka dates him to 1418.4 Pingree’s dating of his father Nṛsiṁha, author of the Govindārṇava, to fl. 1409 would also put Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in the 15th century.5 Kane dates him to c. 1500 and to 1520-1590.6 The editors of the published Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies initially suggested a floruit of 1510, later revising it on-line to 1540.7

---

1 Sheldon Pollock, “The Death of Sanskrit,” Comparative Studies in History and Society, 43 (2) April, 2001: 392-426. The “spate of books” on śādārtha may simply be the result, in part at least, of the more voluminous textual output in this period.
6 P.V. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra (1930) vol. 1, 641 and 686-87, respectively. Vajpeyi accepts CE 1520-1590, Politics of Complicity, 15.
Other pieces of evidence, however, move Krṣṇa Śeṣa up toward the second half of the 16th century. His brother, Śeṣa Cintāmaṇi, completed the Parimala in 1553.⁸ Krṣṇa Śeṣa is documented as active in the cultural life of Vārāṇasī in 1583.⁹ Krṣṇa Śeṣa also wrote the Kaṁsavadha for Govardhanadhārī, the son of Ṭoḍaramalla, Akbar’s minister of finance. Ṭoḍaramalla died in 1586.¹⁰ The Kaṁsavadha, consequently, was written most likely sometime in the second half of the 16th century.

Because of his connections with persons in the 17th century, some have Krṣṇa Śeṣa living into the early 1600’s.¹¹ This is not out of the realm of possibility considering that Krṣṇa Śeṣa’s son, Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, composed the Akhaṇḍamañjarī in 1611,¹² and a student of his named Jayantabhaṭṭa wrote the Tattvacandra, an abbreviation of the Prakriyakaumudi, in 1631.¹³

The vivid part Krṣṇa Śeṣa is reported to play in the saga of Śivājī and Gāgābhāṭṭa also suggests a recently alive and influential personality. Krṣṇa Śeṣa or the elder of his two sons, Vīrēśvara, was the guru of several well-known figures who flourished in the next century: Jagannātha Paṇḍita (1605-1666) and Annapaṇḍita (a. o. of the Tarkasaṅgraha, c. 1623).¹⁴ Krṣṇa Śeṣa’s other son, Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa was writing in the period 1600-1611.¹⁵

Proposed dates, as you can see, are all over the place. Some evidence puts him toward the beginning of the century, some toward the end. Recent histories of Sanskrit literature and encyclopedias now regularly assign Krṣṇa Śeṣa to the 16th century.¹⁶ As it turns out, a broad floruit of the 16th century does seem to be more or less correct and as

---

¹⁰ Kane, HD, I, 423.
¹³ Namely by Shripad Krishna Belvalkar, Systems of Sanskrit Grammar (Delhi: Bharatiya Vidy Prakashan, 1976), 42. Johannes Bronkhorst says the date is uncertain in “Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita on Sphoṭa,” Journal of Indian Philosophy 33 (1) 3-41, 19n64.
¹⁴ Ranganathaswami Aryavaraguru thinks that Vīrēśvara was also Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita’s guru.
¹⁵ Dr. Parshuram Paranjape, personal communication.
exact a date as we are going to get, given the scrappy nature of the evidence. After much sifting and resifting of the evidence, I have dug up a few small pieces of new evidence confirming a broadly 16th century date.

A large part of the problem in dating Krṣṇa Śeṣa has been the puzzle of the genealogical connection between him and an earlier line of Śeṣas dated to the late 14th and early 15th centuries. In his Prasāda, a commentary on the Prakriyākaumudī of his grandfather Rāmacandra, Viṭṭhala gives the genealogy of his family, who acquired the title, Śeṣa.17

Viṭṭhala is the son of the second Nṛsiṁha. He extols in the customary gleaming terms his forebears as supereminent in all branches of learning, as veritable incarnations of Śeṣa and Śambhu. K. P. Trivedi dates Rāmacandra to the latter half of the 14th century.18 The puzzle is that Krṣṇa Śeṣa and his father do not seem to fit into this family tree.

There are two Rāmacandras, three Nṛsiṁhas, and two Krṣṇas in Trivedi’s stemma. We know next to nothing about them. Could one of the Krṣṇas be our Krṣṇa Śeṣa? Possibly, but improbable for a number of reasons. In this early line of Śeṣas, Viṭṭhala is the son of the author of the Prakriyākaumudī, not Krṣṇa. They are from Āndhra, not

17 Much of what follows is indebted to K. P. Trivedi’s introduction to his edition of The Prakriyākaumudī of Rāmacandra, with the Prasāda of Viṭṭhala, Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series LXXVII, 2 vols. (Bombay, 1925), I: xxxiii-lvi. Showing how confounding Hindu genealogies are is another in R. Arvāvaraguru 253 provided by a Vireśvara, supposedly a descendant of the author of the Prakriyākaumudī: Rāmacandra, Nṛsiṁha, Nārāyaṇa, Chakrapāṇi, Vireśvara, Śambhu, Gopāla, and Vireśvara himself. This stemma varies considerably from Viṭṭhala’s, as do the expanded family trees in Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṁsaka 407-8.
18 Trivedi, Introduction, xlv.
Mahārāṣṭra, as the later Śeṣas are.\textsuperscript{19} Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa criticizes Viṭṭhala in his Prasāda referring to him as prāc, i.e., as a predecessor.\textsuperscript{20} Therefore, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa the “Prakāśakṛt” is later than Viṭṭhala. He cannot be Viṭṭhala’s great grandfather Kṛṣṇācārya, also an accomplished and famous Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa in the early to mid 14\textsuperscript{th} century, accepting Trivedi’s chronology.

In the Govindaṇava, Nṛsinha traces his ancestry back to Viṣṇu.\textsuperscript{21} According to V.A. Kanole, Viṣṇu migrated to Vārāṇasī around 1400.\textsuperscript{22} The rest of the family tree is given in the Dharmāṇubandhiśālokacaturdaśī.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
    \node {Viṣṇu} at (0,0) [coordinate] (vi)
    \node at (0,-1) (ram) {Rāmacandra}
    \node at (-1,-2) (nrs) {Nṛsinha}
    \node at (1,-2) (krn) {Kṛṣṇa}
    \node at (2,-3) (cint) {Cintāmaṇi}
    \node at (-2,-3) {Śeṣa Family II}
    \node at (-1,-4) (vira) {Vireśvara}
    \node at (0,-4) (nar) {Nārāyaṇa}
    \node at (1,-4) {Viṣṇu}
    \node at (-1,-5) (pur) {Puruṣottama}
    \node at (0,-5) (cakr) {Cakrapāṇi}
    \node at (1,-5) {Gopinātha}
    \node at (0,-6) {Rāma}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

The two family trees clearly do not match. Śeṣa Family II seems to be is a different branch or later generation of the Śeṣas or a different line of altogether. They are some of Kanole’s Kāśī Śeṣa paṇḍits.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{20} Trivedi, xlvi.
\textsuperscript{21} R. Aryavaraguru, 247-248.
\textsuperscript{23} Dharmāṇubandhiśālokacaturdaśī with a commentary, ed. Gopī Nātha Kavirāja, Princess of Wales Sarasavti Bhavana Texts 22 (Benares, 1927), 1.
\textsuperscript{24} Kanole, 60-63.
The Date of his Father, Nṛsiṁha

The attribution of the SAS to the famous Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in the 16th century hinges on the date for his father Nṛsiṁha, the author of the Govindārṇava. David Pingree and Kane appear to identify him with Nṛsiṁha, the son of Rāmacandra, author of the Prakriyākaumudī and Kālaniṅayadīpikā. The problem is that, with the dates given for them, fl. 1409 or CE 1400-1450 for Nṛsiṁha and fl. 1380-1400 for Rāmacandra, these men seem much too early to be Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s father and grandfather. If Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is alive in the second half of the next century, a gap of 70 to 110 years opens between him and his putative forbears.

I considered several stopgaps. Nṛsiṁha and his son may have been very long-lived men, as frugally and purely living vegetarian Brahmins often are, and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa had a long life and illustrious career spanning the entire century, or even extending a few years back into the 15th century. This was suggested to me by my Sanskrit pāṇḍit Manisha Phanasalkar and was discussed at length as a possibility. It is a stretch time-wise. A second suggestion was that if we take Kane’s latest date of 1450 for the composition of the Govindārṇava, assume Nṛsiṁha wrote it when he was a very young man, and push back the birth date of a very long lived Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa a decade or two, it all can be made to fit.

Such stopgaps, however, became moot, upon discovering that Kane and Pingree’s early identification is open to question and the Nṛsiṁha dated to fl. 1409 or 1400-1450 may be in another, earlier line and did not write the Govindārṇava. Nṛsiṁha, son of Rāmacandra, author of the Prakriyākaumudī, and Nṛsiṁha, the father of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and author of the Govindārṇava are probably two entirely different people. I call them Nṛsiṁha I and Nṛsiṁha II for clarity.

There are seven reasons for rejecting Nṛsiṁha I’s authorship of the Govindārṇava.

I. These early Śeṣas, according to P.K. Trivedi, were from Āndhra country, the later Śeṣas from Mahārāṣṭra, possibly some place on the Godāvarī River. The Nāndeṭ lineage lists firmly tie the Śeṣa family to southeast Mahārāṣṭra.

---

25 Pingree, Census A 4, 162, A 5, 464; Kane, I, 543; Trivedi, xliv.
26 Yudhiṣṭhir Mīmāṃsaka also suggested that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was cirajīvī, dating him to the fifteenth century, but living up to the time of Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita, III, 492.
27 Trivedi, xxxviii, xlvi; vide note 18 above. Kaviraj, describes the Śeṣa vaṃśa as Tailaṅga Brahmins from Andhra who became interconnected with the Maharashtrian Brahmins, Kāśi ki Sārasvata Sādhana 14n1.
28 Kanole, 56-73.
II. Parshuram Paranjape believes that the gotra of the earlier and later Śeṣas were completely different. The gotra of Rāmacandra I- Nṛsinha was Kauḍinya and the gotra of Rāmacandra II- Nṛsinha II-Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was Vṛddha Viṣṇu. This is a weak piece of evidence, for reasons discussed later. The gotra of the Nanddev Śeṣas was Pāraṣāra.

III. No source ascribes the Govindārvavā to Nṛsinha I, not even his son Viṭṭhala in his Prasāda does so. Pingree simply assumes this.

IV. In the Govindārvavā, Nṛsinha eulogizes his father Rāmacandra as his guru in conventionally superlative language without mentioning any of the works for which he was famous: the Prakriyākaumudi and the Kālanirṇayadipikā.

V. Some manuscripts of the Kālanirṇayavivarāṇa have a verse giving the date of composition as śake 1331 (1409). Pingree unwarrantably assigns this date to the Govindārvavā as well. Kane gives no primary source for his statement that it was compiled in 1400-1450. In short, there is no solid reason for dating the Govindārvavā to 1409, or any time in the 15th century for that matter.

VI. The dates for Rāmacandra I and Nṛsinha I seem to be firmly pinned down. Datable manuscripts supply a terminus ante quem: Kaviraj says that Nṛsinha I made a copy (pratilipi) of his father’s Prakriyākaumudi in CE 1423. D. R. Bhandarkar and K. P. Trivedi date another manuscript to CE 1437. Based on this, Trivedi puts Rāmacandra I in the latter half of the 14th century. His other arguments for a late 14th century date are quite convincing. A Nṛsinha whose son is living in the latter 16th century is unlikely chronologically to be the son of a Rāmacandra fl. 1380-1400.

Moreover, another manuscript of the Prakriyākaumudi was copied in 1527 CE by Rāmacandra’s great grandson (“śrīrāmacandraścaryasatasutasutenālekhi”). He does not mention the name of his celebrated father, an argumentum ex silentio that his father was not Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, nor is he one of his two sons, Śeṣa Vireśvara or Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa.

VII. Both Trivedi and Kaviraj in their biographies of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa treat the early and later Śeṣas as separate lines. Trivedi regards Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa as an entirely unrelated person from a different region.

29 For the Kauḍinya gotra see Viṭṭhala, Prasāda, in The Prakriyākaumudi of Rāmacandra, ed. by P.K. Trivedi, Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No. LXXVII, 2 vols. (Bombay, 1925), I: 1. v. 3. See Veda-Laksana, 388-89 for the textual evidence that Mr. Paranjape thinks proves Vṛddha Viṣṇu is the gotra of the Śeṣa family. For fuller discussion, see my section on “The Gotra of Parshuram Paranjape.”

30 Kanole, 57.

31 Pingree, Census A 3, 202: śake śaśāṅkānilaviśvasaṃmite virodhivārṣe sitapakṣake ca/ somenabhṣayāya nṛsinha nāma bhīḥ sadṛpikāvivṛṭiḥ samāptā/

32 See Trivedi xliv-xlv.
Krishṇa himself shows in the concluding verses of his commentary that he was the son of Narasimha who was born in the pure family of Śesha. He agrees with the editor of the *Kamsavadha* that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is a Maharashtrian and rejects R. G. Bhandarkar’s identification of him with the nephew of Rāmacandra I.

Moreover, Krishna, the author of the *Kamsavadha* and the *Prakāśa* belonged to the Mahārāṣṭra; while Krishṇa, the nephew of Rāmacandra, to the Āndradeśa.

Kaviraj treats them without explanation as completely unrelated people. In the chapters on the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, he describes Rāmacandra and his son Nṛsiṁha as Tailaṅga Brāhmaṇas from Āndradeśa. In the section on the 16th century he speaks of Nṛsiṁha, the author of the *Govindārṇava*, and his son Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa as Maharashtrian pañḍits with no connection whatever with their predecessors. Later on he appears to distinguish Śeṣa Rāmacandra, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s grandfather, from Rāmacandra, the author of the *Prakriyākaumudi*.

These seven considerations makes it unnecessary, indeed difficult, to link the second set of Śeṣas to the first. The time gap is irrelevant. One is free to put Nṛsiṁha, the father of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and the author of the *Govindārṇava*, in the second half of the 15th century or, for that matter, in the 16th century as the NCC does.

In conclusion, the two sets of Śeṣas seem to be earlier and later family lines bearing the name Śeṣa. Nonetheless, there remains the very real possibility, as always when dealing with Indian chronologies, that the early dates for the first Rāmacandra and Nṛsiṁha are simply wrong. Erroneous conclusions are often drawn from misdating and misreading of manuscripts combined with the misinformation recycled in secondary sources. As Kanole has shown, there were many lines of Śeṣas, nine in Nāndeś alone, plus the Kāśi branch whose relation to those in Nāndeś cannot be exactly pinned down.

---

33 Trivedi xlviii.
35 Trivedi li.
36 Kaviraj 5-8.
37 Kaviraj 14-15.
38 Kaviraj 34n1.
39 My conclusion, following Trivedi, that the later Śeṣas are different from the earlier ones from Āndhra was independently reached, as I discovered *ex post facto*, by V. B. Bhagavat, in the introduction to *Sūktiratnakāra* (Commentary on Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya*) by Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, fasc. I: Āhnikas 1 and 2, edited by B.V. Bhagavat, Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, No. 140 (Pune, 1999), 14. Robert A. Hueckstedt also follows Trivedi in “Some Later Argument on *iko yān aci*,” *Indian Linguistic Studies: Festschrift in Honor of George Cardona*, edited by Madhav Deshpande and Peter Hook, (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2002), 49-53.
40 Kanole, 70-3.
The Govindārṇava

The Govindārṇava is a general digest of religious practice. It has two other names: the Śmṛtisāgara and Dharmaṭattvāvaloka. Śeṣa Nṛsiṁha says in his introduction that he compiled this dharmaṇraprabandha at the command of Govindacandra, or Govindadeva, the King (mahārājādhirāja) of Kāśi. Julius Eggeling describes Nṛsiṁha as his minister, as the compilers of such “law books” often were. The work is divided into six sections (vīcīs, waves), on saṁskāra, āhnikā, śrāddha, śuddhi, kāla, and prāyaścitta.

In the Preface to A Digest of Hindu Law, Colebrooke dates Nṛsiṁha to the time of Laksāmdhara.

Laksāmdhara composed a treatise on administrative justice by command of Govindra Chandra, a king of Casi, sprung from the Vastava race of Kayasthas. He is likewise author of a Digest entitled Calpataru, which is often cited. By command of the same prince, Narasinha, son of Ramacandra the grammarian and philosopher, composed a law-tract entitled Govindarnava, and several other treatises.

Laksāmdhara is c. 1125 and is the author of the huge and influential corpus of Hindu law, the Kṛtyakalpataru. A date in the 12th century is far too early. Colebrooke fell into this mistake because Nṛsiṁha was also patronized by a Govindacandra, king of Kāśi, but four centuries later. Both Nṛsiṁha and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa were clients of the kings of Kāśi. Nṛsiṁha wrote the Govindārṇava for Govindacandra and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa wrote the Pārijātaharana and the Padacandrikā for Narottama, his younger brother. In the Govindārṇava, Nṛsiṁha calls them the Śrīvāstakas of Tāṇḍava or Tāṇḍetikā, a town near Kāśi. In the Pārijātaharana, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa calls them the Śrīvāstakas of Tāṇḍavapura. The Catalogus Catalogorum dates the Śrīvāstakas to the 16th century—most probable, but unsupported by any primary source.

---

41See Kane for the little we know about the Govindārṇava, still in manuscript only. Eggeling gives an extract from the introductory verses: no. 1566 in Julius Eggeling, Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office, Part I. Vedic Manuscripts (London: 1887), 484.
42 A Digest of Hindu Law on Succession, xix.
43 Kane I. 315-18.
44 Pārijātaharanaacampū, ed. Dvijendra Nātha Miśra, Savasvatībhavana Granthamālā 132 (Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1991). In stanza 18, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa names Narottama, the brother of Govindacandra, as the patron. The NCC is the source for the Padacandrikā.
45 Verse 13 in Ulwar extract 304, Peter Peterson, Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of H.H. the Maharaja of Ulwar [Alwar] (Bombay: Times of India Press, 1892), 112-117.
46 PJH vv. 9-10.
47 The entry for Govindārṇava, NCC, VI, 212, mistakenly has “Śrīvāstava.” I have attempted to date these Śrī Vāstakas without success.
Eggeling lists a number of the authorities Nṛsiṁha cites.  
An attempt to date the Govindārṇava by these quoted authorities was inconclusive. Most are in the 12th-14th centuries. From the 14th century there is Hemādri, Mādhavacārya, and Viśveśvarabhaṭṭa. Nṛsiṁha quotes some of the authors and works his son does—Aparāka, Medhātithi, Mitākṣarā, Kalpataru, etc.—and many he does not. What is noticeable is that Nṛsiṁha cites a number of early texts also cited by other 16th and 17th century authors: Dalapati, Raghunandana, Ṭodaramalla, Kamalakara, Nārāyanabhaṭṭa, and Acala Dviveda.

The sources that quote the Govindārṇava are more telling. Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita, Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa (Nirṇayasindhu, 1612), Divākara Kale, Śambhu Bhaṭṭa, Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa, and Mitrāmiśra (Vratapraṇāsa) belong to the 17th or 18th centuries. That the Govindārṇava is not cited in texts earlier than these suggests a recent date in the 16th century for its composition and strengthens the case for a Nṛsiṁha writing in the second half of the 15th or first half of the 16th century.  

To sum up, attribution of the Govindārṇava to a Nṛsiṁha dated to 1409-1450 is wrong. The author is probably a later Nṛsiṁha. When he compiled the Govindārṇava is an open question, anytime from 1450 on. He wrote it for Govindacandra of the Śrīvāstakas, the ruling family of Kāśi, perhaps not as grand a potentate as Lakṣmīdhara’s Govindacandra of the Gāhodvālas, the Emperor of Kanauj, who reigned (c.1104-1154) over the city in the era of Muslim invasion, but rather a local princeling in the 16th century. That Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa wrote two works for his younger brother Narottama—the Pārijātaharaṇa and the Padacandrīkā—reinforces a 16th century date for the Govindārṇava as well. Kanole also dates Nṛsiṁha around the cusp of 1500 and puts theGovindārṇava in the first half of the 16th century.

Did the famous Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa write the SAS?

The evidence for a Kṛṣṇa of the Śeṣa family living and writing in Vāraṇāsī in the second half of the sixteenth century is sure. What is not sure is whether he wrote the SAS. It is not at all certain that the Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa of the SAS is the same as the author of the Prakriyākaumudipraṇāsa, Kaṁsavadha, and other works of vyākaraṇa and kāvya. For that matter, it is not even sure how many of these other works are by him.

49 Peterson 58. “The book is quoted in the Nirṇayasindhu and Vratapraṇāsa, but does not seem to have been met with before.”
The scholars who have studied the SAS—Kaviraj, Kane, Sharma, Jaiswal, Vajpeyi—assumed that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa wrote it. In 1912, Ranganathasvami Aryavaraguru regarded the authorship of the SAS as open to question. It is still. Nonetheless, my conclusion is that he is probably did. The weight of evidence as it now stands tips in this direction, if we set aside the Pingree-Kane dates for his father. Although, compared to other authors, we have a relatively large stock of evidence for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, the piece is still missing that would conclusively attribute the SAS to him.

Evidence for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s Authorship of the SAS

I have turned up seven slender pieces of internal and external evidence for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s authorship. Some emerged in the process of translating the SAS. Others I ran across while rummaging through secondary sources, Kane, Kaviraj, etc. One is from a surprising source, a soi-disant descendant of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. My contacts and sources in Pune supplied me with innumerable insights and suggestions. The conservative nature of Dharmaśāstra, with its reverential citations of smṛti, makes it difficult to date a text by its content. The latest sources Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cites—the Prāśādañjīpya and Kṛṣṇabhattiya—are only very roughly dated by Kane to before 1500. Nevertheless, the SAS as a Navya Smṛti nibandha could have been written substantially in the form it is in any time from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century.

I. In the introductory verses, the author of the SAS calls himself Kṛṣṇa Śeṣanṛṣirṣiraja, and in the closing verse, Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa. He concludes the first section by signing off as Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and Sri Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, and the sections on “inquiry into prescriptions and prohibitions for Śūdras” (78) and āhṇika (189) with Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa.

A major problem for identifying authors and dating texts is that names such as Nrṣirṣiṁha and Kṛṣṇa were extremely common among Brahmins and were passed down from grandfather to grandson in a family such as the Śeṣas. As pointed out before, there are at least three Nrṣirṣiṁhas and two Kṛṣṇas in the early line of Śeṣas, none of whom seems to be the men we are looking for. There are scores of texts in the NCC authored by a Nrṣirṣiṁha and a Kṛṣṇa. Variant names are rife. The author of the Govindārṇava is called Narasiṁha (v. 80), an alternative for

51 R. Aryavaraguru 249.
Nṛsiṁha that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa uses when referring to his father-guru in the *Prakṛtacandrīkā*. He calls him Nṛsiṁha Sūri in the *Prakāśa* (v. 35).

In texts now attributed to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, we find Kṛṣṇapāṇḍita, Kṛṣṇakavi, Śeṣakṛṣṇa, Śri Śeṣakṛṣṇa, Śri Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa, Śri Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita, and Mahākavi Śri Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. There is little evidence that all these Kṛṣṇas are one-and-the-same. In most cases, there is none but the name. Is the Kṛṣṇa Śeṣanṛsiṁhaja of the SAS the same person?

As Ludo Rocher has pointed out, there is a tendency in Indological studies to look for one great author to whom many works can be ascribed. The idea of one prolific and versatile Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa is appealing. Voluminous production was certainly common in this era. There is no doubt that many wrong identifications have been made in Sanskrit literature because of the authors’ identical names. Reading scholarly publications from Colebrooke’s time shows how they all started by assuming that there was only one Kātyāyana, one Patañjali, etc., for everything that went eponymously under these names.52

Compounding the problem of identification is the fact that Śeṣa is a generic title and honorific, not a family name. Indeed, Mr. Parshuram Paranjape believes that the actual family name of the Śeṣas was Paranjape or Deva. Many of the received names of Sanskrit pañḍits consist in part or wholly of such honorifics rather than actual family names. Śeṣa was a title conferred on many pañḍits, especially those accomplished in vyākaraṇa-śāstra by association with Patañjali, the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*, regarded as an incarnation of Ādi Śeṣa, the wisdom energy of Viṣṇu. It is not unique to this family of Śeṣas, although they were some of its most illustrious bearers, due to their eminence in grammatical scholarship.53 Great pañḍits and gurus were honored as incarnations of Śeṣa-Ananta-Patañjali-Viṣṇu. In the *Akhanḍamañjari*, Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa appears to refer to his father, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, as Śeṣa Viṣṇu.54 In the *Govindaṁava*, Nṛsiṁhaja, playing on the word “śeṣa,” says that the progenitor of his family was Viṣṇu.55 Is this a real ancestor, or the divine Śeṣa Viṣṇu?

Kanole reported a curious oral tradition of the family about how the Śeṣas got their name that has the folk color of Nag worship. A lady of the family gave birth to a snake. When the snake died, it appeared in a dream saying that

---

52 Personal communication.
53 R. Aryavaraguru lists many others with the surname “Śeṣa” and no known connection to our Śeṣas apart from the name, p. 252.
54 Personal communication, Parshuram Paranjape.
55 R. Aryavaraguru quotes these verses, 248.
Śeṣa should be the family name. The Nāndeś Śeṣas thereafter performed a śrāddha on a snake hill in commemoration, kept images of Nag, and offered nagbali.⁵⁶

II. The first verse of the introduction begins with the word alikula (a swarm of bees), a favorite opener for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, used in two other texts, the Prakriyākaumdīprakāśa and the Prakṛtacandrika. It is no doubt unwise to see much significance in this. Such maṅgalācaranaḥ (benedictory prayers) are highly conventional in their imagery and tropes. All three are prayers to Gaṇapati.

\[
alikulakalagātākarnaottālakarnā-\hspace{1cm}SAS
tākarnā-\hspace{1cm}SAS\]
\[
alikulakalagātākarnaottālakarnā-\hspace{1cm}SAS
\]

May Lord Gaṇapati burst asunder the flood of our sins,
as he makes a slanted blue lotus dance, a treasure of purity.
The quarters of space resound with the soft beat of his flapping ears,
pricked up as he hears the low hum of a swarm of bees.

The verses from the Prakṛtacandrika and Prakriyākaumdīprakāśa not only begin with alikula, but are verbatim.

\[
alikulamanḍitaganaṇḍam pratyūhavāhyatimārtāṇḍam\hspace{1cm}PC
tsindurāruṇaṇḍam devam vetanātuṇḍam avalambhe.\hspace{1cm}PKP\]

I devote myself to the elephant-faced god, the sun routing the darkness of obstacles.
His trunk is red with sindoor and a swarm of bees adorns his temple.

III. The SAS quotes a stanza (1) on tarpana from the Dharmānubandhiślokacaturdaśī, another work by Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, as we are informed in the introduction by his great-great-grandson Rāma.

Rāma wrote a jīkā on the Dharmānubandhiślokacaturdaśī.⁵⁷ This is a very short, easy text of 14 stanzas in śārdūlavikrīḍita meter on śrāddha. Rāma gives the dos-and-don’ts of particular ritual observances with mīmāṁsika explanation of points of disagreement and references to scores of other authorities. Its editor, G. N. Kaviraj, praises it as one of the best of such texts on ritual, remarking that those described are typically south Indian in character, as we would expect from a southerner like Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. The first of the fourteen ślokas are verses on when not to offer sesame with tarpana and other matters and, remarkably, are also found in the SAS (220).

Do not perform tarpana with sesame seed on a Sunday, Tuesday, or Friday falling in the constellation Māgha, on the seventh day of Anaṅga, in one’s house, at night, on birthdays and felicitous occasions, or at dawn and twilight. Perform it only with water.

---

⁵⁷ The Dharmānubandhiślokacaturdaśī with a commentary, ed. Gopī Nātha Kavirāja, Princess of Wales Sarasavti Bhavana Texts 22 (Benares, 1927).
One should not incur pollution on the occasion of a marriage, vow, tonsure, and good fortune, on the thirteenth, first, sixth, and eleventh lunar days, and on a death, Mahālaya śrāddha, pilgrimage to Gaya, an auspicious day, and on arriving at a tīrtha.

This appearance in both works might seem to cinch authorship by Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. The śloka, however, is worryingly appended to the end of the text of the SAS in an out-of-place and interpolated manner. Its occurrence in the SAS may be an editorial artifact since Kaviraj was the editor of both the SAS and the Dharmānubandhiślokacaturdaśī. Nonetheless, it is one of the stronger pieces of evidence for his authorship of the SAS. As Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa has just been discussing śrāddha and liṅga pūjā, these last instructions on tarpāṇa at a tīrtha may be his way of wrapping up.

IV. A manuscript from Deccan College (ms. no. 55, 1872-1873), copied at Stambhatīrtha (modern Cambay) and now at BORI (ms. 50, 1872-73), one of the two on which Khiste and Kaviraj based their edition, and, I, my translation, can be dated precisely to samvat 1647, 4 March 1591. A copy, of course, is only a terminus ante quem and can tell us nothing about the date of composition.

V. Legend attributes the SAS to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. According to G. S. Sardesai, Viśveśvara(Gāgā)bhaṭṭa rebutted ideas ascribed to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and may have quoted the SAS in the Kāyasthadharmadīpa of Viśveśvara (Gāgā)bhaṭṭa with the phrase “yathoktam śiromanau.” I have not been able to verify this.

VI. Kane reports that the Govindānava and SAS are mentioned on the subject of bhūtayajña in the Ācāraratna of Lākṣmanaḥbhaṭṭa, whom he dates to 1580-1640. Lākṣmaṇa is the younger brother of Kamalākara, the author of the Śūdrakamalākara, and the uncle of Viśveśvara(Gāgā)bhaṭṭa. However, as with Gāgā, Lākṣmaṇa does not refer to the author by name. This is the second unconfirmed reference to the SAS reported in another text; and, it does not link the SAS directly with Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa.

---

58 Kane HDS I. 641. The next earliest ms. of the SAS is dated to 1672 and is deposited in the Baroda library according to Sardesai in his Marathi Riyasat, the Marathi version of his New History of the Marathas.
60 Kane, I. 641.
61 Personal communication, Parshuram Paranjape. One is left to speculate about possible influence.
After paying homage to his patron Pilājī (SAS 2), Krṣṇa Śeṣa tells us that he is the son of Śeṣa Nṛsiṁha. Nṛsiṁha is not mentioned again in the text, but the Govindārṇava is. Krṣṇa Śeṣa refers the reader to it eight times for further information on various topics. He never attributes it to his father or Nṛsiṁha by name, but one naturally assumes that his father is the author.

At the fourth mention (175) Krṣṇa Śeṣa says, for the one and only time in the text that “the rest of the particulars about his can be seen in the “govindārṇave asmatkṛte,” i.e., in “our,” or more usually “my” Govindārṇava. It is hard to know what to make of this remark. Is Krṣṇa Śeṣa claiming to have written it himself? The only Govindārṇava in existence unambiguously claims its author is Nṛsiṁha. We may have a case of something not infrequently found in Sanskrit textual production: the son completing or collaborating on the work of his father and guru. As S. K. Belvalkar explains:

If the statement in Śādṛcārasiromani is of any value, it can only mean (a) that Śesha Kṛṣṇa, perhaps at the request of his father, completed the work left incomplete by Narasimha, whatever be the cause that prevented him from completing it himself, (b) Śesha Kṛṣṇa may have written a running commentary on the work.

Among Brahmin pāṇḍits, scholarship often seems something like a family concern in which texts are inherited as a patrimony and jointly authored. Another example of this is seen in Viśeṣvara(Gāgā)bhaṭṭa and his father, Dinakara. His Śādṛadharmoddyota is part of the Dinakaroddyota of his father, as we see in the list of topics it covers: ācāra, āśauca, kāla, dāna, pūrta, pratiṣṭha, prāyaścitta, vyavahāra, varṣakṛtya, vrata, śūdra, śrāddha, and saṃskāra. And his Kāyasthadharmadīpa is in its saṃskārakhaṇḍa. In fact, Kane says that the Dinakaroddyota was finished by the son. Something similar seems to have been the case for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. He either helped his father compose the Govindārṇava or later added to it and so claimed it as his without gainsaying his father’s authorship.

As far as solid evidence goes for the SAS, this is what we have. What can we infer from these meager facts? The SAS was written before 1591; how far before, we cannot say. The 1591 ms. copy could even be an original. While the Kāyasthadharmadīpa of Gāgābhaṭṭa and the Ācāraratna of Lakṣmaṇa may mention the SAS, no definitive attri-

---

62 It is interesting to note in passing that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cannot resist a pun on the family name, Śeṣa: King Pilājī has commissioned him to write a manual for Śūdras after hearing all the dharmas, dharmān aśeṣān, from the mouths of the learned. Nṛsiṁha also makes great play with the word in the introduction to the Govindārṇava. It must be said, however, that such śeṣa witticisms were a common conceit with Sanskrit pāṇḍits. As noted elsewhere, puns and allusions to incarnations of Patañjali and Viṣṇu have created much confusion in tracing the genealogy of the Śeṣas.

63 SAS 62, 105, 152, 175, 180, 189, 209, and 220.
65 Kane HDS I. 564.
66 Vajpeyi 259-60.
67 Kane 702, 640.
bution of the SAS to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is made by any author. On the other hand, the Kamsavadha (vv. 1.21, 23) and Prakriyākaumudiprakāśa (Intro., vv. 26, 34) are ascribed to the same author on the basis of shared verses and names. The ślōkas and names found in both the SAS and the Dharmānubхиślōkacaturdaśī are as equally slight or firm an attestation of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s authorship of the SAS.\(^{68}\)

If the younger brother of Kamalamā, Lakṣmanā, was referring to the SAS, it is conceivable that Kamalamā composed the Šūdrakamalākara with those works in mind, perhaps even as a direct stimulus. The tale of his nephew Gāgābhata’s rebuttal of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa becomes more plausible. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa appears like a recent and living figure of authority and influence. The Śeṣas and Bhaṭṭas were two of the leading families of Mahārāṣṭrian pāṇḍits in Vārāṇasī at this time.\(^{69}\) If there is a kernel of truth in this legend, it may give us a glimpse into a scholarly rivalry between them with political implications.

In conclusion, what can we say then about the date and author of the SAS? Not much either new or with precision. The famous Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa most probably wrote the SAS, maybe a work of his mature or senior years. His father, Nṛsinha, was the author of the Govindārṇava and his grandfather was a Rāmacandra who is not the author of the Prakriyākaumudī. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa lived in the second half of the 16th century through the reign of Akbar the Great. Kane and Vajpeyi’s date of 1520-1590 is more or less right, give or take a decade. Given the inadequacy of the biographical evidence, it seems best to stick to a general time frame: Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s grandfather in the 15th century, his father Nṛsinha, 15th to 16th century, and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa living through most of the 16th century, roughly 1510-1590.

**Pilājī Rao, Patron of the SAS**

In the introductory and closing verses of the SAS, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa says that he composed his manual for Śūdras at the behest of Pilājī, son of Keśava. All we know about Śri Pilājī Nrṇāla is what Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa tells us.

King Pilājī is pot-born Agastya, drinking up the ocean of hostile kings’ power. By his gifts of food, cloth, gold, places of rest, and horses daily bestowed, from little boy to old man, Prayāga, king of tīrthas, displays among the people its power of granting wishes.

He was a dākṣiṇātya sovereign, who displayed his prowess in the south like Agastya, and a generous patron of pilgrimage at Prayāga. He was a military leader engaged in some military actions against neighboring kings in the

\(^{68}\) See III above.
south and was a munificent benefactor of religion. The Hindu kings of south India were often the most ardent patrons of the holy places of pilgrimage in the north.

Who is this Pilājī? In the time of Śivāji and the Peshwas, a number of Pilājīs came into view. Pilājī Nilakanth, Pilājī Gole, and Pilājī Sanas were commanders under Śivāji, and Pilājī Shirke was his son-in-law. The chieftain Pilājī Mohite fought against Śivāji with the Sultan of Bijāpūr. Pilājī Gaekwad (d. 1732), a Maratha leader, allied to the Peshwas, became the Maharaja of Baroda, and Pilājī Jadhav was a Peshwa sardar. All these Pilājīs are too late to be ours.

Pilājī, or Pirājī, appears to be a dāksinātya name, i.e., a Deccani or Maratha name, more frequently found later on among Maharashtrians. There is a Śrī Pilājī Gurav in the 20th century, a devotee of Sai Baba in Shirdi. The name “Pila” reminds one of the “Pillai” (alternatively spelled Pilli, Pillay, and Pulle) common among non-Brahmin forward castes in Tamil Nadu, Kerala, and Andhra Pradesh, but has no pertinence to the Ghorpades in Karnataka, as far as I can see.

Although no eminent Pilājī in the sixteenth century can be found to fit the bill in his view, Khiste mentions in passing Pilājī Ghorpade, scion of the Mudholkar line of the Ghorpade dynasty, cousins of the Bhonsle lineage of Śivāji. This Pilājī was the Rajah of Mudhol after his father, Cholaraj (d. 1579). Khiste gives Pilājī a date of 1578-1598 and Sardesai 1562-1596. There are several later Pilājīs/Pirājīs in the Ghorpade family line.

Khiste gives him short shrift, too hastily ruling him out because his father’s name was not the Keśavadāsa in the SAS. In looking for an eminent or famous patron, Khiste did not observe that all of Krṣṇa Śeṣa’s patrons appear to be petty princes and local rajahs. This Pilājī may or may not be the patron of the SAS, but he is quite similar to his other patrons, such as Narottama, king of Tāṇḍava, for whom he composed the Parijātaharaṇa, and Padacandrika,

73 Introduction (upodghāta) to the SAS, pt. 2, 3.
74 Sardesai, Historical Genealogies, 36-7; Khiste, Introduction pt. 3. Pilājī is clearly referred to as Raja succeeding his father in 1579 on the website: http://www.royalark.net. On the website, which appears to have been set up by the family, his brother is given as the successor: http://rajaofmudhol.com/index.htm. The old house of the Ghorpades were the chiefs of Mudhol up to the 20th century.
75 Sardesai’s dates for three Pirājīs are 1690-1737, d. 1729, and c. 1795. Pilājī is sometimes spelt Pirājī in the Ghorpade family line.
or Viravara (Birbal?) of Patrapuñja, for whom he wrote the *Prakriyākaumudīprakāśa*, and Govārdhana, the son of Ṭoḍaramalla, patron of the *Kaṁsavadha*. Even that the father’s name was not Śrī Keśavadāsa, but Cholaraj Ghorpade is not a serious obstacle. Śrī Keśavadāsa looks like another magnificent royal or pious title with which he is endowed, like *paramavaiṣṇava*, “great devotee of Viṣṇu,”

Śrī Pilājī, great devotee of Viṣṇu, jewel of his family and varṇa, sprung from the lotus feet of Śrī Hari and the Yādavas. SAS 221

At any rate, Khiste has stumbled across a personage who is of the sort we are looking for, if not actually the one, without fully appreciating his find.

Mudhol is in Bagalkot District in northern Karnataka and is famed for a breed of hound. 76 The Principality of Mudhol became a 9-gun-salute princely state during the Raj. The Ghorpades preferred to see themselves as Maratha military commanders. 77 They were, but well after the Deccan Sultanates and the Mughals. In the 16th and 17th centuries, the Ghorpades were, in fact, loyal feudatories of the kings of Bijāpūr, first the Bahmanīs, then the ‘Ādil Shāhis, for whom they soldiered and served as finance ministers. Later on, they switched their allegiance to the Mughals, and although a branch of the Bhonsle family, long kept their independence from Śivājī and the Peshwas.

This is a murky period of unremitting war and treacherous, shifting alliances between Muslim and Hindu states. The Shah of Bijāpūr and the kings of Vijayanagara fought back and forth over Mudhol. Pilājī’s father, Cholaraj, was a mansab who fought with the Sultanate forces at the battle of Talikot (1565), which brought down Vijayanagara, and in subsequent engagements at Bankapur and Shira. He shared in the spoils of war: receiving troops, villages, and jagirs in Vijayanagara territory. He had three sons, among whom was Śrīmant Pilājī Raje Ghorpade Bahadur, Chief of Mudhol. In 1593-1595, Pilājī served with his brothers in the Carnatic (1593-1595) fighting with the ‘Ādil Shāhis against the Nayaks.

How do these facts fit the Pilājī in the SAS? These Ghorpades were indeed martial, many dying on the battlefield, perhaps even Pilājī himself.

lighting up the face of the south with a blaze of unequalled valor, defeating his enemies over the land, he is victorious. SAS 221

Such a warrior king under the suzerainty of Muslims might have a special motivation in sponsoring Hindu pilgrimage to the tīrthas of the north and in patronizing their sacred establishments, advertising a name for devotion and charity.

By making many tīrthas free of taxes with his donations, people congregating from far distances easily clasp the hands of the immortal goddesses. Gaining first dharma, the bridge granting the fruit of the three ends of life, appearing like Prayāga, the triple-braided confluence, he took in hand the attainment of the visible and invisible ends of man. Steadfast in respecting and honoring the Dharma, support of good government and morality, constant and faithful in the protection of his subjects, generous and pure of heart, devoted to the lotus feet of Śrī Govinda, noble and courageous. above all, as guardian of the law, he adorns the dharma with excellent and imperishable wisdom. SAS 2

Like the rulers of Vijayanagara, whom he was fighting in alliance with Muslims, he might have felt a heightened concern in a time of strife to propagate Dharma. As a sideline to the upstart Bhonsles in Pune, the Ghorpades may have had similar problems of caste status and legitimacy to deal with. Pilājī, therefore, may have seen a point in promoting the social stability of caste by showing interest in the lives of good Śūdras, the artisans and peasants who were the sources of manpower and revenue in the villages he was acquiring as a jagirdar. Such interests might have inspired the commissioning of a work on śūdradharma from a fellow Deccani and famous scholar, expert, and intellectual in Kāśī, as Śivājī would later enlist the Bhaṭṭas for public relations.

Is this Pilājī the patron of the SAS? Possibly. The timing works well. If we accept a date of 1510-1590 for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and 1562-1596 for Pilājī Ghorpade, they were contemporaneous during the latter part of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s life. This would place the SAS in the age of Akbar when Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was a renowned figure on the intellectual scene and rājas such as Pilājī were patronizing famous scholars of Kāśī and subsidizing pūrtas and pilgrimage to holy places.

And there is the Bījāpūr connection. As we have seen, if we accept Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s authorship of the Murārivijaya, Nṛsiṁha was honored by the paṇḍits of the Bījāpūr court as bhaṭṭabhaṭṭāraka. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Bījāpūr became a great and cosmopolitan center of trade, culture, and learning rivaling Delhi and Agra. It was known as the “Banaras of the south.” The Ādil Shāhi Sultans were themselves men of letters and liberal, tolerant patrons of Islamic and Hindu artists, musicians, poets, scholars, and teachers. Moreover, according to two documents (ruq‘as) issued by a Council of Ministers, a Śeṣa Vāmana, son of Ananta (Shesh Wāman bin Anant in

78 Aryavaraguru (1912): 247.
the Persian), was appointed Royal Librarian to Ālī ʿĀdil Shāh (1558-1580). Vāmana was a member of the Nāndeḍ Śeṣas.

So it appears then that both the Ghorpades and the Śeṣas had links with Bijāpūr. As Rosalind O’Hanlon observes, there is a strong plausibility that someone like Pilājī from a successful jagirdar family in the service of the Bijāpūr court might have wanted to commission a work of Dharmaśāstra from a pāṇḍit family so esteemed at that court. The plausibility is reinforced by the fact that another family member appears to have been court librarian. Of course, this may all be nothing but a speculative house of cards, if any of the pieces are wrong.

---

80 P.M. Joshi, “ʿĀlī ʿĀdil Shāh I of Bijāpūr (1558-1580) and his Royal Librarian: Two Ruqʿas,” Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay, New Series 31-32 (1956-57): 97-107. Kanole found these documents in Nāndeḍ among the family records connecting Shesh Wāman with the Nāndeḍ Śeṣas. It is uncertain what relationship Wāman may have with Nrṣirinha or Krṣṇa, or the three of them with the Nāndeḍ Śeṣas, but all the pieces of circumstantial evidence fit together in identifying them as in the same extended family group and placing them here. Nāndeḍ is in the Marathwada district of southeast Maharashtra on the Godāvārī River. Mudhol is in northern Karnataka. So there is also geographical propinquity, at the very least, between Krṣṇa and Pilājī. See V.A. Kanole in Mahamahopadhyaya D.V. Potdar Sixty-first Birthday Commemoration Volume: studies in historical and indological research presented to M.M. Datto Vaman Potdar (Poona: D.K. Sathe, 1950): 56-73.
Krṣṇa Śeṣa

This biographical sketch of Krṣṇa Śeṣa and his times assumes that he is the author of the SAS. As argued before, this may not be so, but is slightly more probable than not. Even if he is not the author, Krṣṇa Śeṣa is an intrinsically interesting figure in his own right, well worth knowing better. He is one of those brilliant figures in the Indian summer of late Sanskrit. He is typical of the independent poet-paṇḍit of the age, a versatile polymath, versed in all the arts and sciences of śāstra. Krṣṇa Śeṣa authored poetic works (kāvyas, nāṭakas, campūs) and texts on neo-Pāṇinian vyākaraṇa, including one on Jain Prākrit and another on the philosophy of sphota. I assume that the thirteen works attributed to him in the NCC are by one and the same Krṣṇa Śeṣa, another problematic assumption.

Krṣṇa Śeṣa’s Kāśī

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Vārānasī, the City of Light, have long been extolled as a golden age of Sanskrit learning and literature by Indian scholars. Modern scholars too now speak of efflorescence, brilliance, and cosmopolitanism. Many of the greatest names in Sanskrit in these years lived and worked in Kāśī, the meeting place of the different cultures of India. Scholars and writers came there from all around the subcontinent. The prestige of the city was at its peak. More than a university town, it was the intellectual and cultural summit of India and Krṣṇa Śeṣa was one of its most celebrated figures.¹

Although there is a certain amount of embellishment in this picture, it is true in its main outlines. Undoubtedly, the convergence of scholars from all around the subcontinent, and especially from Mahārāṣṭra, made 17th century Kāśī an intellectually stimulating milieu for the ambitious and talented. As Pollock remarks:

We have no usable social history of Varanasi intellectuals before the period under consideration here [i.e., the 17th century]. But it is hard not to believe that the city’s incorporation into the Mughal Empire at the end of the 16th century, and the growth of pilgrimage, especially on the part of Maharashtrians, that may have been facilitated by the establishment of the empire, did not have something to do with the efflorescence of the intellectual class and its cosmopolitan mixture. (21-22)²


With the advent of the Mughals, we see a great flourishing of learning, which earned for Varanasi François Bernier’s famous tribute, “the Athens of India.” Bernier, a doctor and student of Pierre Gassendi, traveled across India during the reign of Aurangzeb. He visited Varanasi and described it in a letter:

It is the Athens of India, whither resort the Brahmins and other devotees; who are the only persons who apply their minds to study. The town contains no colleges or regular classes, as in our universities, but resembles the schools of the ancients; the masters being dispersed over different parts of the town in private houses, and principally in the gardens of the suburbs, which the rich merchants permit them to occupy. Some of these masters have four disciples, others six or seven, and the most eminent may have twelve or fifteen; but this is the largest number. It is usual for the pupils to remain ten or twelve years under their respective preceptors, during which time the work of instruction proceeds slowly.3

Bernier saw a placid town of gurukuls, to his mind not unlike ancient Greek academies and lyceums. His picture of the quiet flow of intellectual and religious life in the town would most likely have been much the same in Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s day, three quarters of a century prior, if not more so, before Aurangzeb’s wars. The traditions of learning went on despite the political ups-and-downs as a sacred font of permanent values.

The English merchant explorer Ralph Fitch, passed through Benares, the “principal mart of Bengal goods,” circa 1585 in his “wonderfull travailes” around eastern India. He saw an exotic India of pagan idol worship and the strange ritual practices at the ghāṭs, many of which are dealt with in detail in the SAS. He visited closer to the time of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s activity there than Bernier, but saw nothing of the inner intellectual life of the city. Haklyut published his bemused observations of the “greatest idolators that ever I sawe.”4

In which period the SAS was written is a critical question for interpreting it. Simply stated, does it reflect the tolerant climate that comes in with Akbar or the more conservative retrenchments of the tougher days of Turko-Afghan domination and the Sultanates? In a sense though, it is not really an either/or. Both conservative and liberalizing tendencies are evident in the SAS. Comprehensive digests like the SAS were products of the era in which orthodox Hindus consolidated their position under Islamic rule by reinforcing caste rules and tightening up Dharma. In tandem, a more inclusive approach worked to reconcile lower castes to Brahmanism. Liberalizing relaxation is the trend in the 16-17th centuries with the civilities of Mughal rule, at least until the renewed zeal of Aurangzeb to suppress idolatry, but starts from this earlier conservatism of beleaguered Hinduism.

---

4 Early Travels in India 1583-1619, ed. William Foster, 20-23.
This fluctuation of fortunes was a recurring pattern, as can be seen in the timeline on the next page. The centuries of Muslim domination (1206-1528) were often hard times. Vārāṇasī saw bursts of Muslim iconoclasm when temples and sacred places were demolished, taxes imposed, and Dharma under threat, alternating with periods of religious and intellectual restoration. Brahmanical conservation was one response; another was Bhakti. During all the difficulties of war and oppression Vārāṇasī became a tenacious stronghold of orthodoxy where traditions of learning and religious life went on. Young Brahmins came here to study at the feet of great masters in the schools of Nyāya logic, Advaita, and linguistics. Manuals and digests on every subject poured out of the copyists. Simultaneously, Kāśi was a center of the vibrant devotional renaissance of Bhakti.

If we accept that Dharmaśāstra embodies an ongoing response to changes in social custom, then a smṛti like the SAS would reflect both of these trends: the conservative consolidation of Brahmanism and the easing of Śūdra disqualifications to capture and channel the popular fervor of Bhakti devotionalism. Not coincidentally, these darker centuries of conquest and foreign rule (1200-1500 CE) are the time when śūradharma becomes a particular concern and we see the “spate of books” dealing with the caste duties and ritual rights of Śūdras. The need to fortify the caste structure explains why the duties of Śūdras became “a favorite topic of the latter days of the śāstra.”

**Timeline of Major Historical Events in Vārāṇasī (12th-17th centuries C.E.)**

**12th century.** Rule of the Gāhaḍavālas, a “golden age” before Muslim conquest, commemorated in the Kāśī Khanda Māhāmya.
Rāmānujācārya visits the city.

1194. Qutbuddin Aibak and Muhammad Ghūrī sack the city and demolish Viśvanātha, the Golden Temple.

1206. Establishment of the Delhi Sultanate.

1294. Jhāneśvara visits the city.

---


6 *Śūdras in Ancient India*, 305.

7 Derrett, *Dharmaśāstra and Juridical Literature*, 57.
1296-1316 Ala-ud-din Khilji rules Delhi.

13-14th century. Turko-Afghan rule.

14th century. Sharqī kings of Jaunpur rule the city.

1398-1518. Kabir lives here his entire life.


15th century. Ravidās is born here (1376) and becomes a disciple of Rāmānand.

1469-1539. Guru Nānak visits the city and debates the paṇḍits.

1486-1517. Lodī rule in Delhi.

1494. Sikandar Lodī.

1478-1530. Vallabhācārya settles in the city in his later years and dies there.

1486-1534. Chaitanya lives here for many years.

1526. Babar, victorious at Panipat, founds the Mughal Empire.

1527. Humāyūn wins Vārāṇasī.

1525-1539. Kāśī frequently changes hands.

1532-1623. Tulsīdās is born. He composes the Rāmacaritamānas at Tulsi Ghāṭ; and dies in the 1623 plague.


1563. Akbar revokes the pilgrimage tax.

1564. Jīza abolished.

1567. Akbar takes Vārāṇasī. Intellectual life flourishes; temples, wells and ghāṭs rebuilt by Hindu rājas.

1572-1580. Great reforms of the empire.

1575. Beginning of religious dialogues at the court of Akbar; Toḍaramallā rebuilds Viśvanātha temple.

1589. Death of Toḍaramallā.

1605. Death of Akbar.

1655-1656. Dārā Shukoh translates the Upaniṣads into Persian with the aid of the paṇḍits of Kāśī.

1666. Renewed policies of temple demolition and taxation by Aurangzeb.

1600-1750. Second “golden age” of Kāśī. Maratha cultural and political ascendancy.
In the 15th and 16th centuries, many Brahmins, including the Śeṣas, emigrated from the Deccan to Vārānasī. Why was this happening? Vajpeyi speculates about the reasons in the case of the Bhaṭṭas, 8 who relocated from Paṭṭhan to Vārānasī after 1525. Disorders in the Deccan during the breakup of the Bahmanī Sultanate and the wars of the successor Sultanates with Vijayanagara and the Mughals may have driven many Brahmins north. Famine too may have played a part. 9 Patronage for Brahmins in Hindu kingdoms in the south may have dried up and they had either to adapt to service in Muslim administrations or find a more congenial milieu. This they did in Kāśī with its opportunities for success and fame in the patronage of “small-time” rajas. The situation may have been similar for the Śeṣas escaping the loss of career opportunities and social dislocation in the Deccan, when they moved to Vārānasī around 1500 and found patronage with the Śrīvāstäkas of Taṇḍava.

Rosalind O’Hanlon, however, believes that the establishment of the post-1490 Sultanates, the break up Vijayanagara, and the consolidation of the Mughal state led to a proliferation of new courtly centers in central and southern India with patronage to offer. 10 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s patronage by Pilājī of Mudhol in Karnataka would seem to be a good example. This was certainly the case later in the century when the Sultans of Bījāpūr and the Mughals became munificent patrons of Hindu arts and learning. By the days of Akbar the Great, attraction had replaced escape as the motivation with the great efflorescence of learning and culture in Kāśī as a central node in the cultural networks of north and south. Hindu princes like Toḍaramalla and Birbal patronized the famous paṇḍits of the city like Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, and sponsored the building of temples and ghāṭs and subsidized pilgrimage, as Pilājī does at Prayāga.

The dākṣinātya Brahmins who moved to Kāśī presided over the scholarship and jurisprudence of the city for the next two centuries, a period a great brilliance. Indeed, the story of the southern paṇḍits in Kāśī is the history of Sanskrit literature in these years. They were honored residents of Kāśī up to 1912. Seven families were prominent: the Śeṣa, Bhaṭṭa, Dharmādhikārī, Bhāradvāja, Pāyaguṇḍe, Caturdhara or Chowdhuri, and Puntamkar. 11 The rise of the Marathas (≈1664-1761 CE) amplified Mahārāṣṭrian domination of the shastric life of Kāśī.

8 Vajpeyi 30-42.
9 A suggestion of Dr. Sumitra Kulkarni, a Maratha historian at the University of Pune, January 2009.
Famous Contemporaries

If we accept a date of 1520-1590 for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, this would make him a contemporary or near contemporary of a great many celebrated people in the long 16th century, including in the field of Dharmaśāstra: Raghunandana, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, and Appaya Dīkṣita. The latter years of his life overlap with the early careers of Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa (Nirayasinghu 1612), Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita, (1575-1645), and Nanda Paṇḍita. A glance at the list below shows what a period of political, religious, and intellectual ferment it was. Many of the great figures of Bhakti were alive just before or during Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s time. He was living in the great wake of Bhakti. I list only the most outstanding personalities. As Gopi Nath Kaviraj’s history of scholarship in Benares shows, there were a great many lesser-well known and obscure (to us) people producing hundreds of works in Dharmaśāstra, Nyāya, Vedānta, Mīmāṁsā, Vyākaraṇa, and Jyotiṣa at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fl. Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa</td>
<td>1540-1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa</td>
<td>1610-1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgā Bhaṭṭa</td>
<td>1640-1700, 1620-1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghunandana</td>
<td>1490-1570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appaya Dīkṣita</td>
<td>1520-1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita</td>
<td>c. 1570-1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annaribhaṭṭa c. fl.</td>
<td>1560-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja</td>
<td>1590-1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭojī</td>
<td>1660-1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhusūdana Sarasvati c.</td>
<td>1500-1570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakāśānanda</td>
<td>1550-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghunātha Siromani fl.</td>
<td>1475-1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijñānabhiṣku</td>
<td>1550-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallabha</td>
<td>1479-1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaitanya</td>
<td>1486-1533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghupati Upādhyāya fl.</td>
<td>1550-1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīva Gosvāmi</td>
<td>1517-1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūpa Gosvāmi fl.</td>
<td>1489-1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanda Paṇḍita</td>
<td>1595-1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsīdāsa</td>
<td>1532-1623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru Nanak</td>
<td>1469-1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūkārām</td>
<td>1577-1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīrābāī</td>
<td>1498-1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dādāi</td>
<td>1544-1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūrđās</td>
<td>1479-1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekanāth</td>
<td>1528-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabīr</td>
<td>1398-1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humāyūn</td>
<td>1508-1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akbar</td>
<td>1542-1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todārāmalla d.</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Fitch in Benares</td>
<td>1585-1586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and Akbar

In the Ain-i-Akbari (II. 30), Abu-l Fazl lists the eminent men of learning of his day.12 Most are Muslim scholars and divines, but among the 140 names are 32 Hindus, including a Kishn Pandit, viz., Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita in Persian transliteration.13 We can confidently assume that Kishn Pandit is our man: Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was probably the most famous bearer of the name Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita at this time.

---

13 Ain-i-Akbari, p. 611.
Abu-l Fazl includes a number of men with whom Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa shared the patronage of the court of Ṭoḍa-ramalla or sat with in Brahmin councils: Nārāyaṇ, viz., Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, a fellow Banarasi paṇḍit, Madhsudan, viz., Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, the greatest Vedantist of the day, who cut a figure in the court of Akbar in the 1580’s, and Bidyānīwās, viz., Vidyānivāsa, a co-signer with Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa of the 1583 vyavasthāpatra at Benares.⁴ Vidyānivāsa was a leading Naiyāyika of Bengal and debated Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa before Ṭoḍa-ramalla. There is no evidence that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was close to the darbar of Akbar, as was Madhusūdana Sarasvatī. As an illustrious man of letters, its glory no doubt shone on him through the patronage of the house of Ṭoḍaramalla, for whose son, Govardhana, he wrote the Kaṁsavadha.¹⁵

Abu-l Fazl divided his scholarly eminences into five classes, putting Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in the fourth with “those who look upon testimony as something filled with the dust of suspicion and handle nothing without proof,” namely, experts in Nyāya, Mīmāṁsā and Vyākaraṇa.⁶ Although dialecticians are the most numerous class, Vedantists are given the highest honor with Muslim theologians as the masters of sacred knowledge who “perceive the mysteries of the external and the internal.”

Abu-l Fazl, wazir of Akbar and one of the nine jewels of his court (navratnas), wrote the Ain-i-Akbarī, the third volume of the Akbarnama, circa 1597. It is a kind of government report and gazette on the administrative, fiscal, economic, and cultural state of affairs. It is clearly in line with Akbar’s policies of religious toleration, ecumenicalism, and supremacy. As he declares:

I will speak of the sages of the period and classify them according to their knowledge, casting aside all differences of creed. His Majesty, who is himself the leader of the material and the ideal worlds, and the sovereign over the external and the internal, honors five classes of sages.¹⁷

As court historian, Abu-l Fazl promulgated the official ideology of the reign.

The question arises, did the SAS reflect Akbar’s policy of toleration? The short answer is that it does not in any immediate way, even if was composed at this time. On the other hand, the contents of Dharmaśāstra do now begin to track political needs in a more direct or discernible way than heretofore, as we see in the case of Śivājī and Gāgābhāṭṭa. At most, one can say that the SAS was not out of tune with the tolerant and inclusive spirit of the zeit-

⁴ See page for a discussion of this legal document.
⁶ Ain-i-Akbarī, p. 606.
¹⁷ Ain-i-Akbarī, p. 606.
geist. Any spirit of conciliation detectable in the SAS, however, was a response internal to Dharmaśāstra to the cultural climate of Bhaktism rather than directly to Mughal state policy. In a sense, this is true for Akbar’s policies as well. Whatever raisons d’État were prompting him (freeing himself from Sunni clerics and checkmating rebellious Muslim nobles), his religious policies of bridge-building and pluralism were themselves riding the high tide of religious reformation in both Muslim and Hindu communities.

Akbar hosted religious dialogues among Shias, Hindus, Jains, Zoroastrians, and even Jesuits in his Hall of Worship (Persian: Ibādat Khāna). He began holding these interfaith dialogues in 1575 at Fatepur Sikri under the influence of the Sufi idea that the same god could be found through different religion traditions with no monopoly on truth: a Muslim version of Bhakti. He called his campaign of ecumenical harmony “Perfect Reconciliation.” His “Divine Faith” (Dīn-i-illāhī, 1581) with its eclecticism and claim of infallibility may not have been much more than a government promotion of ethical conduct and social peace among all his subjects, not unlike what Asoka had done centuries before, but it was an expression of the trend to syncretism in religion and the cultural assimilation of Muslims and Hindus.

In both Hinduism and Islam many mystics, scholars, intellectuals, and ordinary folk were actively seeking some form of synthesis. Kabir and other poet-saints in the popular devotional bhakti tradition of Hinduism offered a middle ground where Ram/Rahim could be worshipped freely in a rejection of the formalism of both religions. Others such as Daud Dayal (1544-1603) shared devotional beliefs and practices with sympathetic Sufis. An avowedly synthetic movement led by Guru Nanak (1469-1539) began in Punjab. In folk culture, there was substantial sharing of customs, ceremonies, and beliefs between ordinary Muslims and Hindus. Such practices as the worship of the smallpox goddess Sitala were often practiced as ardently by Muslims as Hindus in the countryside.

Bhakti derived much of its fervor from the aspirations of ordinary Muslims and Hindus, i.e., Śūdras and other low castes, and many of its saints were such ordinary folk.

The emphasis in the SAS on good conduct (acāra) and the universal moral obligations (sāmānya-dharma) of non-violence, truthfulness, honesty, purity, and charity incumbent on all castes irrespective of varṇa and āśrama dove-

---


19 For religious change, Sufism, and cultural assimilation among Indian Muslims, see A. A. Rizvi, Muslim Revivalist Movements in Northern India in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Agra, 1965).

tails with the temper of the times rather than the policies. The Gupta age had experienced a similar flourishing of toleration that was registered in the reforms in the position of Śūdras that furnish the ṣmārta authorization for the expansion of religious rights we see in the nibandhas.

In 1563, Akbar lifted the pilgrimage tax on bathing at tīrthas and, in 1579, abolished the jizya tax on non-Muslim dhimmis. These were no doubt popular measures, but may have been more symbolic than fiscally significant. It is unsure to what extent they were collected. A significant revenue stream in the medieval period for both Hindu and Muslim rulers, pilgrimage tolls were tapped by local rajas as income. Remitting them when collected by Muslims was a way to curry popular favor. In their piety and public spiritedness, they provided financial relief to pilgrims by defraying or remitting the tax along with other subsidies for worship at the great holy places of Prayāga, Benares, Haridwar, Gayā, and the temples of Somanātha and Puri.

This is pertinent because King Pilājī appears to be doing something like this at Prayāga. In the introductory verses of the SAS, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa extols Pilājī as a great patron of pilgrimage to Prayāga, who freed it from taxes:

He has devoted his great wealth to the healing of sin lowered in the waves of the immortal river Gāṅgā, shimmering with all-pervading glory. By his gifts of food, cloth, gold, places of rest, and horses daily bestowed, from little boy to old man, Prayāga, king of tīrthas, displays among the people its power of granting wishes, celebrated in hundreds of scriptures. By making the treasure of tīrthas free of taxes with his donations, people congregating from far distances easily clasp the hands of the immortal goddesses. Gaining first dharma, the bridge granting the fruit of the three ends of life, appearing like Prayāga, the triple-braided confluence, he took in hand the attainment of the visible and invisible ends of man. SAS 2

The translation of tīrthānām nikaraṃ vidhāya vikaram yena as “making the treasure of tīrthas free of taxes” depends on a conjecture that vikaram means “without taxes.” However, this is in no way evidence for dating the SAS after

---

21 At SAS 18, 56, 76 universal moral and ethical duties are required of even the low castes.
23 Shah Jahan reimposed the pilgrimage tax, as did Aurangzeb in 1679 to much popular resentment. The Marathas and the British (1809-1840) continued to collect it.
24 Romila Thapar, Early India: From the Origins to AD 1300 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 479.
25 For example, in the fourteenth century, the Rajput Maharana of Mewar, Lakshman Singh, subverted the tax collected from pilgrims traveling to the sacred sites in the Gāṅgā plains by the local Muslim Turks. What’s more, he did not confine himself to providing financial relief to pilgrims: he invaded the Sultanate of Jaunpur to liberate the holy places of Prayāga, Benares, and Gayā. www.royalsplendour.blogspot.com/2007/12/mewar-greatest.html.
27 A kara is a hand, a sun- or moon-beam, a tax, toll, tribute, or duty.
1563. The SAS was written for a southern Hindu king with a Hindu king’s concern for Dharma and his reputation as a godly sponsor of pilgrimage. As such, it could have been written any time in the prior two centuries.

**Traces of a Life**

The accounts of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa are full of tidbits of fascinating and contradictory information that are unsourced and undocumented. We are told that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was a Tailaṅga Brahmin. The Śeṣas were natives of the village of Nandī (mod. Nāndeś) on the banks of the Godāvarī River, or resided upriver in Paṭhan. They came into association with Mahārāṣṭrian Brahmins, possibly through intermarriage, becoming in effect Maharashtrians. Maharashtrian Brahmins emigrated to Vārāṇasī fleeing famine, war, and Yavanas in the south or for mokṣa. They were of the Advaita sect.

Where do these facts come from? Many are speculations and inferences from works attributed to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa or his father. Some are anecdota recycled from book to book. Some have harder evidence for them, e.g., the association of the Śeṣas with Nāndeś. Some seem to have a kernel of lost but plausible truth: that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was the guru of Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita, and Gāgābhaṭṭa contested his ideas. The best approach seemed to make a clean sweep and lay out the basic facts.

The most solid piece of evidence for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in Benares is a nirṇayapatra, a legal letter written in Marathi in 1583 (śake 1505) by a Ganesa Sastri Kozhrekar from Benares to the heads of the Konkan Devarṣi/Devarukh Brahmins. The letter describes the ruling by a Brahmanical council sitting in the Muktimāṇḍapa, the hall of justice connected to the recently restored Viṣveṣvara temple. At issue was a dispute over the standing of two Devarṣi Brahmins, Vitthal Jyotiṣi and his son Kṛṣṇa, as agnīhotṛi priests (who maintain a perpetual sacrificial fire). This had been
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29 These two facts are in Kaviraj, Kāśī, 14-15.
30 *Sphoṭatattvarinirṇāṇa* with the *Tattvapratikṣāka* commentary of Mahākavi Vasantryambaka Śevade, ed. by Brahmananda Tripiṭāṭhī, *Chowkhambā Surabhārati Granthamālā* 251 (Vārāṇasī: Chowkhambā Surabhārati Prakāśana, 1994), Intro. 3.
31 “Dakshini Pandits,” 11.
32 Vajpeyi develops an “ethno-theory of cultural flow” on such speculations, 30-42.
33 Aryavaraguru, 247.
34 See note 81 for sources.
subject to a hostile challenge which the council in Benares resolved by affirming the decision that Devarṣi Brahmins had the same “vedic karmas” as Chitpavan and Maharashtra Brahmins and should share food with them in amity.35

Several leading pāṇḍits from the north and south are named as present: Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa Pāṇḍita, who is called “the head of the Maharasstras,” Bhāvagaṇeśa Dīkṣita of the Cīrpāvana Brahmins and student of Vijñānabhikṣu, Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa, leader of the Karhades from the Konkan, Gopi Bhaṭṭa of the Gurjaras, Vidyānvīsa Bhaṭṭacārya, head of the Gauḍa (Bengali) pāṇḍits, and Raghubati Upādhyāya, the famous scholar of Mithilā, Vaiṣṇava poet, and associate of Chaitanya and the six Gosvāmis, who settled in Vārāṇasī in his old age.

Pollock, Vajpeyi, O’Hanlon, and Deshpande see such legal documents as illustrating Vārāṇasi’s role at this time as a center not only of dharma scholarship, but of transregional judicial authority where disputes over varṇa status and privilege back home were referred for adjudication.36 Caste controversies “on appeal” from back home in the Deccan would have been a special concern for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa as a pramukha Mahārāṣṭrian.

The Nāndeḍ lineage lists (vaṇiśāvalis) that V.A. Kanole discovered confirm the long association of the Śeṣas with Mahārāṣṭra.37 Kanole was an “indefatigable and enthusiastic” scholar of Nāndeḍ, who went to the Śeṣa family in the 1940’s, when they were still living in Nāndeḍ, and got access to their family documents, lots of lineage lists, land and revenue records, and remembered family history, but curiously little in the way of Sanskrit śāstra.38 He gives genealogies for nine lineages with 100-200 names of male family members. The Śeṣa family of was as large as it was prestigious. The Nāndeḍ Śeṣas were Āsvalāyanasūtṛī Desāstha Brahmins of the Pārāsara gotra.39 Their founder (mūla puruṣa) was a Rāmakṛṣṇa in the 13th century. One document puts the Śeṣas in Nāndeḍ around 1400.40 Nāndeḍ was an important scholarly center and tīrtha like Paiṭhan upriver. In it was a neighborhood of Brahmins called Siddhanathapuri where the Śeṣas once had a compound, now derelict.

Kanole’s view is that the Śeṣas were originally from Nāndeḍ. It is unclear, however, what the relationship is between the three or four families of Śeṣas in Kāśni, whose genealogies are less well known—Rāmacandra-Ṇṛśirha-Kṛṣṇa is apparently only one of them—and the Nāndeḍ lines or between them and the earlier Śeṣas, as examined

38 Joshi, “‘Alī ‘Ādil Shāh I of Bījāpūr (1558-1580) and his Royal Librarian: Two Ruq’as,” 98.
39 Kanole, 57.
40 Kanole, 62n6.
previously in the section on dating. None of his Nānde lineages match the stemmata for Šeṣa Family I or II. One can only say that the circumstantial evidence preponderates that the Kāśi Šeṣas were some stem of the family group from the Godāvari-Paiṭhan-Nānde region.

Kanole thinks that Viṣṇu, the ancestor of this line, migrated to Benares around 1400 and Nṛsimha in the first half of the 16th century, thus corroborating my independently arrived-at conclusion on this point. We see that Šeṣas were residing in Benares by 1473 from a record of property division dated šake 1551 with the names of Šeṣas as both residents (kāśikāras) and cosigners. What is clear is that Šeṣas were moving back and forth between Kāśi and the Deccan throughout this time. Kanole mentions later Šeṣa paṇḍits and poets whom various sources put at the Bijāpūr, Mughal, and Maratha courts.

The Nānde lineage lists corroborate the verse in the Murārivijaya, a play attributed to Kṛṣṇa Šeṣa, placing the family on the Godāvari River.

The great and learned poet Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa is the son of Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha on whom was bestowed the title of Bhaṭṭabhaṭṭāraka in the court of Vidyānagara [Bijāpūr], the crowning jewel of the society of scholars, resident in the south on the banks of the Godā.

The author’s name is given as Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa. The 1583 nirṇayapatra says that Šeṣa Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa Paṇḍita was in attendance. Apparently, therefore, Kṛṣṇa Šeṣa was also known by the name Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa. He calls himself Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa in several of his grammatical works as well.

**Kṛṣṇa Šeṣa’s Family**

If Kṛṣṇa Šeṣa was in the 16th century, his sons and grandsons are men mainly of the 17th. The NCC ascribes to his brother, Šeṣa Cintāmaṇi, the Parimala, a commentary on the Rasamañjarī of Bhāṇudatta, a treatise on rhetoric
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41 See the vanśāvalis at the end.
42 Kanole, 61.
43 Kanole, 63-4.
44 Cited in “On the Šeṣas” 247.
(alaṅkāra); the Rukminiḥaraṇa, a nāṭaka on Rukmini’s abduction and marriage to Kṛṣṇa; a commentary on the Meghadūta; and the Canda-prakāśa.\textsuperscript{45}

Unaccountably, the NCC makes Śeṣa Cintāmaṇi the son of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. The colophons of the Parimala and Rukminiḥaraṇa clearly state that the author is the son of Śeṣa Nṛsiṁha and lived at Bradhnapura, which is a town on the Tapti River flowing through northeastern Mahārāṣṭra and Gujarat, and another piece of evidence for the Deccan origin of the Śeṣas.\textsuperscript{46} The colophon of the Parimala gives a completion date of 1552.\textsuperscript{47}

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa had two sons, Vireśvara and Nārāyaṇa. Vireśvara authored no works we know of, but, according to honorable mentions in their works, was the guru of Annarībhata and Jagannātha Paṇḍita.\textsuperscript{48} Annarībhata studied grammar with Vireśvara in Kāśī, but is best known as the author of a popular introduction to Nyāya, the Tarkasaṃgraha. Jagannātha Paṇḍita was a famous scholar-poet at the courts of Shah Jahan and the last great poet to write in Classical Sanskrit.\textsuperscript{49} Rosalind O’Hanlon thinks Viśveśvarā may be the Śeṣo-pakhya Viśveśvarā Śarma listed among the attendees at a Brahmin assembly in a 1630 nirṇayapatra.\textsuperscript{50}

To Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, the younger brother of Śeṣa Vireśvara, the NCC attributes the Sūktiratnākara (Jewel Mine of Wise Sayings), a ṭīkā on the Mahābhāṣya.\textsuperscript{51} Parshuram Paranjape also attributes the Akhaṇḍa-maṇjarī (Anīṅgya-lakṣana), a work on compound words not separated by an avagraha in the Pada-pātha, the Tapara (Sarva-tapara), and the Natānta-pāḍāṇi (Napara) to him as well.\textsuperscript{52} The NCC attributes the latter two texts to another Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa. Paranjape believes that the two Śeṣa Nārāyaṇas are the same person and the son of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa; he therefore ascribes all the works in the NCC to him.

\textsuperscript{45} NCC VII.59b.
\textsuperscript{47} A mid-16\textsuperscript{th} century date for Cintāmaṇi accords best with the evidence.
\textsuperscript{48} The Philosophy of the Grammarians, 237; and “On the Śeṣas” 250-51. In the first two prose sentences of the Manoramākucamardanam, edited by Madhusūdhan Sāstrī with the Bālakrīḍā Hindi commentary by the editor, Krishnasadas Sanskrit Series 34 (Varanasi: Krishnasadas Academy, 1983), Jagannātha states that his teacher was Vireśvarapaṇḍita of the Śeṣa vanśa and Vireśvara’s sons had written a critique of Bhaṭṭojī.
\textsuperscript{49} Sheldon Pollock, “The Death of Sanskrit.” See the “third movement” on Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja, the king of scholars, as the “last Sanskrit poet,” pp. 404-12.
\textsuperscript{50} “Letters Home,” 25.
\textsuperscript{51} NCC 89a. The first two āṅnikas of the Sūktiratnākara have recently been published, edited by B.V. Bhagavat, Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, No. 140 (Pune, 1999). Eggeling, I. 158-59, no. 590. A later hand has added the date saṁvat 1575 (1518 CE).
\textsuperscript{52} Kṛṣṇayujurvedyāḥ Samānasaṃdīhi; NCC X. 69ab; Vedalakṣana 372 73, 388-389.
In the verse preamble of the Śūktiramākara, after stotras to Gaṇapati, Cāṇḍīkā, Kāmākṣī, and Kṛṣṇa, Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa pays tribute his father and names five of his grammatical works.

I revere Kṛṣṇa, teacher of the world, embodiment of compassion, delighting in his divine pastimes, the one captivator of creation, infinite and eternal. Author of an inquiry into the topics in and out of the Bhāṣya, Śrī Śeṣa, like no other is regarded for the thousand-mouthed wisdom of Śeṣa shining in his commentaries. His book, Desire of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, a commentary on the Śrī Padacandrīkā, composed by immersion in the eight-fold grammar, is now complete. He wrote the nibandha, Ṣabdābharaṇa, the true āṭkā on the Prakṛtyākṣumudī, and composed the Prakṛtacandrīkā patiently to help the whole world. Like no other, Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the son of Nṛsiṁha Sūrī, has become the ornament of learned men, digging into the six systems of philosophy.

Note the ambiguity of father and deity. He goes on to say (vv. 7-15) that he composed the work at the ur-ging of King Phirinda, praising his valor in many verses; the āṭkā he has written for him on the Mahābhāṣya is superior to prior or “old” āṭkās; and, with devotion to Śrī Kṛṣṇa, nothing is impossible. Evidently, the son was as great a devotee of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as his father. 53

---

53 Interesting trivia: his student, Rāmacandra Śeṣa, wrote a commentary, the Bhāvadhyotanikā on the Naishedhacarita of Śrī Harṣa (see CC 306b, under the entry for “Naishedhacarita”); and his great-grandson, Viṣṇu, wrote a Prakāśikā on the Mahābhāṣya (see The Philosophy of the Grammarians, 243).
Śeṣa Cakrapāṇi, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s grandson, was the younger son and pupil of Vireśvara, the younger brother of Puruṣottama, and the father of Gopinātha.\textsuperscript{54} The date in the NCC for him, 1443-1493, is way off, too early by a century and a half.\textsuperscript{55} Among other works, he wrote an important “shattering” critique of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita’s Praṇḍhamanoramā called the Khaṇḍana. Bhānuji Dīkṣita, Bhaṭṭoji’s son, answered with a defense of his father, the Manorāmāṇmandaṇā.\textsuperscript{56} This is all indicative of the vigorous debate and controversy among contemporaries that became more visible in the generation after Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. Such critical battle was always characteristic of Indian intellectual life, but it may appear to have a new intensity and immediacy for us because we have many more texts from this period.

Remarkably, Cakrapāṇi may not only be among the attendees listed in the 1630 nirṇayapatra as Śeṣopakhya Cakraṇaṇe along with his brother Viśeśvara, but also among the attendees as Cakrapāṇi Paṇḍit Śeṣa at another Brahmanical council convened in 1657 to render a decision on the “true brahmaness” of some Devarśi Brahmins.\textsuperscript{57} There was a who’s who of over ninety eminent paṇḍits present from “Maharashtra, Karnataka, Konkan, Tailanga, Dravida, etc,” including Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa, Anantadeva, Nṛsiṁhāśrama, Gāgābhāṭṭa, the grandnephew of Appaya Dīkṣita, and many others distinguished in Dharmaśāstra, Nyāya, and Vedānta. That makes in toto three legal letters documenting how active and prominent the Śeṣa family was in the institutional life of the day.

Gopinātha, is the father of Rāmacandra, the author of a commentary on the Dharmānubandhiślokacaturdāṣī of his great-great grandfather, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa.\textsuperscript{58}

The Gotra of Parshuram Paranjape

During an eight month stay in Pune my Sanskrit paṇḍit, Nirmala Kulkarni gave me an introduction to Dr. Parshuram Paranjape. Mr. Paranjape is a Sanskrit scholar at the Vaidik Samshodhan Mandal at Maharashtra Vidyapeeth who, amazingly, claims to be a descendant of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, more precisely, a member of the same gotra, not a lineal descendant. I had two interviews with him (Dec. 2008, Jan. 2009), Manisha Phanasalkar acting as my Marathi inter-

\textsuperscript{54} According to the genealogy in the Dharmānubandhiślokacaturdāṣī 1.
\textsuperscript{55} See NCC VI, 283, “(Śeṣa) Cakraṇaṇi” and Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṁsaka I. 532,540-541.
\textsuperscript{56} “On the Śeṣas,” 251n8.
\textsuperscript{58} Dharmānubandhiślokacaturdāṣī 1.
locutor. He has been researching Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, and has written a Sanskrit thesis on his works.59 He told me a great many interesting things about the Śeṣa family, which partly have the character of family traditions. Most beguilingly, he thinks that Gāgābhāṣṭa referred to the SAS in his Kāyasthadharmadīpa with the phrase “yathoktam śiromaṇau.”

Paranjape claims that the gotra of the Śeṣa family was Vṛddha Viṣṇu. This gotra name is of later, non-Vedic origin. Their Vṛddha Viṣṇu gotra distinguishes them from the earlier line of Śeṣas, who were of the Kauṇḍinya gotra, according to Viṭṭhala.60 There are three surnames in the Vṛddha Viṣṇu gotra: Mehendele, Paranjape, and Nene. The family name of the Śeṣas was Paranjape. Śeṣa was not the original family name. The gotra has many members and side branches. Mehendele and Paranjape are common names in Maharashtra even today. The Paranjapes follow the Baudhāyana school of the Rg Veda. Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa composed a Śrauta Prayoga according to this school. The Mehendele and Nenes follow the Yajur Veda. Some later Paranjapes acquired the name Deva, as they earlier had the title of Śeṣa. Paranjapes also adopted the name Mandalika. Although family names changed over time, the gotra Vṛddha Viṣṇu remained constant.

His claim that the gotra of the Śeṣa family was Vṛddha Viṣṇu is based on a verse in the Natānta-padāni (or Nāpara-Laṅkāna), which he attributes to Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, son of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, rather than to another Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa as does the NCC.61 The NCC attributes the Natānta-pādani, Tapara, Nāpara, and some works on Miṁāṁsā, including the Śrautaprayoga to a Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, son of Vāsudeva and grandson of Ananta,62 and the Śūktiratnākara to Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, son of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa.63 Paranjape believes that one Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa wrote all the works ascribed in the NCC to these two authors. He adds the Akhaṇḍamaṇjari (or Aningya-Laṅkāna), composed in 1600-1611 on the topic of compound words, which the NCC does not mention at all.

His argument is as follows. In the verse at the end of the Natānta-pādani the author calls his family “vṛddhaviṣṇukulā” and his father Garuḍadhvaja.

 hariṁ namaskṛtya nateṣṭadam vibhum
   jagannivāsaṁ tam adhokṣajāṁ param
   dayānīdhīr yasya kaṭāksamātrataḥ
   prayāti māko 'pi paṭutvam aṁjasā

59 Parshuram Paranjape, Kṛṣṇavajurvediyah Samānasaṅdhih, unpublished thesis deposited at Vaidik Samshodhan Mandal, Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Pune, India.
60 The Prakṛtiyākaumudi of Rāmacandra, with the Prasāda of Viṭṭhala, I.1.
61 Following Veda-Laṅkāna 388-389.
62 NCC X.69ab.
63 NCC 89a.
Worshipping Hari, the all-pervading, in whom the whole world rests, the transcendent, the supreme, at a mere glance from him, the treasure of compassion, even the dumb become sharp instantly.

I, the son of Garuḍadhvaja, moon on the ocean of the Vṛddha Viṣṇu family, have written this commentary for the joy of Vedic priests.

Paranjape problematically takes kula as gotra, letting him identify the gotra of the Śeṣa family as Vṛddha Viṣṇu. Why are the two Śeṣa Nārāyaṇas in the NCC the same man? In both the Natānta-pādāṇī and Akhaṇḍamaṇḍarī, Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa refers to his father Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa under the names of Viṣṇu in line with the convention that great scholars of grammar were incarnations of Viṣṇu, Nāga Śeṣa and Śeṣa Patañjali. In the Akhaṇḍamaṇḍarī, he calls his father Vāsudeva, and his grandfather, Ananta. This presumably led the NCC to mistake Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, son of Vāsudeva, for a different person from Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, son of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. On this reasoning, the Garuḍadhvaja, another of the names of Viṣṇu, in the verses above from the Natānta-pādāṇī is also Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. Similarly, in the Sūktiratnākara (vv. 4-6) Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa plays on the name of Kṛṣṇa as both father and deity, expressing again the traditional belief that the human and divine coincide in the person of the guru as the very embodiment of wisdom and learning.

It is difficult to know what to do with this argument. It has a certain plausibility from the point of view of traditional guru reverence, but it rests on one piece of tenuous textual evidence and the indemonstrable supposition that divine names are being applied to persons. Therefore, I have not placed much weight on it among the pieces of evidence in support of my contention that the gotras of the early and late Śeṣas are different and therefore Nṛsiṁha and the Govindārṇava are datable to the 16th century.

Word play with śeṣa and identification with Śeṣa Patañjali are, not surprisingly, common with regard to the Śeṣa family and are found in Nṛsiṁha, Śeṣa Govinda, Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣīta, and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa himself. The studied ambiguity in such punning on śeṣa, with its potent associations with Śeṣa Viṣṇu and Patañjali, makes it difficult to assess Nṛsiṁha’s claim in the Govindārṇava that old man Viṣṇu was his ancestor. Śeṣa Cintāmaṇi likewise traces the genealogy of the Śeṣa family back to mythic origins in his Rukminiharaṇa.65

64 Ibid.
Mr. Paranjape wisely warned me against relying on encyclopedias and secondary sources with their reproduction of unauthenticated information as, for example, that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was a Tailaṅga Brahmin and just about everything else in Kaviraj’s Kāśi kī Śārasvata Sādhana.

As for his claim that Gagābhaṭṭa mentions the SAS in his Kāyasthadharmadīpa, this remains unverified. The text needs to be more thoroughly combed than I have been able to do. I suspect it may be an error or misreading on his part. In any case, a mere mention of the Śūdrācīrāsiromani without the author’s name would do little to corroborate Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s authorship or date the text. Nor would it shed light on the legend of Gagābhaṭṭa’s attack in his campaign on behalf of Śivāji’s kṣatriyahood on the view attributed to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa that in the Kaliyuga the Kṣatriya varṇa had disappeared and only the Brāhmaṇa and Śūdra varṇas remained.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa Guru

The high repute in which Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was held in the field of grammar and his influence on subsequent students is well known and requires no repetition. A verse in Śeṣa Govinda’s Sarvasiddhāntasāṁgraha captures it:

Sarasvatī knows the truth of the bhāṣya spoken by the serpent Ananta,
on earth Śeṣa or Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, no one else.66

Who is this Śeṣa Govinda? No clue. Just another of the many unplaceable Śeṣas listed by Aryavaraguru.67

Aryavaraguru also claims that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was the founder of the Benares School of Grammar, which included such later luminaries as Bhaṭṭoṭjī and Nāgojī Dīkṣita.68 It is not clear what relationship Bhaṭṭoṭjī had with Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, but it is certainly plausible that he learned grammar from him. In a verse found in one older manuscript of the Śabdakaustubha, Bhaṭṭoṭjī says that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was his guru.69

I had Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa as my guru, not different from Śeṣa, who taught me all the sentences of Śeṣa himself.

---

66 Sphoṭatattvanirūpaṇa, Prakkathanam 3.
67 Aryavaraguru in “On the Śeṣas,” (252) dates him to fl. 1590, but what his relation to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa may have been is unknown, perhaps a family member. See Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, vol. I, compiled by Karl Potter, 2nd rev. ed. (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983), 378. In Kanole, bearers of the Śeṣa family name are scattered all around from Kāśi to Bījāpūr to Ujjain. The Nāndeḍ lineage lists have several Govindas. Kanole, 71.
68 As asserts Aryavaraguru, 247.
On the other hand, the acute critique of him in the Praudhamanoramā rather suggests some rivalry between them. Be that as it may, Bhaṭṭoṭi made his home in Vārānasī and must have been personally know to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. His most famous work is the Siddhāntakaumudi, the most popular primer on Pāṇini. Jagannātha Paṇḍita (1590-1665) in turn takes Bhaṭṭoṭi to task in his Manorākucamardana and is usually construed to say that Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita was Bhaṭṭoṭi Dīkṣita’s teacher. He accuses him of writing with base motives and confusing Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s ideas.

Was there a parallel lineage of influence on subsequent Dharmaśāstra paralleling his grammatical influence? The only positive evidence for it is the commentary on his Dharmānubandhiṣlokacaturdasī by his great-great grandson Rāma, hinting that his work on dharma may also have been held in some esteem. S. C. Banerji speaks of the “Vārānasī School of Dharmaśāstra,” including in it Lakṣmīdhara, Dalapati, Vireśvarabhaṭṭa, author of the Śūradharmabodhini, Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, Kamalakarabhaṭṭa, and Nandapaṇḍita, but makes no mention of Kṛṣṇa. As noted above, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa did have some kind of impact on the Bhaṭṭas, if only in legend, as one of the rival families of Deccan derivation who came to dominate the intellectual life of Vārānasī. In fact, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s main stimulus on both later grammarians and neo-smṛti-kāraṇas seems to have been as an object of attack, despite his veneration as another incarnation of Śeṣa.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s Śiṣya-Guru Paramparā

---

70 Suryakant Bali, Bhaṭṭoṭi Dīkṣita, 7.
71 The Philosophy of the Grammarians, 240; Systems of Sanskrit Grammar, 38-40.
72 Aryavaraguru rejects this reading, making Śeṣa Vireśvara his teacher (251).
73 The locus for these statements is the first two prose sentences of the Manorākucamardana, quoted in Hueckstedt, “Some Later Argument on iko yan aci,” 51n18. iha kec in nikhilavidvamuktaṇāmaṇiśya-kālamāla-līta caranakamaḷānām gīvānagurauguravagrāmsāmāṁsādhamahimandhāntākhandamaṇḍhamahimandhāntānāṁ śeṣavāṁśavatārsanāṁ śrīkṛṣṇākhyapān-dītānāṁ cirāyārcitayoh pādakayoḥ prakāṣidāntāsābduṇāsānās teṣu ca pāramesvaram padam prayāteṣu kalikāla-vanśavadībhavantānāṁ tatra bhavādhībhiḥ ullāṣitam prakṛiyāpṛakāśām iṣayānavaḥpanāḥbhandhānaḥ dūṣanāḥ svayam nirmātyāṁ manorāmāyāṁ ākulya-kāraṇaḥ, sa ca prakṛiyāpṛakāśākṛtam paurair ahklasāśtra mahārāvavamvanyācalayāmāna-mānaśānāṁ asmadguruvīreśvarapaṇḍitānāṁ tanayair dūṣitāpi svamāti parikṣārtham punar asmābhīr api nirikṣyate.
74 Banerji, History of Dharmaśāstra, 57-61, 151-53.
Aryavaraguru takes notes of another disciple of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, one Jayantabhaṭṭa, dated to the seventeenth century.  

Another member of the “Benares School” recasting Pāṇini, he wrote the Tattvacandra, an abbreviation of the Prakṛtykaumudī and Prakāśa. This is what he tells us about himself and his guru.

After imbibing the essence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita’s ocean of teachings, savory with argument respecting Śeṣa, Jayanta wrote a short, to the point exposition on the Satkaumudī to delight the excellent. He was born on the bank of the Tapti in Prakṛśāpurī, illumined by his father, Śrī Madhusūdana, jewel of the learned. After looking at all the opinions of scholars, he collected their principles and completed an analysis. Considering that access to the ocean of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s teachings is difficult for those of little intelligence, he opened this little spring for their sake, revealing the light of truth in them. With Jayanta’s assistance, may it long shine in Kāśi.

Works Attributed to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa

In the late 19th century scholars such as Oppert, Bühler, Kielhorn, Peterson, and Bhandarkar catalogued the Sanskrit manuscripts scattered about in India in libraries and private collections. They turned up works by Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa son of Nṛśimha, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Śrī Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, Śrī Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa, Kṛṣṇa Kavi, Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita, and so on, not knowing if these were by the same author or not. Their finds were compiled by Theodor Aufrecht in the Catalogus Catalogorum: An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit Works and Authors, vol. I. pt. 1, 117-18; 661-62.

The Catalogus Catalogorum attributed the works now allotted to a single Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in the NCC to three different Kṛṣṇas: Kṛṣṇa or Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita and Śeṣakṛṣṇa. The Kṛṣṇa of the SAS is catalogued separately from the poetic Kṛṣṇa and the grammarian Kṛṣṇa.

Seven poetic works, two campūs, one kāvya, and four nāṭakas are attributed to Kṛṣṇa or Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, the son of Narasiṁha or Nṛśimha:

75 NCC VII, 180a; Eggeling, Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office, II. 170-71, no. 625. The ms. is dated to saṃvat 1687. If it is not a later copy, that would put Jayanta c. 1630.  
76 Sanskrit text in “On the Śeṣas,” 250.
To a Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita or Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa, son of Narasiṅha or Śeṣa Nṛsiṅha, the CC ascribed five works on grammar:

- Padacandrikā
- Prakriyāprakāśa
- Prakṛtacandrikā
- Upapadatīṣṭravyaśākhyāna
- Yanlugantaśiromaṇi

And to another completely different Śeṣakṛṣṇa is ascribed the SAS. Given the plurality of Kṛṣṇas, Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭas, Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍitas and Kṛṣṇa Kavis, the many works ascribed to them, and the improbability of them all being by one Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, this caution was and remains prudent.

The New Catalogus Catalogorum (IV.365ab-66a) credits thirteen works to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa or Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, adding the Sphoṭatattva, Śabdālaṅkāra, Kṛṣṇakautūhala, Dhmānubandhiślokaṭcaturasḍī, and the Govin-dārṇava with Śeṣakṛṣṇa as coauthor, and deleting all the literary works but two: the Kaṁsavadha and the Pārijātaharaṇa.

**Works of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in the New Catalogus Catalogorum (1968)**

- Pārijātaharaṇa
- Padacandrikā
- Kaṁsavadha
- Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi
- Prakṛtyaumudipraṅkāśa (or Gūḍhahāvavivṛti)
- Upapadatīṣṭravyaśākhyāna
- Govindārṇava
- Dharmānubandhiślokaṭcaturasḍī
- Kṛṣṇakautūhala
- Prakṛtacandrikā
- Yanlugantaśiromaṇi
- Śabdālaṅkāra (or Śabdābharaṇa)
- Sphoṭatattva

Aryavaraguru listed eleven works, adding the Murārvijayanāṭaka and omitting the Uṣā and Satyabhāmā kāvyas, the Govindārṇava, Dhmānubandhiślokaṭcaturasḍī, and Śrīkṛṣṇakautūhala. He included the SAS with the proviso that its authorship is “still open to question” (249). It still is.

**Works of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in “On the Śeṣas” (1912)**

- Upapadatīṣṭravyaśākhyāna
- Kaṁsavadha
- Padacandrikā
- Pārijātaharaṇa
- Prakṛtyaapraṅkāśa
- Prakṛtacandrikā
- Murārvijaya
- Yanlugantaśiromaṇi
- Śabdālaṅkāra
- Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi
- Sphoṭatattva
Of these texts, the Kaṁsavadha, Prakriyāprakāṣa, and Pārijātaharana are the most securely ascribed to the same author by internal evidence. On what basis the others are is not always clear, presumably, on a name basis. The kāvyaś are especially problematic. As noted before, some of them, such as the Kriyāgopana, have Kṛṣṇa Kavi as author.\textsuperscript{194} Is Kṛṣṇa Kavi Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa? There are a few pieces of literary evidence arguing for the identity of the poet and grammarian Kṛṣṇas.

As mentioned earlier,\textsuperscript{195} shared verses linking the Kaṁsavadha (KV) and Prakriyāprakāṣa (PKP) led Trivedi to conclude that the commentator (prakāṣakṛt), is the same as the author of the KV.\textsuperscript{196} A phrase from KV 19:

\begin{quote}
पुत्रीणिमणिलिमणिनम�
rejects the idea that grammatical expertise mars poetry and “shows that the author of the Kāṃsavadha was a great grammarian.” These verses are all in the prologue of the KV where the director (śūtradhāra) and actress (naṭī) are wittily sparring over whether the author, an accomplished grammarian, can be a poet. In her opinion, grammar spoils poetry with pedantry. The director defends grammatical correctness as essential to eloquence and praises the author as a man of deep learning. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa speaks through the mouth of the director and actress:

Director: Sparkling gem of the whole world, the son of Śrī Nṛsiṁha, Kṛṣṇa the poet, out of curiosity has composed a play entitled the Kāṃsavadha with which he honors us. We are now going to perform it for the delight of this fine and cultivated audience. 19

Actress: (aside) How can you put him among poets?

Director: My dear, why do you doubt it?

    Writing a poem is not difficult for a person whose mind is adorned with all fourteen arts and sciences as wonderfully as his is. 20

Actress: I’m just saying that even though he seems like a pleasant writer of verse, clever people are critical of scholarly writers.

Director: Yes, but

    On the head, a garland of coral flowers murmuring with a cloud of bees, on the rounded hips, the jingle of a girdle, on the feet, the twinkle of anklets, in her lap, the song of a parrot, or on her breast, a soft lute, giving ear to the music of these, Sarasvatī thinks her burden bright. 21

and:

Not even the sweetness in the nectar-rayed moon, in the pure food of the gods, in the trembling sea of milk thick with billowing waves of beauty, in the bloom on the lower lip of a lovely girl matches the perfection in the illustrious scholar-poet Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita’s waves of words. 22

Actress: Well, I’ve heard that he’s rigorously trained in grammar. How can he be a poet?

Director: Knowledge of grammar is a grace, not a blemish.

    Speech that is full of emotion and figures of speech, but ungrammatical, like a sick body, does not entertain. 23

Actress: I’m saying something else. I’m not attached to the notion that his tongue, spoiled by constant application to the hard and harsh rules streaming from the thousand poisonous mouths of Śeṣa, Lord of Serpents, may not charm people of taste keen on sweet and mellifluous sentiments. 24
From this exchange, we can gather that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa prided himself on his talents as a poet, although most famed as grammar guru to later outstanding figures in the field, e.g. Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita. As a poet-scholar and a grammarian who writes dramatic verse, he rejects the typecast of the crabbed pedant who cannot write well.

These verses suggest that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa had a conventionally high opinion of himself and his abilities, an impression seconded by Trivedi’s view that his style and manner in the Prakriyāprakāśa is boastful and far-fetched. The style of the SAS also seems, at times, nitpicking. It may be too much of a stretch, however, to see a personal style here. Self-advertisement and guru glorification were customary. Dharmaśāstra did not place a premium on individual style. The Brahmin paṇḍits of Vārāṇasī, however, did have a large investment in their reputation and prestige as independent authorities. This is the point of the long banner with which he is introduced as the author of the SAS.

śrīmatsarvantrasatantravidvadvara
śrīsesakṛṣṇanirmitah śūdrācārasiromani

The Śūdrācārasiromani composed by Śrī Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa most excellent among master scholars learned in all the venerable sciences SAS 1

Without reading too much significance into this title (it was probably the work of the copyist or editors), it does capture the value placed on personal distinction and autonomy by these free-lancing paṇḍits. Individual réclame and family repute garnered the patronage of the little rājas who were commissioning works from Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and his father. The Śeṣas and Bhaṭṭas were, in a sense, scholarly entrepreneurs. Paṇḍits such as Gāgābhaṭṭa were like “traveling Sanskrit consultants.”

Vajpeyi traces this new stress on self-promotion to a crisis of patronage in the Sultanates that sent southern Brahmīs north to Kāśi drawn there by its pan-regional centrality as a seat of Sanskrit learning and law. It was the place to seek fame and fortune.

…it was as though ksatriya-s had disappeared altogether from the world of Maharashtra’s brāhmaṇa-s. With them vanished an era of brahmanical influence. The brāhmaṇa-s of this world-without-ksatriya-s left their unmoored city, went elsewhere. In their new home in Kāśi, they were no longer able to rely on politically powerful local Hindu patrons. With the disappearance of the “brahmaksatriya” complex of hegemonic interests, the relocated Maharashtrian brāhmaṇa-s became—were forced to become—autonomous historical agents who would work for small-time Hindu rājā-s wherever they might be located, in any radial direction from Banaras.

197 S.K. Belvalkar, Systems of Sanskrit Grammar (Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 1976), 38-40 describes “recasts” of Pāṇini such as the Śiddhāntakaumudī.
198 Trivedi, li-lvi.
199 Vaypeyi, Politics of Contempt, 36.
She locates the emergence of the new discourse on śūdradharma in the catering by juridical scholars such as Kamalākara and Gāgābhaṭṭa to a new class of patrons, as Derrett puts it, “consequent upon the emergence of a new Shudra (subsequently partly Shudra and partly Kshatriya) aristocracy in the Deccan.” The adjudication of the caste status disputes of ruling elites often of Śūdra, extra-varṇa, or otherwise contested origins necessitated a new discourse in Dharmaśāstra.

Because of his ties to the south, one wants to include Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in this development. Kamalākara and Gāgābhaṭṭa were engaged in fashioning a new discourse of Śūdras in response to the new realities of caste, the upward mobility of Śūdras, and the ambiguous caste status of new ruling elites i.e., the Marathas in their homeland. There is nothing in the SAS as overt as Gāgābhaṭṭa’s role in the legitimation of Śivājī and the Kāyathas. Coming several decades before, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is not engaged in quite the same enterprise, but, one senses, he is sailing into the winds of change.

The patronage lost and power vacuum left as Hindu kings in the Deccan fell to the Muslims and Mughals must also have contributed to the Brahmin concern with the notion of disappearing Kṣatriyas in the Kaliyuga. Again, there is nothing of this in the SAS, but it becomes a matter of some urgency later on for Gāgābhaṭṭa.

A Descriptive Catalogue of the Works

Kāvya

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa wrote a number of Kṛṣṇa-kāvyas, indicating that he was a devotee of his divine namesake. The attribution, however, of several is tenuous. In the SAS, special attention is given to Viṣṇu pājā, rather than to Kṛṣṇa devotion per se. In the SAS (220-21), Pilājī is called the son of Keśavadāsa, who is a “Parama Vaiṣṇava,” devoted to the lotus feet of Śrī Govinda, and sprung from the lotus feet of Śrī Hari. That is pretty much it. Among these literary works, only the Kāṁsavadha and Pārijātaharaṇa can confidently be credited to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. One takes his Kṛṣṇa-kāvyas as tributaries to the outpouring of Vaiṣṇava bhakti literature in this period.

Kāṁsavadha by Mahākavi Śrī Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa.201 The Kāṁsavadha is a nāṭaka in seven acts telling the story of the slaying of the demonic Karisha by his nephew, Kṛṣṇa (Hari. 2.85-86; BhP 10.44; VP 5.15 ff). In the prologue(v. 13) KS

---


says that the drama was commissioned and performed for Govârdhana, the son of Akbar’s famous general and Min-
ister of Finance, Tôdaramalla (d. 1586), dating it roughly to the late 1500’s. Reference is also made to 
gurur-
giridharinâmâ. Some take this as another name for Govârdhana, but it may refer to his guru, possibly Giridhârinâ-
tha, the grandson of Vallabhâcârya. Edited and Printed in Kâvyamâla 6.

**Pârijâtaaharâna.** A campû in five “Expirations” (ucthvâsas) on Krśṇa’s theft of the pârijâta tree from the garden
of Indra to appease the jealousy of his third wife Satyabhâmâ. Based on Harivamśa 64-81 and Bhâgavata Purâṇa X.
59, the subject was popular; four other kâvyas are known. Printed in Kâvyamâla 14.

In the introduction (1.18) and last verse, KS tells us that the PJH was composed at the command of the great
Mahârâja Narottama, of the Śrî Vâstakas of Tândvapura. His brother is Govinda, presumably the patron of the
Govindârâvana, making these local potentates important patrons for both KS and his father. The relation of Tândava
to Kâśi is not geographically or politically clear, nor who exactly his brother, Kâśirâja, “king of Kâśi,” is (1.13).

In the first five verses, KS reverences Śambhu, Viṣṇu, Lakṣmî, Sarasvatî, and Krśṇa, then extols Tândava-pura
and the Śrî Vâstakas (1.9-14). I omit a lengthy prose description of Narottama’s royal magnificence in commission-
ing the PJH. The author then introduces himself and his subject (1.17-18) assured that his devotion to Hari will pu-
rify his work of defects (19).

---

**First Uchhvâsa**

May the longing mind of Satyabhâmâ rejoice in the pârijâta flower, which is heavy with black bumblebees intoxicated with its sweetness. She disdains the mandâra tree, bursting with fat, sluggish bees captivated by its slowly flowing drops of nectar.

May her auspicious glances, the channels of the nectar of mercy, like boats over the ocean of the world, grant us good fortune.

I reverence Śambhu, the power and the glory, in his wild dance, appearing here adorned with golden earrings, peacock plumes, coiled serpent, and drum, shining with the splendor of the autumn clouds.

I reverence the lotus feet of Mukunda of surpassing beauty, in his palace, the home of lovely Lakṣmî, where the swift stream of the heavenly Ganges flows with its throngs of devotees, among them Indra, in the form of a bee.

Like a cloudless autumn sky may Sarasvatî, mistress of all the arts, protect us bestowing all excellent gifts on her devotees. With her gleaming smile she dispels the veil of darkness.

May the sage Vâlmîki, the incarnation of poetry, born in an anthill on a sandy beach, who delights the mind with words full of sense, pour out for me a treasure of wishes.

Sarasvatî does not go near the harshness and vulgarity of people without taste and does not step on the quaking black mud and ash of bad men.

---

Tāṇḍavapura is the ornament of the whole world, the very image of empire, on the shore of the celestial Ganges, the abode of blessings, where break the waves from the churning stone of sacred Mount Mandara near the walls of the city of the Lord of Gaurī.

This is the city of the great Śrīvāstaka family a broad land abounding in all good things of fortune, whose pure and spotless honor the whole world has long acclaimed. The crown jewel of lord-protectors in a land where misfortune has been banished, they are the Western Mountain at dawn, red with the saffron on the breasts of heroes’ wives.

In a world slippery with the muck of the Kaliyuga, a dark rain falls. The Dharma limps along weakly stumbling. Who else but they steadfastly upholds it sending forth a garland of valiant heroes.

In this city is a family of noble, pure, and distinguished character, who rest upon Viṣṇu, the Preserver of the Universe, whose rise was achieved through the discipline of mind that burnt up, the God of Love, foe of Śaṅkara. How many glories have they achieved, and still more again, through honor shining cool and brilliant like the autumn moon.

Mādhava with absolute devotion to Maheśvara, rampant as a lion over the battlefield imparted fearless courage to good men. Then Narottama, the younger brother of Kāśirāja, triumphs surpassing, it is said, even Govinda, celebrated for three shining exploits.

Wishing to converse about Kṛṣṇa, the younger brother of Indra, with a taste for the sweetness of new poetry, for a pill of sugar, a cure of words for a mind more and more overcome with a slow throbbing illness, commissioned the son of Śeṣa Nṛśimha.

I, Kṛṣṇa, a scion of the Śrī Śeṣa family, son of Nṛśimha Sūri, now begin the story of the theft of the pārijāta tree in fine prose and verse by command of Lord Narottama, jewel among kings, to promote spirituality and virtue through the tender pastimes and sweet discourses of Keśava.

Hari will take away any and all defects of body and mind in my language graced by pure and total devotion to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Let the captious vainly find fault with my poem. There is no value in mischievous trifling with the story of Hari.


**Kṛṣṇagopana or Candraśīlāśa.** A *kāvyā* in 14 cantos on the story of the Rāmāyana. Doubtfully attributed to KS by Gustav Oppert since the author, Kṛṣṇakavi, is said to be the son of a Raghunātha Dīkṣita. Oppert, ms. 4540.

---


**Muktācarita.** Another attribution repeated in secondary sources and based on Peterson’s Reports.²⁰⁸ Raghunātha Gosvāmi wrote a “Pearl Story” (c. 1550) relating the pastime of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa with the gopis and cowherds, in which Kṛṣṇa shows them how to grow pearls.

The following works are often attributed to KS in secondary sources, entirely, it appears, on the basis of the CC.²⁰⁹ The NCC omits all of them with good reason.

**Satyabhāmāpāriṇāyā.** A nāṭaka in which Kṛṣṇa wins the hand of Satyabhāmā in marriage by recovering the syamantaka jewel. Sphulinya also wrote another Satyabhāmāpāriṇāyā in the 16th century. (Hari. 1.39; 2.122-134; BhP 10.59 61, 83).²¹⁰ Oppert attributes it to a Kṛṣṇakavīndra.²¹¹

**Satyabhāmāvilāsa.** Another dubious attribution, possibly the same as the Satyabhāmāpāriṇāyā The CC attributes it to KS, Oppert to a Kṛṣṇakavīndra, “perhaps the same as KS,” perhaps not.²¹²

**Uṣāparīṇāyā.** A campū on the marriage of Uṣā, and Aniruddha, the grandson of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, who rescues him from Bāṇa. Another episode from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. MS. catalogued by Oppert.

**Murārivijaya.** A nāṭaka by a Kṛṣṇa Kavi on Lord Kṛṣṇa Murāri and his victory over the five-headed demon Mura guarding Narakasura’s castle (Vāmana 61.68-77; BhP 10.59).²¹³ Another ms. catalogued by Peter Peterson containing the line:

> The great and learned poet Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa is the son of Bhaṭṭa Nṛsiṁha, on whom was bestowed the title of Bhaṭṭabhaṭṭāraka in the court of Vidyānagara [Bijāpūr], the crowning jewel of the society of scholars, resident in the south on the banks of the Godā.

As discussed previously, Aryavaraguru took this line to show that KS composed the Murārivijaya. Nonetheless, howsoever much the circumstantial details may be agreeable, it is far from sure that Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa or Kṛṣṇa Kavi is KS.

**Vyākarana**

With the grammatical works we are on firmer ground, since this was his claim to fame. The following five titles are mentioned by Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa in the Sūktiratnākara (1.5-6) as works of his father.²¹⁴

---

²⁰⁹ as e.g. in IEOIL, HCSL, and Kṛṣṇa-Kāvyā.
²¹⁰ *Kṛṣṇa-Kāvyā* 3.
²¹¹ *List of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, vol. II, ms. 2260.
²¹³ Peterson’s Report, III, 21; CC I, 462; CC II. 106.
²¹⁴ *Sūktiratnākara* by Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, ed. by Vāman Śāstrī Bhāgavat.
Prakriyākaumudi-prakāśa. \(^{215}\) KS also calls it “Gūḍhabhāvavivṛti” (Exposition of the Hidden Meaning) and “Sat-prakriyākaumudīprakāśa” (Gloss on the Prakriyākaumudi) in the introduction and conclusion. The Prakāśa is a commentary on the Prakriyākaumudi of Rāmacandra. The grandson of Rāmacandra, Viṭṭhala, wrote a commentary on it, the Prasāda, in which he eulogizes in detail Rāmacandra and the earlier Śeṣas. KS sharply criticized the Prasāda as obscure, incompetent and dull (see for example vv. 36-38). Bhaṭṭojī roundly criticized Viṭṭhala and KS in his Manoramā. \(^{216}\) In his 46-verse introduction, KS recounts (34) how he was commissioned to write the Prakāśa by Viṭṭhala, one in the line of “petty” kings of Patrapūrī, in the Ganges-Yamunā Doab, to teach grammar to his athletic son, Kalyāṇa. This Viṭṭhala may be Bīrbal, a minister to Akbar. \(^{217}\) KS says that his father, Śrī Śeṣa Nṛsiṁha Śūri is his guru in the concluding couplets (2).

Śabdālaṅkāra. A large lost work on grammar of which the Prakāśa is an abridgement according to verse 45:

Like gold refined in fire, I have extracted the essence of the Śabdālaṅkāra and put it here out of consideration for good people wishing to know the principles in their purity. \(^{218}\)

Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa calls it the “Śabdābharaṇa.”

Padacanḍrikā. A versified grammar with commentary (vyṛtti) written for Narottama by Śrī Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, son and student of Śrī Śeṣa Nṛsiṁha Śūri. Colebrooke, Eggeling and the NCC say it is based on Sārasvata grammar. \(^{219}\) Rāganāthasvami Aryavaraguru rejects the claim, seeing it as clearly Pāṇinian. \(^{220}\) This must be correct if neo-Pāṇinian KS is the author. The Sārasvata School of Grammar simplified and abbreviated Pāṇini, reducing his rules to 700 aphorisms. \(^{221}\)

Śrīkṛṣṇa-kautiḥhala. Desire of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The NCC takes this be the title of a commentary on the Padacanḍrikā, on the basis of a verse in Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa’s Śūktiratnākāra (1.5), where it is said to a grantha written by “immersion in the eight-fold grammar,” presumably the Asāḍhyāyi, and a “completed vivaraṇa on the Śrī Padacanḍrikā.” It is not clear if by Śrī Kṛṣṇa is meant the author, deity or both, as is often the case for incarnate gurus. There is no other evidence beside this mention.

Prākṛtacanḍrikā. \(^{222}\) a Prākṛt grammar in nine chapters (prakāśas) with a ṭīkā by Śrī Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita, the “little sister” (v. 440) of his Padacanḍrikā He again calls Nārasiṁha/ Nṛsiṁha his guru (1.3; 9.37).

The opening and closing verses.

Bees are swarming round the forehead of Gaṇapati.  
Like the sun, he destroys the darkness of a host of calamities.  
His trunk is red like sindoor.  
I resort to the god of gods with the face of an elephant.  

Sarasvatī is writing with a lotus in her book.  
May she guide us to completion of this work.  
She pours the essence of learning into the budding mouths of new poets, surpassing others in sweet eloquence, like a stream of honey.  

---

216 Trivedi xlvi, Systems of Sanskrit Grammar 37.
217 So believes Aḍyā Prasāda Miśra, Prakriyā Kaumudī Vimarsaḥ, Sarasvatī Bhavana Studies 16 (Vārāṇasī: Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1966), 125.
218 NCC IV.365b.
219 Eggeling, Catalogue Pt. 1. 252, ms. 903. NCC IV.365b.
220 “On the Śeṣas,” 249.
221 Systems Sanskrit Grammar 76-87.
The 85-verse introduction lionizes Ncitta, the ms., it is composed in six sections called
amply, and a forbear, Vi

The original language is Sanskrit.
Prākrit is derived from it. Prākrit is of three kinds:
derived from the Sanskrit word, the same as the Sanskrit word, or the vernacular. 4

May clever scholars setting aside their labors,
relax at long last from their craft
and enjoy this younger sister of the Padacandrikā,
the fine Prākṛtacandrikā, in the company of poets. 440

Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s modest request is that his work,
laid at the lotus feet of his teacher Narasiṁha,
the joy of the Śeṣa family, may give delight in its clear merit 441

And so, the Prākṛtacandrikā written by Śrī Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita is complete.

Sphoṭatattvanirūpaṇa. 223 This is a short Vedantic work of nineteen kārikās with an auto-commentary on sphoṭa theory, i.e., the inherent relation between sound and meaning and the logotheism of śabdabrahman. Notices 1431. G. B. Palsule summarizes the contents observing that, though late, the work is a conservative presentation of the subject.224 There is nothing navya about it. Vasantrayambaka Śeṣade’s Tatvapraṣāṣika commentary includes four kārikās (54) in addition to the nineteen that plainly assign the text to Śrī Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, and, incidentally, includes the SAS among the set of texts most solidly assigned to him.

Yaiṅugantaśiromaṇi. The yaiṅug part of the Prakāśa, on the formation of the intensive without the suffix ya. The ms. in Eggeling does not name the author, but there is a colophon in Notices stating the author as Śrī Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita. 225 Colebrooke described the treatise as a gloss on Raghunātha Śiromaṇi’s commentary on Gaṅgeśa’s Sabdakhaṇḍa.

Upapadatiṁsūtravyākhyāṇa. MS. catalogued by Weber. 760, p.216. Nothing more is known about it.

Dharmaśāstra

Govindaṛṇava. This is a digest in manuscript, apparently coauthored by both Śeṣa Nṛsiṁha and his son KS for Ma-

hārājādhīrāja Govindacandra (aka Govindadeva) of Tāṇḍava. Also called “Smṛtisāgara” and “Dharmatattvāloka” in

the ms., it is composed in six sections called vičīs (waves) on sanskāra, āhnika, śṛddha, śuddhi, kāla, and pṛayaś-citta.

The 85-verse introduction lionizes Nṛsiṁha, the fourth avatar of Viṣṇu, and recounts the lineage of the Śrīvāstaka dynasty: Śivadāsa, Gaṅgādāsa, Maheśadāsa, Nayanasiṁha, Mahendra, Mādhavadāsa, and his sons Govindacandra, the patron of the Govindārṇava, Kāśirāja, and Narottama. Nṛsiṁha then praises his father Rāmacandra, himself quite amply, and a forbear, Viṣṇu.

Glory to Nṛsiṁha. Because of the power of māyā,
the self-illuminating glory has taken the form of Nṛsiṁha.

223 Sphoṭatattvanirūpaṇa with the Tatvapraṣāṣika commentary of Mahākavi Vasantrayambaka Śeṣade, ed. by Brahmananda Triṃṭhit, Chowkhambā Surabharat Granthamālā 251 (Vārāṇasī: Chowkhambā Surabhārat Prakāśana, 1994).
224 The Philosophy of the Grammarians, EnInPh. 214-217.
225 Eggeling, Catalogue I, no. 704, p. 186, and Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts, no. 1772, V. 90, respectively.
The superimposition of the mind conceals the true light of the world. His real form is self-illumination. He has taken this second form, whose essence is supreme bliss, attainable without the Veda. This is the glory of Nṛsiṁha, the beginning and end of the universe. When Nṛsiṁha suddenly manifested his terrible form with fierce claws, Lakṣmī trembled with fear. He withdrew that form and smiled at her. She was astonished to see his play of māyā. He embraced her with hundreds of lovely words. May such a Nṛsiṁha protect you.

Here on the banks of the sacred Ganges, in the kingdom of Śiva, the abode of truth, calm as Brahma, saving every creature, the conditions are good for the four vargas. He has pacified all the obstacles and broken all the fetters at Benares, where the incarnation of valor, Śivādasa, the king of Kāśi, laughs at Indra. He has taken away the distress of the whole world and made the enemy tremble. Gaṅgādāsa was born from him and was like Viṣṇu. He made famous his name as a devotee of Gāṅgā. He satisfied his family with glory more than all other kings. He was the embodiment of eloquence looking down upon Indra. After him was born Mahēśadāsa, devotee of Kṛṣṇa, foe of demons. He promoted the worship of Hari and Hara with no difference. From him was born Prince Nayanasiṁha, who heard the lion’s roar; on the battlefield, he scattered the elephants and horses of the enemy. In his lineage was born the ornament of the earth, King Narendra, who delighted the eyes of the people. The earth laughs and receives her lord with flowers like Indra. Glorious, his enemies destroyed, ever devoted to Mādhava. Mādhavadāsa was approached by good men, a store of the jewels of virtue.

Rāmacandra was my guru. He was well versed in all the arts and sciences, with all the marks of a great and learned man, rigorous in logic, Mimāṁsā, Vedānta, Sāṅkhya, and the eight systems of grammar, a proficient composer of books, an ocean of literature, only tilaka of the world. His son was the wise Śrī Nṛsiṁha, prudent, modest, the one abode of virtue, in conduct, four-faced like Brahmā, wayfaring in the forest of the Vedas like five-faced Skanda, ever engaged in overturning the mountains of intellectual pride like six-faced Kārttikeya, thousand-faced in his astonishing knowledge of a thousand sāstras, the gem of the stainless Śeṣa family. Govindacandra himself, with his mind set on the way to uplift the dharma and induced by affection, requested Śrī Nṛsiṁha, the white lotus of learned men, to compose the Govindārṇava, a fine digest of dharma. Nṛsiṁha composed this text for the pleasure of learned men with his permission. This composition is my effort to collate śruti, smṛti, Purāṇa, and the various digests and extract their essence. The reader should first understand the contents. There are six chapters explaining all the meaning of the sāstras, since the principle of dharma is not clear, due to the differing opinions in the digests. We explain it for the satisfaction of the sincere and intelligent with the help of logic. Although there are said to be four puruṣārthas, namely, dharma, artha, kāma, and mokṣa, the fruits we get from them depend on dharma. That is why it must be first acquired.

This is the preface to the Smṛtisāgara of Nṛsiṁha Śūri.
Ulwar extract 304 gives a long description of the town of Tāṇḍava near Benares, said to surpass Delhi and Kalpi.226

Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi.

Dharmānubandhiślokacaturdasi. A brief text of fourteen ślokas in śārdūlavikṛḍita meter describing various rituals of tarpaṇa, śrāddha, etc., with a tīkā by the great-grandson of Śrī Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Rāma. The editor, Gopi Nath Kaviraj, praises the skill and clarity of the author and observes that “all the procedures explained in the text are typically south Indian.”227 The SAS included verses also found in it on performing tarpaṇa with sesame. They appear haphazardly appended, but are one of the few slim pieces of circumstantial evidence for KS’s authorship.

The introduction goes:

Honoring Śrī Kṛṣṇa, his son, Vireśvara, his son, the learned Śrī Puruṣottama, his son, Śrī Cakrapāni, and my guru, Gopinātha, I, Rāma, illuminate the meaning of the ślokas composed by Kṛṣṇa. May it be an offering to the Lord of the Universe.

---

226 See fn. 40.

227 Introduction, granthaparicaya: p. 1. सर्वो दाक्षिणात्यानां सराजितेवानुसरति।
Translating the Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi

Is the SAS a Navya Smṛti?

Until recently, late Medieval Sanskrit was seen as an arid desert of scholasticism and pedantry, an age of encyclopedias. That is quite true, but it was also an age of great refinements in grammar, logic, philosophy, law, and belles-lettres. Late Sanskrit is currently undergoing a reevaluation and renewed study, most notably in the work of Sheldon Pollock and the other participants in the Sanskrit Knowledge Systems Project. Indian scholars had always regarded this late medieval/premodern era (1550-1750) as a rich and glorious age of Sanskrit. Western scholars have now begun to come around to their view. The period is now seen not merely as one of backward-looking conservatism and hidebound traditionalism, with all the orientalist tropes of Brahmanical decadence, stagnation, and mumbo-jumbo, but as displaying many elements of innovation. It was in fact the last surge of creativity of the Sanskrit “cosmopolis,” before the “death of Sanskrit.” There was an explosion of brilliant developments, particularly in grammar and logic, the so-called Navya Nyāya and Navya Vyākaraṇa, what might be called the New Turn, before its end in exhaustion. Indeed, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was one of the leading lights of neo-Pāṇinian grammar: he was most famed for his work in this field.

1 contributors this reappraisal of Late Sanskrit as innovative, especially in the fields of linguistics and philosophy are: Johannes Bronkhorst, Yigal Bronner, Rosalind, O’Hanlon, Jonardon Ganeri, Jan Houben, Christopher Minkowski, Dominik Wujastyk, Karen Preisendanz, and Madhav Deshpande. Their many interesting works are too numerous to cite. I direct you to the website, “Sanskrit Knowledge Systems on the Eve of Colonialism,” www.columbia.edu/itc/meal ac/pollock/sks/proposal.htm, April, 1, 2010.

2 Pollock in “New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-Century India”, discusses navya discourse as a new historical phase in Hindu thought. They represented brilliant new intellectual achievements that were seen as new in their day, but in the sense of dynamic stasis and conservative innovation. The same goes a fortiori for Dharmaśāstra. It was the supreme repository of transhistorical truths. Stasis was “not failure, but achieved goal.” Dharma was one, but as the recorder of custom and accepted social practice (sadācāra), as Richard Lariviere believes, Dharmaśāstra incorporated regionally varying customs and new states of affairs into its perfected world of discourse. See Richard Lariviere, “Dharmaśāstra, Custom, ‘Real Law’ and ‘Apocryphal’ Smṛtis,” Journal of Indian Philosophy 32, no. 1 (Feb. 2004) 611-27. Consequently, the modus operandi of Dharmaśāstra since the Sūtra period had been to reconcile the differences in prācām mata, the “opinions of the revered ancients,” and in sīstācāra, the “conduct of the educated and respectable.” That was not a new procedure. Of course, its methodology underwent great scholastic elaboration in Neo-Smṛti. There is a certain amount of academic hype, therefore, in the laudation of 17th century Benares. Incidentally, Pollock says that Rāmacandra was “almost certainly the uncle of Sesa Krsna.” More likely, his great-great uncle if Pingree’s fl. 1409 stands.
Something not dissimilar was occurring in Dharmaśāstra as well. Should the SAS then be included in this newness as another specimen of Navya Smṛti? Vajpeyi and Pollock think so, seeing the heightened interest in śūdraḥarma at this time as something quite new:

The rise of a new discourse on śūdraḥ, to which Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Kamalākara and Gāgā Bhaṭṭa contributed decisively, and the relation of this discourse to changes in polity and society in western India during the latter part of the sixteenth and through the seventeenth centuries, are the subject of a University of Chicago dissertation now in progress by Ananya Vajpeyi. They see a Neo-Smṛti paralleling Neo-Nyāya and Neo-Vyākaraṇa, stimulated by the intensified interaction between the regional schools of Mithilā, Bengal, Vārāṇasī, Orissa, Assam, and South India occurring in pan-Indian centers of intellectual life like Kāśi, and comparable in innovative debate and renewed interest in the subject of Śūdras. As we can see in the case of Raghunandana, Kamalākara, and Gāgābhaṭṭa, topical controversies became common even in that most conservative of forms, Dharmashastric nibandha.

Navya began as a term for the logical innovations of Navya Nyāya, the school of new philosophical analysis pioneered by Gaṅgeśa (fl. 1320) and Raghunātha Śiromaṇi (fl. 1550). By the seventeenth-century, scholars are producing new kinds of scholarship that is conscious of its newness in comparison to the accumulated heritage of the past. In other words, they have become aware of the historical development of knowledge, due perhaps to the increasingly objective experience of themselves as Hindus vis à vis Muslims and Dharma as a unique cultural tradition with a past and present. This experience of novelty was accentuated by the intensifying circulation and interaction of intelligentsia, texts, and traditions in Mughal India.

We now periodize Dharmashastra into three or four periods by their distinctive forms: śūtra, metrical lawbook, commentary, and digest (nibandha). The mnemonic aphorisms of the śūtrakāras—Gautama, Āpastamba, Baudhāyana, and Vāsiṣṭha (600-100 BC)—were self-contained teachings and long coexisted without much concern with inconsistency. But, even now, the working principle was to reconcile the conflicts among schools with tradition.

3 “New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-Century India,” 19n27. One wants to go along with this, but Pollock is assuming a lot here: that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa wrote the SAS and was responding to contemporary issues of caste in western India, i.e., Mahārāṣṭra in the same way Gāgā Bhaṭṭa was to do in the case of Śivājī and the Kāyasthas. That Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was reacting to “changes in polity and society” is an empty assertion, no doubt true, but undocumentable. We know too little about the particulars of time and place of composition, patron, and socio-political moment to engage in more than speculation.

4 And not merely a generic label for the period of nibandha production from the 14th century on, as S.C. Banerji uses it, while fully recognizing the heightened interactions between regional schools as its chief feature. A Brief History of Dharmashastra (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1999), 5-6.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa quotes from a great many now lost and fragmentary dharmasūtras: Atri, Uśanas, Kaśyapa Gargya, Jātukarnya, Devala, Paitihānasi, Bṛhaspati, Bharadvāja, Śāttātapa, Sumantu, and Hārīṇa.

The smṛtikāras work up the dharmasūtras and earlier texts, adapting them to contemporary needs. The great verse lawbooks of Manu, Yājñavalkya, Nārada, Parāśara, and Kātyāyana (200-400 CE) were then followed by their commentators, Bhāruci (7th c.), Viśvarūpa (8th c.), Medhātithi (9th c.), Govindarāja (12th c.), Haradatta (13th c.), Kullūka (13th c.), Śūlapāṇi (15th c.), and so on. The period of commentaries overlaps with the digest period. Nanda Paṇḍita, for instance, wrote a commentary of navya originality on the Viśnusmṛti as late as 1623. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa also quotes many texts from this mostly lost corpus of commentaries.

The digest period begins, leaving aside earlier, non-extant works, with Lākṣmīdhara’s huge Kṛtyakalpataru in the twelfth-century and lasts until the seventeenth. The topics dealt with in śāstra expand enormously with massive and detailed volumes on judicial procedure, civil law, gifts, vows, penance, purity, impurity, worship, jyotiṣa, śrāddha, tīrthas, and sanskāras. The digests came to grips with the size, variation, and conflict of views in this mass of material by devising the characteristic methodology of the nibandha form. The nibandha grew out of the commentary, resolving discrepant views on particular subjects by collating citations from a vast array of śrauta, sautra, śāstric, paurāṇic, and tantric sources. It treats topics, not a text.

Derrett divided nibandhas into two kinds. In the first, the author paraphrases the law through a scissors- and-paste compilation of quotations with a minimum of comment. His purpose was to restate the law by modest and impersonal loyalty to his sources. He finds his restatement by letting the primary sources speak. As Derrett puts it, “He merely showed what the true authorities might have meant.” The SAS is in this mold. Half of the text consists of citations. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa often applies this method with such laconic restraint that his own view is not always obvious. He lets it emerge from his collage of citations. On the other hand, he does engage in a good deal of commentary and discussion, and in that respect the SAS is like the Śūdrakamālatkara, an example of Derrett’s second kind of nibandha: a lecture that quotes its sources as it proceeds and is half or more argumentation.

---

6 Derrett, 49.
7 There is something peculiar about Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s relationship to his sources. There is a preponderance of these later smṛtis over classical ones. A large volume of his quotations are from lost texts that Derrett called “bogus smṛtis,” which he regards as spurious productions. Ludo Rocher thinks that these have not been preserved simply because no one wrote a commentary on them. Only those dharmasūstras have survived that were commented on. And, in addition to the lost smṛtis, there are all the quotations in the SAS attributed to Manu, Yājñavalkya et al. that do not appear in the preserved texts.
8 Dharmaśāstra and Juridical Literature, 52.
9 Ibid., 48.
Krṣṇa Śeṣa displays little of the historicism Pollock sees as characteristic of navya literature. There is no awareness that śūdradharma has changed over time. He is aware of a diversity of views. He sets forth and resolves problems by differentiating the varying views of scholars and schools. This is typical nibandha procedure. However, he does not temporally position them. The idea of chronologically sorting out the dharmaśūtras, dharmaśāstras, let alone the Purāṇas and itihāsas he cites, has clearly never occurred to him.

Krṣṇa Śeṣa refers to predecessors as prāc, to old commentators as vṛddha, and to other schools of Dharmaśāstra, such as the “Easterners,” on occasion. However, he never uses historically periodizing words such as ancient (prācīna), modern (navīna), independent (svatantra), the up-to-date (atinavīna), antiquated (jīrṇa), contemporary (ādhunika), and traditionalist (sāmpradāyika) that come into currency in the seventeenth century among the Bhaṭṭas and others. Although the idea of advance beyond or superiority to the prācīna in the sense of old is not in the SAS, it comes robustly into play in the next century, even among Dharmaśāstrīs. The idea of old authorities (prācīna) as opposed to new scholars (navya) becomes common. This was a step beyond the digest writers, who referred to the aphoristic sutras and metrical lawbooks as prācīna smṛti.

We can conclude then that the SAS is not navya in the Pollock sense. The lack of historicizing terms shows that the SAS was prior to the full take-off of that development in the 17th century. The SAS is navya only in the generic sense of being in the era of the nibandha. Its method is formally conventional. It does not directly address topical controversies as do Kamalākara and Gāgābhaṭṭa. It maintains the appearance of being hermetically sealed off from any immediate sociopolitical relevance.

The procedures Krṣṇa Śeṣa follows were entirely characteristic of the nibandha. The growing weight of tradition, the śruti, sūtra, śāstra, and Purāṇa that all had to been given their due, made the nibandha form of quotation and synthesis the inevitable solution. As Lariviere points out, Dharmaśāstrīs, as recorders and custodians of custom, were always responding to new circumstances and needs within the parameters of their highly traditional discourse. Dharmaśāstra was the paradigm case of the “persistence of the old in the new.”

---

10 Trivedi, PKP, Intro. xlviii; SAS 50, 122, 212.
11 Pollock rounded up these historicizing terms mainly from the writings of the Bhaṭṭas: Kaunda, Kamalākara, and Gāgā. “New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-Century India,” 8-9. Krṣṇa Śeṣa is styled svaṭāntara, “an independent scholar and expert,” in the SAS (1). The Sāktiratnākara (14-16), we are told by Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, clarifies the deep and difficult meaning of “old” tikās on the Mahābhāṣya. This was a not uncommon claim to fame, hardly invented in the 17th century, but perhaps more pronounced then.
The Khiste-Kaviraj Edition

I have translated the edition of the text published in two parts in 1933 and 1936 in the *Princess of Wales Sarasvatī Bhavana Texts* series. The first part was edited by Pandit Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī Khiste, professor of Literature and assistant librarian of the Sarasvatī Bhavana Library at the Government Sanskrit College in Benares. The second part was edited by the librarian of Sarasvatī Bhavana and the Principal of the College, the highly honored paṇḍit, philosopher, and prolific author Gopī Nāth Kavirāj. As librarian from 1914 to 1937, he edited seventy-two texts in the Princess of Wales series of Sanskrit texts, including the *Dharmānubhandiślokacaturdāśī* (no. 22) and the SAS (no. 44).

They produced this first edition by collating two manuscripts obtained from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Pune and the other, presumably, from the MSS. collection of the Sarasvatī Bhavana Library. The two manuscripts were torn at the end so that the latter part of the text of the SAS is in a damaged and fragmentary condition. The BORI ms. is very poor, with bad handwriting, worn-out, musty, worm-eaten paper; torn pages, missing folios 50 and 55; and the benediction, table of contents, names of authorities, and colophon tinged with red pigment. The edition itself is possibly an even worse mess, full of scribal errors, misprints, deplorable or absent punctuation, confusing placement of the text on the page, and disarrayed, run-on, and chopped up sections, paragraphs, and lines.

There is an undetermined number of manuscripts of the SAS in the Sanskrit MSS. collections around India, at Baroda, Delhi, Vārāṇasī, Madras, and Pune. There are three at the Oriental Institute in Baroda alone and several at Darbhanga Sanskrit University in Bihar. Since Khiste-Kaviraj based their edition on two only, a number of questions cannot be definitively resolved: for instance, Gāgābhataṭṭa’s claim that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa held the view that here were no Kṣatriyas in the Kaliyuga. There are many confusing and problematical readings in their edition as well. A more thorough editing job may have purified the text of them. I have made use of a copy of the ms. deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in my translation.

In their introduction, Khiste and Kaviraj unquestioningly identified the author of the SAS with the famous Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, cementing this view in place. Aryavargavasvami had tentatively including the SAS in his list of the works of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, scrupulously commented that the authorship was still open to question. This is a question the editors of the SAS would have done well to reopen, but did not. They made the easy and attractive assumption that one and the same Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was the author of all the works attributed to him.
Gopi Nath Kaviraj: Pandit of Kāśī

Gopi Nath Kaviraj (1887-1976) was a most remarkable scholar, very much in the image of Kṛṣṇa Ṣeṣa himself and, like the luminaries of late Sanskrit, deeply learned in many fields of Sanskrit. He was a polymath who wrote voluminously with well-regarded erudition on epigraphy, Indian history, and on all the classic philosophical systems, as well as Yoga, Śaiva thought, and Tantric sādhanā and cosmology. He was regarded as a Mahayogi and spiritual teacher of divine grace on a par with Aurobindo and developed a philosophy of evolutionary salvation similar in some respects to his. I think, if I may say so, one might even detect something of his subtle understanding of sādhanā in the editing of the ritual detail of the SAS. If nothing else, it surely equipped him well for the task. Among his historical works, he wrote a literary history of Benares from the 13th to the 18th centuries entitled Kāśī Kī Sārasvata Sādhanā, which depicts the intellectual milieu in which Kṛṣṇa Ṣeṣa lived and worked.

Kaviraj would be fittingly included in his story of the pāṇḍits of Kāśī as one of the last and greatest, in his case, in the field of Tantra. Kāśī has a long tradition of Tantra. He was awarded the honorific of Mahāmahopādhyāya for his work in Tantric philosophy and practice. He played a leading part in the modern revival of Tantra and the rediscovery of Kaśmiri Śaivism. Kaviraj was exceptional in combining traditional Sanskrit learning with historical and critical scholarship and Tantra yogic practice. He shares with Sir John Woodroffe, a.k.a. Arthur Avalon, the credit for rehabilitating Tantra and purifying it of its supposedly negative and disreputable associations in the public mind with degraded forms of magic and sex. He recovered its ancient history of texts and practice, especially that of Kaśmiri Śaivism, as serious subjects of religious and philosophical inquiry, initiating the current western vogue for Tantra, albeit in popular forms considerably more hedonistic than he intended.

Note on Translation

Kṛṣṇa Ṣeṣa describes the SAS as sakalalaghunibandham, “an easy, but complete digest,” a śūdrapaddhati, “a manual for śūdras.” Khiste says that it is laghurapi gambhīrārtha, “although easy, deep in meaning.” In his view,

---

14 SAS 2. A śūdrapaddhati, “handbook for Śūdras,” one assumes, was written for fellow Brahmins who would be pastoring to Śūdras, officiating as priests, performing rituals and sacrifices, and instructing them how to perform their devotions. They were not written for Śūdras to read, most of whom in any case were illiterate and without Sanskrit learning. Although, in many parts of
although there are many other nibandhas describing śūdradharma, in comparison with others of this kind, this light, easy digest arouses the greatest admiration for its superior excellence.\textsuperscript{15}

This may be a little overstated, but the SAS text does have a remarkable character, all the many topics of śūdradharma are dealt with succinctly, but thoroughly. Sources are commanded with great familiarity and pointedly commented on. This, however, can seem like mīmāṁsaka quibbling at times. The general drift of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s argument can be more or less made out, but is often rendered a difficult task by his elliptical and notational mode of commentary. He will string together many citations from various smṛtis and Purāṇas on a particular topic, then others that present contradictions and alternative views. This is standard nibandha style, offering a compendium of extracts from authoritative sources. Many times he just seems interested in presenting the variety of views held on a particular question or topic and with minimal, or no discussion. He is very sparing in expressing any view of his own. This often only emerges from, or has to be inferred, from his citations. His style could be described as commentary by selective citation and could be that of either an old master or a very diligent śisya. The many referrals to his father’s Govindārṇava suggest the humility and filial piety of a younger man for his paternal guru.

A principal explanation for the absence of strongly enunciated or novel judgments is the traditional interpretative practice of Sanskrit pañḍits. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa has the reverence of all Dharmaśāstrīs for smṛti. If it is all true in some sense, it must all be treated with respect. All the variant views and contradictory opinions are therefore laid out and compared and a resolution must come to light harmoniously from scripture itself, since the truth is already there. It is the same hermeneutical method in use since the Brahmaṇas to interpret “apparent” variations and discrepancies in śruti—as, for instance, the Vedantists’ forced and ingenious readings of the heterogeneous and conflicting contents of the Upaniṣads.\textsuperscript{16} Of course, this meant in practice that points of view were smuggled in through a process of selective citation, creative etymology, and construal of meaning. A new idea or view must be shown to be consonant

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{15} Introduction to the SAS, pt. 2, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{16} Cf. for the example, the fanciful interpretation of the flamingo’s word śūdra in the Brahma Śūtra (I.3.4) as compounded from the verbs to sorrow (śuc) and to run (dru) and thus referring to Jānaśruti’s grief, not to him. The purpose is to justify the Śūdras’ disqualification to study the Vedas.
with tradition, since nothing is new in the sanātanadharma. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is not advancing new ideas. He finds all his conclusions already stated in smṛti.

The remarkable thing about the passages and verses he quotes from smṛtis and Purāṇas is that many of them cannot be found in any of the standard editions of the texts we have. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa also not infrequently quotes from Dharmashastric authors and texts which are no longer extant, or only mentioned in other sources. This shows us that he had access to and knowledge of a large stock of texts now lost to us.

This raises many interesting, but difficult-to-answer questions about the kind of texts he had access to, their written and oral character and manner of transmission, and his own inherited traditions of learning and scholarship. To what extend is he, or any paṇḍit in the sixteenth century, relying on written texts or memorized oral versions? Not a few of the verses he quotes, even from Manu, are not found in our standard editions. The quotation of a text we do have is often as not a variant.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa presents much material, especially concerned with grhya- and pūjā-prayoga without any reference or source at all. These how-to-do-a-domestic ritual and worship sections are drawing on an extensive literature of supplement (pariśiṣṭa), practical guidebooks of procedure (prayoga) and “manuals” (paddhati). These guides and manuals follow the ritual of particular schools and admit many local customs and prevailing practices. They provide much secondary information and commentary on and explanations of difficulties in the grhyasūtras. They show how Vedic rites are modified over time or become obsolete and new ceremonies of worship of the gods, and festivities accompanying the saṁskāras are introduced as cultural circumstances change.

The Gemstone of Śūdra Conduct
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42. Śūdras, due to their lack of education, do penance only in the form of giving and vows such as the kṛcchra without japa and homa performed with Vedic mantras. 61

43. The pañcagavya (five milk products) is optional for women. 62

44. Śūdras and the pañcagavya as part of penance. 62

45. A Śūdra should do japa and homa as parts of penance with the help of a Brahmīn. 62

46. Service to the twice-born as the chief duty of a Śūdra. Only by living in accord with that is his work fruitful. 63
47. A Śūdra is prohibited from accumulating wealth.

48. What is permitted and forbidden to the Śūdra according to Medhātithi.

49. Two kinds of *saṃskāra*: *daiva* and *brāhmaṇa*. *Daiva* sacraments are performed with Vedic mantra and not for the Śūdra. Among the 16 *smārta brāhmaṇa* sacraments starting with *garbhadāna*, he has marriage and last rites without Vedic mantras.

50. Although there is a prohibition of some rites for Śūdras, in general there is a counter-exception (*pratiprasava*) for some, for example, the five great sacrifices (*pañcayajña*), rites for the deceased (*śrāddha*), birth (*garbhadāna*), naming (*nāmakarana*), first steps (*niṣkramaṇa*), first cooked food (*annaprāśana*), and ear-piercing (*karnavedha*).

51. Discussion of the text in the *Brahma Purāṇa* that the Śūdra always takes the rite of marriage alone.

52. Prohibition of the sacrament of tonsure (*cūḍā*).

53. Discussion of tonsure.

54. Prohibition of *upanayana* for Śūdras.

55. Although a Śūdra is ineligible for sacraments such as the birth ceremony (*jātakarma*), parting-of-the-hair (*sīmanta*), at the time of the sacrament, the benedictions (*maṅgalācāra*) current in his family line should be performed, but not the sacrament.

56. A Śūdra does *ābhyaudatika śrāddha* with uncooked food only.

57. *Saṅdhyā* prayers and acts of worship not for Śūdras.

58. Women and Śūdras not entitled to *pranaṇa*.

59. Initiation with Vaiṣṇava mantra for Śūdras.

60. Initiation for Śūdras in Pañcarātra.

61. Śūdras entitled to worship and initiation with Śakti and Viśṇyaka mantras.

62. The sacred thread (*yajñopaviṇa*) not to be worn by Śūdras.

63. A Śūdra is permitted to worship images of Śiva and Viṣṇu at a distance, but not to touch them.

64. The three top *varṇas* are prohibited from worshipping an image of Viṣṇu or a Śiva *liṅga* touched by a woman or Śūdra.

65. No Śiva *pāja* for someone who has abandoned his own dharma.

66. Brahmins not prohibited *pājā* and touching a Śiva *liṅga* etc., even if they have abandoned their own dharma.

67. Women and Śūdras unauthorized to touch *liṅgas* consecrated at the present day, but not primordial *liṅgas* consecrated in ancient times.
68. The dharmas for sat-Śūdras devotedly serving the twice-born are as far as is consistent: shaving the hair each month, eating ucchiṣṭa, making a living by obedient service, and performing the pañcamahāyajña. The rest have the common dharmas (sāmānyadharmaṇa) such as non-harm. Everyone is entitled to praise the name of the Lord.

II Observances Śūdras Keep in their Daily Life (āhnikas).

1. Deities venerated in the early morning.

2. Excretion
   a. Rules on excreting for a Śūdra.
   b. No need for a Śūdra to put an upper garment over his ear to accomplish this act effectively
   c. The rules on excreting and testimonia for them.
   d. The rule that he should not hold a water pot when excreting.
   e. Prohibition of excreting while looking at the wind, fire, a Brahmin, the sun, a cow, or water.
   f. Do not urinate in a pool, tank, river, spring, chaff or charcoal bin, in a shrine, on a King’s highway, in a cemetery, in a shade, crossroad, on a bank, at foot of a tree, in a holy place, in a pit or hole.
   g. Do not wipe off excrement with the right hand or such things as virana grass used for sacrifice.
   h. One should not use the right hand to clean below and the left hand to clean above the navel.
   i. Excessive cleaning is not necessary.
   j. Purification takes place immediately after excreting. Discussion of the kind of clay to be used, different for each varṇa, and the amount.
   k. Vedic students clean two times more that a householder, forest dwellers three times, ascetics four times, women and Śūdras half as much.
   l. Uninitiated twice-born, women, and Śūdras clean only until all scent and trace is gone.
   m. No limit to the number of cleanings prior to marriage for a Śūdra. After marriage not limiting the number is an offence.
   n. A Śūdra washes first the right foot of a twice-born, then the left; but for the feet of a Śūdra, it is the reverse.
   o. If after purification he sees another’s or his own excrement,
he should look at the sun, a fire, *soma*, a cow, or a Brahmin. 88

3. Sipping water (*ācamana*). 89
   a. Discussion of sipping water. 89-91
   b. When not to sip water. 91-94
   c. Alternatives to sipping water. 94-95
   d. Exceptions to sipping. 95

4. Washing the teeth (*dantadhāvana*). 95-100

5. Hair care. 100-101

6. The rule for *kuśa* grass applicable to bathing. 100

7. The rule for bathing (*snāna*). 101-107
   a. Bathing at home and at a *tīrtha*. 104-107
   b. How to bathe. 107-111

8. The rule for vertical sectarian marks (*ārdhavanḍara*). 111-113

9. The rule for *brahmayajña*, included among the five daily acts of devotion. 112
   a. How to do *brahmayajña*. 113

    a. The order in which *tarpana* is to be offered. 118
    b. How to do *tarpana*. 119
    c. Short *tarpana*. 126

11. The rite of *pājā*. 128-140
    a. Worshipping *pīthas*. 129
    b. Worshipping the five *paṅcāyatana* deities. 130-132
    d. *Śāligrāma* stones, *lingas*, and the placement of the five deities. 132-134
    e. Variations in the forms of worship (*upacāras*). 135-137
    f. The merit in worshiping with conch shells, bells, and music. 137-139
    e. Bathing the images of the deities. 139-140

12. Clothing. 140

13. Fragrant substances. 140
14. Incense. 141-142
15. Lamps. 142-3
16. Food offerings (naivedya). 143-147
17. Circumambulation (pradaksina). 145-146
18. Bowing (pranama). 143-147
19. The transgression and disposal of garlands (nirmalya). 147-149
20. How to do pujā to an earthen liṅga. 149-151
21. Flowers. 151-154
22. Offences. 155-157
23. The Five Great Sacrifices (pañcamahāyajña). 157-176
   a. Balis. 168-170
   b. Daily śrāddha. 170-176
24. The rite for meals (bhojana). 176-184
   a. Observances after eating. 184-18
   b. The rule for betel. 186-187
III On the subject of purity for Śūdras. 189-205
IV Differences for Śūdras in carrying out the dead. 205-206
V Giving piṇḍas and aṅjalis of water. 206-209
VI A consideration of ekoddiṣṭa. 209-212
VII Sapindikarana. 212-217
VIII Gotra and Pravara. 215-217
IX A discussion of śrāddha. 217-219
X Pūjā to an earthen liṅga. 219-220
XI Concluding verses. 220-221
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First Section

1 May Lord Gaṇapati burst asunder the flood of our sins, as he makes a slanted blue lotus dance, a treasure of purity.1 The quarters of space resound with the soft beat of his flapping ears, pricked up as he hears the low hum of a swarm of bees. King Pilājī is pot-born Agastya, drinking up the ocean of hostile kings’ power, whose reverence and honoring of worthy Brahmīns has pleased all the gods, He has devoted his great wealth to the healing of sins lowered in the waves of the immortal river Gaṅgā, shimmering with all-pervading glory. By his gifts of food, cloth, gold, places of rest, and horses daily bestowed, from little boy to old man, Prayāga, king of tīrthas, displays among the people its power of granting prayers, celebrated in hundreds of scriptures.

2 Because he has made the treasure of tīrthas free of taxes with his donations, people coming from far distances as they like clasp the hands of the immortal goddesses. Gaining first dharma, the bridge granting the fruit of the three ends of life, appearing like Prayāga, the triple-braided confluence, he took in hand the attainment of the visible and invisible ends of man. Steadfast in respecting and honoring the Dharma, support of good government and morality, constant and faithful in the protection of his subjects, generous and pure of heart, devoted to the lotus feet of Śrī Govinda, noble and courageous, above all as guardian of the law he adorns the dharma with excellent and imperishable wisdom. After hearing all the dhammas from the mouths of the wise and learned, and concerned by their confusion and mixing,

---

1 See the section on “Śūdras and the Pañcāyatana Deities.” Nibandhas, unlike the metrical law books, reserve verse for the beginning, end, and section markers. This is true for the SAS, which opens with some ornate verses in mālāni meter. The proemium is a stotra to Gaṇapati, followed by a prose-verse section in which Krṣṇa Śeṣa extols King Pilājī, as he will again in the coda, for his prowess in south India and his patronage of pilgrimage and worship at the tīrtha of Prayāga, the holiest of sacred places, revered for washing away sins. He compares him to the pot-born Agastya, who drank up the ocean, compelled the Vindhya mountains to prostrate themselves before him, and conquered and civilized the South. Similarly, Pilājī has swallowed the hostile power of the lords of the earth. He is a faithful devotee of Lord Krṣṇa, a steadfast guardian of the dharma, and a benevolent protector of his people. More verses in Jagati meter then tell us that his text is an easy, but complete manual (padhāti) on the customs (dhammas) suitable for the four varnas, written for the benefit (śūrdopakārārtham) of Śūdras and commissioned by King Pilājī out of concern for the confused mixing of dhammas (sankarasāṅkhīkhamānas).

Krṣṇa Śeṣa’s verse is well-crafted but conventional—what one expects from a paṇḍit with a taste for writing Krṣṇa-kāvyas in the more pedantic age of the digest. As Derrett (Dharmaśāstra and Juridical Literature, 14) pointed out, late Sanskrit, following the period of the metrical law books, has all the characteristic shortcomings of late Latin: a loss of clarity and spontaneity, inelegant versification, hackneyed cliché side-by-side with scholastic over-refinement, plus a tasteless, sprawling looseness of diction that may have been due to the southern language background of many of its authors. Krṣṇa Śeṣa’s style, however, tends to the terse and elliptic.

He begins his discussion with the origin of the Śūdras, citing the most famous text for it, Rg Veda 10.90. 12:

His head became the Brahmin; his arms he made into the Kṣatriya; his thighs became the Vaiśya; from his feet the Śūdra was born.

He then cites Yājñavalkya on the foundation of śūradharma and of the varna system is itself: the division between Śūdras and the three twice-born varnas, the key difference being that only the twice-born have the right to use Vedic mantra.

Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras are the varnas; the difference is that the first three are twice-born; their activities, from the time of conception to burial, are regulated by mantras.
he adeptly produced a manual of Dharma
for the benefit of Śūdras, suitable for the fourth varṇa.
In compliance with his request, Kṛṣṇa the son of Nṛsiṁha,
after consideration of the Dharmaśāstras, composed this manual for Śūdras.

On the Origin of the Śūdras

Śruti states:

His head became the Brahmin; his arms he made into the Kṣatriya;
his thighs became the Vaiśya; from his feet the Śūdra was born. RV 10.90.12

Similarly, the Manusmṛti states:

To people the world, he fashioned the Brahmin, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya,
and Śūdra from his head, arms, thighs, and feet, respectively. M 1.31

The Brahmins and the others mentioned in these verses are the four main varṇas, as Yājñavalkya says:

Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras are the varṇas;
the difference is that the first three are twice-born; their activities,
from the time of conception to burial, are regulated by mantras. Y 1.10

The same sage also explains the purpose of the division into castes:

Indeed, sons born in blameless marriages of men and women
of the same varṇa are of the same jāti, fit to extend the lineage. Y 1.90

“Sons” stands for offspring generally. “Women of equal varṇa” are married women of the same
varṇa, because of the final formula “this rule applies to married women of the same varṇa.”

That means that offspring born to women wedded in legitimate marriages, being “of the same
jāti,” i.e., being of the same jāti as their mother and father, have the status of Brahmins, and so
forth. Note that the term “varṇa” is used here conventionally for the four jātis of Brahmin etc.

Because of the phrase “of equal varṇa,” the offspring of parents of unequal varṇa, such as Mūrdhāvasik-
tas, are not a class. In addition, Yājñavalkya says “married women,” to prevent Kuṇḍas, Golakas, and

---

2 Y 1.92d
3 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa says that certain offspring of parents of differing varṇas (asavarnä) such as the secret Mūrdhāvasikta and the “illegitimate” offspring of parents of the same varṇa (savarnä), are na varnatva, i.e., have “no varṇa.” He seems to mean by this that they have an irregular varṇa status. He sometimes appears to use jāti as a synonym for varṇa (e.g., Kṣatriya by jāti, see note 27) and more often patrilineally speaks of the jāti of the mother and the varṇa of the father. There is incongruity between varṇas as ideal classes and jātis as actual castes, especially the impure mixed ones. The problem was to classify the messy complexities of caste and reproduction within the abstract schema of varṇasankara. Its schematics leaves considerable room to adjust varṇa status to real socio-economic position.
others, although born of parents of equal varṇa, from having varṇa status. As a result, offspring of unmarried women—Kuṇḍas, Golakas, Kāṇīnas, Sahodhas, Paunarbhavas, and Kṣetrajas—are not a class. The phrase “of the same jāti” indicates offspring of the same jāti as that of both their fathers and mothers, and that is missing with these. Hence, nothing prevents them from being labeled as of the same jāti as that of their mothers, because, even then, the label that they are of the same jāti as both parents does not apply to them.

That is why Devala says:

One born of a Brahmin by a Brāhmanī is a full-fledged (saṁskṛta) Brahmin; the same is true for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras

born from fathers of their varṇa to women of the same varṇa. D 1.295.

If that means “born from a father and mother of the same varṇa,” then “full-fledged” means “worthy of undergoing the proper rites of passage,” i.e. a prime Brahmin.

If the preceding is true, the question is how is it possible that Nārada, Vasiṣṭha, Viśvāmitra and others, who were not born from wombs, were Brahmins? They were, indeed, not born to wedded women of the same varṇa.

There is no such problem here, since this text does not actually say that they are Brahmins and so forth.

This would lead to sentence splitting and make the definition too narrow. The only thing the text says is that they are of the same jāti as that of their mother and father.

Nor does it create any incompatibility. Indeed, in the case of sons not born from wombs, the fact of being of the same caste as their fathers and mothers is not based on anything else. Whereas their being Brahmins, is a new and extraordinary attribute due to the grace of god, like a golden jar being a pot.

5 Y 1.92d.
6 Two types of sons are born of someone else’s wife: kuṇḍa and golaka. If her husband is alive, he is kuṇḍa, the “son of an adulteress”; and if her husband is dead, he is golaka, the “son of a widow.” These two, born in another’s “field,” make the divine or ancestral offering given to them futile to the donor both here and hereafter.” M 3174-5. Olivelle (2005): 117. Kṛṣṇa Seṣa’s problem is how to categorize them, since they fall into the cracks between varṇas. They are descended from a Brahmin father, but their illegitimacy may place them among Śūdras, Brahmanically speaking, while socially they are regarded as above Śūdras.
7 More precisely, women not married to the father of the child.
8 These are respectively the son of an unmarried girl, the son of a remarried widow, the son of a woman pregnant with another man’s child at marriage, and the son fathered by a stand-in for the husband (niyoga).
9 In the quote above from Y 1.90.
11 The text may be defective. Rocher suggests the emendation: svebhā svayonijāh savarnebhayah savarnoppanāh ityarthah.
12 I.e., Devala does not say that they are Brahmins, etc., but that they are worthy to undergo the rites that will make them full-fledged Brahmins.
13 avyāpti.
In summary, a special invisible quality is effected by the six duties of Brahmins, but it is not part of its manifestation, because of the extrasensory nature of the invisible. For that reason the concluding phrase, “This rule applies to married women,” too is valid. It means that the injunction applies to married women only.

In reality, however, even in the case of a son born out of wedlock, there is no proof that he is of the same jāti as his mother. Smṛti texts on levirate make the newborn a son, but they do not assign him a jāti. I will discuss how even being a son does not apply here to him.16

Also, to say that, in the case of a levirate marriage, the field is more important than the owner is not agreeable, in view of the rule laid down by Manu:

When a seed, carried by flood or wind, sprouts in someone else’s field, it belongs solely to the owner of the field; the sower does not reap its fruit.17

Because of the text:

People are in disagreement, some saying, “a son belongs to the husband of the woman,” and others, “the son belongs to the man who fathered him.”18

and because he is independent, the owner of the field alone can be the more important element.

Moreover, if Dhrāṣṭra, Pāṇḍu, and Vidura19 were not Kṣatriyas, they could not perform the dharma of the Kṣatriyas, according to statements by Śaṅkha and Viṣṇu on the overruling in their case of the dharma of levirate offspring because of śruti texts referring particularly to the married state of the woman and so on.

But those born of infidelity have the dharma only of Śūdra, according to the restrictive text:

But tradition regards all the “delinquent-born” as having the same dharma as Śūdras.20

---

14 I.e., the fact that beings not born from a womb are called Brahmins is not incompatible with the texts that require a Brahmin to be born from a Brahmin father.
15 Literally, Brahmaness in them is like the potness in a golden jar. The metaphor is not entirely perspicuous as phrased, but the general point is clear: if Nārada, Vasiṣṭha, Viśvāmitra and other seers were Brahmins, this was by divine grace alone, since they were not born of a womb. Vasiṣṭha and Agastya were conceived in a pot from the seed of Mitra and Varuṇa. They are special cases like a golden jar among pots and do not contravene the point being made that full Brahmaness is inherited from two Brahmin parents.
16 Levirate or, more accurately, niyoga marriage is not discussed elsewhere. Questions of the varṇa of illegitimate sons and famous sages who were “supernaturally” born are only treated in this section.
17 Olivelle, Manu (2005): 192. The text gives only the pratīka.
19 Vidura, the stepbrother of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Pāṇḍu, was the son of a Śūdra maidservant, but he performed the dharma of a Kṣatriya, again illustrating what Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is arguing here: the preponderance of paternal varṇa over maternal jāti and the revelation of true varṇa character.
20 The first half of the verse, which accounts for the opposition in the second half, reads: “The six types of son born to women belonging to one’s own or the class immediately below have characteristics of a twice-born.” Olivelle, Manu (2005): 210.
On the other hand, we consider it proper that Mūrdhāvasiktas and others be recognized as Kṣa-
triyas even though this is based solely on the fact that they perform their dharma.

Furthermore, Devala labels these as not being of the same varṇa:

If a son is born to a another man by a woman of the same varṇa, he is called ārota; he has the dharma of a Śūdra jāti.
If sons are born by a man, even to women of the same varṇa, they are called Vṛāyas, deprived of making vows, prevented from performing saṁskāras, and excluded.

“Excluded” means living outside varṇa. Baudhāyana, in turn, says this:

The sages distinguish eight forms of marriage. Those born from women married in these are of the same jāti, no others.21

Similarly, Vyāsa:

The sons of a lawful wife are of the same jāti, they are excluded otherwise.22

And Manu:

Tradition regards all the “delinquent-born” as having the same dharma as Śūdras.23 M 10.41

“Delinquent-born” means born against the rules. Manu says this quite clearly:

The sons of twice-born men with wives of the varṇa immediately below are considered only (eva) similar and disdained due to their mother’s defect.24 M 10.6

These sons are “disdained” due to the defect that their mothers belong to the same varṇa as their father’s. Since they have been lowered vis-à-vis their father’s varṇa, and are considered only similar to the mother, not to those sons born of their fathers’ main wives.25 Note that the similarity extends only to those sons obtaining the same dharma as their mothers’. The word “only” shows that the texts of Śaṅkha and others makes the sons acquire their mothers’ dharma, not their jātis.

Similarly, the same sage also says this:

The sons of twice-born men by women of the class immediately below their own, which have been enumerated in their proper order, are given the name of the next lower class because of their mother’s defect.26 M 10.14

21 Not found in the Baudhāyanadharmaśūtra.
22 This verse, like most of those Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa attributes to Vyāsa, is not in the Vyāsa Samhitā. Unsurprisingly, since he elsewhere quotes Vyāsa as the legendary author of the Mahābhārata (41) and Brahma Sūtra (51).
24 I.e., the fathers’ wives of the same caste as his.
25 This is Rocher’s translation, differing from Olivelle’s (2005), who tries to harmonize M 10.14 with 10.6 quoted just above.
He means that they get the name only, Kṣatriya etc., not that they are Kṣatriyas etc., by jāti.26

Similarly, in the Viśvambharaśāstra27 also it is said that such sons are only equal to the caste of their mothers:

A Mūrdhāvasikta, born from a Brahmin father with a Kṣatriya mother, is equal to Kṣatriyas.28

Aparārka’s overall conclusion on this is as follows: “The word ‘married’ implies29 that the sons of a young girl as well as the sons of a remarried widow are full-fledged classes. Similarly, according to a text of Śaṅkha, the Mūrdhāvasikta and the like have the same jāti as their mothers, and they, too, are a class.” 30

On the contrary, according to Śaṅkhadhara,31 since all delinquent-born sons, such as the Kunḍa and Golaka, are Brahmans, they are all entitled to the rites of initiation, Vedic education etc. He, therefore, uses phrases such as “not so, say others,” and “or alternatively, others say.” And these are set alternatives.32 The children of a woman tainted by repeated lapses are outcaste; therefore, they are not entitled to rites of passage. But the children of a woman who has stumbled only once, forcibly enjoyed against her will by another man, are not tainted, and, therefore, are entitled to rites of passage.33

This is all incompatible with the Yamasmṛiti, where the following is said:

Sons born out of wedlock to women of the same class are called Kunḍa, if the husband is living, and Golaka, if dead. Both are of low jāti. The sons of twice-born men by women of a different varṇa, who are married to other men, are called kunḍagolaka. They are said to be of their mothers’ caste, not their fathers’ Their sons cannot marry relatives on their fathers’ and mothers’ side.34

---

26 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa calls Kṣatriya a jāti here.
27 Kane I: 1106, mentioned in Śūdrakamalākara.
28 Reading ksatrāyām for ksatriyāyām metri causā.
29 It is an upalakṣaṇa.
30 For Aparārka, the Kāñña, Paunarbhavana, and Mūrdhāvasikta have varṇatva, the opposite of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s interpretation of Yājñavalkya earlier (SAS 3). Normally, when a nibandha author quotes a word from a commentary on a smṛti, he has previously quoted the entire verse. This is not the case here. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa quotes only one word—vinna, “married.” There may be a gap in the text, or Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is being characteristically elliptic. The full passage is found in Aparārka’s Commentary on Yājñavalkya, Anandāśrama Sanskrit Series 46 (Poona, 1903): pt 1, 117-118.
31 Texts quoting Śaṅkhadhara are listed by Kane (1:1230). Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa should now be added.
32 Vyavasthitavikalpa, a “fixed option.”
33 According to Manu III. 174, a Kunḍa is the offspring of an adulterous relation between a married Brāhmaṇa woman whose husband is living and a Brāhmaṇa man. A Golaka is the secret offspring of a Brāhmaṇa widow and Brāhmaṇa man. Kane II. 78, 80. Although illegitimate, they are conceived upanayana.
34 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cites many minor smṛtis such as Yama. But the verses above on Kunḍa and Golaka, as is often the case, are not in the text we have. The Yamasmṛiti is in a collection of 27 texts, Dharmasmṛtisaṅgraha, Anandāśrama Sanskrit Series 48 (Bombay, 1883).
The author of the Mitākṣara, Medhātithi, and others are in agreement on this.

Consequently, Yama prescribes that the penance for killing a Kuṇḍa and the like is the same as that for killing a son born against the order of varṇas, as follows:

For killing a son born of a woman of a different class,
he shall perform a sāṅtapana kṛcchra; for killing a Sūta, a Kuṇḍa, or a Golaka, a kṛcchra.

The Smṛtikaumudi makes a distinction here. It denies rites of passage such as initiation to Kuṇḍas and Golakas only if they are fathered by non-Brahmins, not, however, when they are the offspring of a Brahmin by a Brahmin woman. Indeed, in accordance with the smṛti:

Kuṇḍa or Golaka Brahmins, who only know how to perform the morning and twilight prayers, should recite and pray to the gods when bathing, eating, and at twilight, joining the others after taking their meal separately in a garden.

Kuṇḍa or Golaka sons born of Brahmin parents are allowed to undergo initiation, and so forth, on the pretext of performing such acts as morning and evening worship.

The Mitākṣara quotes another smṛti text with the words:

Both Kuṇḍas and Golakas may be consecrated with the rites of passage, as they deserve.

Taking his place in a temple, on occasions such as the bathing of the god, he should recite the texts like a bard. The phrase saying that he should stay in a “separate garden,” i.e. a hut, forbids him to reside in town to prevent mixing with other castes. But enough of this prolixity. Let us return to our subject.

The main classes, born of parents of the same varṇa, have been explained. Details of their duties, common and particular, will be discussed later.

Yājñavalkya defines the anulomas as follows:

---

35 A sāṅtapana kṛcchra is a penance lasting two to seven days with the consumption of sour milk, ghee, and kuśa grass and recitation of the Gāyatrī. Wilhelm Gampert, Die Sīnezeremonien in der Altitndischen Rechtsliteratur (Prague: Orientalisches Institut, 1939), 48-49.

36 Sandhyopāsana or sandhyāvandana, “morning and evening prayer,” consists of ācamana (sipping water), prāṇāyāma (restraint of breath), arghya (offering water to the sun), marjana (sprinkling oneself three times with water while chanting certain mantras, japa of Gāyatrī, and upasthāna, reciting mantras to the sun in the morning and Varuṇa at twilight. The sticking point for KS, as far as Śūdras were concerned, was the Vedic mantras.

37 There seems to be a contradiction or just a looseness of expression here between the prescription of eating first and then in eating in solitude.

38 The text is ambiguous: it could be a Brahmin father or Brahmin parents. Rocher opted for the latter because the verse is introduced as applying to a Brahmin man with a Brahmin woman.

39 He recites varṇakas, perhaps “sections of text,” “syllables,” or “verses.”
The son born to a Brahmin by a Kṣatriya woman is a Mūrdhāvasiktā, by a Vaiṣya woman, an Ambaṣṭha, by a Śūdra woman, a Niṣāda or Pāraśava.40

Pāraśava is a synonym for Niṣāda. But differently from the Niṣāda, who is of reverse birth and lives as a fisherman, the occupation of the Pāraśava is not polluted. In all these cases, “born to a Brahmin” is syntactically connected with the term “by wedded wives.”41

Thus, even though Paraśurāma, born to a Brahmin by a Kṣatriya woman, was a Mūrdhāvasiktā, either through the intensity of his tapas or by the grace of the Lord, he was a Brahmin, with all of a Brahmin’s duties, just like Viśvāmitra. In fact, it does not stand to reason that one’s paternal origin is nullified because one belongs to a certain jāti.42

In this way, sons are born to a Brahmin by a woman of the three lower varṇas, in the order of high to low. Devala and other smṛtis give them different names, “of the same varṇa,” and so forth. In such cases, these names are to be seen as alternatives, just as with Niṣāda and Pāraśava.

Next:

To a Kṣatriya by a Vaiṣya and a Śūdra woman two sons are born: a Māhiṣya and an Ugra, respectively; to a Vaiṣya by a Śūdra woman, a Karanā. This rule applies only to women married to the father43

A Kṣatriya can marry wives of two lower varṇas, in that case begetting two different sons: a Māhiṣya son by a Vaiṣya wife and an Ugra son by a Śūdra wife. A Vaiṣya can marry one wife of a lower varṇa. His only son by a Śūdra wife is called a Karanā. Note that all these different kinds of son, starting from sons of the same caste, Mūrdhāvasiktas and so on, require that they be born to the legitimate wives of their fathers; they do not apply to any other kind of son. All this has already been detailed earlier.

Thus, the anuloma (regular) sons born in descending order are six in number. So says Manu:

40 The Mitakṣarā on Y. 1.91 and Medhātithi on Manu 10.8 distinguish this Niṣāda from another of pratiloma birth who lives by fishing.41 Y.1.92d.

42 The sentence means that it is not reasonable to think that one’s uppannatva, “the fact of being conceived,” ‘the paternal connection,’ would be annulled by the mother being of a different class and, therefore, placing one in a specific jāti. Paraśurāma, Mūrdhāvasikta son of the seer, Jamadagni, and sixth avatara of Viṣṇu, illustrates Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s view that the varṇa character of the father can overrule the mother’s jāti dharma. This is in line with his pliable stance on how varṇa is displayed. Character will out and is demonstrated and achieved by karmic action. Paraśurāma’s paternal brāhmaṇatva is manifested through his tapas and annihilation of the Kṣatriyas, although his mother, Renuka, is Kṣatriya. Similarly, the great Rṣi, Viśvāmitra, was born a Kṣatriya, but transformed himself into a Brāhmaṇa. Vettam Mani, Purāṇic Encyclopedia (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975), 568-572, 872-876.

43 Rocher proposes emending brāhmaṇāderavarāsa to brāhmaṇādavarāsa since Y 1.91 deals only with the anuloma offspring of Brahmins. Other classes are treated in Y 1.92.
To a Brahmin, by wives of three castes; to a Kṣatriya, by two; to a Vaiśya, by one: these six are called lowborn (apasada).

“By three” means by wives of the Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra varṇas. “By two” means by wives of the Vaiśya and Śūdra varṇas. “By one” means by a wife of the Śūdra varṇa. They are called “lowborn” (apasada), because they are “dragged down” (apakṛṣṭa), from their place (sadas). That means that they have been degraded from the main varṇas.44

Yogī also tells us the pratiloma (reverse order) sons:

The son of a Kṣatriya by a Brahmin woman is called a Sūta;
by a Vaiśya, a Vaidehaka; by a Śūdra, a Caṇḍāla, who is outside all observances.
A Kṣatriya woman bears to a Vaiśya a Māgadha son, to a Śūdra, a Kṣattā.
A Vaiśya woman bears to a Śūdra an Àyogava son.

Y 1.93-94

The sons fathered on a Brahmin wife by a Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra are, respectively, the Sūta, Vaidehaka, and Caṇḍāla. Likewise, the son fathered by a Vaiśya on a Kṣatriya wife is a Māgadha, and on a Śūdra wife, a Kṣattā. The son fathered on a Vaiśya wife by a Śūdra is an Àyogava. These are the six reverse sons. Therefore, the regular and reverse order sons combined are twelve.

Devala says of the graded ranking of regular and reverse order sons:

11 The sons of savarṇa (same varna) parents are best; best after them are anuloma sons. Pratiloma sons are in-between, degraded, and out of order.

This is saying that the sons of parents of the same varṇa are the best of all. Others are intermediary, i.e., born to a mother and father of different varṇa. Because of the division into regular and irregular, they are of two kinds. The first are slightly inferior to their father because begot in a low womb by a higher varṇa father and because they have the same dharma as the mother. The second have fallen out-of-varṇa and are the lowest because they were begotten on a wife of higher varṇa by degraded seed. They are said to be “fallen” because they have lost the complete cycle of sacra mental rites. Manu argues the very same thing by a question and answer:

If we ask, who is better, the accidental son of a Brahmin man and a non-Ārya woman or the son of a non-Ārya man and a Brahmin woman?
The answer is the son of an Ārya man and a non-Ārya woman becomes an Ārya by his character, but the son of a non-Ārya man and an Ārya woman is non-Ārya.
Neither should receive the rites of passage—this is the settled law—the former because of his inferior birth, the latter because he was born against the varṇa order.

44 This is a typical example of traditional etymology and difficult to render in English. Apasada is analyzed into two elements: apa indicating “downward motion,” and sadas, based on the verbal root sad, “to sit down.”
A “non-Ārya” means one of a lower jāti; an “Ārya” is one of a higher jāti. “Accidentally” has the sense of unintentionally. “Neither one” means one born of the seed of a higher jāti father by a woman of a lower jāti, or one born of the seed of a lower jāti father by a higher jāti mother. The reason for this is that “they lack the required qualifications.” “Because of his birth” means because of the womb from which he is born. The negation in “neither should receive the rites of passage” has the force of slightly or a little, meaning that they should receive the rites of passage to a lesser degree than the top castes. This is so, because Ānākha extends the dharma of the mother to those born in the regular order, whereas Manu teaches that those born in the reverse order have the dharma of Śūdras. Indeed, he says:

The six kinds of son born of one’s own caste and the next down have the dharma of the twice-born; but all those called “delinquently-born” have the dharma of Śūdras.

On the other hand, the same sage tells us that the full cycle of rites of passage applies only to the main varṇas:

Just as good seed planted in a good field thrives, so the son of an Ārya father and mother deserves all the rites.

Note that among these only Brahmins are entitled to all six rites, according to a text of Manu:

Brahmins, whose mothers are of the same class and are steadfast in their proper activity, rightly perform the six acts in due order.

We will elaborate further on how the three other varṇas have only three acts, namely, sacrificial worship, learning the Vedas, and charitable giving.

It has been said:

The dharma of anulomas is the same as that of their mothers only.

Also:

45 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa takes ārya and non-ārya, like uttama and apakṛṣṭa, to be relative terms, not absolute as does Manu when he defines anuloma and pratiloma sons.

46 śāstraḥ II Pān. 6.3.105.

47 apadhvamsajāḥ

48 svayonisthā

49 Only Brahmans live by yajana, adhyayana, and dāna, and also their counterparts yājana, adhyāpana, and pratigraha.

50 Cf. VS 16.2: anulomāsu mātravarnāḥ. “Sons begotten on women of lower caste have the maternal varṇa.” The ensuing discussion is to show that the mother’s dharma sticks only to anuloma, not legitimate savarṇa offspring.
Those, who marked by their mother’s āti procreate children with women of their own class; beget children similar to themselves, with the same dharma. Since the term “by their mother’s āti” cannot be a means of procreating children. Therefore, the instrumental case ending indicates implication. Even as words such as “crow” imply others things beyond “crowniness,” the very fact that “āti” implies more than it says means that its demarcating genus is different from the individual (vyakti), even if he belongs to it merely by practicing the dharma that his āti practices. Indeed, as we already said above, a Mūrdhāvasikta, for instance, is not really a Kṣatriya, and so forth

[Question] Since a crow and the like are sometimes perceived as linked to its habitation and so forth, they are considered as upalaksanās. But why is it that one never sees the Mūrdhāvasikta and people like that as Kṣatriyas?

[Answer] Yes. Yet, even though we do not see Mūrdhāvasiktas as inherently related to Kṣatriyas, we do, nevertheless, see them as linked to them because they are intimately related to their parents. For something to imply secondarily something else, a close relation or direct link is not essential. Indeed, such is not the case for a crow in a tree linked with its habitation.

In conclusion, the meaning of the sentence quoted above is clear. Those who are marked by their mother’s āti may have the same dharma as their mother’s, but if they father children on women of their own āti, the offspring is of the same āti as their own. Thus, the son of a Mūrdhāvasikta man by a Mūrdhāvasikta wife has the dharma of a Mūrdhāvasikta. The same is also generally true for the Māhiṣya and other anulomas. That means that the sons a lower man fathers on women of a higher āti than his own are also like him, i.e. of a lower āti. On the other hand, the

51 upalakṣita. This may be a gloss, since the commentary may make sense when read without it.
52 It is unclear whether this is a quote or commentary. It looks to be a quote, because a commentary on the term “māturjātyā” follows in the next sentence.
53 māturjātyā
54 An upalakṣana, a word that intends to say more than it actually does. The commentary justifies the insertion of the term “upalakṣitāḥ” in the quotation: Why can one not just say: वे न मातृदाता स्वपक्षिण प्रमुखति ? Answer: because the term “māturjātyā” does not have the ordinary meaning of the instrumental. They do not procreate by means of their mother’s āti. They are only marked, implied, encompassed by her āti. For Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, paternal varna is the essential dharma, the genus of legitimate and savarna offspring. paternal āti only marks it with secondary associations. The word “crow” may call up all kinds of associations: its nest in a tree, eating rubbish, etc.; but these have nothing to do with what delimits “crow,” namely, its “crowniness.” In the same way, the term “māturjātyā” may associate the Mūrdhāvasikta with the Kṣatriya varna of the mother—he practices its dharma, but the demarcating genus or delimitator, kṣatriyarva, does not apply to him. It is characteristic of dharmasāstṛēs to make the point grammatically.
55 vyavacchedatavam
56 “Crow and the like” must be standard exempla for upalakṣanas.
57 This sentence seems to be commenting on a non-quoted verse.
illegitimate son of a Mūrdhāvasikta man with a Mūrdhāvasikta woman to whom he is not married is delinquently born, and, as such, has only the dharma of Śūdras. And the same is true for others born to pratiloma parents.

Manu says:

The “low-born among the twice-born, and those traditionally called “delinquent-born,” should live by the work the twice-born themselves scorn.

M 10.46

That is to say, by service to the twice-born, but not by sacrificial worship and the like, because of the text that states that “they have the same dharma as Śūdras.”

The Dharma of Regular and Reverse Order Castes

On this subject Uśanas says:

A Mūrdhāvasikta is born from the union of a Kṣatriya female and a Brahmin male. He is regarded as a Kṣatriya, but of a higher status. He performs the rites of the Atharva Veda, both obligatory and occasional. He rides a horse, a chariot, or an elephant at the king’s bidding. He makes his living in the military or by practicing medicine. The secret son of a ruling class lady and a Brahmin is a physician; however, when he promotes and honors the authority of a consecrated sovereign, he is a Vandaka. He practices Ayurvedic medicine in its eight parts. His occupations are astrology, calculating, and physic. A Gūḍhajataka is the illicit and accidentally conceived son of a male and female of noble status. He is also Kṣatriya, but forbidden consecration. The legitimate son of a Śūdra female and a Brahmin male is called an Ambasṭha. He makes a living by farming and is also called an Āgneyanartaka. His livelihood is the medical treatment of men, horses, and animals.

This progeny, although of Brahmin seed, is dragged down by the inferior caste of the mother, and according to textual warrant, obtains only the same jāti as the mother and Vaiśya duties, not the best dharma of Brahmins, i.e. the six duties. And so, the statement by Vāsisthāyana that “he is higher than the other Vaiśya jātis” should be disregarded as fundamentally in error.

The son of a Vaiśya female and a Kṣatriya male is a Māhiśya and a regular union.

Engaged in the eight qualifications, knowledgeable in the 64 āṅgas, he has all the rites including initiation. Astrology, divination, and prognostication by sound are his livelihoods.

In the Viśvambhara Śāstra we are told: 
An Ugra (Śūdra mother, Kṣatriya father) makes a living by the arts of war. Skilled with the sword and bow, he is expert in combat. He stands apart among men as the mighty “Rajput.”

The son of a Śūdra female and a Vaiśya male is a Karana, a scribe.

These are the offspring of regular unions (anuloma).

The son of a Brahmin woman and a Kṣatriya is the Sūta, a mahout; taming horses is his main occupation.

The marriages of ruling class men and Brahmin girls results in a Sūta, twice-born but reverse.

He is unfit for trade; his job is to remind a ruler of his duties. The son of a Brahmin female and a Vaiśya male is a Vaidehaka. His chief occupation is the craft of stone and wood.

He is commonly known as a “Śūtradhāra,” a mason.

16 The so-called Cāndāla is the son of a Brahmin female and a Śūdra male. He always subsists on the rags and personal items of condemned thieves. He wears lead or iron ornaments, with a leather strap around his neck or cymbals on his hip. He removes waste from the village during the morning, not entering during the rest of the day, and lives on the southwest outskirts of the village. If they do not ball together here, they are to be punished severally.

Manu says:

They must roam about in villages and towns at night. They may go around during the day to perform their duties with distinguishing marks by royal order. They should execute the condemned always in the authorized way at the king’s command, and may take their clothes, beds, and ornaments.

M 10.54cd, 55ab, 56

In another smṛti:

When they go into town during the day to carry out their responsibilities, uttering “śimbola,” crouching and cowering fearfully.

The son of a Vaiśya male and a Kṣatriya female is a Māgadha. He lives as a bard, a storyteller, and royal praise singer.

Another text states:

A Kṣatriya female gives birth to a Māgadha son by a Vaiśya. He is called a Bandijana and is excluded from the tie of vows.

He is somewhat higher than a Śūdra and makes a living as an expert in the six languages of poetry, rhetoric, and prose.

58 “The Rajpoots of Bombay are said to perform “the karm of Sudras.” “They are of various tribes in the Dekhan.” M. A. Sher- ring, Hindu Tribes and Castes, first published 1879 (Delhi: Cosmo Publications, 1974), II: 180.
59 One takes simbola to be a term of respect for a Lord or master like sahib, but we just do not know. Perhaps a variant of bhoh. So far, it has not been identified with any word in a Prakrit or modern Indian language. It may be of tribal origin, as were many Śūdras.
for praising rulers in prose and verse writings.

The son of a Vaiśya man and a Kṣatriya woman is a Kṣattā, and should be an attendant or doorkeeper.

The son of a Śūdra male and a Vaiśya female is an Āyogava, a doorkeeper.

But in Uśanas:

Some of them are weavers who make cloth for a living.

These are the reverse order dharmas.

Mixed Castes to the Second Degree

Vaiśvambhara says:

Those of mixed marriages are impure and disordered in varṇa.
A living is made only from the work of the jāti and depends on jāti alone.
The son of a Brahmin without the sacraments and a Brahmin woman is called a Rjukaṇṭha.

And Manu says of the Vrātya:

Sons born to the twice-born by wives of their own varṇa who do not observe the sacraments should be designated Vrāyas, the broken-vowed. M 10.20

The son born to a Rjukaṇṭha by a Brahmin wife is an Āvartaka.
The son of an Āvartaka and a Brahmin’s wife is a Kaṭadhāna.
The son of a Kaṭadhāna man and a Brahmin woman is a Puspaśekhara.
The Rjukaṇṭha, Āvartaka, Kaṭadhāna, and Puspaśekhara make their living from the worship of Viṣṇu with dancing, singing, telling stories, and playing musical instruments like the conch and vīnā.

And elsewhere:

They should make their living by extolling Hari and Hara with musical and verse compositions in the appropriate dialects of the country.
The common customs of the people are laid down by them, for Śūdra conduct is nowhere else.
The son of a Brahmin and a woman called a Puspaśekhara, is a Bhojaka by jāti and makes a living from worship services for Sūrya. The son of a Brahmin and a Bhojaka woman is regarded as a Devalaka. His livelihood is by worship of Viṣṇu.

---

60 Verse 10.20 in current editions of Manu is a bit different, adding that Vrāyas “have fallen from the Sāvitrī.” The following verses list the offspring of Vrātya Brahmins, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas, but the terms are quite unlike those in the SAS or vaguely similar. Instead of Rjukaṇṭha, Manu has Bhṛjjukaṇṭhaka and Āvantya Vāṭadhāna and Puspadha in stead of Āvartaka, Kaṭadhāna, and Puspaśekhara. Olivelle remarks that this entire second discourse (10.16-23) is suspect and appears to be an attempt to account for ethnic groups and tribals as mixed castes. Law Code of Manu, 283.

61 The reading is not sure here: jātyeka or jātyeva śāśvato jāhoyo viṣṇupūjanajīvika.
The son of a Māhisya woman and a Brahmin is an Ābhāra, a milk-seller. 
An Udāvīha is the illegitimate son of a Brahmin and a Vaideha woman. 
He carries parasols and traffics in women.

A Vaideha woman is the daughter of a Vaiśya man and a Brahmin woman.

The son of a Brahmin and a Niśāda woman is a Vaiśṭika, a porter.
A Niśāda, the son of a Brahmin and a Śūdra woman, is commonly known as a Kahānīra.62
The son of a Brahmin and a Māgadha woman is a prison guard.

People call him “jailor.” A Māgadha woman is the daughter of a Kṣatriya woman and a Vaiśya man.

The son of an Ambaśṭha woman and a Brahmin is a coppersmith.

An Ambaśṭha is the son of a Brahmin and a Vaiśya woman.

But elsewhere:

He should manufacture different kinds of copperware for his livelihood. 
He should behave like a Śūdra at all times.

He is colloquially known as a Kāmsāra.

The son of an Ugra woman and a Brahmin is called a Kumbhakāra, a potter.

An Ugra woman is the daughter of a Kṣatriya and a Śūdra woman. Elsewhere:

He is lower than the Śūdra in dharma as a pot is lower than a pot made of clay.63
The son of a Kṣatriya without sacraments and a Kṣatriya woman makes a living by dealing in arms.64

In the Jātiviveka65 it is stated:

The son of a Kṣatriya without sacraments and a Śūdra woman performs the rites for Śūdras. 
He trains the sons of Kṣatriyas in the skills of the sword and bow. 
Receiving money from them as a livelihood, he should keep his own dharma.

He is colloquially known as a “king’s guru.”

He unlawfully fathers a Malla son on a Kṣatriya woman. 
Supplying sport for kings, he earns a living by fighting. 
The son of a Vaiśya father and a Śūdra’s wife is called a Vaitālika. 
He makes his living by the arts of pleasure, panegyric, and homage.

The son of a Kṣatriya and a Pāraśava woman is a Kīnāṭa, a coppersmith.

62 A kaṭṭāra is a water carrier in Hindi.
63 “Good” Śūdras, the offspring of Śūdra unions, are dharmically better than mixed varṇa issue, here, the Ugra, the offspring of a Kṣatriya male with a Śūdra female. Manu (10.9) says that the Ugra is cruel in his behavior and dealings having the characteristics of both Kṣatriya and Śūdra. The word “ugra” simply means fierce, savage, cruel.
64 The mixed caste sons of Kṣatriyas are often said to take up careers in soldiering, arms manufacture, dealing and training, and in sports (like the Malla below).
65 There are several works by this title in Kane HD, 1.2, index.
He has the name “Tāmbera.” A Pāraśava woman is the daughter of a Brahmin and a Śūdra woman.

A keeper of the harem is born from a tradesman and a Brahmin woman. He manages women’s apartments and caters to kings. He makes a living by the care and feeding of courtesans. He makes assignations with women know as “ladies for hire.” Only the bon-vivant who has contact at night with these women who live by their beauty is the lord of their lives. No one, even a loved one, is their husband.

Tradesmen are the offspring of a Śūdra and a Vaiśya woman.

The son of a Pāraśava woman and a Māhiṣya is called a Mālākāra, a gardener. A Sūpakāra, a cook, is born from a Sūta and a Vaideha woman. The son of a Brahmin woman by a Kṣatriya is called a Sūta, and by a Vaiśya, a Vaideha. The son of an Āyogava woman and a Vaideha is a Maitreyaka, a bell ringer at dawn and a singer of hymns.

An Āyogava woman is the daughter of a Śūdra and a Vaiśya woman.

The son of an Ambaṣṭha woman and a Vaideka man is a Harimekhalā. From an Āyogava woman and a Karaṇa man comes a Sairandhra, a perfumer. His livelihood is selling sweet-scented items such as flowers and sandal.

A Karaṇa is the son of a Vaiśya man and a Śūdra woman.

The son of an Ugra woman and a Pāraśava man is the swift-footed Jāṅghika.

21 They are professional runners colloquially called “Vāri.”

The son of an elevated Śaiva Pāṣupata, who has been outcasted, and a Śūdra’s wife, is held to be a Bhasmāṅkura. He makes a living from the worship of Śiva and donations to Śiva. Wearing dreadlocks and ashes, he should worship the Śiva iṣṭa. Unhusked betel, money, cattle, fields, gardens, and anything else donated to Śiva Candaṇḍa in devotion are his means of living.

The son of an Ugra woman and a Kṣatriya is called a Kṣemaka, a porter.

An Ugra woman is the daughter of a Kṣatriya and a Śūdra woman.

A Kuśīlava is the offspring of an Ambaṣṭha man and a Vaideha woman, and works as a dancer and performing artist.

A Vaideha woman has a Brahmin father and a Vaiśya mother.

A Nirmanḍalaka is the son of an Ābhīra man and manufactures feathers for arrows and makes arrow with saws for a living.

---

66 Tāmberas were a subcaste of Kaseras, braziers (brass smiths) in Bihar. H. H. Risley, Tribes and Castes of Bengal, Ethnographic Glossary, (Calcutta, 1892), II. 291.

67 Conjectural reading of udara (belly): rājīnudarapusthaye.

68 Mālis were a caste of domestic and market gardeners widely spread except in the south. Hutton, Caste, 285.
The son of an Ugra woman and a Māgadha is a Kuntala, a barber. He is called “Nāpita,” and is deft with a razor.

An Ugra has a Kṣatriya father and a Śūdra mother, a Māgadha a Kṣatriya mother and a Vaiśya father.

He is called “Nāpita,” and is deft with a razor. He cuts beards and is adroit at paring nails. He serves all the varṇas by doing this kind of work in town. A Nāpita barber is a low and dishonest man, but is regarded as higher than Śūdras.69

22 Manu says:

The son begot on a Śūdra girl is a Brahmin but without the sacraments he is called a Nāpita and is also better than Śūdras.

The word “Nāpita” is explained in the Uṣanas Smṛti in this way:

There is shaving on the occasions of birth, death, or initiation. The shaving is above the navel (nābhi); hence, he is called a Nāpita.

Yājñavalkya says:

A Rathakāra is begotten by a Māhiṣya on a Karaṇa wife. Y 1.25

He lives as an artisan knowledgeable in all the śilpa śāstras.70

He may perform all the sacraments such as initiation because there is a text to that effect. Indeed, Śaṅkha says that “the Rathakāra is the secondary mixing of a Kṣatriya and a Vaiśya, i.e., the son of a Māhiṣya father and a Karaṇa mother;71 he is entitled to have upanayana performed, to offer sacrifices and gifts; and he make a living by learning how to tame horses, drive chariots, and construct buildings.”

The Mitākṣarā quotes this passage and comments:

Similarly, when a Mūrdhavasikta and a Māhiṣya intermarry and have children, since they are the offspring of a Brahmin and Kṣatriya respectively, the rites of passage such as initiation apply to them, because of their twice-born status.

In the Jātiviveka:

---

69 A good example of the flexibility of varnasankara to register real social status. The barber caste in Bengal had high status in Bengal. Some amassed wealth, practiced as physicians, and regarded themselves as “clean” Śūdras. Risley, Tribes and Castes of Bengal, 124-29.

70 This sentence is not in the Yājñavalkyasmrty.

71 This shows again the anomalous varṇa status of Rathakāras: they are mixed caste and partly Śūdra, but have upanayana.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kṣatriya} & \leftrightarrow \text{Vaiśyā Vaiśya} \leftrightarrow \text{Śūdrā} \\
\downarrow & \text{Māhiṣya} \leftrightarrow \text{Karaṇi} \\
\downarrow & \text{Rathakāra}
\end{align*}
\]
The son that a Māhiśya woman bears to a Vaideha man is called a Kāyastha; his work is laid down as follows.

A Māhiśya woman is born to a Ksatriya father and a Vaideha mother. A Vaideha is born to a Brahmin woman and a Vaiśya father.

A Kāyastha should practice the occupations of writing the scripts of different regions, calculation, algebra, and arithmetic. He is the lowest of the Śūdra jātis and has the five sanskāras: tāpa, pundra, nāma, mantra, and yāga.

Service to the four varṇas, clerical work, business, and craft are stipulated as his livelihoods. Kāyasthas and others of that class must not wear a sīkhā, the sacred thread, garments of saffron cloth, nor touch the images of the gods.

A Śālakya is the son of a Mālakāra father and a Kāraṇa mother and is a jewel cutter. Known as “Mañjhāra” (necklace). In another text, the same man also has the name “Mañju” (topaz).

A Śālmaka is the son of a female Kulāla (potter) and a Mañju and is a nāgavalli dealer.

A Śilindhra is the son of a Mālakāra and a Kṣatriya woman and provides personal care services (massage, bathing, shampooing, fragrant oils). He is excluded from śūradharmas and makes his living by massage. From a Śilindhra man and a Kṣatriya woman is born the so-called Kolhāti (juggler, acrobat, itinerant performer).

Colloquially known as a “Bahurūpi” (a street impersonator).

The son of a Vaideha male and a Rūpakārī, (a female performer) is an Andhasika (cook).

Colloquially known as a “Pācaka (cook).”

The son of a Vaiśya and a Kāraṇa female is a Gocārī (cowherd).

A Mañju wife with a Kaṭadhāna (a maker of straw baskets and mats) produced a Chāgalaka, who is commonly known as an “Ajāpāla” or goatherd.

In the Jātiviveka:

He is excluded from the Śūdra jātis; he should not kill goats; it is said that his livelihood consists in the money made from his she-goats.

By a Sairandra mother the Kṣemaka begat the Śayyāpāla, a keeper of the bed chamber.

---

72 adhama: śūdrajātibhya:
73 Possible reading of ambhasā: with water.
74 Nāgavalli is a Sanskrit and Telugu name for the twining betel plant
75 Risley say that the Bahurūpas of Bengal were mimics and actors, who took on various characters and disguises and were believed to have been originally low-caste Hindus who converted to Islam. They often appeared as Akbar’s decrepit old nurse or as Śiv-Gauri—half Śiva, half Gaurī, in humorous dialogue. *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, I: 45.
76 Correcting na vadeca saḥ to na vadhec ca saḥ.
A Kṣemaka is a Pratihārī (porter).

A Śayyāpāla lives as a skilled manager of the royal bed. The son of a Karmacanḍāla woman and a Puspaśekhara is named a Maṇḍalaka and is a dog-breeder.

The Karmacanḍāla, or occupational Caṇḍāla, will be described below.77

The Maṇḍalaka is employed by a king to keep dogs. The son of a Vadinī female and a Śūdra male has the name “Syandolika.”78 He is outside the four varṇas and is a madder dyer. With this dye he colors and prints garments, an efficient and skilled artisan. He is also known as a Śaucika, who works with scissors and needle.

The Niṣada, a forger of metal tools and weapons begat on a Śūdra female the Kukkuta. He is an producer at all kinds of theatrical shows, or, because he makes a living from metalworking, he is at the same level as the lowest castes (antyajas).

25 The Ulmuka is born to a Māgadha female and a Kśatriya male and is a blacksmith.

In another text:

He makes a living as a blacksmith and is best among the antyajas79 and lower than the Brahmin, Kśatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra varṇas.

The Mauḥkali, an oil miller, is the son of an Ugra and a Pāraśava female. He should wash clothes to make a living. He is regarded as the son of an Ugra male and a Vaideha female.

An Ugra has a Kśatriya father and a Śūdra mother; a Vaideha has a Brahmin mother and Vaiśya father.80 He mills sesame seed oil, and is the best among the antyajas. He is ascribed the occupation of tilaka because he sells pure sesame oil. Due to the noise caused by the mill pounding the sesame seed, the Mauḥkalika should always live outside of town.

A smṛti text similarly states:

A sesame or sugar cane press should not be operated within hearing range by Śūdras or degraded caste persons.

77 SAS 27.
78 If not corrupt, syandolika is a hapaxlegomenon. Emendation to dolika or olica makes little or no sense.
79 Lines 3 and 10 have the unclear expression uttamaścāntyajātītaḥ. Line 6 has pratamaścāntyajasu, “and first among the antyajas,” which I take to be synonymous. These castes seems to be on the border between low Śūdra and antyaja.
80 This entry on the Rajaka may also be from the “other text,” and inserted here to complete the entry on Ulmuka. Kṛṣṇa now returns to the Jātīviveka.
The child which a Rathakāra woman cohabiting with an Āyogava bears is rated as a “Sūtradhāra.”
He is an actor and dancer proficient in the performing arts.
He should always be composing shadow-puppet plays and wondrous and exciting shows.
He should live outside of town.

A Kuravinda, the son of a Kukkuṭa female and a Sūta, deals in silk and muslin apparel.
He ought to follow the way of life of the sub-castes.
The son of a Venyā and Āvartaka is a cloth weaver.
A Venyā is an actress.
The son of an Ābhīra female and a Kukkuṭa is a Sauvāra, traditionally known as “Kosaṭa.”
He should make clothing for all jātis for his living.
The son born in reverse of that (i.e., Ābhīra father, Kukkuṭa mother), is called a Niḷikartā, an indigo maker.
The progeny of a Kuntala father and Mañju mother is called a “Barbara.”
The Dhigvāna is born from an Āyogava female and a Brahmin and makes armor; his job is to supply nice leather saddles.

He is colloquially known by the name “Moci.”

A Kārabolika female bore to a Vaideha male the “Meda” dwelling in mountain forests and the wild in pursuit of wealth.
Commonly know as “Gohu.”

An Ayogava female bore to a Pāraśava the Kaivarta; he is lower than all the jātis and always takes up the fishing net.
He should catch fish and other aquatic animals for a living; he sails a boat on rivers swollen in the rainy season ferrying people across and collecting fares from them.
The son of a widow and an ascetic is called a Karmacanda, i.e., a Canḍāla by virtue of the work he does—as a laborer who builds wells, tanks, &c., he should be untouchable.
The son of a Niṣāda man and a Śūdra wife is termed the Pukkasā; he is like the subcastes in various ways and feeds his body by killing animals that live in the jungle; his profiting from harm to hawks is criticized by good people.
The son born in reverse of that (i.e., Ābhīra father, Kukkuṭa mother), is called a Nīlīkṛṣṇa, a shoemaker.

81 Sūtradhāra is explained etymologically as one who “should constantly produce sūtras,” i.e., “lines.”
82 He is a śatilīsa, trained in Nāṭyaśāstra.
83 Nilakaṇṭha in his commentary on Śāntiparvan 12.294.5-6 says that a jalamaṇḍapikā is the southern word for shadow puppet theatre wherein the actions of leather figures are cast on a thin cloth. This also, incidentally, provides another example of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s dākṣiṇātya vocabulary: M. L. Varadpande, History of Indian Theatre (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1987), vol. I: 65.
84 The edition has veṣavismayavarte, a curious phrase. A veṣa is a house of prostitution or dress and may make better sense if we follow up the reference to Nāṭyaśāstra in the previous line and emend it to dveṣa (aversion). As vismaya (astonishment) is one of the eight bhavas, dveṣa may be the bhava of krodha (anger).
85 The text has the unclear śyenapāṭhikā. A śyenapāṭha, “eagle’s flight,” is a feat of jugglers according to Monier-Williams, but that seems not to be what going on here.
he is the lower than the subcastes and makes shoes, headgear, and horse equipage from cow and buffalo hides for a living.

An Ābhīra female and a Veṇa male produce a “Śaunḍika” son.

In another smṛti he also has the name “Śauṣkala.” He is declared the “lowest,” i.e., excluded from all dharmas.

He gains a living by making and selling liquor.

A Kaivarta female conceives from a Jāṅghika male the Manguṣṭha, who is considered a Rajaka, washerman.

“Rajaka” is merely the general name. His dharmas are discussed elsewhere.86

His specialty is baking and powdering chalk lime; and should unceasingly gain a living by it; he is at all times untouchable for mankind.

A Kumbhakāra female conceived from a Dhisya male the Citrakara; he is outside of varṇa and lives as a painter of pictures.

From a Vaiśika male and a Kuruvinda female comes the Kimśuka, a plasterer and bricklayer; He is said to be a subcaste, subsisting by bamboo utensils.

From a Karmacandāla a Vaideha female conceived the Pāṇḍusopāka, the jāti of Buruḍas, or basket and mat makers, always at work splitting bamboo.

The son of a Niśāda male and a Vaideha female is the Gāruḍa, best of dīndima drummers; his way of life is traditionally like that of the seven subcastes.

A Dhigvan female bore to an Āyogava male a son designated “Durlabha;” he makes good utensils and hard saws; when it comes to mixed jātis,87 he is the best among the lowest.

A Kaivarta female in union with a Canḍāla male bore a son called Saunika. He slaughters goats and sheep and sells their meat.

Commonly known as a “Khātika.”88

A Śaunḍika female got from a Dīndima male the Kināśa, an insect catcher.

The Canḍāla outcaste, born to a Brahmīn mother and Śūdra father, was described earlier.89

From a Canḍāla a Pukkasa female begot the Śvapāka who cooks at night;90 he cooks dog meat and lives on that alone.

The son of a Niśāda female and a Canḍāla male scavenges dead horses and donkeys; under the name Domba, he must dwell in cemeteries living on the dead.91

---

86 The Rajaka is only discussed here. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa perhaps means in another text (anyatra).
87 Less likely, jātisanke may be the name of a text.
88 Khatīks were a caste of butchers, but also vegetable sellers, fruiterers, masons, and rope makers, in Northern India showing how caste splits into subcastes through changes in occupation. J. H. Hutton, *Caste in India*, (OUP, 1951): 34, 51, 101.
89 SAS 16.
90 Uncertain reading: rātrijāpake. Ludo Rocher emends it to rātrīpācaka, noting that nothing is as often confused in manuscripts as ē and aṁ at the end. It is more likely that śvapākas are cooking dogs under cover of night than doing japa.
91 Doms were a caste of scavengers, as here, but later also musicians, weavers, traders, and money-lenders, possibly of aboriginal origin. Hutton, *Caste*, 34-35.
The Mleccha jātis originated from Šailandhra males and Meda wives.

Manu says about them:

But, gradually, by neglecting rites and overstepping Brahmins, these Kṣatriya jātis have fallen in the world to the level of Śūdras: the Paunḍrakas, Codas, Dravidas, Kambojas, Yavanas, Śakas, Pāradas, Vālhikas, Činas, Kirātas, and Dāradas.92
All the castes outside those born from the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet, whether speaking foreign or Ārya languages, are called Dasyus.

M 10.43-45

So, that is the way currently to distinguish the mixed castes. The same sage also describes in general the causes for them:

By adultery between castes, by marriage with disallowed women, and by deviating from the work right for them, the mixed varṇas arise.

M 10.24

In this connection, Yājñavalkya tells how some of these hybrids obtain a higher jāti and how some of the higher ones obtain a lower jāti:

A higher jāti is known to be attained in the seventh or even in the fifth yuga; the same is true in the case of a reversal of livelihood. Whether they are higher or lower depends on what they were before.

Y 1.96

When jātis such as the Mūrdhavasikta, for instance, are elevated, the superior character of the Brahmin, etc., manifests itself in the seventh or fifth yuga or birth cycle. The sixth is implied here as well by the words “or even.”

The alternation occurs in this manner. A Mūrdhavasikta woman, produced by a Brahmin father and a Kṣatriya mother, is married by a Brahmin; she bears a daughter. This daughter is married by a Brahmin; their daughter, in turn, is married by a Brahmin, and by uninterrupted succession, the fourth daughter gives birth to a fifth generation Brahmin son. So too, an Ambaṣṭha woman, produced by a Brahmin father and a Vaśya mother, bears a daughter. The daughter, in turn, bears a daughter, and so on successively, until the sixth generation daughter gives birth to a seventh generation Brahmin son. Thus, there is a gradual improvement from daughter to daughter

---

92 The MSS. of Manu 10.44 have variant readings for these ethnic names. Olivelle has chosen Puṇḍrakas, Kāmbojas, and Pahlavas for his edition. The Kāmbojas were in what is today northwest Pakistan. Pahlavas=Persians; Činas=Chinese; Yavanas=Greeks; Codas and Dravidas=southern Indians (Dravidians). *Manu’s Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mañava-Dharmaśāstra*, 336n10.44; 819.
in the aforementioned lines of descent. Other similar changes can be inferred.

Next, if someone, in a “reversal of livelihood,” i.e., a turnabout in his means of livelihood, makes a living by the degraded occupation of a lower caste person, he becomes equal to him in the fifth, sixth, or seventh birth. For example, when a Brahmin, Kṣatriya, or Vaiśya cannot live by the main occupations of his caste, he is permitted, in adversity, to do the degraded work of a lower varṇa than his own. But, if a Brahmin, when freed from adversity, does not give up the livelihood of a Kṣatriya and produces a son, who continues to live by such an occupation and propagates the line, then, the sixth-generation will produce a seventh generation Kṣatriya. If he continues to make a living by a Vaiśya occupation, the fifth generation will produce a sixth generation Vaiśya; and, if by a Śūdra occupation, the fourth generation will produce a fifth generation Śūdra. In the same way, a Kṣatriya, making a living by a Vaiśya occupation, produces a Vaiśya in the sixth generation, and by a Śūdra occupation, a Śūdra in the fifth generation.

A “reversal of livelihood,” like birth, is of two kinds: anuloma and pratiloma, i.e., the low performing the work of the high, and the high performing the work of the low, indicates the state of being higher and lower: highness and lowness should be determined as before, i.e., by birth, such that a Brahmin living as a Śūdra is better, and a Śūdra living as a twice-born is the very worst.

As Vasiṣṭha says:

Those who are unable to support themselves by their own lawful work may resort to the next worst livelihood, but never to one better. V 2.22

However, the author of the Mitākṣara explains the mixed caste system differently. Varna mixing is threefold: mixing varṇas, mixing a varṇa with a mixed varṇa, and mixing mixed varṇas. Of these three, mixing of two varṇas is the marital union of two people belonging to two of the four basic varṇas. This, in turn, is said to have twelve forms, because of the division into anuloma and pratiloma. Mixing mixed varṇas is the marital union of two people of mixed varṇas; it is described by the text beginning “the Rathakāra is begotten by a Mahisya male on a Karaṇa female.” (Y 1.95ab). Finally, mixing a varṇa and a mixed varṇa is the marriage of a person in a varṇa and a person in a mixed varṇa. This also is of two kinds, because of the difference between regular

---

93 The edition wrongly duplicates the citation of Y 1.95ab.
and reverse order. For instance, the offspring of a Mūrdhavasikta woman with a Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, or Śūdra, the offspring of an Ambaṣṭha woman with a Vaiśya and a Śūdra, and the offspring of a Niśāda woman with a Śūdra, are born in reverse order.

Likewise, the offspring of a Brahmin with a Mūrdhavasikta, Ambaṣṭha, or Niśāda woman, the offspring produced by a Brahmin and Kṣatriya with a Mūrdhavasikta or Ugra woman, and the offspring of a Brahmin, Kṣatriya, or Vaiśya with a Karanā woman are born in regular order. By the principle of vākyabheda, “higher and lower” here corresponds to the earlier phrase “good and bad.”

This concludes my detailed description of the four varnas.

It was for the son of Keśavadāsa, King Pilājī the illustrious, an ocean of only good qualities, a treasury of blessings to the good, cynosure of the learned, that the preceding enquiry into caste was made in the Gemstone of Good Śūdra Conduct by Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa.

Thus ends the first section, an enquiry into caste, in the Gemstone of Śūdra Conduct, composed by the venerable Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa.

94 Vākyabheda is giving two meanings to one sentence. This violates the Mīmāṃsā principle as applied to the interpretation of ritual that one sentence must convey one particular meaning only: arthaikatvād ekam vākyam (Jaimini Śūtra 2.1.46).
On this subject Parāśara says:

> The highest dharma for a Śūdra is to serve the twice-born. Anything else he does would be fruitless.  

PS 1.70

Indeed, service to them is the cause of attaining the supreme good.

Manu says so explicitly:

> For the Śūdra, the dharma leading to happiness is simply to render obedient service to reputable Brahmin householders who are learned in the Veda.

M 9.334

Because of the word “highest” in Parāśara, a Śūdra’s dharma is service to Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas too. Likewise, he also says:

> Pure, serving the higher, soft-spoken and humble, and always taking refuge in Brahmins, he attains a higher state.

M 9.335

Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas are both “higher.” “Taking refuge in Brahmins” means that, although engaged in service to Kṣatriyas, etc., for a livelihood, his person is entrusted to a Brahmin.

Somewhere there is a variant reading that says “he attains a higher status with regard to jāti.”

The Mahābhārata says:

> The Brahmin must be served by a Śūdra at a distance like a blazing fire. But he is served with personal contact by a Vaiśya or Kṣatriya.

MB 13.58.33

Gautama says:

> The Śūdra is the fourth varṇa with a single birth. Speaking the truth, refraining from anger, and purification apply to him also. According to some, he should simply wash his hands and feet in place of sipping water. He should make ancestral offerings, support his dependents, provide for his wife, serve the upper castes, seek his livelihood from them, use their discarded shoes, umbrellas, clothes, mats, and the like, and eat their leftovers. He may also support himself by working as an artisan. The Ārya whom he serves must also support him, even when he is infirm and unable to work, and in similar circumstances he should support the upper using his stock for that purpose. He is allowed the use of the ‘na-

---

95 Correcting the Khiste-Kaviraj edition’s param to parama.

96 Other readings of Manu 9.335 are: “utkrṣṭim jāṭita śnute” in place of the Khiste edition’s “utkrṣṭim gatim aśnute.” Patrick Olivelle has “ucchritim jāṭita śnute” with the variant, “utkṛṣṭām jātim aśnute.” Manu’s Code of Law, 809. Hence, Kṛṣṇa is right in his gloss on a “higher state.” If an acceptable reading, it refers to jāti.
maskāra’ mantra. According to some, he may offer the minor domestic sacrifices (pākayajñas) himself.

G 10.50-65

“Single birth” means the absence of the second birth in the form of initiation with the sacred thread. Some hold the view that washing the hands and feet serves the purpose of sipping, but others require a single drink of that water. “Support his dependents” means providing for those who must be fed. “Provide for his wife” means to be devoted to varṇa-appropriate wives. Some say he is to devotedly support these wives only and not take on other responsibilities. Service to those of the three higher varṇas, i.e. Brahmīns etc., means providing a living to them. “Worn out,” i.e., previously used up shoes, clothes, etc., should be given to him by those he has previously served. “Mats” are seats made of grass. “Eat leftovers” means eating what remains in a dish after a meal. This refers to non-dāsas. Others interpret the rule, “One should not give leftovers to a non-Brahmin,” as referring to a Śūdra householder on the basis of the statement by Vyāghra that:

Day by day, leftover food should be given to a Śūdra who keeps the domestic rites, non-leftovers to a householder.

Manu says:

The leftovers of their food must be given to him as well as their old clothes, old grain, and old furniture. M 10.125

Medhāthiti explains this as follows: “Leftovers,” i.e., what remains in a pot of food for guests and so on, should be given to a Śūdra who has served you, not those in a dish. ‘Old grain” is poor, spoiled, and stale grain. ‘Old furniture” are beds, seats, etc.

“He must be supported by him even when infirm” means that, although weak and incapable of working, a Śūdra must, nevertheless, be supported by whomever he previously served.97 Manu says of a poor Brahmin:

Śūdras must allot to him out of their family property a maintenance, depending on his ability, industry, and the number of those he must support. M 10.124

“From their family property” indicates to Medhāthiti that he is to be supported like a son. That means that he has to take into consideration the number of people he will have to support. “He should support the higher,” i.e., in return, the Śūdra should support the Ārya,” when he is poor,” i.e., without a livelihood, by means of money earned through handicrafts. A Śūdra’s “stock,” i.e.,

97 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa now resumes his discussion of the quote from Gautama at 34.5-6.
his savings of money, is used to nourish him.

On the obligation of the low caste to offer their support to the Ārya, Jātūkārya has this to say:

The Ārya seeking help from a low caste person, who appears like a servant, should be treated as such. The poor, but diligent and learned Brahmin should always be supported by a Śūdra, though he never served him.

“He is allowed the use of the namaskāra mantra.” This means that when offering vaiśvadeva etc., a Śūdra is permitted by Dharma experts to pronounce the names of the different deities in the dative, followed by namah.

The “pākayajñas” are the five great sacrifices. Although Vedic recitation (brahmayajña) is not accomplished with cooked food, it is still designated as one because of its close association with them. Or else, the word “pāka” denotes “excellence” so that pākayajña means excellent sacrifices.

“He may offer himself,” etc., means that, “according to some,” he should not let his son, wife, or any other offer the pākayajñas. In any case, it follows that there is nothing wrong when a Brahmin, etc., has someone perform the pākayajñas.

The question then rises, since the pākayajñas are performed in a sacred fire, how is a Śūdra entitled to perform them? Indeed, according to the text of Yogi:

A twice-born householder should perform the domestic rites each day in his marriage fire, or in the fire brought when inheriting property, and, failing those, he should offer them in water. Y 1.97

The Śūdra has no marriage fire

If, however, we follow Gobhila’s view that homa is offered with mantra, he has no marriage fire, because marriage homa is performed with mantra, and a Śūdra is denied homa due to the fact that he is deprived of mantra.

The namaskāra mantra, however, directly speaking, is authoritatively described as a feature of the five sacrifices—marriage homa is not performed with it. To this, some authors answer that, since texts such as Y 1.97 have different readings for each of the twice-born classes, and because of the clear sanction Śūdras have to perform the pākayajñas, they may offer them simply in a non-

---

98 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s citation differs from the accepted edition. Yājñavalkya (1.97d) has śrautam vaitānikāgniṣu. He has tadbhave dvi-jō 5psu ca.
sacred common fire. Therefore, a marriage fire is not obligatory even for the three upper varnas; how much less does it have anything to do with Śūdras. Aparārka and Medhātithi interpreted in this way. Others, however, say that failing a smārta fire, the three upper varnas are instructed to put them in water. Therefore, Śūdras too should offer vaiśvadeva and so on in water.

In the Prabhāsa Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa:

A Śūdra ought not to hold darbha grass, drink the milk of a brown cow, or eat on the middle leaf of the palāśa tree, beautiful lady. He must not utter the Om mantra, eat sacrificial cake, wear a lock (śikhā) and sacred thread, recite Sanskrit words, or press the triple pressings of soma. He should always perform rites with the namaskāra mantra. Committing forbidden acts, he sinks down, dragging his ancestors with him.

The phrase “must not wear a śikhā” applies to degraded Śūdras. On the other hand, Vaśiṣṭha,⁹⁹ permits this to a sat-Śūdra:

38 The Śūdra’s way of living is limited to service to them. Wearing locks of hair is not restricted for any, except for leaving a śikhā.¹⁰⁰

The term “or” means they may either shave all the hair off or shave the hair leaving a lock. This is determined by whether he is, respectively, an asat- or sat-Śūdra. The SmṛtiKAumudī explains it differently: “While Vaśiṣṭha will show later that, for Śūdras, tying a lock, which partly established anyhow, is optional, except at the time he performs ritual acts. He here incidentally indicates that this option is true ‘for all four varṇas,’ i.e., Brahmans, etc.” At the time for ritual, a loose lock is always disallowed, but at non-ritual times is optional.

Similarly, Manu says:

Śūdras living by the rules should do a monthly shearing of hair, follow Vaiśya rites in matters of purity, and eat the food of twice-borns.

“Monthly” does not mean “a month long,” but “once every month.” “Living by the rules” means to serve the twice-born and perform the five great sacrifices. “Vaiśya rites in matters of purity” are Vaiśya ways of dealing with birth pollution, etc., and ācamana. We should take this to mean the fifteen days of impurity for birth pollution. And, ācamana for a sat-Śūdra consists in drinking three mouthfuls of water.

But is it not laid down that a woman and a Śūdra are purified once touched, meaning by touch-

⁹⁹ Misspelling of Vaśiṣṭha.
¹⁰⁰ This quote is not in the Vaśiṣṭha Smṛti.
ing the lips with water one time only? He has no sacred thread since it is no concern of his. Hence, Baudhāyana says:101

Śūdras supervised by Āryas should shave their hair every month and perform sipping like Āryas.

“Supervised by Āryas” means serving Brahmins etc. “Like Āryas” means like Vaiśyas.

Manu says:

If a Śūdra wishes to earn a living, let him do honor to a Kṣatriya, or a Śūdra may want to make his living by rendering honor to a rich Vaiśya. He should serve Brahmins alone for heaven or for both. The meaning of the term “jāta-Brahmin” (born to serve Brahmins) will be fully realized.

M 10.21-22

“For heaven” means in order to reach heaven. “For both” means to wish for heaven and a livelihood. The term “jāta-Brahmin” means service to Brahmins as the highest duty.102 Nevertheless, both objectives of obtaining heaven and a livelihood by employment with the twice-born are attained by service to Brahmins. If employment with them is not possible, there is the aim of heaven alone.

If a livelihood by serving Kṣatriyas or Vaiśyas is not possible, emergency dharma should be done. Says Yājñavalkya:

The principal task103 of a Śūdra is to serve the twice-born. If he cannot make a living by that, he may become a merchant or live by various crafts, caring for the welfare of the twice-born. Y 1.120

Manu:

When a Śūdra is unable to enter into the service of twice-born men and is faced with the calamity (atyaya) of his sons and wife, he may earn a living by the activities of artisans. M 10.99

40 “Atyaya” means loss.

That is, the work of artisans and various kinds of crafts, the practice of which best serves the twice-born. M. 10.100

“The work of artisans” is carpentry, wood-cutting, and the like; “crafts” are leaf-cutting, graphic

101 The text here resembles Baudhāyana DS on sipping (1.8.22-23).
102 The term “jāta-Brahmin” and KS’s definition is peculiar. A jāti-brāhmaṇa or “birth-Brahmin” is a mocking term for a Brahmin who does not study the Vedas and coasts on the prestige of his birth. Scharfe, Education, 102.
103 Y 1.119 has pradhānam karma.
Devala:

The duties of Śūdras are serving the three higher castes, feeding their wives and family, husbandry, cattle-rearing, carrying loads, shop-keeping, painting, dancing, music, etc.

Parāśara:

The salt, honey, liquor, buttermilk, ghee, and milk is not spoilable by Śūdra jātis; he can sell these to all. PS 1.171

And,

Selling liquor, meat, eating forbidden food, and cohabitation forbidden by law, by committing these even a Śūdra at once falls. PS 1.72

As for the Laghuparāśara text:

If a Śūdra sells liquor or meat, if he eats things not to be eaten, if he has intercourse with a women with whom it is forbidden, he is outcasted immediately,

As well as the text from the Kālikāpurāṇa which forbids selling honey, meat, and the like, as follows:

A Śūdra can sell any substance without incurring blame, except for five of them: honey, hides, liquor, lac, and meat,

these rules apply in case of emergency and the like. The principal means of livelihood is to live by serving the twice-born. If that is impossible, he may sell goods commercially, except for honey, liquor, hides, lac, and meat, or he may earn a living by painting, and the like. In the case of extreme emergency, he is allowed to sell even honey, liquor, and so forth.

Uśanas summarizes the sequence in exactly the same way:

Living by service to the twice-born, practicing all crafts, and selling all wares are said to be śūdradharma.

In the Nṛsiṁhapurāṇa:

He should give unasked; he should rely on farming for a living; heeding the Purāṇa, with regular worship of Nṛsiṁha.

Parāśara:

104 The text has the indecipherable atrāyāṃ nigarva.
If a Śūdra drinks the milk of a brown cow (kapilā), if he has intercourse with a Brahmin woman, and if he meditates on the text of the Veda, he becomes a cāndāla.

“Meditating (vicār) on the text of the Veda” means knowing it, because the verb “car” means to go and the rule is that verbs meaning “to go” mean to know. Since knowledge is acquired by means of hearing, reciting, and thinking about it, these three are forbidden.

Similarly, a sūtra of Vyāsa on the non-qualification of Śudras states:

On account of the prohibition of hearing, studying, and its meaning, and on account of smṛti. BS 1.3.38

In the Śāṅkarabhāṣya this sūtra is explained as follows: “On account of this sūtra, too, the Śūdra is disqualified, since it forbids him to listen to the Veda, to learn it by rote, and to be concerned with its meaning. Smṛti denies the Śūdra the right to listen to the Veda, it denies him the right to learn it by rote, and it denies him the right to learn its meaning and to act upon it.”

First of all, in connection with the qualifications of Śudras, Gautama forbids them to listen to the Veda:

42 If he listens intentionally to the Veda, his ears shall be filled with tin (trapu) and red resin (jatu). G 12.4

And:

Truly, a Śūdra is but a walking cemetery.

Śābara on Jaimini VI.1.38

And, then:

If he repeats it, his tongue shall be cut out; if he commits it to memory, his body shall be split asunder. G 12.5-6

“He” means a Śūdra, “listens in on” means comes near and listens with the intent of learning it.

Therefore, some say that merely listening to the sound of the Veda does not constitute a fault on the listener’s part. Trapu is tin and jatu is lac.105 “Walking” means that the Śūdra is just like a burial ground in human form.106 “Repeating” and “committing to memory” are two kinds of knowledge in the form of inquiry about the text and its meaning, respectively. Accordingly, any kind or any degree of deliberation on the meaning of the Veda is prohibited. Both Karmamimāṇsā and

---

105 Resin from the lac insect used for varnish, wax, etc.
106 Kane 2: 154n358.
Brahmamimāṃsā very clearly discuss the texts of the Vedas in this light, in the usual manner of primary and final views.

The Nyāya śāstra, on its part, discusses the duality of the Self, which is understood from such Vedic texts as:

Two brahmans should be meditated upon—the higher and the lower.

Maitri U 6.22; MB 12.224.59

A pair of two beautiful winged birds, friends….

Śvet. U 4.6; Mu. U 3.1.1

which seem to oppose śruti texts such as:

There is only one brahman, without a second.

On the other hand, the explanation of the sixteen padārthas, supports their view. The logicians call this the discipline of thinking. As Udayanācārya says:

This rational discussion of God, which takes the designation “reflection,” is simply worship that is done following scripture.

Nyāyakusumānjali 3

For the same reason, study of the Vedāṅgas is also prohibited to Śūdras, because these, too, result in understanding the meaning of the Vedas. That’s why they are “limbs” of the Vedas. Besides, the very text that enjoins studying the Veda, “One should study one’s own Veda,” prescribing study up to an understanding of its meaning, involves teaching the Vedāṅgas as the basis for this understanding. If, as far as the Śūdra is concerned, the very thing to be achieved, namely, the study of the Veda, is removed, the study of the Vedāṅgas, which is useful for it, is automatically removed as well. That is why the Kūrma Purāṇa states:

When a twice-born studies one Veda, two Vedas, or more Vedas than two, together with their Vedāṅgas, in order to understand them, then he becomes a snāyin, the highest of the twice-born.

As for the Vedic grammar of Pāṇini and the other Ṛṣis, this is forbidden, either because it is smṛti, or because it is a Vedāṅga. On the other hand, as far as non-Vedic grammar is concerned, nothing can be deduced about it: since it is not helpful for the Vedas, there is no injunction about it.

107 Emending vaidikam to avaidikam as the needed contrast to the vyākaraṇam ārṣam in the preceding sentence.
Of course, there is this:

The wise should not use *mleccha* words, i.e., words not formed according to grammar. Corrupt and ungrammatical, indeed, is *mleccha*.

Since the *arthvādas*, which extol the injunctions, enjoin proper usage, grammar, which is enjoined as a mean to interpret them, will be accessible even to a Śūdra.

This is of no use. Indeed, except for bad speech at a ritual, there is no fault in using improper speech because of a passage from the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*:

> There were two Ṛṣis by the name of Yarvan and Tarvan. They usually said “yarnāṇas” and “tarvāṇas” whenever “yadvāṇas” and “tadvāṇas” were to be spoken, but they never mispronounced them during a sacrificial ritual.

 MBh 1.17.9

and because of the śrutī text:

> This word, like a thunderbolt, harms the sacrificer like putting the wrong accent on “Indraśātra.”

 TS 2.4.12

Now, if one asks the question: according to the śrutī text “he should not omit to perform the five sacrifices with the namaskāra mantra,” the Śūdra also performs sacrificial acts, is good pronunciation required in this case? The answer is no, because speaking Sanskrit is especially prohibited to Śūdras in the Prabhāsa section of the Skānda Purāṇa:

> A Śūdra should not take *darbha* grass; he should not drink the milk of a brown (*kāpila*) cow; he should not eat on the shiny middle leaf of the *brahma* tree he should not pronounce the OM *mantra*; he should not eat the sacrificial cake; he should not wear a sacred thread or topknot; he should not speak Sanskrit; he should not recite the Veda nor enjoy the three libations of *soma*; he should accomplish ritual with the namaskāra mantra to be sure; if he commits forbidden conduct, he sinks together with his ancestors.

And so, the prohibition of mispronunciation is concerned with something other than women and Śūdras. For the same reason, it is accepted that Vedic grammar is not be studied because it is a matter of speaking Sanskrit words.

Manu also prohibits the study of *smṛti*:

---

108 I.e., it is wholly aprāpta. Something is aprāpta when ones does it either naturally, or because there is an injunction to do it. Studying grammar is neither something one does naturally, nor, as the text says, is there an injunction about it.

109 Cf. MBh 2.8: *brahmanena na mlecchitava itī pārabhāṣīta vā / mleccho ha vā eṣa yadvāṇas / mlecchā mā bhūmety adhyetavyaṃ vyākaraṇam.*

110 Y.1.121.
The man for whom the rites beginning with the impregnation ceremony and ending with the funeral are to be performed with the recitation of Vedic mantras, he is entitled to study śāstra; no one else is entitled to this. M 2.16

“This” is smṛtiśāstra.

Likewise, the Bhavisya Purāṇa says he is not entitled even to hear the Vedas. After he heard Sumantu enumerate the smṛtis beginning with:

“Listen, the Dharmaśāstras are Manu, Viṣṇu, Yama, and Aṅgiras,”

and then say:

“When they had heard and understood these Dharmaśāstras, they went to the city of Vṛdhraka and rejoiced, no doubt about it,”

Śatānīka said:

“I do not want to hear these Dharmaśāstras spoken of by you, virtuous leader of the Brahmans, for they are secret, twice-born. they were promulgated by the Pāṇḍavas for the three varṇas only, not for Śūdras. Hear what I say about this. All the Vedas were instituted for the Brahmans, etc.; likewise, the śāstras of Manu, etc., and the Vedāṅgas completely.

BhP Brāhma parva 1.44-50

Moreover, it is also forbidden to listen and memorize Purāṇas, because of the text:

‘The Purāṇas are the fifth Veda according to the saying that Purāṇa is equal to Veda.’”

Similar is the reference to the Purāṇas in the Kūrma Purāṇa:

This śāstra should be memorized regularly by Brahmans on each parvan of the lunar month; it should not be recited in the presence of a Vṛṣala; he who deludedly recites it goes to many hells.

In the Bhavisya Purāṇa:

A Śūdra reading Purāṇa, Veda, and smṛti from delusion or desire goes to kuṭṭanam together with his ancestors.

“Kuṭṭanam” (crushing) is the name of a hell.

Also:

May the king, his reign and line be short-lived in whose kingdom Śūdras are always reading Purāṇa and Veda.

And:

111 Parvan: the days of the four changes of the moon, i.e., the eighth and fourteenth day of each half month and the full and new moon.
The Purāṇas, Dharmaśāstras, and Vedas were uttered by the seers.
A king should not have Śūdras improperly learning scripture as they like.

In the Vāyaviyasamhitā:

This ancient gem, the Purāṇa of Puruṣásana, should not be told to those who don’t know the Veda, nor given to a heretic; for when given to him he goes to hell.

But is it not said that Śūdras are entitled to listen to the Purāṇas? In the Bhavisya Purāṇa, following the question of Śatanāka:

The Śūdras seem deeply dejected before me, deprived of sacred knowledge, to my great grief.
Which was the knowledge proclaimed for them, twice-born, of old by the sages?

Sumantu says:

Good ! good ! mighty-armed one, hear the supreme word.
Hear, greatest of kings, the Dharmaśāstras pronounced for the benefit of all four varṇas.
But especially made purifying for Śūdras by the sages are the eighteen Purāṇas and the deeds of the descendent of Raghu, Rāma, tiger of the Kurus, for success in achieving the object of all their desires.

BhP Brāhma parva 1.51-55

Similarly, referring to the Purāṇas:

These Dharmaśāstras pronounced by the learned, tiger of the Kurus, always belong to the best of the four varṇas.
and are worthy to be heard in this world, great and virtuous king.
The duty of Śūdras is service and knowledge only by the Purāṇas.

BhP Brāhma parva 1.65-66

Some learned men say Śūdras are the same as women.

And:

They declare the study of doctrine is for the twice-born, O best of sages.
For Śūdras freed from worldly attachment and women, great sage,
the study of Purāṇa has been pronounced by the learned the study of doctrine.

Other texts such as this one in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa must be understood in the same light:

The triad of women, Śūdras, and the twice-born in name only do not have access to the śruti. Thus, the Bhāgavata Purāṇa was composed for them by the merciful sage.

BP 1.4.24-25

True, but the import is this: an examination of statements prohibiting hearing shows that hearing and reciting are prohibited as a principal occupation; the rules about hearing apply to Śūdras as they perform their duties to the twice-born when they sit engaged in listening to the Purāṇas. For
this reason, the Bhaviśya Purāṇa speaks of the special manner of hearing them.

While attending to images of the gods or to Brahmins, the Śūdra is fully free to listen, and so are the other twice-born. Indeed, duties concerning śruti and smṛti are proclaimed for the Brahmin, great king.

Therefore, Śūdras should never hear them without a Brahmin.

“Attending to images” means that is the main occupation while listening,” because he can listen freely on the occasion of worshipping them, but he cannot do so on his own. That is said in “without a Brahmin the Purāṇas, etc., should never be heard.” That means by being a listener while attending to a Brahmin. The same goes for one who recites Purāṇas in his presence, because in the negative injunction “this śāstra should not be memorized in the presence of a Vṛṣa,”112 “in the presence” refers to him. But others says that when the Purāṇas are recited by someone in violation of the prohibition, the reciter incurs guilt, not the Śūdra. Thus, hearing them is fully allowed, not studying and reciting them. They should not be studied and recited by another than a Brahmin or Kṣatriya, because of the prohibition of it in the Bhaviśya Purāṇa:

A Śūdra should hear it only, never study it.

But in the Vāyu Purāṇa, the Sūta says:

A Śūdra is not in any way entitled to the Vedas. VaP 1.28

The Brahmins have shown that I am entitled to the Purāṇas.

This texts establishes that the Śūdra is authorized, because a Sūta is a Śūdra by reason of his mixed caste, according to the text of Yogi [Yājñavalkya] that a “Sūta is the son of a Kṣatriya father and a Brahmin mother.”113

Or, this text must be interpreted as saying that he is authorized through Brahmins, i.e., by substitution of them. Even though, in this case, there is no question of memorizing, a Śūdra should come to understand and enact dharmanas indirectly from the Purāṇas or by instruction from the mouth of Brahmins proficient in śruti and smṛti.

The text, “he should not omit to perform the five sacrifices with the namaskāra mantra,”114 shows that the namah mantra is the only mantra to be used as in “reverence (namah) to the gods, reverence to the ancestral fathers.” Or in all rituals a Śūdra should repeat aloud only “namah,” not

112 A vṛṣala is a low, contemptible man that in later language means a Śūdra. Monier-Williams.
113 Y 1.93a.
114 Y 1.121. Kṛṣṇa quoted it earlier (44) and will again (157).
Vedic, Śmārta, or Purāṇic mantras. Gautama also says,” he is allowed the namaskāra mantra.”

On the other hand, in the Smṛtiakumudī, beginning with the text “In the Amuśāsana Parvan,” the following verse is quoted:

Svāha and namah are prescribed as the mantras for the Śūdra; with these two he should perform the pākayajña rites himself, with mantra (brahmavān).

The Svāha or the namah salutation, since both are assumed collectively. “With these two” means with the Svāha and namah mantras. In the word “brahmavān,” brahma means mantra. The sense is that he who knows these should perform the pākayajñas in his own right. Some say that there is no Svāha mantra in the case of Śūdras because it is commonly rejected and is contrary to good custom.

About this, the Gauḍa says:

The purpose of reciting mantras is dual: achieving the invisible and achieving visible ends, by way of showing what has to be performed

Of these two ends, the invisible is manifested just by pronouncing a mantra in the form of the namaskāra mantra in the generally accepted form; but to show the visible end he should have mantras recited by a Brahmin. Although a Śūdra is forbidden to hear or to recite mantras, this is not forbidden when there is a special text to that effect. As we see from the text in the Varāha Purāṇa in connection with the funeral rite for a single deceased ancestor (ekoddiṣṭa):

This same rule has been enjoined for Śūdras, but without mantras; for a Śūdra without mantras (amantrasya), a Brahmin is taken with the mantra.

VṛP 188.48

“Is taken with the mantra” means that a Brahmin is called upon as its reciter. The purpose of the adjective “without mantras” is to extend the rule to all those who are without mantras. As a result, when the rite is performed by a woman, a Brahmin should recite the mantra, for the rationale is the same for both. Since it is possible also by methodical meditation, it is not even necessary for a Brahmin actually to recite the mantras, because he only instigates the visible ends. The phrase “a Śūdra without mantras” is a metarule, and a metarule is not limited by context. Hence, a mantra

115 G 10.64.
116 There are four works beginning with gauḍa in Kane (1974): I. 2. 1025.
should also be recited by a Brahmin on other occasions than the funeral rite for a single deceased ancestor, namely, when bathing, giving gifts, etc.

For the same reason, the older commentators say that, even though the statement by Kātyāyana that “in rituals for one’s father, there is twice as much darbha grass,” is quoted in the chapter on śrāddha, being a metarule, it applies to any paternal calamity\textsuperscript{117} whatever.

Madanapāla explains the text differently: “When in the śrāddha of a particular school after the formula of invitation, it is enjoined that the mantra be recited by a Brahmin, then also in a śrāddha performed by a Śūdra as patron the mantra should be recited by a Brahmin invited for the purpose. This is the meaning of the verse, “a Brahmin is taken with mantra.”

The author of the Kalpataru, on his part, says that Śūdras are disqualified for Vedic mantras, but not for Purānic ones. Therefore, since Purānic dharma is specifically prescribed for women and Śūdras, and since these dharmas came into being with specific mantras, Śūdras recite Purānic mantras as part of ritual.

Such is also the custom in Madhyadeśa. Duties that are explicitly forbidden to Śūdras are suppressed; those directly enjoined are maintained. But those that are neither enjoined nor forbidden are commonly followed, but only those without mantras. Some Vedic or Śmṛta obligations, although performed without Vedic mantras, are also forbidden.

Vyāsa in the Mokṣadhharma says:

Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas are the three twice-born varṇas; they are equally qualified for it, O excellent one. MB 12.285.25

“For it” means in matters of śruti, such as performing sacrifices for others, and in matters of śmṛti, such as morning and evening worship. We will see later that they are qualified for sacrifices and the like by special texts.

The Kūrma Purāṇa has spoken of the fruit of each one practicing his own dharma:

The place of Prajāpati is assigned to the Brahmans who practice the rites, the place of Indra to the Kṣatriyas who do not run away from battle, the place of the Maruts to the Vaiśyas who follow the duties prescribed for them, and the place of the Gandharvas to the Śūdras who follow the path of service.

KP 1.2.66-67

\textsuperscript{117}Pitṛkṣaya: father diminution.
In the *Mahābhārata*:

If anyone of the three non-Brahmin *varṇas* wish to live according to the *āśramas* hear, Pāṇḍava, the laws for the *āśramas*. All the *āśramas*, except for desirelessness, are prescribed for the Śūdra who has fulfilled his duty of obedient service and completed the task of extending his lineage with the approval of the king, Lord of the earth, or follows his own dharma and the customs of his country.

The life of begging is not for him who is following his own true dharma.

“Desirelessness” is the stage of renunciation. The point is that he is eligible for the three stages, excluding renunciation. Note that begging should not be practiced while in the stage of studentship, which comes down to saying that all pure duties of the other stages may be performed.

The *Matsya Purāṇa* shows, in the guise of an account of what will happen in the future, that other things, too, are forbidden to a Śūdra. For example, at the beginning of its account of how people will behave in the Kaliyuga, it says:

Thenceforth all this world will fall on terrible times.
Men will be liars, beaten down, and destitute of righteousness, love, and prosperity.
The observance of *śruti* and *smṛti* will be slack, caste and order demolished.
Weak-souled and deluded, they will fall into caste confusion.
Brahmins will be of Śūdra stock,
and Śūdras, verily, will be the source of mantras.
Brahmins will come to them seeking the meaning of the Vedas.

In the *Kūrma Purāṇa* it says:

Very bad men, impious, immoral, filled with anger, with little intelligence,
they speak falsely, are greedy, and wrongly-born.

“Wrongly-born” means of mixed-caste birth. Likewise, it states:

Due to bad designs, bad learning, bad behavior, bad courses,
and defects in the actions of Brahmins,
the dissolution of the people occurs.
Most of the rulers will be Śūdras and will oppress Brahmins.
White-toothed Śūdras, doing ascetic practices, shorn and wearing ochre garments
will follow the laws of piety at the close of the age.
Seeing the twice-born, those of little wit will not move from their seats,
and the Śūdra minions of the ruler will beat the most excellent of Brahmins.
Although he knows that Śūdras are sitting on their high chairs among the twice-born,
under the sway of the Kaliyuga, the ruler does not suppress them, chastiser of foes.
With flowers, ornaments, and other adornments the twice-born
of little learning, wealth, and power wait upon Śūdras.
Even when honored, Śūdras will not look on the best twice-born, O prince.
The twice-born will stand at their door looking for an opportunity to serve;
the dependents of Śūdras, they crowd round them in their carriages.
Dwelling in the most awful impiety they recite Vedic verses.

It had already been said before that *mantras* should not be recited by a Brahmin at the time of a rit-
In the Kaliyuga, Śūdras are the source of mantras. They have contact with Brahmins by sleeping, seating, and dining with them. Kings are mostly Śūdras and harass Brahmins. Śūdras behave like Brahmins and Brahmins behave like Śūdras. Kṣatriyas are not kings and Brahmins are dependent on Śūdras. All are respectful to Śūdras honored by Brahmins.

The dim-witted do not stir from their seats on seeing Brahmins. Brahmins put a hand over their mouth and humbly speak in the ear of low Śūdras. Then Śūdras versed in dharma study the Vedas. Kings of Śūdra birth perform the horse sacrifice. Therefore longevity, strength, and beauty in the Kaliyuga diminish. But, then, in a short time men attain completion. Good men without ill-will will practice the dharma laid down in the scriptures at the end of the age. What is gained by the practice of dharma in a year in the Tretā will be gained in a month in the Dvāpara. What an intelligent man might do, striving to the utmost, is attained in a day in the Kaliyuga.

By a consideration of texts such as these we see that Śūdras are at fault and are doing things they ought not when they sleep, sit, and eat together with Brahmins, recite and listen to the Vedas, expound Vedic subjects, put themselves before Brahmins, harass and order them about, follow their way of life while wearing the ochre garb of a renunciate, shaving the head, and going “white-toothed,” not rising on seeing a Brahmin, striking them, using high beds, seats, and carriages in front of Brahmins, dishonoring a Brahmin when he is comes to visit, making him wait at the door, having Brahmins serve them, following the dharma of higher castes, performing sacrifices, and following the rules meant for a person sacrificing. Therefore, these things should not be done.

Next, Parāśara forbids other things than these:

If a Śūdra sells liquor or meat, eats forbidden food, or has illicit relations, he loses caste instantly.

“Liquor” means everything such as rum and the like. “Meat” means both flesh that may be eaten and flesh that may not be eaten. Note that this prohibition is for times when there is no emergency; it was said earlier that in an emergency there is no offence. Cow flesh is not to be consumed on account of the prohibition on eating cows and animals in the Kaliyuga. “Illicit relations” is incest with his mother, sisters, and so on.

118 The reading of this line is uncertain. The editor correctly adds na after mantra. It is more likely that the reading was brāhmāṇena na and that it was left out by haplography.
Since in the negative injunctions on drinking spirits, wine, and so forth, only members of the three upper varṇas are specifically mentioned, the drinking of wine is not prohibited for Śūdras on account of a text in Manu:

Half of his person falls whose wife drinks liquor.  
No expiation is ordained for a person half-outcaste.

If this refers only to wives of the twice-born, it is meaningless. Indeed, they are already forbidden to do so by the text, “therefore Brahmans, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas should not drink wine.” Since they appear in the subject of the sentence, \(^{119}\) words expressing the masculine are not meant to refer to males only. For the same reason, this prohibition applies to Brahmin women and so forth, i.e., the uninitiated, because it is based on caste only.

Similarly, in case of contact with a wine-drinking Śūdra, even the penance laid down to counteract the contact does not hold. For if someone makes use of liquor, wine, etc., the drinking of which is prohibited to him, he incurs loss of caste. Contact with those who have lost caste is a cause of losing caste, also because of the smṛti text:

And the one who has such contact becomes a fifth.\(^{120}\)

Besides, since a Śūdra is not prohibited drinking wine, there is no penance for contact with him. On the other hand, there is penance for a Śūdra when he has contact with a member of the upper three varṇas to whom drinking wine is forbidden. But, whatever penance is declared for contact with any liquor-drinker, they say that a Śūdra should perform a quarter less.

However, the killing of Brahmans, etc., is prohibited for Śūdras too, since non-violence is the common duty of all castes. As Viṣṇu says:

Patience, truth, self-control, purity, charity, sensory restraint, non-harm, obedience to the guru, pilgrimage, mercy, honesty, freedom from greed, reverence to gods and Brahmans, and no ill-will, this is the universal duty. \(\text{VS 2.7-8}\)

In the Mahābhārata it is said:

Performing rites for the departed, austerities, truth, and non-anger, contentment with one’s wife, purity, constant freedom from ill-will, self-knowledge, and forbearance, is the common dharma, Prince. \(\text{MB 12.285.24}\)

\(^{119}\) uddeśya  
\(^{120}\) I.e., he is outside the four varṇas.
Supply “to all four varṇas.”

Now, should someone object, since Śūdras are not permitted to pursue knowledge, how then are they eligible to follow mokṣadharma, we reply that although they are not entitled to discuss the meaning of Vedic texts, it is not incompatible with the fact that they are permitted to think about the knowledge of mokṣadharma gained from Purāṇas incidentally heard while engaged in the business of serving Brahmins. The Śūta Smāhitā of the Skānda Purāṇa says as much:

57  The Brahmin devoted to the dharma of beatitude, O Lotus-eyed, is the first in qualification for worship and meditation on Hari. Other Brahmins, seers, Kṣatriyas, and likewise, Vaiśyas are qualified for meditational practice by degrees. Brahmin women also are qualified for sacred practice. For Śūdras there is service and knowledge only through the Purāṇas. Some experts say women have the same status as Śūdras.

ŚP 1.7.18-21

In the Mokṣadharma section of the Mahābhārata we are told that:

Constantly attaining knowledge, whether Brahmin, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, or even Śūdra of low birth, one endowed with faith should always show reverence for it. Birth and death does not befall the faithful. From knowledge comes liberation for men, not from non-knowledge, so the divinely wise twice-born say. Therefore, one should increase knowledge and thereby free oneself from birth and death.

MB 12.306.84-85

Where there is no explicit mention of caste or prohibition for the Śūdra, then is he fully entitled.

Similarly, in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa:

58  The triad of women, Śūdras, and the twice-born in name only do not have access to śruti. Thus, the tale of the Bhāratas was told by the merciful sage.121

BP 1.4.24-25

“Twice-born in name only” are sons fathered by men of the first three varṇas on Śūdra women. They are Vrātyas, the sons of men in the first three varṇas who have lost caste through non-performance of the sacraments.

Hence in the Mahābhārata:

Taking refuge in me, son of Kunti, those of low birth, women, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras too, attain the supreme goal.

MB 6.31.32

121 This verse was quoted earlier (47) with Bhāgavata Purāṇa instead of “tale of the Bhāratas.”
Therefore the great sins such as killing of a Brahmin apply to Śūdras also. And, the penance for a great sin for a Śūdra is four times more than for a Brahmin, as stated in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa:

The penance sanctioned for Kṣatriyas is double that for Brahmins, for Vaiśyas triple, and for Śūdras quadruple.
A penance should be regarded as a vow for the purification of sins.

The sense is that whatever the penance is for a Brahmin in a particular instance, in the same instance a Kṣatriya should do twice as much penance, a Vaiśya three-times as much, and a Śūdra four-times as much.

On the other hand, The Opinions of the Twenty Four states:

Of the penance handed down by the great Rṣis, for a Brahmin, a Kṣatriya should do a quarter less, a Vaiśya half, and a Śūdra a quarter for all these offences.

This does not apply to the fourfold acts of violence committed by a lower person against a higher according to a text in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa:

The guilt incurred by a lower varṇa person for killing an upper varṇa person should be considered heavier as you go down from a Kṣatriya to a Śūdra, without doubt.

Yājñavalkya similarly says:

In the case of a person of lower varṇa using abusive language toward someone of higher varṇa, the penalty is double, triple, or quadruple respectively.
But when a higher vilifies a lower, the damages are half by rank.

Verbal abuse by a Śūdra, Vaiśya, or Kṣatriya is penalized on a graduated scale of four-, three-, and two-times respectively. And, penalties are said to be punishments. For the same reason, when a mixed-varṇa person, such as a Mūrdhavasikta (son of a Brahmin father and Kṣatriya mother), kills a Brahmin, the penance is more than for a Brahmin and less than for a Kṣatriya, i.e., half as much more than the penance for a Brahmin. So he has eighteen years.122 In the same way, for all the rest of the mixed varṇas, less penance should be set for the anuloma mixed varṇas, and more for the pratiloma mixed varṇas. Whatever penance is prescribed for a Śūdra, women, children, the ill, and the old shall get half of it. As Aṅgiras says:

122 The edition is garbled here. To make sense, aṣṭādaśāśārdhāni, “18 halves,” must be changed to aṣṭādaśāśābdāni, “18 years.” The penance for a Mūrdhavasikta who kills a Brahmin is said to be one and half times that of a Brahmin. Manu (11.73), Yājñavalkya 93.243), Viṣṇu (50.6), and others say that for killing a Brahmin the perpetrator must stay in the forest for twelve years, perform a mahāvrata for 12 years, and so on. So 12 years is the base penalty.
One who is eighty years old, a child of less than sixteen years of age, women and the sick are allowed half the penance.

And, at the same age women do a quarter of the penance when men do a half. As Angiras says:

Before twelve years or above eighty,
there is only half for men and a quarter for women.

One should understand this to mean that for any varṇa, whatever the penance is said to be, old men from that varṇa should do half, and women a quarter.

On the other hand, the Viṣṇu text, “the rule is a quarter should be paid in the case of boys for all offences,” is for uninitiated boys.

Note also that the text by Śaṅkha:

When a boy is between five and nine years old,
the brother, father, or other friendly person may do the penance.
For a child younger than this there is no fault or sin;
he is not subject to the law and there is no penance,
do not mean to exclude penance entirely, because rules on penance are the same irrespective of stage of life, varṇa, age, and particular conditions, and therefore, apply to those listed in it as well.

All this text does is establish that these individuals should not be subject to the full expiation.

conditions of stage of life, varṇa, and age, and particular conditions, but is explaining the lack of full expiation. Thus, since a quarter is proposed for boys after the fifth year, before that, he sets a slightly less penance. But whenever a particular penance has been set for Śūdras, the gradual diminution should be made starting from each particular rule.

The determination of a penance by a Śūdra is forbidden in the Explanation of the Law:

Now a Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, or Śūdra should on no account make a determination of penance, in the view of the learned.

In the Opinions of the Twenty-Four Sages we read:

Just as Brahmins, etc., should not drink milk in a dog skin, like that, speech from a Śūdra’s mouth should on no account be heard. The words even of an educated Śūdra, knowledgeable in the śāstras, should not be heeded, like food offerings thrown out for the dogs.

If a Śūdra in his pride of knowledge speaks to a Brahmin, he goes to a terrible hell until the end of creation.

Aṅgiras says:

So a Śūdra, always following the dharma, should offer penance, without chanting mantras and making oblations in fire.
This means that a Śūdra, because of his lack of education, should be instructed in the forms of giving and making vows such as for the kṛcchra fasts, exclusive of chanting mantras and fire oblations that are to be performed with Vedic mantras.

On the other hand, on the basis of this text of Jābāla:

At the beginning and end, especially, of all kṛcchra fasts, she should offer a sacrifice in the household sacred fire with clarified butter, but without the vyāhrīs. She should do śrāddha at the end of the observance with things like a cow and gold in her right hand. Women should not offer homa nor drink the five cow products,

other say that because of the rule that women offer homa in the ordinary domestic fire only, women and Śūdras offer homa in a non-sacred common fire with a Brahmin officiating. But the pentad of cow products for women is optional, seeing that Pārāśara prescribes it in this verse:

One performs the prājāpatya fast to purify women and Śūdras. He or she should prepare the five cow products, and by bathing and drinking them become pure. PS 12.4

and forbade it earlier. It is not forbidden for a Śūdra man.

As for the verse:

If a Śūdra drinks the five cow products, or a Brahmin drinks wine, these two acts are the same: both will dwell in the hell called Purulent, VS 54.7; Atri 300

that refers to the five cow products that are not part of penance.

A Śūdra should do japa and homa as part of penance with a Brahmin officiating, according to the metarule:

A Śūdra being without mantra, a Brahmin should be taken for the mantra. VrP 188.48

Likewise, in the Explanation of the Law:

If someone’s fasting, vows, sacrifice, pilgrimage, bathing, chanting and so on are effected by Brahmans, the fruit is his on whose behalf it is done.

The rest of this can be seen in the chapter on penance in the Govindārṇava.
Devala says:

The duty of a Śūdra is service to the twice-born varṇas, avoidance of sin, and fostering his family.

In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa we read:

Having right to the sacrifice of prepared food by service to the twice-born only, he generates people of his own. This makes the Śūdra very fortunate.

A Śūdra is also to give gifts and offer the sacrifices of prepared food. He makes all the offerings for ancestors.

Manu says:

Serving Brahmans is regarded as the distinctive work of a Śūdra—anything else he does is futile.

What this means is this: Only a Śūdra wholly dedicated to serving the twice-born may do the five rites for a householder, etc. This is not incompatible with service to them. But by turning away from service to them, doing the five rites becomes totally ineffectual, because such a person has no right to do them.

In the Ānuśāsana Parvan of the Mahābhārata we read:

Passion, anger, delusion, cruelty, malice, dishonesty, enmity, pride, fraud, falseness, abuse, calumny, greed, baseness, and contempt take possession of a Śūdra at birth. A Śūdra’s dark dispositions are destroyed by devotion to the twice-born. By serving the twice-born a Śūdra attains the supreme good.

Harmless, virtuous, worshipping the gods and twice-born, a Śūdra is honored for following his own dharma and garnering its approved fruits.

Similarly:

The Śūdra should never accumulate property. A bad one in his greed for wealth would put his betters under his control. Or when king, he may indulge his desire for wealth in accord with dharma.

The point here is that he would have power over the twice-born, i.e., tread upon them, not value them. “When king,” and so on, means that if a Śūdra is king and is granted permission by the twice-born, he may accumulate wealth as he wishes. Or, if he obtains the position of staying at
the royal court or protecting the king’s family, then, with the permission of the twice-born, he is free to accumulate wealth as he pleases.

Manu says:

Even though he may be able, the Śūdra shall not amass wealth; for when he acquires wealth, the Śūdra obstructs Brahmins.  

and:

For the Śūdra there is no sin; nor is he worthy of any sacrament. He is not entitled to the sacred rites; but there is no prohibition against them.  

Medhātithi says about this that no sin accrues to a Śūdra, as it does for the twice-born, in committing any violation which is not expressly prohibited to him by actual name, but what, without reference to any particular varṇa, is prohibited as a general rule to everyone, such as harming living things, stealing, lying and so forth. Similarly, a Śūdra has no right to any sacrament that is not specifically stipulated for him. However, I will show later on that the rites of conception, naming, first walk, first food, marriage, and death, for which there is explicit authority, are not prohibited.

With regard to this second half of the verse, a Śūdra has no right to śrāta or śmārta rites which are to be accomplished with mantras. But there is no prohibition for common observances such as bathing, fasting, worship, and so forth, which are accomplished without mantras. Since in the case of such acts as bathing, fasting, vows, giving, and worship there is no obligatory duty, their omission is no sin. That is why there is no prohibition against them because their prohibition is not prescriptive, they apply to everyone, and are conducive to his welfare when performed. In the same way they say that such things as eating garlic are also not prohibited, but there are beneficial results in avoiding it.

As Manu said:

There is no sin in eating meat, drinking liquor, or having intercourse — that is the natural activity of creatures; but abstention has great rewards.  

“Meat-eating” means as prescribed in an injunction. The word “liquor” also implies garlic and

123 Or else, the meaning is that the Śūdra is not permanently entitled.
things of that sort. “Intercourse” is sexual relations with one’s wife at the proper and improper
time. Because visible and invisible fruit arises even from avoiding anything generally forbidden,
abstention has great rewards. But one should not suppose that the absence or prohibition of rites
such as the Soma sacrifices leads to great rewards when he does not perform them, since these are
enjoined for specific varṇas.

Nor may one say that Śūdras can do Soma sacrifices, and so on, provided they use no mantras,
based on the text in Manu:

If those who, knowing their duty and wishing to acquire merit,
imitate the practices of good men without reciting mantras,
they incur no sin—they obtain praise.

M 10.127

Not so. With the mantras left out, the performance of rituals that involve mantras would not have
the required sound. They must be done exactly as ordained by scripture. Otherwise, the ritual is
imperfect. How could mantra-less Śūdras have anything to do with rituals that are perfectly ac-
complished only by mantras from Vedic texts? By this reasoning, Śūdras are not qualified even for
rites such as the birth ceremony.

On the other hand, “without reciting mantras, they incur no sin,” means this: in the case of such
acts as bathing, fasting, and worship of the gods, which are completed without mantras, their right
to perform them is clearly not denied. There is no sin in performing them without the authorita-
tively taught Vedic mantras.

Vyāsa has something similar in the Moksadharma.

One hears opinions that, for a certain sacrament, the Śūdra does not loose caste,
that he is not worthy of performing it, that he cannot perform a ritual
prescribed by the Veda, and that he is not forbidden to perform it.
By performing the rites that promote their well-being,
without the mantras, he incurs no sin.
Whenever low people take up the ways of the good,
they attain and rest in happiness here and hereafter.

MB 12.285.27, 29-30

For this reason, the Śūdra has no right to the sacraments that are accomplished with Vedic
mantras.

There are two kinds of saṃskāra: daiva and brāhmaṇa. The pākayajñas (sacrifices of cooked
food), havis (burnt offerings), and soma are divine. Because they are performed with mantras,
they are not for him. The *smṛti*-based rites of conception, and so on, are *brāhmaṇa*. There are sixteen of them, as Jātakarnya says:

Garbhādhāna (impregnation), puṁsavana (male conception), sīmanta (parting the hair), jātakarma (birth), nāmakaraṇa (naming), annaprāśana (first rice), caula (tonsure), mauḍī (initiation), the four vows, godāna (gift of a cow), samāvatana (graduation bath), vivāha (marriage), and antyam (last rites). These are the sixteen ordained rites.

These are obligatory. In this case, Śūdras are to do those without mantras, as Yama says:

Such is the Śūdra, too. He should do the rites without mantras. 

Prajāpati did not provide him with any Vedic verses.

Yājñavalkya also says:

Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras are the four *varṇas*. 
The first three are the twice-born. All their rites from conception to death are performed with mantras. 

It is understood here that since only the rites of marriage and death are ascribed to the Śūdra, he does not have the others. Thus, Sumantu says:

The rites of conception, parting of the hair, birthday, naming, first rice, tonsure, sacred thread, and vows, conduct, study, the rites of homecoming and marriage, sacrifice, and giving are common to Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas.

Manu also says:

The consecration of the body, starting with conception, should be effected for twice-born men with auspicious Vedic rites, cleansing in this life and the next. 

Vedic rituals are rituals done with verses from the Vedas. With these, the twice-born, not Śūdras, should purify the body.

Although, in this way, there is a general prohibition, it is suspended in particular instances. For example, on the basis of the text:

Devoted to his wife, pure, supporting his dependents, zealous in offering śrāddha, he should perform not forgo five great sacrifices with the “namaḥ” mantra. 

one who is pure from performing the five great sacrifices and śrāddha, and supporting his dependents, is allowed the rite of conception. Indeed, devotion to one’s wife is intercourse with her at the proper time, and that is precisely the time of impregnation.

In the same way, Śūdras can do the naming ceremony according to Yogi, but the name should
suggest the repugnant. According to the Mānavaśāstra, it should have a suffix denoting service;\textsuperscript{124}

and, according to a text of Vyāsa:

\begin{quote}

The name for a Brahmin should end in “sharma.”
for a Kṣatriya in “varma;” for a Vaiśya the name
should include “gupta,” and for a Śūdra “dāsa.”
\end{quote}

According to the text:

69 In the fourth month the ceremony of taking the infant out of the house is done.  
In the sixth the ceremony of first rice, and any other dear to the family, M 2.34

Śūdras have the rites of first appearance in public and first solid food, because no specific varṇa is referred to. The word “infant” is used to include Śūdras. The rite of ear-piercing is also for him, since no particular varṇa is cited. He does not have the other rites, as they are done with mantras.

In the Brahma Purāṇa we also see the following:

The Śūdra, on his part, has simply the sacrament of marriage always.

By the word “simply” is expressed the denial of the other rites to Śūdras. The explanation in the Kalpataru is similar:

The word “simply” means that the other saṁskāras are denied.

But the word “simply” does not deny mantra; because of his lack of knowledge only are those mantras inapplicable to a Śūdra.” So we understand this to mean that the performance of the rites of naming, ear-piercing, first walk, and first solid food is optional. And, in this way, there is no contradiction with smṛti, since smṛti achieves its aim even though laying down the rites of naming as optional.

The rite of tonsure, however, is for the twice-born only, according to the text of Manu:

The first cutting of the hair is for all twice-born, by dharma. M 2.35ab

A Śūdra’s hair is cut in the fashion of his own family— but this is not the rite of tonsure, because the term “tonsure” only applies when there are five tufts, four tufts, etc., and because this is not possible for Śūdras. Thus, Laugākṣi says:

The rite of tonsure is done toward the end of the third year. The descendants of Vāsiṣṭha have a lock on the right side, the Átris and Kāśyapas on both sides; the Bhrigus shave the whole head; and the Ángiras keep five locks. Some keep a line of hair for its auspiciousness, others wear a top-lock (śikhā) or follow family tradition. The rite is performed on an auspicious day of the waxing moon and the four lunar changes.

\textsuperscript{124} M 2.32.
A lock, generally speaking, should be made in the top middle of the head, but for the Vāsiṣṭhas, it is on the right side. For the Ātris and Kāśyapas, it is on both the left and right sides. For the Bhrgus, all of the head is shaved—no lock is worn. For the Āngirases, there are five: one is in the middle surrounded by four to the four directions. Some, on the other hand, make a line of hair for good luck; it goes all around from the forehead to the base of the ear; in the middle of it, there is or is not a lock, depending on the custom. The “top-locked” wear a single lock anywhere by no fixed rule, and so, its place is determined by the domestic rites of the house. I have explained earlier that when it comes to shaving a Śūdra, there is the alternative of wearing locks or shaving him totally.125

Initiation, too, is not for a Śūdra, because it is taught with reference to specific varṇas: a Brahmin should be initiated in the spring, a Kṣatriya in the summer, and a Vaiśya in the autumn.

Āpastamba similarly says:

Non-Śūdras without guilt may undergo initiation. A 1.16

And Manu, too, shows that these rites are for the twice-born only:

By fire offerings for the fetus, the birth rite, the first cutting of hair, and the tying on of the muñja grass cord, the sin of paternal seed and maternal womb is wiped from the twice-born. M 2.27

On the other hand, the Śūdra has the rite for the dead, since it has the form of a respectful disposition of the body, and the cremation is in an ordinary, non-consecrated fire.

And so, whereas a Śūdra is not entitled to saṁskāras such as birthday day and parting-of-the-hair, yet at the appropriate time for these rituals, one should perform just an auspicious ceremony which is traditional in his family, not however, the s saṁskāra.

But the bathing, giving of gifts, and so on, mentioned in the verse:

When a son is born, the father is enjoined to bathe with his clothes on, is also his, because it does not contradict any other rule. For the same reason, rites such as those for the fetus and the expectant mother, honoring Śaṣṭhī on the sixth day after birth of a child, the ceremony of sitting on the ground (bhāmyupaveśana), and so on, are not forbidden to him.

125 SAS 38.
I will later discuss how a Śūdra can make offerings to ancestors on joyful occasions such as marriage with uncooked food only, on the basis of texts such as “but with raw uncooked food a Śūdra can.”

Morning and evening prayers are also not for him, as we see from the reference to twice-born in this text in the Kūrma Purāṇa:

The twice-born should observe sandhyā in the morning and evening with a collected mind. Non-observance due to desire, greed, or fear leads to sinking down.

KP 2.12.1

And śruti says:

Then these Veda experts, facing east at dawn, consecrated with the Gāyatrī mantra, cast water up into the air. The water became a thunderbolt that hurled the Rākṣasas upon the island of the Mandeha.

Taittirīya Āranyaka 2.2

The words “Veda experts” and “consecrated with the Gāyatrī mantra” the non-entitlement of those not entitled to recite others for the Gāyatrī. Those eligible to recite it are the three higher varṇas only. Kātyāyana says that one should initiate a Brahmin with the Śāvitrī, a Kṣatriya with the Tristubh, and a Vaiṣya with the Jagatī, or all with the Śāvitrī.

Women are prescribed worship:

Pūjā is similarly recommended for all Śūdras free of worldly stain, for all other men as well, O great bull of sages. Seeing a house of god, let him bow (pranāmenaiva).

The life of a man who does pūjā in this way prospers.

“Pranāmenaiva,” means with the five syllable mantra “Śivāya namaḥ” plus Om. “With Śiva and a namah at the end only” means just “Śivāya namaḥ” without the pranava, thereby conveying that women and Śūdras are not entitled to the sacred syllable Om.

But Śūdras have initiation with Vaiṣṇava mantras, as we see from the verses in the Varāha Purāṇa beginning with:

I will now speak of the glorious initiation of the four varṇas.

VrP 126.11a

---

126 SAS 217.
127 For mandehārunadvipe. Some commentators, Śāyana and Bhāskara Miśra, say that the Mandehas are Rākṣasas cast upon the island of Aruna (dawn). They are described in some Purāṇas. See Willibald Kirfel, Das Purāṇa vom Weltgebäude (Bonn, 1954) and The Rāmāyana of Vālmiki: An Ancient Epic of India, IV. Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa, trans. Rosalind Lefeber (Princeton: Princetown University Press, 1994): 301-302n36-37.
128 The text on page 72 appears to be corrupt.
and then:

I shall also speak about the initiation of the Śūdra who is devoted to me,
by means of which he is freed from all sin. VrP 127.22a

and concluding with:

Such is the procedure of initiation for Śūdras and its attendant ceremonies. VrP 127.32a

And in this passage from the same text, referring to the Pañcarātra:

If Vedic mantras are not available to them, persons who unhesitatingly seek me
by following the Pañcarātra teaching will attain me.
The Pañcarātra is prescribed for Brahmans, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas.
By way of hearing, it will reach people like Śūdras. VrP 10b-12a

The Bhavisya Purāṇa states:

One may give initiation to Brahmans, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas of good family,
and Śūdras in the sūryamandala.130

There is also initiation with the mantras of Śakti and Vināyaka in various Āgamas. The capability
of doing pūjā is granted in the same source:

Now I will speak of the acts that a Śūdra performs
while abiding in me, hear me
O husband and wife, with whole-hearted faith and devotion.131

When chanting the Gāyatrī mantra, Brahmans say “tat savitur vareṇyam,” Kṣatriyas say “deva
savitur,” and Vaiśyas, “viśvārūpaṇī.” Consequently, since there is no Gāyatrī for the Śūdra, he is
not entitled to the morning and evening worship performed with it.

Furthermore, from the fact that one who is deprived of sandhyā is equal to a Śūdra, in this text:

With a calm mind, let him perform morning and evening prayers (sandhyā).
The man who does not pray to the east and to the west is the same
as a Śūdra and excluded from all dharma

it is understood that a Śūdra is not eligible to perform sandhyā. Such things, however, as medita-
tion on Viṣṇu are not prohibited at this time, since they are not incompatible. And so, those saying
that Śūdras can perform morning and evening prayers with the namaskāra mantra are repudiated,

because the namaskāra mantra is expressly prescribed for the five great sacrifices, offerings to
ancestors, setting a sacred fire, and bathing.

130 Text corrupt. A sūryamandala is a sun circle or symbol of the solar orb and solar system with many varied uses in initiation
and worship involving, e.g., Sūrya, Nārāyaṇa, Śakti, and Gāyatrī.

131 A guess. This line is untranslatable given the corruption of the edition.
Investiture with the sacred thread is not for him. Manu also enjoins it only for the twice-born.

A Brahmin’s sacred thread should be three cords of cotton and is worn upwards, a Kṣatriya’s is made of hemp, and a Vaiśya’s of wool.

Thus, Śūdras have no right to use even smārta mantras such as the praṇava at an initiation performed with śrauta mantras.

Likewise, regarding the worship of Śiva, the Skanda Purāṇa beginning with:

I will tell you the rule of worship, Brahmins.

and having prescribed the mantra:

With the blessed five syllables plus Om.

continues:

Let the brahmaçarin, the householder, and the righteous retiree daily worship the great god Śiva, the all-knowing, the all-creating, the Lord of Mother Pārvatī.

The renunciate should worship the Lord of Lords with Om only. Worshipping with the “Śivāya namaḥ” mantra only, devoted to me, absorbed in me, submissively doing my work, knowing the right place and time, free of passion and darkness, abiding in constant thought of me, loving the namaskāra mantra. Leaving behind thousands of Rśis, I go to the Śūdra alone who is pure in deed and practices with my sacred knowledge in this way.

Similarly, the Narasiṅha Purāṇa states:

Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, women, and the lowest Śūdras devotedly revere the supreme god who is half-lion, and are freed from the ocean of tens of millions of unhappy and evil births. Worshipping the supreme god, they attain their desire.

Likewise, in the Liṅga Purāṇa:

Then the great god Rudra in his divine realm said, “Brahmins and Kṣatriyas especially should revere me. I wish only to hear the homage of Vaiśyas and Śūdras. And women too have the right to pūjā etc. without a doubt”

These verses allow only worship at a distance, not also touching. This is said in the Brihat Nārādiya:

For women, the uninitiated, and Śūdras, Janeśvara, there is no authorization to touch either Viṣṇu or Śaṅkara.

---

132 This line (5) of the edition is corrupt. The Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra does define the sacred thread. Only by changing vas-travinyāśādīni into vas-travinyāśādīti can the text refer to an unknown quotation from Baudhāyana.

133 My best guess. These three verses have lacunas in the edition.
Also:

Anyone who bows to a linga or image of Viṣṇu touched by Śūdras will experience the torments of hell as long as the moon and stars exist. Anyone who bows to a linga or Viṣṇu attended by women will stay in hell until the end of the world.

As well as:

If a man adores a linga or Viṣṇu worshipped by Śūdras, there is no expiation for him, even by myriads of severe penance.

All these texts forbid worship involving contact with the images, but not worship itself, because that is enjoined everywhere.

There is a verse, however, in the Skanda Purāṇa that makes a distinction:

The man who abandons his own dharma and relishes another’s is the fabulous moon-beam drinking partridge, a fraud, and a fool—even when he offers worship to me, I smell the odor of corpses.

This tells us that pūjā should not be offered to Śiva by anyone failing to perform his varṇa duties. But the same text says that, even when delinquent in his dharma, a Brahmin still has all the rights to pūjā.

I am ever pleased with the adoration of Brahmins filled with Vedic mantra. I do not shrink from the touch of the twice-born, O You of Lovely-Face. Even when touched by a Brahmin given over to the ways of Śūdras, I rejoice still more when worshipped by him, Beautiful One.

Because of the reference to “twice-born” in this passage, Śūdras who have a livelihood equal to them and women, are forbidden to touch a linga or image—they should offer reverence only from a distance.

This prohibition of touching applies to lingas set up at the present day, not ancient ones established from time immemorial, as the Nāradaṇa Purāṇa says in this verse:

When a linga is set up properly by learned Brahmins, from that time forth, let no Śūdras and women touch it.

As for verses such as:

Kāyasthas and such people should abstain from the śikhā, investiture, wearing saffron clothing, and touching the images of the divinities, and:

134 The word yogakṣema in this sentence is unclear. Gautama (28.46) uses it in his section on inheritance. Olivelle translates it as “security measure,” perhaps a bit too contemporary in connotation, and Sharma (Śūdras, 97) as “livelihood.” “Joint property” springs to mind.
Chanting prayers, performing austerities, pilgrimage to holy places, the practice of mantra, and worship of divinities are the six downfalls for women and Śūdras, their inconsistency is to be explained away in the manner previously discussed—as relating to their fields of application explained by their being compatible or not with service to twice-borns depending on their being sat- and asat-Śūdras.

The marks of sat-Śūdras are said to be: shaving the hair each month, consuming the surplus food of the twice-born, making a living by service to them, and performing the five great sacrifices. These should be regarded as the dharmic duties of good Śūdras only—the others have those common to everyone, such as non-harm to living creatures. But, it is accepted in all the Purāṇas that everyone has the privilege of praising the name of the Lord.

This inquiry into the injunctions and prohibitions in the Gemstone of Good Śūdra Conduct was written by the author, for the sake of Śrīmat Keśavādaśa’s son, Śrīmat Pilāji, the standard of authority for eminent men of learning, the one ocean of virtue, the treasure of good fortune.

This concludes the discussion of the positive and negative injunctions for the Śūdra in the Gemstone of Śūdra Conduct.

An Account of the Observances Śūdras Keep in their Daily Life

Manu says:

Let him wake at the hour sacred to Brahma and reflect on his duties and interests, the bodily cares that are caused by them, and the true meaning of the Vedas.
The Brahma is the third hour of the last watch of the night, prescribed as the right time to awaken.

And likewise:

The house of the husband and wife who do not slumber at the Brahma hour is always honored by the gods, together with their ancestors.

In the Smriticandrīkā it says:

Sleeping at the Brahma hour annuls merit.
A pādakṛćchra cleanses the deluded man who does.

135 Āhnikas. See Kane II: 640ff for their description.
Visṇu says:

The man who on rising from bed glorifies Madhusūdana with songs of praise makes his sins vanish without a trace.

In the *Vāmana Purāṇa* are these verses:

If you get up at dawn and see a learned man, a prosperous man, a lord of men, if you get up at dawn and see, from misfortune you are free. If you get up at dawn and see a wicked man, an ill-starred man, a drunk, a naked or a noseless man it means disaster.

**Urination**

The *Visṇu Purāṇa* says:

Then, arising from his bed, he is to void his excrements, my lord, in the southwest quarter, a bow shot or more away.                VP 3.11.8

May Brahma, Visṇu, Śiva, the sun, moon, Mars, and Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, together with Saturn wish me good morning.

These are the things one should first look at in the morning.

Kātyāyana says:

A learned Brahmin, a fortunate man, a sacred fire and its maker.

Yājñavalkya says:

When a man urinates or defecates, he should put the sacred thread over his ear and face north during the day, at dawn, and twilight, and at night, face south. Y 1.17

Since a Śūdra does not have a sacred thread, it is out of the question for him to put it over his ear.

[Objection:] Since the texts of Baudhāyana and others that “he should put on clothing for initiation,” ordain an upper garment and the like as fulfilling the function of the sacred thread and he can just put one of these over his ear.

[Reply:] Not so. When there is a sacred thread, putting it over one’s ear is a *saṁskāra*, not a complementary act, like the fact of wearing it around the neck while performing a *śrāddha*, while

---

136 *Pādakṛcchra*: a vow in which taking eating and fasting are done on alternate days.
137 Detailed rules are laid down in the *smṛtis* on answering the call of nature (*mūtrapuṣṭotsarga*) and *śauca*, mixing the hygienic, healthy, moral, and religious.
bathing, and so forth. There is no authority for putting a garment over the ear, and texts such as:

What even a particular person does without the sacred thread, is as good as not done, pertain to acts performed according to śruti and smrti [and ergo, they apply here]..

However, since a wearing the sacred thread is excluded (niyama)\(^{138}\) and a penance is prescribed for not wearing it when eating, and so on, he is forced to put a garment over his ear.

[Objection:] The fact that a penance is prescribed in the verse:

One who drinks, urinates, or eats not wearing the sacred thread must do six prāṇāyāmātrikās during the day, and at night, three.\(^{139}\)

indicates that the penance is subsidiary to urinating.

[Reply:] Not so, since this text applies to the twice-born. Compare the Vṛddha Pāṛśara:

If a twice-born eats, urinates, defecates, or ejaculates without the sacred thread, a Brahmin must fast for three nights, a Kṣatriya does a pādakṛccchra,\(^{140}\) a Vaiśya must fast for one day and one night. Such is the purification laid down of old.

Consequently, there is no reason for a Śūdra to put a piece of clothing over his ear.

Others say that he must put on his ear a….. of two aṅgulas; if, however, no solid piece of cloth or the like is available, this does not apply.\(^{141}\)

Hārīta says:

On six occasions one should remain silent: when defecating, copulating, urinating, washing the teeth, bathing, and eating.

Aṅgiras says:

Rising at the last watch of the night and sipping water, spreading the ground with grass, covering the head with a robe, keeping silent and taking care to avoid spitting and heavy breathing, he should evacuate wastes in a clean place with a collected mind.

Manu says:

Covering the earth with wood, leaves, clods, and grass, let him evacuate. M 4.49

And also:

He should not urinate facing the sun, or look at his own dung, the sun, a cow, a fire, or a Brahmin. M 4.52

\(^{138}\) When there are two possibilities (here, wearing or not wearing the sacred thread), niyama is the rule that excludes one of the two and restricts the possibilities to a single one.

\(^{139}\) Prāṇāyāma or breathing retention as a form of penance. It is unclear if a prāṇāyāmātrika is one penance or a set of three.

\(^{140}\) See previous note.

\(^{141}\) There is a gap in the text where the corner of the manuscript was torn off.
Manu:

A Brahmin may do it facing any direction he likes in a shade, in the dark, day or night, and when in danger of his life. M 4.51

According to the Grhya Pariśiṣṭa:

Wear the sacred thread on the back hanging down from the neck. When wearing one or two pieces of clothing, put it over the right ear.

But in the Kṛṣṇabhāṭṭīya we find:

He should wear the brahmaśūtra over the right ear when urinating, over the left when defecating, and in the usual way over the left shoulder during sexual relations.

The original source of this text is uncertain.

Āpastamba says:

If he without sipping water, anointed with oil, while shaving, or during intercourse, and voids urine and faeces, he is purified in one day and night.

Āpastamba says:

If he without sipping water, anointed with oil, while shaving, or during intercourse, and voids urine and faeces, he is purified in one day and night.143

Daksṣa says:

Certainly when urinating and defecating, first take some clay, but when taking it afterwards, go into the water clothed.

As well as:

With a water pot in his hand let him void his wastes. That water, like urine, is the same as drinking liquor.

Manu:

Never discharge urine and feces while facing the wind, a fire, a Brahmin, the sun, the water, or a cow, nor in a plowed field, in water, an old ruined temple, a green grassy spot, on a mountain or an anthill, in a hole where animals live, walking or standing on a road, by a river bank, in ashes, or in a pasture. M 4.48,46,47

Yama:

Don’t make water in ponds, pools, springs, chaff and charcoal keeps, temples, highways, cremation grounds, fields, threshing floors, in an open shade, and a crossroad. Avoid water, banks, and a path.

142 A rarely quoted work, probably the same as the Karmatattvapradipikā of Kṛṣṇabhāṭṭa mentioned by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s contemporary, and dated to 1400-1550 C.E. by Kane (II.1: 1080).

143 This sentence is not in Āpastamba and is unclear.
Avoid the foot of trees, holy spots, and rain reservoirs.

Hārīta:

Don’t make water with shoes on, in a bathing-place, door, or square.

Devala:

Don’t defile a liṅga with waste.
Don’t idle there too long or talk.

**Cleanliness**

Bharadvāja:

Then removing excrement and urine with earth, wood, and grass, rise with the garments lifted up, firmly holding the penis.

In the *Skanda Purāṇa*:

Holding the penis with the left hand, carefully get up.

Vyāsa:

One should not wipe with a stone, straw, charcoal, with a bone, or sacrificial grass.

In the *Viśṇu Purāṇa*:

Wipe off excreta with the left hand and with fragrant vīraṇa grass, not used for sacrifice: in that way, health is maintained.

Devala:

The man familiar with dharma does not use the right hand to clean below. Likewise, he should not wash above the navel with the left hand.

Dakṣa says:

The Brahman, being based on cleanliness, should always strive for it. If he forgoes clean behavior, all his actions are to no avail.

On this topic, Yājñavalkya says:

Rising while holding his penis, he carefully cleans away every smell and smudge with water and earth.

Paiṭṭīnasi says:

After excreting, do not clean oneself in a water pond.
One should carefully do it with water drawn from somewhere else.

Vivasvat says:
At night only may one clean without drawing water; afterwards clean the place, or it becomes impure.

Ṛṣyaśṛṅga says:

He must wash with water the place where he has eliminated.

Manu says:

Fine sand for the purpose of cleaning should never be taken from a roadside, a cemetery, a palace or a hut.144

The Viṣṇu Smṛti states:

He should not use earth with the bodies of living creatures in it dug up by a plow.

In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

Avoid earth for cleaning that has been dug up from an ant- or mole-hill, from a body of water, left over from cleaning, or from a habitation.

Yama says:

Do not use clay from the outside of ponds, wells, and tanks. Take it out of the center of the water down to the wrist.

Kaśyapa says:

White clay is recommended for a Brahmin, red for a Kṣatriya, yellow for a Vaiṣya, and black for a woman and a Śūdra.

Manu says:

Cleanse with the water and earth valued in each region.145

Śātātapa says:

After urinating, clean the penis once, the left hand thrice, the two hands twice, and double after a seminal emission.

For cleansing after defecation, the Viṣṇu Purāṇa states:

Apply earth good for cleaning once to the penis, three times to the anus, ten times to the left hand, and seven to both hands.

On cleaning the hands Hārīta says:

Apply one to the penis, three to the anus, ten to the left hand, six to the back, and seven to both hands.

“To the back” because the left hand came close to it

---

144 Another verse not in the Manusmṛti.
145 Also not in Manu.
Śaṅkha says:

Wash the fingernails with three applications of mud; three are always recommended for the feet, if one wishes to be clean.

For Marīci says “the feet” means for each foot:

Wash the feet three times as well as the ankles, but the hands up to the wrists, removing smell and stain.

In the *Brahma Purāṇa*:

Then apply earth twice to the feet with well-washed hands.

Even though smell and stains can be removed by the stated number of times, Manu says:

He should apply water and earth until all obvious smell and impurity caused by it are gone. He should wash until sure it is clean.\(^{146}\)

Devala also says:

The learned set no limit to the number of times to clean.

Manu gives the amount of earth for cleaning ordure:

First, half a palmful, second, a quarter palmful, and third, an eighth of a palmful are recommended.

On cleaning the hands, among other things, Śāttāpara says:

A lump the size of a fresh gooseberry is prescribed for a moon fast.\(^{147}\)
Likewise for all oblations and the clay for cleaning.

Śaṅkha says:

A householder cleans once, a Vedic student twice, a forest dweller thrice, and an ascetic four times.

In the *Āditya Purāṇa*:

The learned prescribe a half measure of cleaning for women and Śūdras.

But more, if odor and traces persist. Pitāmaha in the *devaloka* said:\(^{148}\)

He should clean until it is good.
The learned don’t specify the number of cleanings.

The twice-born before initiation, Śūdras, and women are enjoined to clean until odor and traces are eradicated.

The *Vṛddha Parāśara* says:

\(^{146}\) Not in Manu.

\(^{147}\) An *induvrata* is a fast in which the amount of food is diminished a certain portion each day over a fortnight or month. Monier-Williams.

\(^{148}\) Pitāmaha is Lord Brahma in the world of the gods. This citation may be from the *Brahma Purāṇa*.
The sick clean as they are able, the well as prescribed.
An uninitiated boy carries it on until all odor and smears are eliminated.

Dakṣa:

Half of the cleaning set for the day is recommended at night.
a quarter of that for the sick, and an eighth for a healthy man on the road.

In addition, Parāśāra says:

If he finds excrement in a place he has gone into to eliminate
he should always do a half-cleaning.

When it is not possible to divide the number into two because it is an odd number, take one half or
the next higher even number.

On this topic some authorities say: Before marriage, there is no restriction of the number for
a Śūdra, but he must remove all trace and smell. Even if he does not marry, after twelve years
there is no restriction of the number, and it depends on his skillfulness, or lack thereof, at cleaning. But, after marrying, a Śūdra offends if he disregards the restriction on the number of times
one applies earth. We infer this from the statement that “an uninitiated boy carries it on until all
odor and stain are eliminated.”

When washing the feet, the twice-born castes do the right foot first, then the left, Śūdras the re-
verse.

In Hārīta’s view:

If, after cleaning, he sees his own or another’s urine or faeces,
he should look at the sun, a fire, soma, or a Brahmin and a cow.

Devala says:

So, washing his feet separately up to the knees,
and his hands up to the wrists, he should sit quietly.

89

Sipping Water

Parāśāra says:

The twice-born should sip water with the top of the head and neck covered,

149 Ācamana, “sipping water from the palm,” the rules for which in the smṛtis are elaborate and the occasions many, starting with sandhyopāsana in the morning. See Kane II: 315-316, 652.
putting the sacred thread over the left shoulder, restrained in body and speech.

Bhāradvāja says:

A twice-born must stretch out his hand before him like a cow’s ear, and take up the water holding the fingers together.\(^{150}\)

Yogī says:

The proper way to sip water is with the thumb and little finger out, facing the northeast.\(^{151}\)

Yogī says:

Sitting cross-legged in a clean place facing north or east, the twice-born should always sip water from the brahmatīrtha part of the hand.\(^{152}\)

Manu says:

A Brahmin should always sip water from the root of the thumb, from the root of the small finger, or from the tips of the fingers, never from the root of the index finger.\(^{153}\) M 2.58

Hārīta says:

The bottoms of the little finger, index finger, and thumb, and the finger tips are the prajāpati-, pīṭṭha-, brahma-, and deva parts of the hand, respectively. Y 1.19

Yama says:

He should not sip water until he has touched it with his left hand; for on the left hand are the 12 Ādityas, Varuṇa and the 30 gods.

Yogī says:

The twice-born should touch the heart, throat, and palate with water in succession. A woman and a Śūdra should purify by touching once inside with water. Y 1.21

“Once inside” means touching the palate with water one time. This is meant as an exception to the view expressed by Gautama\(^{154}\) that ācamana is performed three or four times. That pertains to the asat-Śūdra. The sat-Śūdra, to the contrary, should perform ācamana only once according to text of Manu that, “the sat-Śūdra should follow Vaiśya rites in matters of purity,” as said before.\(^{155}\)

---

\(^{150}\) The edition has parvataḥ, which is unclear, Ludo Rocher suggests parvataḥ “before him,” by reference to Aparārka Aparādīṭya, ed. anon., Anandāśrama Sanskrit Series 46 (Poona, 1903-04): 38.

\(^{151}\) According to Kane, Yājñavalkya was styled Yogīśvara by the Mitākṣara and other later works. Besides the Yājñavalkya-smṛti, there are three other works of uncertain authorship: Vṛddha Yāj., Brhad Yogī Yāj., and Yoga-Yāj. Some commentators quote from the Yāj. smṛti as from the Yogī Yāj., as Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa may be doing here, which suggests that they treated all of these works as one author’s, namely Yogī Yājñavalkya. See Kane (1974): 448-57.

\(^{152}\) Although attributed to Yogī, this verse is in Yājñavalkya (1.18). The previous one is not.

\(^{153}\) The roots of the small finger, index finger, and thumb, and the tips of fingers of the hand are, respectively, called the prājapati- (or kāya as in this verse), pīṭṭha-, brahma-, and daiva-tīrthas. A tīrtha is that part of the right hand from which water is sipped. See Kane II: 316n750, 652.

\(^{154}\) G 1.36.
Manu says:

A Brahmin is purified when the water reaches the heart,
    a Ksatriya, to the throat, a Vaiśya, Śūdra, and women too, to the palate.\textsuperscript{156}

Uśanas gives the amount going to the heart:

A quantity of water the size of a black gram bean reaches the heart.

Pracetās says:

With water, not warm, not frothy, and cold,
    not with water from a pond or a crevice.

Paitīnasi says:

After sipping, throw the remaining water on the left hand.
    Touch the nostrils with the forefinger and thumb.\textsuperscript{157}

The \textit{Vṛddha Śaṅkha} says:

Touch the eyes with the thumb and middle finger joined together,
    then touch the ears with thumb and the ring finger joined together.
    Touch the shoulders with the little finger and thumb,
    then the navel and heart likewise with the palm.
    Then touch the head. This is the rule for sipping.

Yogī says:

After sipping water three times, wash off twice and touch the nine apertures of the body.

In the \textit{Bhaviṣya Purāṇa}:

The water that an excellent man pours out on the ground
    gladdens the Nāgas and their chief, Vāsuki, O son of Bharata.

An interpolation in Paitīnasi states:

With one foot in the water and the other on dry ground he should sip water;
    nevertheless, if he puts them both in the same place he is purified.

\section*{How to Sip Water}

Devala says:

One should not perform \textit{ācamana} wearing shoes in the water, with loose hair,
an untucked hem, or an untied śikhā, while wearing a turban or with the head wrapped up, nor while walking, lying down, moving about, touching others,158 laughing, chattering, or busy looking yourself over.

He should not touch his hair, waistband, and lower body. If he touches them, he must wash once more.

Yama says:

He must not perform ācamana with unwashed feet, standing on dry ground while wet, without the sacred thread, or wearing no inner garment.

He must do tarpana, ācamana, and japa in water wearing wet clothes.

He must do tarpana, ācamana, and japa on dry ground wearing dry clothes.

A very bad man is he who does ācamana on dry ground wearing wet clothes; His m<s drink the water dripping from his clothes.

Viṣṇu says:

He who performs ācamana while standing in water up to the knees and thighs attains purity. Below that, even if he performs ācamana a hundred times, he is not purified.

Śāṅkhāyana says:

A “high-footer” should not perform giving, sipping water, eating, sacrifice, worship of the gods, Vedic recitation, or offer water to ancestral fathers.

A “high-footer” is one who puts his feet up on a seat,159 on his knees or thighs, or sits on his hams.

Vyāsa says:

Indeed, if a twice-born sips water with his curled-up finger tips, the Rṣi said it is the same as drinking spirits.

The water left over from drinking, washing the feet, and cleaning is all like urine unless a firebrand is waved around it.

In the Kūrma Purāṇa:

He must not drink water lifted with the left hand or with the mouth.

In the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa:

He should perform ācamana with kuśa grass in his hand; purifying kuśa grass is not ucchiṣṭa; avoid the remnants of a meal.

Hārīta says:

If a twice-born places kuśa grass in the left hand, if would be like sipping blood and filth.

Also:

The wise man places kuśa grass in both hands.

Do not perform ācamana with a blade that has a knot.

Śāṅkhāyana says:

158 The Smṛticandrīkā (II: 269) attributes the next four lines to Viṣṇu.
159 The Smṛticandrīkā (II: 270) quotes these two lines from Gobhila with avasathikho, “sitting on the hams,” instead of the edition’s avasathiko.
Never perform ācamana holding kāṣa grass.
Since there may be an injunction for it,
penance purifies this offence. The same goes for dūrvā grass.

In the Krṣṇabhāṭṭiya:

If he sips water with an iron, tin, lead, or copper cup,
even a hundred times, at no time is he purified.

The source for this is uncertain.

94 Sāṅkhya-yāna says:

The drops that fall on the feet of a man who pours water
for someone else to sip are like drops on the ground
and do not make him ritually impure.

Occasions for rinsing the mouth with water according to Manu are:

After sleeping, eating, spitting, telling a lie, and drinking,
or when he is going to recite the Vedas, sip some water,
even if already ritually pure.

Alternatives to Sipping

Mārkaṇḍeya:

He may perform ācamana, touch a cow’s back, and look at the sun.
And he may also take hold of the right ear. In the absence of the former,
he should do the later, as this is within his ability.

Bṛhaspati:

If a twice-born touches damp grass, cow dung, or earth,
breaks wind, cries out, or feels anger,
has contact with a cat or mouse, laughs out loud, or speaks untruth,
on all these occasions, let him touch his right ear.

The Vyddha Śātātapa:

When one sneezes in the act of reciting, gets something in the teeth, speaks
an untruth, spits, or converses with the defiled, touch the right ear.

95 Aṅgiras:

If one sees a cāndāla or such while praying or making offerings, sipping purifies.

---

160 The edition’s vidhisambhavāt is not clear. It must go with pāda c.
161 This verse in also Manu 5.142.
162 This reading, which leaves out ksutva, “sneezing,” is not attested in Olivelle’s edition (2005): 587.
163 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa quotes a variant differing slightly in the pādas and their order from the reconstructed version in Bṛhaspatismṛti
If one touches a dog or such, sip water or touch the right ear.

Sāṅkhya-yāna:

Āditya, the Vasus, Rudra, Vāyu, Agni, and Yama are always and ever in the right ear of a Brahmin.

Exceptions to Sipping

After consuming water and herbs, chewing betel, and for all sweet-flavored medicinals, the clear-sighted need not sip water. When offering madhuparka, soma, water, and oblations to the five prānas, a Brahmin does not become impure according to the Rṣi Aurva,

The water in this case has been consecrated with mantra.

Śātātapa says:

A twice-born does not become unclean by bits of fruit, roots, and oily comestibles sticking in the teeth, by betel, or sugar-cane.

Vasiṣṭha:

Bits of food sticking in the teeth are like the teeth, as is anything in the mouth or what remains after sipping. Swallowing it, one becomes pure.

Washing the Teeth

The Vṛddha Śātātapa says:

Since one is unready for devotion when there is stale food in the mouth, one should with all diligence wash the teeth. On rising in the morning, without talking, wash the teeth with a flossing twig ten fingers long for Brahmans, nine for Kṣatriyas, eight for Vaiśyas, and six for the rest. But four for women. One who has lost teeth brushes very lightly, one with regular teeth, moderately, and one with bad teeth, three times.

Kātyāyana says:

Facing east, one experiences confidence, joy, and health; facing south, the terrible, facing west, failure; facing north, loss of cattle, women, and people; but facing the northeast direction, one attains all desires.
In the *Chandoga Pariśīṭa*:

On rising, wash and make yourself clean and composed, and chanting a *mantra*, make use of a toothbrush.

The *mantra* is:

O Lord Tree, grant us life, strength, beauty, vigor, children, cattle, wealth, Brahma, wisdom, and intelligence.

Viṣṇu says:

Each morning, silently use a tooth brush, twelve fingers long, including the brush at the end, and as wide at the top as the small finger.

In the *Mahābhārata*:

After washing the hands, feet, and face, calm and collected, raising the right arm and the other knee, sit down facing east and brush the teeth.

“Raising the right arm” means being *upavītā*, i.e., wearing only an upper garment, because there is no sacred thread on the right shoulder.

Bhāradvāja:

While washing his teeth he should not look at a person of low or fallen caste, heretics, idol attendants, dusty animals of burden, beggars, criminals, outcastes, a dog, pig, ass, or rooster. Anything like these the wise twice-born should not see while cleaning.

In the *Bhārata*:

One must avoid twigs that are leafy, dried, split, barkless, knotty, and made of *pālāśa* or *śāmśāpa* wood.

Uśanas says:

Brushing the teeth with *tinduka, inguda, bandhūka, mocā, amaraja, vallija*, or cotton would take even the luster of Viṣṇu.

Yama says:

The man desirous of wealth should avoid brushing his teeth while sitting, lying, standing, with shoes on, and the self-possessed man always a twig of *pālāśa* wood.

On woods to be avoided, the *Saṁgraha* says:

Not the ślesmānta, kapīḷu, varvura, dhava, ariṣṭa, aṇjana, aśva, kṛkā(?), bandhūka, ingudī, śigru, dhanvika, dalī, tinduḷ, śamī, śālmalī, pālāśa, accha, guḍīcī, guggula, śaṇa, ?, vidāra, amrikā.
Nārada says:

All thorny ones are good, sappy ones are excellent. *Khadira, karaniṇa, kadamba, fig, tamarind, bamboo, mango, and neem, apamarga, bilva, and udumbara*—these are recommended for cleaning the teeth. NP 1.50.20-21

Viṣṇu says:

The 14th, 8th, 6th, and full moon:
on these days avoid women, oil, meat, and the toothbrush.
On days when śrāddha is offered, birthdays, marriages,
on days of vows, fasts, and indigestion—omit brushing the teeth.

Ācārya:

On the 8th, 14th, and 15th day in each half-month,
and on vyatipāta and sankranti do not use a toothbrush,
nor when troubled by indigestion, vomiting, cough, shortness of breath, fever.
One may brush before sunrise, but not after sunrise and sunset.

Parāśara:

An initiate, a brahmacārī, an ascetic, and a husbandless woman
should always avoid brushing the teeth on a new moon day.
This special rule applies even to women whose husbands are away traveling.
Women who are menstruating or have given birth should omit brushing.
A menstruating woman should brush on the 4th day,
and a post-partum woman on the 10th, even if there are impediments.

Vyāsa:

Wash the teeth with leaves on the 1st day of a lunar fortnight, the 6th and 9th,
at other times with twigs, and always for scraping the tongue.
In the absence of tooth twigs or on a prohibited day,
the mouth is purified with 12 mouthfuls of water.

Yājñavalkya:

Avoid cleaning the teeth with brick, stone, and with other fingers than the ring and thumb.

Viṣṇu:

---

164 The name and identification of several of these flora are doubtful. For example, *ślesmānta* is probably *ślesmataka*, *kapīḷu* may be *kapīḷa, ṛkā (?)* may be *ṛkara* and *vidāra vidāra*. A bunch of plants begin with aśva. The text has lacunae. The meter is perfect sārdulavikrāḍīta (--- Indian in aśva) except for one syllable (śva in aśva) in that should be long. I found useful the Sanskrit glossary in M. Abdul Kareem, *Plants in Ayurveda: A Compendium of Botanical and Sanskrit Names* (Bangalore, 1997). Another good source for flora is K. M. Nadkarni, *Indian Materia Medica*, rev. ed., 2 vols. (Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1976).

165 The adyāt here =bhāṣayet earlier.
Brushing the teeth and scraping the tongue with a twig from a tree with thorns and milky sap making the first half into a brush is indicated.\footnote{The edition is corrupt. The \textit{Smṛticandrika} (II: 278) has the reading, \textit{pūrvārdhakācakam}, “a small brush made from the first half.”}

Vyāsa:

After washing, put it in a clean place.
When kept ready, one attains from the divine the dominion one desires.\footnote{\textit{daivādaṇgaḥ abhāpsitam}. The \textit{Smṛticandrika} (II: 276) has “one attains all the food one desires.”}

It is said in the \textit{Smṛtiratnāvalī}:

Four, eight, and twelve mouthfuls of water purify.\footnote{The \textit{cāṣṭa} qualifying \textit{gandūṣaḥ} must be a faulty reading.}
Take them after urination, defecation, and seminal emission, respectively.
The deities are in front, the fathers on the right, and all the Ṛṣis behind.
Spit out the mouthfuls of water on the left.

Hair Care

In the \textit{Viṣṇu Purāṇa}:

The bathed man then dresses his hair, looks at himself in a mirror, and procure oils, \textit{dūrva} grass, and scent.\footnote{VP 3.11.22 He should look at himself in ghee if he wishes for long life.}
He should look at himself in ghee if he wishes for long life.\footnote{The text is questionable. The third line is not in the critical edition of the \textit{Viṣṇupurāṇam}, ed. M. M. Pathak, I: 307. M. N. Dutt translates it: “Having finally washed his mouth, he must clean and arrange his hairs and must decorate his body, before a looking glass with unguents, garlands and perfumes.” \textit{Viṣṇupurāṇam : A Prose English Translation, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 90} (Varanasi, 1972): 200.}

The Rules for \textit{Kuśa} Grass and the like for Bathing

Harīta:

He who prays with \textit{kuśa} grass, gives gifts with \textit{kuśa} grass, and eats with \textit{kuśa} grass in his hand, has no limit to his lifespan.

Similarly:

The demons, seizers of \textit{japa} and \textit{homa}, manifest in incarnate form, run away from the man with purifying \textit{kuśa} grass in his hand, scattering to the ten directions.

Statements like this are made in general terms. They also apply to Śūdras.

During \textit{japa}, \textit{homa}, charities, recitation of the Vedas, and libations
to the *pitr*, the hand should not be empty of gold, silver, and *kuša* grass.

In the *Māraṇḍeya Purāṇa*:

A Brahmin shall make a *pavitra* with four bundles of *kuša* grass,
one by one less is advised as you go down the *varṇas*.

In the *Smṛti Bhāskara*:\(^{170}\)

Vedic experts say that Brahmins must make the *pavitra* with seven bundles of *kuša* grass,
Kṣatriyas with five, Vaiśyas with four, and Śūdras with two.

---

**Rules for Bathing**

*Māraṇḍeya* says:

Since all the ritual acts of an unbathed man are fruitless,
he is instructed to bathe regularly every morning
with *kuša* grass in his hands and the *śikhā* knotted.
Do *prāṇāyāmas* and properly observe the fixed times.

*Vyāsa*:

Meditate with *Om* and the *Gāyatrī*, then tie the *śikhā*,
sip water again, and touch the heart, arms, and shoulders.

---

102 Note that this is for the twice-born alone, for Śūdras do this in complete silence, since they are not
qualified for *Om*, the *Gāyatrī*, and the like.

In the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*:

The twice-born should not make offerings in fire, worship the gods,
bathe, dine, recite, or pray, with one garment on.

*VP 3.12.19-20*

*Manu* says:

He must never take a bath after eating, when ill, at night-time,
with a lot of clothes on, or in a strange body of water.

*M 4.129*

In the *Māraṇḍeya Purāṇa*:

Do not bathe in an unfringed garment, except for the loincloth,
in something belonging to another, wet, or stitched with a needle.

In the *Smṛti Sāgara*:

If someone asks for sesame and *kuša* grass to perform a rite in water,
the fruit of the rite is not his, but the giver’s.

---

\(^{170}\) See Kane 1\(^2\) : 1152.
Manu says:

The implements for bathing are all placed on the right side.
He who does so attains the great good.\textsuperscript{171}

In the \textit{Saṁgraha}:

Enter water, the house of the gods, a bed, and the residence of Brahmins, with washed feet, unwashed never.

103  In the \textit{Ācāra Sāgara}:

One must know the right time (\textit{tīhi}) for birth, death, anointing, travel, bathing, teeth washing, reading, and writing.

Manu says:

After washing the hands and feet, sipping water in purity and silence, with knowledge of the lunar and solar day, and so on, having properly made his resolutions according to the rules.\textsuperscript{172}

“Let him bathe” is understood.

On the other hand, the \textit{Kātyāyana [Grhya] Sūtra}, in the chapter that begins with the phrase

“Now, after that, the daily bath,” says:

After washing his hands and feet, holding a bunch of \textit{kuśa} grass,\textsuperscript{173} his hair tied in a knot, wearing the sacred thread, and having performed \textit{ācamana}...

The commentary on the \textit{Sūtra} explains this passage thus: “Since wearing the sacred thread at a daily ritual is a given,\textsuperscript{174} the apparently tautological phrase “wearing the sacred thread” is here meant to prevent the bather from wearing a second garment.\textsuperscript{175} Consequently, the Vājasaneyins distinguish themselves by wearing a single garment, whereas the others wear two.\textsuperscript{176} That being the case,\textsuperscript{177} Śūdras should similarly distinguish themselves, depending on the specific sub-castes they belong to.

Parāśara says:

\textsuperscript{171} Not in our editions of \textit{Manu}.
\textsuperscript{172} Also not in \textit{Manu}.
\textsuperscript{173} The edition has \textit{apagrahe}, a misreading for \textit{apagraho}.
\textsuperscript{174} “Is a given” is not a satisfactory translation for \textit{prāpta}. It really means that something is already established by another \textit{vidhi} (scriptural injunction) or by nature, and therefore, needs no \textit{vidhi} any more. Here, since wearing the sacred thread when taking the daily bath is established by another rule, the word \textit{yajnopavīta} cannot just mean that he has to wear the thread. And since every single word in a \textit{sūtra} has a meaning, the commentator comes up with one.
\textsuperscript{175} The second garment is one that covers the upper body: he should not wear an upper body garment in addition to the thread.
\textsuperscript{176} The \textit{Kātyāyana Sūtra} belong to the Vājasaneyin school, i.e., the \textit{White Yajurveda}.
\textsuperscript{177} If wearing or not wearing an upper garment differs among the twice-born according to the school they belong to, Śūdras, too, do or do not wear a second garment depending on their specific (\textit{upadiśta}) sub-caste.
Wash facing the stream where the water is flowing, 
in standing water, always facing the sun. 
If bathing in still water, sprinkle the feet of Brahmans, 
and say the sandhyā prayers facing the sun.

For Vājasaneyins bathing in rivers, etc., is always done facing the sun. If this is the case, the same
holds for Śūdras too, depending on the specific subcaste they belong to.

The Acārya makes a distinction when bathing at home:

At home, he should bathe facing the house, elsewhere, facing the sun. 
The best of the twice-born should bathe facing a flowing current. 
Let him pour into a vessel cold water, kuśa grass, then warm water. 
During bathing at home he should avoid sipping, libations to the pitṛs, 
wringing out clothes, and splashing water with a cupped hand. 
In bathing at home, he should not make libations or wipe with kuśa grass. 
Don’t make libations during it; after doing so, sipping purifies. 
Bathing without a seat or standing on stone— 
the best of the twice-born always avoid these things at home. 
After bathing, the twice-born should take off his wet garment upward. 
if he takes it off downward, bathing again purifies him.

According to the statement in the Chandogaparīśīṣṭa “if at home, without mantras,” one should
do the daily bath unaccompanied by Vedic verses. Others say with a few verses.

Manu gives an exception to bathing with warm water:

On days of death, birth, zodiacal transit, śrāddha, birthdays, 
and contact with the untouchable one should not bath with warm water. 
He who bathes with warm water on the full or new moon, 
you can be sure, commits a sin equal to killing a cow.

The views prevailing among the various schools of the Veda with regard to the necessity for Vedic verses when bathing are described in the Govindārṇava. They can be consulted there.

Viṣṇu makes a distinction:

Bathing with Vedic verses is accepted only for Brahmans, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas, 
but silence for Śūdras and women, joy of the Kurus.

“Silence” means without Vedic and smārta verses.

But Madanapāla reads the text as:

Bathing with Vedic verses is accepted for Brahmans, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas; 
but only silence with the namaskāra mantra is allowed for Śūdras.

and attributes it to Yājñavalkya, commenting that “silence” means that since the prohibition of duties with śrauta and smārta verses is a given, the namaskāra mantra is allowed with just the

---

178 This text appears in neither the Viṣṇu nor Yājñavalkya Smṛti.
“namaḥ” only. The namaskāra mantra is also allowed for smearing the limbs with earth or dung, which is accepted by people of good conduct. For this reason, the mantras beginning with “aśvakrānta” (TA 10.1.8) are excluded. Thus, bathing with Vedic mantras, the procedures of which are described by Manu, Katyāyana, et al., are the concern of the twice-born.

In the Śrīdattāṅkā and other texts, it is said that “silence” means only Vedic mantras are prohibited, not Purānic ones. Therefore, the manner of bathing in the Padma Purāṇa is common to women, Śūdras, and twice-born unversed in the Vedas.

The author of the Kalpataru also says that a Śudra is qualified to recite Purānic mantras as part of the ritual. Others, however, are of the opinion that Purānic mantras should be recited by Brahmins only and a Śudra should just say “namaḥ” himself.

And, in the same way, he may perform bathing with water drawn or not drawn from a well.

Let the learned knower of scripture ritually prepare the tīrtha by uttering the root mantra “namo Nārāyaṇa,” holding kuśa grass in his hand, sipping water according to the rules, pure, and silent. After ritually preparing a square four hands in size, let the clear-sighted invoke Gaṅgā with these mantras:

You are Vaiṣṇavī, born from the feet of Viṣṇu, adored by Viṣṇu. Preserve us from sin until the end of birth and death.

Vāyu said that there are 35 million tīrthas in heaven, earth and sky and they are all yours, daughter of Jahnu. Nandanī is your name, or Nalinī among the gods, Nandā, Prthvī, and Subhagā, Visvakāyā, Śivā, Sitā, Vidyādharī, Suprasannā, and Lokaprasādinī, Kṣema, and Jāhnavī, Śāntā, and Śāntapradāyinī. These are the sacred names to extol at bathing time. Among them, include Gaṅgā Tripathagāminī.

One should pour water held in the hollow of the hand on the head three, four, five, or seven times. One should bathe with earth, wiping it off in the way prescribed.

This entire ritual is, in fact, done at midday, but may be done even at the morning bath because it is the same.

As for the text that runs, “abbreviated form at the morning bath, the rite with Vedic verses at noon,” this is for those who keep a sacred fire at home.

Similarly, in the Chandogapariśiṣṭa, Kātyāyana says:

Because there is little time for sacrifice and much for bathing, don’t protract bathing in the morning; the time for sacrifice is infringed.
A Śūdra should perform his domestic ritual according to the branch of the Veda in which the Brahmin who instructs him is versed; according to his gotra alone should he practice. But if he is not instructed in any particular one, he should follow the Vājasaneyi rite, and the gotra shall be Kāśyapa.

The Procedure of Bathing

At the prescribed time, go to the bank of a river or some body of water, with earth, cow-dung, dūrvā and kuśa grass, flowers, sesame, barley, and a pair of clean garments. Place the earth and other things in a clean spot you have washed. Then wash your hands and feet with the earth and water. Sip water and take a handful of good kuśa grass. If one has a śikhā, tie it and tuck the hem of the lower garment into the waist. Wearing two garments, not one, not more, nor garments worn by another to the extent one is able, with half-garments covered by the upper, outer garment, face east or north and do reverence to the tīrtha. Reverence Varuṇa as Lord of Water. Enter the water and submerge yourself once. Do ācamana, then prāṇyāma without mantras. Meditate on Viṣṇu, and make a vow that “I will do such-and-such a bath at a such-and-such a tīrtha.” Submerge yourself in the river once or thrice as instructed, facing the current, but in any other body of water, such as a tank, facing the sun.

In the Padma Purāṇa, however, the rule is:

After making a vow, prepare a square tīrtha with “namo Nārāyaṇa,” and invoke Gaṅgā with “namo namaḥ.” The mantras beginning with “You were born from the feet of Viṣṇu,” are to be recited by Brahmmins. Others say by oneself. Then, while saying the root mantra, plunge into and come out of the water three times and pour añjalis of water on the head with the root mantra. When bathing with things like earth and cow-dung, make three parts. Say “namaḥ” and daub the head with one part of the earth. Say “namaḥ” and cover the body below the navel with the second part. Then smear the limbs with the dung as before saying “namaḥ.” At once immerse yourself in the water and rise. Perform ācamana. To remove the mud and dung on the limbs, face the current or the sun and immerse the whole body completely for three or twelve times while chanting the
namah mantra for the removal of sin.180 Come out of the water. Repeat three or twelve times according to the branch of the Vedas and do tarpana.

Then as follows:

As before, sip water, face the east or north, pronounce the namah mantra, and say as instructed:

“I will gratify the gods;” “may the gods be gratified;” or, “let the gods be gratified.” Offer three aṇjalis of water with the tips of the fingers, while wearing the sacred thread around the neck like a garland. Pronounce the nama mantra and say, “I will gratify the Ṛṣis,” or, “may the Ṛṣis be gratified.” Offer two each or three aṇjalis with the part of the hand below the small finger. Face south with the sacred thread over the right shoulder, pronounce the namah mantra, and say, “I will gratify the fathers: “may the fathers be gratified.” Offer three aṇjalis with the part of the hand between the forefinger and thumb. Then, sip water twice; put on the two garments; sip again; make a tilaka (whose character is described later); say “namah;” bow to Sūrya; with kuśa grass and unhulled rice mixed in a copper bowl, give arghya to Sūrya; wring out the clothing; sip water; fall prostate like a staff to the Great Deceased. Then go home.

Viṣṇu says that the midday bath is the same:

Having bathed he should give tarpana to the gods and manes still standing in the water in his wet clothes.
If he has changed into dry clothes, he should go up on bank of the tūrtha. V 61.24-25

Śatātapā says that:

After bathing,181 the twice-born should give tarpana in purity everyday to the gods, sages, and fathers, in that order.

Since the term “twice-born” is used here as referring to their precedence, it does not exclude others.

One should always be silent during bathing, worship of the gods, homa, tarpana for the ancestors, recitation of the Vedas, and japa.

Yogi Yājñavalkya says:

The twice-born should wear more than one garment when he performs bathing, giving, japa, homa, recitation, tarpana, and the rites of śrāddha and bhojana.

---

180 Aghamarṣaṇa, “driving out sin,” together with RV hymn 10.190, is an element of sandhyā, but appears not to be what is meant here. Kane (1974): II, pt. 1, 317. Another example, perhaps, of the de-vedification of Vedic rituals for devotional purposes.

181 Kṛṣṇa Ṣeṣa does not always use snātaka in its technical sense of “initiate,” but simply as one who has bathed. See also SAS 100 and 113. This may be part of the process we see in the SAS of refashioning Vedic terms, reserving the technical sense, to make them more available as the general language of devotion and ritual open to Śūdras without strictly dvija reference.
When he does tarpana in a dry place, after bathing by the rule described above, he should put on two washed garments.

Yogi Yājñavalkya likewise says:

After bathing and putting on two spotlessly clean garments, wash the lower body with earth and water, and then the hands. If a washed garment is not available, clothe oneself doubly with hemp, silk, or wool ones, a goat-hair blanket, or a meditator’s shawl. A man must not wring out the clothes in which he has bathed until he has given tarpana to the gods, sages, and ancestors. Whoever wrings out his clothes before tarpana, his ancestors, gods, and sages go without hope.

In the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa:

Right after bathing one must rub off one’s limbs with an empty hand, but not shake out the hair or clothing.

To remove water from the hair and beard, wrap the head in another cloth.

Likewise, in the Mahābhārata:

Washed with fragrance and sweet-smelling water, he got a loosely-fitted turban like a royal swan and wrapped it round his head to dry the water.

MB 7.58.10cd + app. n.10

Meaning, he wrapped it on his head in such a way that it was soft and loose.

Manu says:

White clothing is accepted for a Brahmin, strong red for a lord, yellow for a Vaiśya, and dark like dirt for a Śūdra.

“Dark like dirt” means black.

The Rule for Sectarian Marks

Place Keśava on the forehead, Nārāyaṇa on the stomach, Mādhava on the heart, and Govinda on the navel. Viśṇu is placed on the right side of the abdomen, and Madhusūdana on the left side, Meditate on Trivikrama on the throat area, Vāmana on left side of the belly, Śrīdhara on the left shoulder, Hṛṣikeśa on the right, Padmanābha on the back, and Dāmodara on the hollow of the back, These are the twelve names.

182 See Kane II: 672-674.
183 This seems to be not the placing of physical marks, but nyāsa, “mentally invoking deities and holy texts into parts of the body.” Kane (1974) II. pt. 1, 319.
At the time of puja, homa, and in the morning and evening, pronouncing the names with an alert mind, he should place the marks as prescribed and Vasudeva on the head. Even an unclean man, sinful in conduct and thought, becomes pure by wearing a vertical mark; a horizontal mark is with white clay and a vertical one with sandal, as preferred.

In the Brahmanda Purana it is said:

A Brahmin should make a vertical mark, a Kshatriya a triple mark, There is a half-moon mark for the Vaiśya and a circle for the Śūdra jātis. BmP 3.38

That Śūdras do not do Vedic morning and evening prayers was explained already.

**The Rules for Brahmayajña**

included among the five daily acts of devotion

The Chandoga Parisiṣṭa tells us the right time for it:

He should do brahmayajña before tarpana or after the morning agnihotra offering, or at the conclusion of viśvadeva, not on other occasions.

Here the second alternative “after the morning offering,” is the concern of the twice-born. Agniho-tra is not possible for them, since Śūdras do not keep Vedic fires. Hence, they have the alternatives of “after tarpana and at the conclusion of the viśvadeva.”

Yājñavalkya says:

He should study the Vedas, Atharva, Puranas, Itihāsas, and spiritual science to his utmost to attain perfection in recitation and sacrifice. Y 1.101

The same author says here regarding the unqualified Śūdra:

He should not neglect to perform the five devotional acts of a householder with the namaskāra mantra. Y 1.121

Baudhāyana says:

Next, sipping some water, holding blades of darbha grass, he sits facing east. B 2.8.11

**How to do Brahmayajña**

After bathing, at the prescribed time, he prepares to sit down facing east; sips water; resolves to offer brahmayajña; rinses his mouth; sits on darbha grass with its blades pointing east; fills a hand with darbha;
takes other darbha in his fist; makes a lap sitting in the lotus position, or with his hands and feet stretched out, depending on the teachings of his school; repeats trice or more the mantra namo namah; recites his preferred brahmayajña; lets go of the darbha; rinses his mouth; and sips water. In addition, a Śūdra has the alternative of performing the brahmayajña by reciting those texts, stotras, and the like, which the Purāṇas explicitly allow him to say.

Tarpaṇa

Śātātapa says:

The householder who has finished his studies is to offer tarpaṇa in purity daily to the gods and sages, and ancestors successively.

He speaks of the offence in non-performance:

He who does not give tarpaṇa to the deities, fathers, and munis is indebted to them all and goes down to hell.

Manu says:

Tarpaṇa is always for all four varnas; therefore he should perform it for the fathers and gods for self-purification.

In the Skanda Purāṇa:

A wife should do tarpaṇa daily for her husband and also for his father and grandfather with kuśa, sesame, and water preceded by their names, gotra, etc.

This is when he has no son, etc.

Aṅgiras:

One should not do mārjana, tarpaṇa, or śrāddha when it is raining. The dullard who does so goes to a terrible hell.

Śaṅkha-Likhita:

Don’t give tarpaṇa to the fathers on a brick altar.

In the Kūrma Purāṇa:

Give tarpana to the gods and Brahmaṛṣis with unhusked grain and water,

The “unhusked grain” is barley-corn or rice.

From śrpaṇa, a water libation offered daily to devas, ṛṣis, pīṭras, and bhūtas that “refreshes” or “satiates” them. See Kane 2.1.689-695 for details.

Not in Manu.
to the fathers with black sesame, following the rule in one’s own Gṛhyasūtra.

KP 2.18.85

Gobhila says:

When doing *tarpana* the twice-born always offers white sesame to the gods, speckled sesame to men, and black sesame to the fathers.

Yogi Yājñavalkya makes a distinction here:

If he is pouring well water, he should mix the sesame seeds in the water; otherwise, pour them with the left hand, then offer *tarpana*.  

In another *smṛti*:

Pour sesame seeds in the left hand and offer *tarpana* in the water, never on dry ground, on a cloth, in a vessel, or on the forearm.

This means that one should not place it on the left forearm.

Similarly, Marči too says:

Offer it with an open hand without a mūdra; take sesame in the left hand, leaving the right hand free.  
If sesame is unavailable, gold or silver; if that is unavailable, pour it with *darbha* grass or with a mantra.

And:

Without silver, without gold, and red sesame, without *darbha* grass and Vedic verse, do not approach the ancestral fathers.

Satyavrata says:

*Tarpana* is offered to the fathers with a pearl- or iron-ringed hand, gems, gold, or *darbha* grass; never with an impure hand.

Manu says:

Even water offered to them with a generous spirit in vessels made of silver or inlaid with silver leads to an imperishable reward.

Yogi Yājñavalkya says:

A man is purified by gold on the ring finger, silver on the forefinger, and iron on the little finger.

---

115 Yogi Yājñavalkya makes a distinction here:

If he is pouring well water, he should mix the sesame seeds in the water; otherwise, pour them with the left hand, then offer *tarpana*.  

186 Not in Yājñavalkya.

187 Nirmala Kulkarni suggested “forearm” for the text’s *romamūla*, but it is unclear what this is.

188 The edition has *na sūḍhena kadācana*, “never with a pure hand,” in *pāda ḍ*, which makes no sense. The *Smṛti-candrikā* (II: 514) has *nāsūḍhena*. Nirmala Kulkarni suggested “never with an empty (*śūnyena*) hand.”

Pitāmaha:

Don’t use an earthen cup for tarpana to the ancestral fathers, but one made of gold, silver, or copper.

Śāṅkha says:

Touching the pitrīrtha, he should offer water with a vessel made of gold, silver, udumbara wood, or a vessel of rhinoceros horn.¹⁹¹

Vyāsa:

The gods receive one añjali each, Sanaka and the other sages, two each, the Fathers, three each, and the Mothers, one each.

Śālaṅkāyana states in the Smṛticandrikā that:

Give the three primary Mothers three libations each, and to the others give one libation each; give two libations each to the wives of Ācāryas.¹⁹²

In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

One must sprinkle water thrice to satisfy the gods, likewise for the Rṣis, as stands to reason, and once for Prajāpati.¹⁹³

Yama prescribes the way to give tarpana:

Join your hands together and fill them with a libation of water; raising it up just an ox-horn, toss it in the water.

Dakṣa explains the meaning of “ox-horn:”

Raising it just a “span,” with sesame, facing east, refresh the gods, facing north, men, and facing south, the fathers.

Hārīta:

Do tarpana, ācamana, and japa in the water with wet clothes, and on dry ground in dry clothes.

Kārṣṇājīni makes a distinction for tarpana in the water:

Give libations of water to the deities and fathers in water. Give libations to those deceased without the sacraments on dry ground.

¹⁹⁰ Not in Yājñavalkya.
¹⁹¹ This verse has problems. Khadga is rhinoceros horn or iron. Pitrīrtha is unclear or corrupt. According to Monier-Williams, a pitrīrtha is the tīrtha of the fathers, i.e., Gayā, or the base of the thumb sacred to the pīṭṛs in ācamana. Here, it is most likely the later, although Nirmala Kulkarni suggested “the pilgrim reaching Gayā.”
¹⁹² Not yet located in the Smṛticandrikā.
¹⁹³ In pāda d, the text has pra-jāyate, which seems to be a misreading. The critical edition has the more probable pra-jāpateḥ, “for Prajāpati.”
But the Yogājñavalkya says that where the ground is unclean, all should exclusively receive tarpana in the water:

Or, when the ground is impure, one must give tarpana to the deities and fathers in the water.
If one so wishes, all tarpana may be given in the water.

Satyavrata says:

Wearing the sacred thread over the left shoulder, give tarpana to the gods; then, around the neck to exalted human beings, the sons of Brahmans, and Rṣis.
Next, wearing it over the right shoulder, while kneeling on the ground on the left knee, and holding a bunch of kuśa grass, give tarpana to the deceased. 194

The Vṛddha Yājñavalkya says:

Invariably pronouncing the words “May he be refreshed,” or, “May they be refreshed,” let the one learned in ritual cast water for the gods, and so on.

And he also says:

In all four varṇas fathers receive tarpana by the gotra name of the father, girls by the gotra of the father, married women by the gotra of the husband.

Paiṭhāṇasi on tarpana to be given to fathers says:

With the sacred thread over the right shoulder, facing the south quarter, give tarpana to the divine and non-divine fathers.

The divine fathers are the Vasus, Rudras, and Ādityas; the non-divine are people such as one’s own father. The same author also says the manner in which to do it is this:

Call out the name and gotra of each person, and throw three añjalis of sesame and water for each.

The order of those to whom tarpana is to be given is as follows:

Father, grandfather, great-grandfather, mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother; mother of half-brothers; the three maternal ancestors beginning with the grandfather and their wives; wives and children, etc.; uncles and brothers with their wives, aunts and sisters with their children and husbands; father-in-law; honored guru; students and friends. These are the persons when Mahālaya śrāddha is performed at a tīrtha and for tarpana.

194 One is upaviṣa when wearing the sacred thread over the left shoulder and under the right arm for rites for the gods and sacrifice. One raises the right arm to pass it under, which is why Manu says “When the right arm is raised, a twice-born is called upaviṣa.” One is nivīṣa when wearing it around the neck like a garland for ritual acts of a human character, e.g., excretion, intercourse, and the sacraments. One wears the cord over the right shoulder for ancestral rites. Krṣṇa Śeṣa uses the phrase āpasayam kṛtvā, “not wearing the sacred thread over the left.” Manu uses prācīnāvīṣa, raising the right arm and “wearing the sacred thread to the east.” See Manu 2.63.
How to do Tarpana

Sip water, restrain the breath, announce time and place, and vow “I will give tarpana to the pitrs and gods.” Sit facing east with the sacred thread over the left shoulder, holding barley and blades of kuśa grass by the tips, and give tarpana to the gods with the devatīrtha part of the hand. Facing north with the sacred thread around the neck, holding kuśa grass by the middle with white sesame, give tarpana to the saints with the prajāpatisīrtha part of the hand. Facing south with the sacred thread over the right shoulder, holding kuśa grass doubled in two at the bottom with black sesame, give tarpana to the pitrs. People may also follow this order:

The gods receive one libation each, Sanaka et al. two each, the pitrs three each, and their wives one each.

Some say three libations without distinction.

For Vājasaneyins and for Śūdras instructed in the rite of that school, the order is as follows: After tarpana for the set of paternal pitrs comes the set of maternal ancestors, then the set of mothers. The set of pitrs, the set of mothers, then the set of maternal ancestors is regarded as the correct order for followers of other branches of the Veda and Śūdras instructed in them. Different deities are also to be given tarpana in the various branches. This difference holds both for their followers and Śūdras instructed in them. They should follow the rite as laid down in each.

All this is to be ascertained from their respective Kalpasūtras. I will only quote the view of the Baudhāyana school: “While wearing the sacred thread over the left, I refresh the gods and goddesses beginning with Brahma, and I refresh all the hosts of the gods.” This is tarpana for the gods.

Next, “Wearing the sacred thread around the neck, I refresh the Rṣis beginning with Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana. I refresh all the wives of the Rṣis. I refresh all the sons of the Rṣis. I refresh all the grandsons of the Rṣis. I refresh all the hosts of the Rṣis.” This is tarpana for the Rṣis.

“Wearing the sacred thread over the right shoulder ‘I refresh the pitrs, who are Soma, Piṭṭmat, Yama, Aṅgirasvat, the Agniśvāttas, the Barhiṣads, and the Kavyavāhanas. I refresh all the pi-

195 These are the names of primeval ancestors and classes of ancestors included in the offerings of tarpana. See Manu 3.192. Soma is the ancestor of the Saumyas. The Agniśvāttas are a set of Brahmin ancestors who neglected Vedic sacrifice. The
trs. Namaḥ. I refresh all the wives of the pitṛs. Namaḥ. I refresh all the sons of the pitṛs. Namaḥ. I refresh all the grandsons of the pitṛs. Namaḥ. I refresh all the companies of pitṛs. I refresh my father, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Vasu. I refresh my grandfather, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my great-grandfather, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Āditya. I refresh my mother, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Vasu. I refresh my grandmother, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my great-great-grandfather, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Āditya. I refresh my maternal grandfather, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Vasu. I refresh my maternal grandmother, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my mother’s grandfather, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my mother’s great-grandfather, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Āditya. I refresh my grandmother, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Vasu. I refresh my mother’s grandmother, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my mother’s great-grandmother, the dāsa of so-and-so, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Āditya.”

Then, after giving tarpana to gurus and friends because of their special closeness, one should offer three libations of water while repeating these verses:

May the gods, sages, and human beings,
up to the world of Brahma, be refreshed,
all the pitṛs, the mother, the maternal grandfather, and the rest.
May this water and sesame be for the kōṣis of families past,
living on the seven continents, from the world of humans
up to that of Brahma.

On this topic some say that, as there are many views about tarpana in the different schools of the Veda as well as a plurality of schools and an unlimited number of local traditions and cus-

Barhiṣads are the sons of Atri and ancestors of demonic classes of beings. The Kavyavāhanas or Kāvyas are another class of Brahmin ancestors.
toms, the best form of tarpana for Śūdras is that presented in the Purāṇas in which old dharmas specifically for women and Śūdras are set forth.

Among these, the form of tarpana described in the Padma Purāṇa is outlined thus: I refresh Brahma. I refresh Viṣṇu. I refresh Rudra. I refresh the gods. I refresh the Nāgas. I refresh the Gandharvas, the Apsarases, the Asuras, and the Suparṇas. I refresh the trees, evil spirits, birds, creatures of the air and water, and denizens of the heavens. I refresh beings without abode who are attached to the good. I refresh beings without abode who are attached to the bad. This is tarpana for the gods.

Easterners say that, after refreshing Brahma, Rudra, Viṣṇu, and Prajāpati one by one with a libation each of water, then mentally recite the following verses:

\[\text{Gods, Yakṣas, Nāgas, Gandharvas, Apsarases, Asuras, evil spirits, serpents, Suparṇas, spirits in the sky, birds, creatures of the air and water, denizens of the heavens, beings without abode who are attached to the bad and good, to them I give this water and sesame for their refreshment.}\]

PP Śrṣṭi Khaṇḍa 20.56-58

Pronounce “namaḥ,” and offer a libation for each, one by one.

Next, they say that wearing the sacred thread around the neck, facing north, and pouring with the praṭijñatiṭīṛṭha part of the hand, give tarpana to the Rṣis and sages.

Then, after saying “namah,” with kuśa grass in the middle, mentally recite:

\[\text{Sanaka, Sananda, and Sanātana the third, Kapila, Asuri, Voḍhu, and Pañcaśikha, may they all be refreshed forever by this water I give.}\]

PP Śrṣṭi Khaṇḍa 20.29-30

He should repeat “namaḥ” and offer a libation for each.

But others say that one should give a tarpana of two libations each one by one from Sanaka to Pañcaśikha. “I refresh Sanaka. May Sanaka be refreshed. Let him be refreshed,” and so on. Then give tarpana to Marīci, Atri, Aṅgiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Pracetas, Vasīṣṭha, Bhṛgu, Nārada, [gods] and Brahmaṛṣis, in that order.\footnote{Suparṇas are large-winged birds of prey like eagles and vultures and mythical or supernatural birds like Garuḍa.}

\footnote{All of the seers mentioned here and on the next page are the variously numbered mind-born sons of Brahmā, who are revered as the progenitors of sundry classes of pītras.}

\footnote{“Gods” is a suspect reading, probably to be omitted.}
Next, facing south with the sacred thread over the right shoulder, kneeling on the left knee, holding kuśa grass bent in two, give tarpana with the pitṛśṛtha part of the hand to the pitṛs: the Agniśvāttas, the Somapas, the Haviśmats, the Ěśmapas, the Sukālins, the Barhiṣads, the Ājya-pas.199

**Tarpana for One’s Ancestors**

This should be done according to the school of the Veda in which one has been taught. Some say that, in this case, nothing prevents interchange of the name and gotra. Some scriptural texts do not mention the attribution of the form of Vasu, Rudra, or Āditya. “I refresh my father of such-and-such dāsa name and such-and-such gotra in his form as Vasu. Namaḥ.” In like manner, characterizing the grandfather as Rudra and the great-grandfather as Āditya is proper.

And when giving tarpana to females. “I refresh my mother of such-and-such dāsa name and such-and-such gotra in her form as Vasu. Namaḥ.” Similarly, characterize the paternal grandmother as the feminine form of Rudra and the paternal great-grandmother as the feminine form of Āditya.

Similarly, giving tarpana in this way to the maternal ancestors, out of kindness also give tarpana to the father’s other wives and to paternal and maternal uncles.200

Then, praying to oneself:

Those who are not kin or who were kin in another life or in another way, may they, and all who desire it from us, have contentment.

pronounce “namaḥ” and give three añjalis.

Then, while praying the following verse silently to oneself, wring out your clothes:

And those who were born in our family, but died without sons, may they accept this water wrung from my clothes.

Next, one should dispose of the kuśa grass used for tarpana:

The darbha grass used for reciting the Veda, offering pitṛtarpana,

---

199 According to Manu (3.194-200), Somapas are the sons of Bhṛgu and the soma-drinking ancestors of Brahmins. Haviśmats are the sons of Aṅgiras. Aiyapas, “ghee drinkers,” are the sons of the seer Pulastya and the ancestors of Vaśyās. Sukālins are the sons of Vasiṣṭha and the ancestors of Śūdras. Ŭśmapa is the generic term for a kind of a ancestor who lives on the steam and vapor of sacrifice.

200 gurupatnī: an uncertain term translated here as “father’s other wives.”
and excreting urine and faeces, these should be disposed of,
according to the text of Āpastamba:

The darbha used on an altar, on the road, for Vedic study,
for tarpana to the fathers, strewing an altar, seating, or offering
piṇḍas: these seven kuśa grasses should not be used again.\textsuperscript{201}

Dispose of them with the sacred thread over the left shoulder, facing east or north, and not as
pitṛdharma or addressing the pitṛs. But other texts quote this mantra:

Our fathers, who have gone among the thickets and trees,
may they all have contentment with this good kuśa grass I leave.

They say the disposal within is pitṛdharma, because it is a rite for pitṛs. And, as before, there is the
tarpana of the gods and seers for one whose father is alive. The difference is said to be that liba-
tions with black sesame and a silver vessel are forbidden for it. The Kavyavāhas, Barhiṣads, and
the divine pitṛs must receive tarpana thus: “I refresh the Kavyavāhas, Anala,\textsuperscript{202} Soma, Arya-
man,\textsuperscript{203} Agnisvātthas, the Somapas, and the Barhiṣads.”

But when the father is not entitled to give tarpana due to his loss of caste and the like, the son
himself should give tarpana to the same persons his father would. Some require also libations to
Yama for this. For the divinities, offer a libation to Yama as you pronounce the name of each
while wearing the sacred thread over the left shoulder, facing east, kneeling on the right knee, and
holding straight blades of darbha grass and barley. In the case of the pitṛs, give three libations,
pronouncing each name while facing south, wearing the sacred thread over the right shoulder, and
holding kuśa grass bent in two and black sesame. Saying: “Namaḥ. I refresh Yama, Dharmarāja,
Mrtyu, Antaka, Vaivāsata, Kāla, Sarvabhūtakṣaya, Audumbara, Daghna, Nīla, Parameṣṭhin,
Vṛkodara, Citra, Citragupta, Ravi.”\textsuperscript{204} Reverence each one by one with “namaḥ” and pour a liba-
tion.

Some only accept Yama tarpana on the 14\textsuperscript{th} of Divali, others on Tuesday the 14\textsuperscript{th}. Still others
on the 14\textsuperscript{th} in the dark half of the lunar month. Some also favor everyday when giving daily tar-

\textsuperscript{201} Not in Āpastamba.
\textsuperscript{202} One of the eight Vasus.
\textsuperscript{203} One of the Ādityas, invoked as chief of the manes.
\textsuperscript{204} Names and forms of Yama, the God of Death. Citragupta is his scribe. Alain Danielou, Myths and Gods of India (Rochester: Inner Traditions, 1991): 132-35. The translatable epithets are: King of Dharma, Lord of Death, Mortality, Time, Destroyer of All Beings, the Black, Terminator, Recorder of Deeds, Devouring Wolf-belly, and Radiant Sun.
Some approve it only during tarpana to the gods. Others hold that after tarpana for the pitrs, there is tarpana for Yama by one with a living father and also by one with a dead father.

After giving tarpana in this manner:

To Yama, Dharmarāja, Mṛtyu, and Antaka, Vaivāsvata, Kāla, Sarvabhutakṣaya, Audumbra, Daghna, Nīla, Parameśṭhin, Vṛkodara, Citra, Citragupta, reverence.

pray quietly to oneself, say “namaḥ,” and give one or three libations.

Short Tarpaṇa

While saying “let the world from Brahma to a blade of grass be refreshed,” give three libations. This is short tarpana.

In the case of tarpana out of the water on the banks of tīrthas, etc., wearing a washed garment and sitting down on the bank, toss the water in a clean place. If there is no clean place, toss it in the water. One may put tarpaṇa water on the mounds of those deceased without the sacraments. In the case of tarpana with water drawn from a well, put the sesame seeds in the vessel and give tarpaṇa to the pitṛs. Then throw the tarpaṇa water on ground covered with kuśa grass or in a copper vessel. Pour the water for the pitṛs in a big vessel of iron or some such thing. Hold it by the part of the hand with which a libation is poured. When giving tarpana to the pitṛs, do not do hold the thumb in. One who has not given tarpana should not wring out his bathing clothes. Don’t throw darbha grass in the water. One who has not done tarpana should not pass over flowing water.

These are the rules for tarpana.

Next, sip water and worship the six deities, Brahma, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Savitṛ, Mitra, and Varuṇa, with an aṇjali of flowers and six mantras ending with namaḥ.

Next, worship Śūrya with namaḥ and an upraised arm.

Next, worship the gods of the ten directions with mantras including their name going round from left to right, saluting each with namaḥ and sit down.

205 Unattributed verse.
206 Page 127 of the edition is strange. The strangeness is due to the fact that it is inserted at the end of the section on tarpaṇa and before the section on pūja, bridging them. The Vedic deities are invoked in a pūja-like manner and given arghya, illustrating the popularizing synthesis of theistic devotion and Vedic ritual that comes to be typical of late Dharmaśāstra texts.
Next, worship Brahma, Agni, Pṛthivī, the herbs of the earth, Vāc, Vācaspati, Viṣṇu, Mahat, the Great Ones, and the Lord of Water, Varuṇa, with flowers and unhusked grain in the water and namah mantras. Then rub the head with the same water saying the words “Honor to Tvaṣṭr.”

Bid farewell to them with this verse:

O Gods who came here, go each to your place.

Next, prepare an eight-petaled lotus mixed with sandalwood and invoke Sūrya with the mantra that begins:

Reverence to Vivasvat, Brahmā, the Radiant, All-pervading Brilliance, Light of the World, Savitr, the Energy of the World.

Adore him with red sandalwood, unhusked grain, and flowers. Reverence him with the water in a copper vessel or in the cupped hands along with things like kuśa grass, sesame, barley, dūrvā grass, red sandalwood, and blossoms, while chanting this mantra:

Come Sūrya, shining with the splendor of a thousand rays, bend with mercy to me, O Lord of Days.

The Rite of Pūjā

If the requisites for worship are available at a tīrtha, then pūjā should be done there, otherwise at home. In the latter case, After bowing to a tīrtha, respectfully saluting the Brahmins there, avoiding contact with the impure, with a water bowl in hand and shoes on, go to your house. After circumambulating the cows right there, wash your hands and feet, sip water twice, bow to the deity at the right doorpost, paying honor to the Gaṇapati of the door post, touch the right door post with the right hand, and without touching the doorsill, step in right foot first.

Do reverence saying “Honor to the house and the tutelary deities.” Worship Brahmā at the right pillar of the house, Nṛsiṁha at the left, and Śrī Sūrya at the middle. Then, clean, wearing your best clothes, wise, silent, meditative, free of desire, anger and so on, at the aforesaid time, worship in order Sūrya, Gaṇapati, Viṣṇu, Devī, and Mahādeva, each with their own mounts, weapons, and so on. In a clean place there, sit down facing the deity, place flowers, sandalwood, etc., on the right side, pitchers full of water, bells, etc., on the left, ghee lamps on the right, sesame oil lamps on the left, and the other paraphernalia for pūjā in the proper place. Holding the offering vessel filled with water in front of you, bless the water in it and sprinkle
the place and materials. Consecrate the pitcher with the mantra that begins, “All the seas are in the Gaṅgā and Yamunā.” Pour the water into the prepared offering vessel.

**Pīṭha Worship**

Adoration to the goddesses of the pīṭhas, Ādhāra Śakti, etc.
Adoration to the Kālas starting with Indra.
Adoration to the constellations, Āditya, etc.

This is the abbreviated formula one may use. Details may be consulted in the Āgamaśāstra.

Then, after applying the mantras to oneself and the deity, one invokes the deity with the mantra ending with the name in the vocative saying, “so-and-so come here, be present here.” One then offers worship in the sixteen forms, i.e., the invitation, seat, water for washing the feet, water for reception, sipping, bathing, garments, sacred thread, fragrances, flowers, incense, lamps, food, bowing, circumambulation, and send off, with the different mantras specifying “to this seat for so-and-so.” If such things as garments are not available, one may mentally visualize them and adore the deity with water. The particular things proper to do in this case can be known from the different rules.

But in the Nāradīya Purāṇa it is said:

One should worship Viṣṇu morning, midday, and evening
as morning and evening prayers and daily pūjā are said to be by the learned.
If this is impossible, worshipping Keśava in the morning in long form,
at midday and in the evening, offer a handful of flowers.
Or at midday, after feeding Hari in long or short form,
one may take food—otherwise one goes to perdition.

For all occasional observances at their various times one should especially worship Viṣṇu, the Lord of Lords, with diligent preparation.

In the Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa:

One should worship Hari one, two, or three times daily.
The man who takes a meal without worshipping goes to the hells.

In the Kālikā Purāṇa:

---

207 Pīṭha here seems to mean any altar, image, shrine or holy place of a deity rather than the 52 Śakti pīṭhas. Pīṭrcanam is more or less a synonym for pūjā.
208 The basic and sustaining power of the universe. Some of the following instructions on the use of invocation, mantras, and visualization in pūjā have a Tantric flavor.
209 The edition has indrādikālebhya namah. If this is not corrupt, it is unclear what exactly the Kālas are. Kāla has a range of meanings: black, time, the destroyer of the universe, Yama, and death. It can also be the Mātrkas (divine mothers) and Durgā, but the word is masculine here.
Not honoring Śiva, Bhāskara, Agni, Keśava, and Kauśikī with one’s mind, one goes down from the world of the gods to a low destiny.

And the images of the \textit{pañcāyatana} deities are to be given \textit{pūjā}.\textsuperscript{210}

In the \textit{Padma Purāṇa}:

\[\text{Āditya, Gaṇanātha, Devī, Rudra, according to order,}
\text{Nārāyaṇa the Pure, and at the end the family deity.}\]

From this text we see that worship of Sūrya comes first.

This is what is said in the \textit{Brahma Purāṇa}:

\[\text{The gods do not want offerings of foot-water made by those beings}
\text{who worship others without first honoring Sūrya.}\]

Note that scholars of the \textit{Ṛg Veda} point out that the correct procedure for Śūdras is to worship Gaṇeśa first, then the Sun.

In the \textit{Matsya Purāṇa}:

\[\text{Ask Bhāskara the sun for health, ask Agni for wealth,}
\text{ask Maheśvara for knowledge, ask Janārdana for liberation.}\]

In the \textit{Bhavisya Purāṇa}:

\[\text{Truly, if a man honors the sun for one day,}
\text{his merit is more than if he gives a lakh of milk cows.}
\text{The pleased sun bestows security and prosperity on the man\textsuperscript{211}
\text{who regularly worships its light and devotedly humbles himself to it.}
\text{Surely, the seeker of liberation should sacrifice to the thousand-rayed Sun.}}\]

Similarly, discussing Durgā in the same text:

\[\text{The man who always worships Durgā and bows with love}
\text{he is a yogi; he is wise and holy; he holds liberation in his hand.}\]

In the same text regarding Śiva:

\[\text{But the man who worships constantly Śiva, the lord of the three worlds,}
\text{quickly becomes a vessel of heaven, power, and liberation.}\]

Those who observe commensality must worship the gods separately, as Aśvalāyana says:

\[\text{For twice-born who take their meals together, \textit{brahmajyāna},}
\text{\textit{agnihotra}, sun worship, and \textit{sandhyā} should always be separate.}\]

The supporting object for their \textit{pūjā} is described in the \textit{Nṛsiṁha Purāṇa}.

The seers teach that correct worship of Hari is on these six supports:

\textsuperscript{210} \text{“The householder should worship Āditya, Ambikā, Viṣṇu, Gaṇanātha, and Maheśvara as part of \textit{pañcayajña.” Saṁ-graha.}}

\textsuperscript{211} \text{kṣemam ca yoga ca.}
water, fire, the heart, the sun, sacred ground, and images.

“Hari” is a synecdoche for any image of worship. For this reason the Śatātapa Śmṛti states:

The gods are in earth and in water, the heart and in the sun.
For ordinary men the gods are in the water,
for the wise and learned the gods are in the heavens,
for the dull-headed the gods are in wood and clods of earth,
for the liberated man the gods are in himself.\textsuperscript{212}

What images should be made of is described in the Matsya Purāṇa:

Idols of the gods made of gold, silver, copper, gems, stone, wood, metal alloys, brass, copper amalgams, or fine woods are recommended.

This size is described thus:

From a thumb-joint up to the span of a hand.
The learned advise that images at home be no more.
An image of stone should not be worshipped at home;
in its absence wood is good.

In the Padma Purāṇa:

Men who have honored Hari in the heavens, in the sun, in space, and on the altars of images go to the Viṣṇu plane.
Or those who desire salvation should always honor Vāsudeva in the disc of a śāligrāma stone made of adamantine for that abode of Viṣṇu destroys all sin.\textsuperscript{213}

As the fire in a large piece of wood flashes out when rubbed so all-pervading Hari shines in the śāligrāma.
He who has honored Viṣṇu in the disc made from śāligrāma has performed āgniḥotra and given the earth and sea.
Gods, asuras, yaksas, and the fourteen worlds are there where Keśava is present in the form of the śāligrāma stone.
For three yojanas around a śāligrāma stone all acts of giving and sacrifices are ten million times more effective.
Even an insect that dies within the sound of a śāligrāma goes to the supreme level of Viṣṇu.
The ancestors of the man who does śrāddha on a śāligrāma stone rejoice in heaven for a hundred aeons.
He who gives the most excellent gift of a śāligrāma stone has given the equivalent of the globe of the whole world with its mountains, forests, and groves.
The twice-born who derives money from śāligrāma stones, or any man who consents to its sale or permits its assay, goes to hell until the end of creation.
Therefore, a Vaiśya should avoid buying and selling the disc.\textsuperscript{214}

\textsuperscript{212} Quoted at Kane II.2: 715.
\textsuperscript{213} Śāligrāma stones are ammonite fossils from the Gaṅgātī river in the Nepali Himalayas prized by Vaiṣṇavas as an earthly representation of Viṣṇu. They are differentiated by color and markings as manifestations of his various forms and appropriate for different varnas. They are like lingas. The Varāha Purāṇa forbids Sūdras and women to touch them, but the Skanda Purāṇa says that is the case only for asacchādāras and low women (SkP VI.243.46-48). Although not explicitly stated, the SAS must share the same view. S. A. Dange, Encyclopedia of Puranic Beliefs and Practices, IV: 1390-1397.
\textsuperscript{214} PP III.31.115-117, 120,123, 136,142-145a.
In the *Skanda Purāṇa*:

A śāligrāma stone is not installed like an image; but when doing a great ceremonial pūjā, a wise man offers worship to it. Nor does it receive āvāhana or visarjana, for the Lord is manifest in the śāligrāma—Hari is not so all-pervading even in Vaikuntha or the sun.

In the *Nandi Purāṇa*:

One should not perform the four acts from consecration to send-off on a fixed linga, a fire, water, a heart, and the disc of the sun,

In the *Bhavisya Purāṇa*:

Crystal liṅgas, Your Majesty, are famed in the three worlds. They do not receive pratiṣṭhā, saṁskāra, and āvāhana. In this way alone are the forms of Śiva truly worshipped. Two liṅgas and three Gaṇeśas are not to be worshipped at home; nor should three Śaktis, nor the ten consisting of conches, fishes, etc. Do not worship two cakras on the door or two Sūryas—from their worship a householder obtains perpetual distress.

In the *Saṃgraha*, the placement of the deities is described:

Around Śambhu in the middle are Hari, Gaṇeśa, Bhūdevī, and Ravi. Around Hari are placed Bhāsya, Nagasūṭā, Śaṅkara, and Gaṇeśa. Around Ravi are placed Hara, Gaṇeśa, Aja, and Ambikā. Around Devi are placed Viṣṇu, Hara, Ekadanta, and Ravi. Around Lambodara are placed Iśvara, Aja, Ravi, and Āryā. If Ambā is placed beside Śaṅkara, she is auspicious. If they are separated, she is harmful.

There is a variety in the number of offerings (upacāra) for pūjā: five, ten, sixteen, and eighteen. Five are as follows:

Worship in five forms begins with scents and ends with food offerings.

Ten are as follows:

The water of reception, water for bathing the feet, water for sipping, offerings of milk and honey, and scents to food offerings are the ten forms, in that order.

Sixteen are as follows:

Seats, salutation, water of reception, water for foot-bathing, sipping water, milk and honey, bathing, garments, adornments,

---

215 Emending pratiṣṭhāne to pratiṣṭhānam. These particular verses do not seem to be in the account of śāligrāma in the Skanda Purāṇa (VI. 243).

216 These are assorted names of the pañcāyatana deities. They are differently arranged for pūjā depending on which is placed in the center. The text is elliptic, if not corrupt, and was ingeniously decrypted by Manisha Phanasalkar into the perfect sets of five above. See Kane II.2: 717.
scent, flowers, pleasant incense, lamps, food, sandalwood,
are the sixteen offerings one may give in homage.

Eighteen are as follows:

Seats, invocation, water of reception, water for foot-bathing, sipping,
bathing, garments, sacred threads, ornaments, scents,
flowers, incense, tarpana with food,
garlands, anointing, salutation with namah, and farewell.

In the case of worship for a specific purpose, one can limit these offerings as one wishes. But for
regular worship, there is no limitation.

In the Bhavisya Purana:

Pure, well-dressed, bathed, silent, devoted to meditation, without desire, fear, and strife,
free of anger and envy, reverencing the Self in scented and white clothing,
at the propitious hour, honor the gods each established on his own seat.

In the Devi Purana:

Offerings with saffron, unhusked rice, flowers, yoghurt, dūrvā grass,
and sesame are proclaimed common for all the gods.
If yoghurt and dūrvā grass, etc., are not available, one may visualize them.

In the Bhavisya Purana:

If you make the full eight offerings with earth to the Sun,
you will dwell for ten thousand years in his presence.

The eight are said to be:

Water, milk, blades of kuśa grass, ghee, curd, honey,
red oleander, and red sandalwood,
these are the eight offerings proclaimed by Brahmā.

But in the case of Durgā:

Water, milk, blades of kuśa grass, barley, curd, rice,
together with white mustard, dūrvā grass, tumeric,
the yellow powder made from cow’s urine, and honey,
these are the twelve offerings named, tiger of the Kurus.

In the Skanda Purana:

The man who bathes Keśava with water in a conch shell
obtains the fruit of giving a thousand brown cows.
The man who takes tirtha water in a conch and bathes Keśava
obtains the merit of a thousand brown cows.
By a mere drop of it on the twelfth day of the half-moon,
he redeems a hundred of his family.
Taking the milk of a brown cow in a conch and bathing Janārdana
he gains the fruit of ten thousand sacrifices.
He who bathes the Lord with sesame, flower blossoms, and water in a conch
quickly comes to dwell in my world.
He who puts fragrance in a conch and bathes Madhava saying, “Reverence to Nārāyaṇa,” is freed from the clasp of the womb. What need for bathing in the Ganges does he have who worships Keśava by waving a water-filled conch over my head.

He who puts the water for washing my feet in a conch, great seer of the Vaiṣṇavas, and offers it mixed with sesame obtains the fruit of a cāndrāyana fast. Whether from a river, tank, well, or lake, it all becomes Gāṅgā water—thus says Janārdana.

The Vaiṣṇava who takes in a conch shell Viṣṇu’s foot-water and carries it on his head always is the greatest of ascetics. The tīṛthas in the three worlds, at the command of Vasudeva,217 are all in the conch, Lord of seers; therefore one should always reverence the conch. Before the Lord of Lords, adore the conch with its flowers, water, and grains of rice; its splendor is limitless.

If one puts unguents such as sandalwood in a conch, the Supreme Person bestows the highest joy for a hundred years. If a man circumambulates with arghya water in a conch, he has circled the earth with its seven continents. If a Vaiṣṇava waves a conch over the head of Hari and then sprinkles his dwelling with the water from the shell, there will be nothing inauspicious in his house.218

The same text speaks of the merit in ringing a bell at the time of bathing.

Hear the fruit of merit obtained by the person who sounds a bell before Vāsudeva at the time of bathing and worship. For thousands of crores of years, for hundreds of crores of years, he lives in the divine realm attended by companies of Apsarases. A bell contains the sounds of all musical instruments and is dear to every deity. By sounding it one gets the merit of hundreds of crores of sacrifices. He who bathes the Lord of Lords to the loud ringing of lutes, with songs and music, will be liberated in this life.

The twice-born should always ring a bell filled with all the sound of music when he sees the conch water on his head at the time of worship. For hundreds of aeons, for thousands of aeons, Keśava the Lord will be delighted by the sound of a bell.

Similarly:

The person who bathes Keśava to the sound of flute, lute and the singing of young women becomes a guru. Constant worship of Vāsudeva accompanied by the playing of drums, instruments and the chanting of Om grants liberation to men. Songs, instruments, dancing, and the recitation of books at worship time, Lord of Lords, always delights Keśava.

Now regarding Śiva, in the Kālikā Purāṇa:

If one bathes with the five products of a brown cow,

217 The vāsudevasya cānjhayā in the text may not be the correct reading.
218 Only some of the verses in these three quotes match the published edition of the SkP: II.5.5.12b, 13, 14, 15, 24-27, 31, 32, 34, 35; II.5.6.2-5; and II.5.10.34-35.
or with kuśa grass and water together,
purified by mantras, that is called a Brahma bath.
If even for one day a person performs a Brahma bath on a liṅga,
cleansed of all sin, he is glorified in the world of Rudra.
Bathing with the five products of a brown cow,
or with curds and milk together has indubitably
a hundred times the merit of any other.
The sin acquired through thousands and thousands of years
is all burnt up by a bath of ghee just as fire burns up the fuel.
If a man bathes a liṅga with ghee once
on the eighth day of the dark half of the month,
he saves twenty kinsmen and is glorified in the world of Śiva.

In the Brahma Purāṇa:

An image of the gods should be all anointed with ghee.
Twenty-five ounces should be offered to it with faith.
A bath of 108 ounces is always offered.
The two thousand ounces of ghee offered in a Great Bath
all at once flow out in every direction for the giver.219

Clothing

About this, the Viṣṇu Smṛti says in refrain:

Not indigo cloth.220 VS 66.3

Supply from the preceding sutra: “He should offer.”

In the Agni Purāṇa:

Make offerings to the deity with cloth of good quality,
such as linen with two borders, wood fiber, silk, and cotton,
which are valuable in themselves and dear to oneself.
One should not present old and worn out cloth to the deity.
The fool who does so goes to a terrible hell, the lowest of men.

Fragrant Substances

The Narasimha Purāṇa with reference to Viṣṇu says:

Bedaubing the figure of Viṣṇu the Imperishable with saffron, aloe, cardamom, and sandal
with devotion, O Lord of Kings, one dwells in heaven for crores of kalpas.

The Agni Purāṇa states:

219 This description of bathing an image with measures of ghee and of a mahāsāna has textual problems and appears not to be in
the published texts of the Brahma Purāṇa.
220 The edition has nīlaraṅka, the VS, nīloraktaṁ, i.e., “indigo-dyed cloth.”
When besmeared with sandal, aloe, camphor, saffron, and other precious roots and woods in devotion, Hari bestows the greatest blessings; curcuma, deer testes, and red sandalwood, when offered to Puruṣottama, bring merit to men.

But with regard to Śiva the same text says:

My king, you should know that there is eight times more merit in aloe-wood than in sandal. Black aloe, in particular, possesses twice that merit; and twice the merit of that is found in saffron. If you daub the image of Śiva with sandalwood, aloe, and camphor, finely ground into a paste, you will dwell in heaven a crore of kalpas.

Incense

On this subject, in the Vāmana Purāṇa it is said that Viṣṇu’s:

favorite incenses are tuhika, kāṇa drops, dāru, bensoin, aloe, sandal, saṅkha, and jasmine.\(^{221}\) VmP 68.20

\(Tuhika\) is spikenard; \(kāṇa\) is a kind of \(guggulu\) gum; \(dāru\) is the deodar pine; \(sāṅkha\) is the fragrant resin of \(nakhi\).

142 In the Narasimha Purāṇa:

The devotee of Narasimha, O King, offers the incense of bdellium, and \(guggulu\) resin mixed with ghee and sugar. Well perfumed all over, he is freed from all sins, and transported in a chariot yoked with Apsaras, he reaches the world of Vāyu. He is glorified in the world of Viṣṇu. NsP 34.24-26

Viṣṇu says:

No matter from a living creature for incense. VS 66.8

Meaning that substances derived from living beings, such as musk, should not be given as incense.

These are only incense for Śūrya and Durgā.

In the Śiva Purāṇa:

The man who offers \(guggulu\) with ghee to Śiva attains the world of Rudra and meets with the world of Gāṇapati.

In the Bhavisya Purāṇa:

By wood-apple resin with ghee or the \(bilva\) fruit, a man attains the results of an \(agniṣṭoma\) sacrifice.

\(^{221}\) This verse has many variations from the text of the VmP.
Wood-apple is the *kapittha* or monkey-fruit tree.

**Lamps**

On this topic we read in the *Viṣṇusmṛti*:

For lamps, nothing except ghee and sesame oil.

Supply “one should offer.”

In the *Narasimha Purāṇa*:

Hear the blessings for the devoted worshipper of Viṣṇu who duly lights a lamp with ghee or sesame oil.

Casting off all sin, shining like a thousand suns, he is transported in glory to the world of Viṣṇu.  

NsP 34.26-28

In the *Bhavisya Purāṇa*:

By offering ghee lamps to Śiva one obtains a divine chariot a hundred *yojanas* in size, shining like ten thousand suns.

Similarly, in the general chapter for lamps:

One should not destroy the lamps offered, nor let them be without oil.

The destroyer of lamps who does so is born as a mouse or a goat.

“Oil” also includes ghee. Therefore, do not take ghee or oil out of a lamp bowl.

**Food Offerings**

On this topic the *Varāha Purāṇa* states:

These are acceptable to me: cow curd, milk, and ghee.

Buffalo, sheep, and goat are not fit.

“Not fit” means they should not be offered by a devotee of Viṣṇu. In this verse, buffalo curd is forbidden for Viṣṇu, not milk.

Similarly, the *Viṣṇu Smṛti* says:

Not forbidden foods as offerings, nor goat and buffalo milk, even though they are lawful food,

nor the flesh of five-clawed animals, fish, and boar.  

VS 66.12-14

---

222 *Naivedya*: the food offered to a deity or image.
Supply: “He may give.”

In the Varāha Purāṇa:

Venison, goat, and hare flesh is acceptable; these are favorites of mine and should be used, O Vasudharā.

In the Agni Purāṇa:

Foods which are good to eat and acceptable should be given; and fruits which are choice and tasty, O Janārdana.

But for Sūrya and Durgā:

Offerings of wheaten cake, krśara, apūpa cake, kheer, jaggery sweetmeats, curd with sugar and spices, rices, barley, wheat, mung beans, black gram, meats, sesame, etc., beverages, and ripe fruit should be presented.

Regarding Śiva, in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa:

With offerings of food with jaggery, sugar, ghee, the merit of foods cooked with ghee is a hundred times.

Similarly, one should offer to Śiva ripe fruit abounding in citron. The fruit of whatever is offered is in the presenting of the food.

As for the vessel for food offerings:

Gold, silver, copper, bell metal, palāśa leaves, and lotus leaves are the vessels most dear to Viṣṇu.

Circumambulation

The particulars of pradakṣiṇa are described in the Pariśiṣṭa appendix.

Do one for Vināyaka, two for Sūrya, three for Śaṅkara, Give four to Keśava, seven to the sacred pipal tree.

Elsewhere we read:

Give one to Caṇḍi, eight to Ravi, three to Vināyaka, four to Viṣṇu, and half a pradakṣiṇa to Śiva.

In the Āditya Purāṇa:

A man should do three pradakṣiṇas at Śiva’s sacred place, A human being obtains the fruit of a thousand aśvamedhas.

In the Liṅga Purāṇa:

Pradakṣiṇa.
One walks left to right, then in reverse; one should not cross over the *liṅga* channel until death.

In the *Great Nārādiya*:

When doing *pradaksīna* for Śiva, a mortal should not cross over the *liṅga* channel.\(^\text{224}\)

Similarly:

Ascetics circumambulate from right to left, but *brahmārins* from left to right. Householders always go round both ways when offering *pradaksīna* to Śiva. Covering it first with grass, earth, lotuses, wood, stones, and such things, he may cross over the *liṅga* channel.

---

**Bowing**\(^\text{225}\)

Next:

The wise man who prostrates himself to Śiva, the Lord of All, on his hands, knees, and head will attain all his desires.

In the *Nārādiya Purāṇa*:

Just one bow made to Kṛṣṇa is equal to the concluding baths of ten *aśvamedhas*. The performer of ten *aśvamedhas* is born again. The man who bows to Kṛṣṇa is not born again.

In the *Bhavisya Purāṇa*, regarding Śūrya:

He who worships prostrate like a staff on the ground with a *namaskāra* attains a state not reached by even a hundred sacrifices.

Likewise, regarding Devī:

The adept attains the fruit of all sacrifices and fasts, and all pilgrimages to *tīrthas* by bowing down his head to Saṅkūśa. The adept who bows before Candikā with his body stretched out straight as a staff attains supreme happiness.

They mention the special rules for *namaskāra*:

One should not do *japa*, *homa*, and *namaskāra* in front, behind, or on the left side of the inner sanctuary of a temple. In front, one obtains death, behind, decay and decline. On the left side would be destruction, on the right the granting of all desires.

But it is performed in front for Śiva:

---

\(^{224}\) The “*liṅga channel*” (*somasūtra*) is the conduit for draining the water and other liquids with which a *liṅga* is bathed.\(^{225}\) *Praṇāma*.  

---
Throwing oneself down on the ground like a staff before Paśupati,226 all sins fall away simultaneously and do not rise again.

Transgression and Disposal of Nirmālya227

Stepping over nirmālya is forbidden in the Narasimha Purāṇa. Nārada says to Śāntaratha:

Henceforth, do not tread upon the remains, O wise man, of offerings to Narasimha and the other heavenly gods.

Also in the Bhavisya Purāṇa:

One should diligently avoid disturbing the night sleep of Bhāskara the sun; for when violated, it is inauspicious.
He who does so steps into dark and monstrous hells.

The disposal of nirmālya is explained in the Brahma Purāṇa:

Flowers that have been on the limbs of Brahmā and Viṣṇu are given to Brahmins.
Flowers from the image of Rudra and all the ghee should be burnt immediately.
What remains of gifts to the other gods and what was offered to Brahmā should be given to Brahmins.
Offerings to Viṣṇu are given to the Sātvatas, offerings to Śambhu to the ash-limbed ascetics.
What is offered to the Sun goes to the birds, what is offered to the Lord to the Sākyas, what is offered to the divine Mothers goes to women.

But what remains of offerings to the spirits, ghosts, and demons should be thrown away.

“Ghee” is a synecdoche for milk and the like. The “Sātvatas” are performers of pūjā (Bhāgavatas).

The “Lord” is Buddha. The disposal of ghee, etc., used in bathing was given above. Because of the words “to Brahmins,” etc., this text more specifically refers to the disposal of naivedya.

In the Bahuvrkapariśṭa, it is said:

It is taught by Gods, Siddhi yogis and Rṣis that the naivedya of Viṣṇu purifies.
Contact with those who consume, tread upon, and give away the naivedya of Śiva subtracts merit.

In the Padma Purāṇa:

Never touch the objects, food, fruit, and water of Śiva.
Don’t tread on the nirmālya: the man who does falls into hell.

But, according to the Agni Purāṇa, those who only worship Śiva are not so prohibited:

Reverently take his foot-bath water and nirmālya.

In the Āditya Purāṇa:

---
226 The edition has paśoh paśupateragre. The paśoh seems redundant.
227 The remains of offerings to a deity, such as garlands and flowers.
He who out of devotion deferentially takes the nirmālya of Parvatī’s lord will surely obtain the fruit of a royal consecration.

But one should not take it out of covetousness and the like:

149 He should not even touch them with his foot or step over them, Nārada.

Everyone may take them after giving Caṇḍā her portion. The absence of a portion for Caṇḍā portion in some circumstances is stated in the Agni Purāṇa.

When there is a liṅga of white Narmadā stone, a moving, metal, original, or naturally arising liṅga, and for all images of Śiva, a Caṇḍā portion is not required. AP 97.60

Some say that those who are not committed to Caṇḍā do not sin in keeping the nirmālya. On contact with a śāligrāma stone, everyone may take the nirmālya of all the gods.

Thus, in the Skanda Purāṇa:

All the nirmālya of Śiva—vessels, flowers, fruit—which can be taken, from the touch of a śāligrāma stone becomes pure.

In the Bhavisya Purāṇa:

If someone eats the remains of Mukunda’s food day by day, in every bite is the merit of more than a hundred cāndrāyana fasts.

In the Varāha Purāṇa:

He who does not drink the water of a śāligrāma stone but pours it upon his head, is spoken of as a Brahmin-killer. For those who reverence the lamp flame and incense with their hands, the sins acquired in seven births are instantly destroyed. VrP 156.5d

In the Bhavisya Purāṇa, the way to perform pūjā to an earthen liṅga is given:

150 He who makes and worships an earthen liṅga with an altar is wealthy and blessed in this life and becomes Rudra at the end. Bid it farewell with “Hara, Maheśvara, Śūlapāni, Pīnākadhṛt, Paśupati, Śiva, and Mahādeva.” While taking earth, shaping, establishing, invoking, bathing, worshiping, and bidding farewell, recite these names from Hara to Mahādeva.

The manner of performing pūjā to his eight forms is described in the Bhavisya Purāṇa, where Viṣṇu says:

Viṣṇu in the Viṣṇu Smṛti says:

---

*228* Caṇḍā “glowing white hot” is the name of Durgā in her incarnation as the slayer of Mahiṣa. The Caṇḍā portion is, presumably, her share of the offerings to Śiva.
Good! well done! most excellent Brahmin.
You have asked me a good question, faithful one.
Now hear the whole great set of Śiva mantras.
Reverence to Śarva in the form of earth.
Reverence to Bhava in the form of water.
Reverence to Rudra in the form of fire
Reverence to Ugra in the form of wind.
Reverence to Bhīma in the form of space.
Reverence to Pasūpati in the form of the sacrificer.
Reverence to Mahādeva in the form of the moon.
Reverence to Iśāna in the form of the sun.
These are the eight forms of Śiva. One should sacrifice to Śiva
on a līṅga with an altar proceeding gradually from east to southeast.

This means that first worshipping Śiva in the līṅga with, “Namaḥ Śivāya,” one should then
worship the eight forms going counterclock-wise.

Then making and worshipping a līṅga of gold just the size of a small gooseberry,
or a līṅga studded with gems you are glorified in the world of Śiva.
Making a līṅga of clay, ash, cow-dung, brass, copper, or bell metal
and worshipping it once, you will live in heaven for 10,000 kalpas.

In the Devī Purāṇa:

A līṅga bestows place and wealth and grants all desires.
A crystal one from the Narmadā mountains is best, but make it of anything else
and worship it, and you will gain the prescribed result.

In the Āditya Purāṇa:

The householder should always worship a white Narmadā stone līṅga as prescribed,
or one formed from earth and minerals, or one of sugar or curd.

In the Nandi Purāṇa:

The householder should not worship any līṅga that is
three-cornered, flat and rectangular, holed, bent, or reddish.

Likewise:

Initiates other than Brahmins and women are instructed to worship
at their own līṅga given by their guru, and nowhere else.

Flowers

In the Narasimha Purāṇa:

Worship Hari with forest-grown flowers, or mountain-grown plants,
fresh, dewy, sprinkled with water, without living creatures in them,
or flowers grown in one’s own garden.

For the recommended flowers, etc., see the Govindārṇava. The prohibited ones are noted
here. For Viṣṇu avoid these:

The flowers of the kṛkara and the thorn-apple should not be given to Kṛṣṇa. Dogbane and milkweed should not be presented to Janārdana.

Kṛkara is the karavīra (oleander); others call it karīra (caperbush).

Avoid the silk-cotton tree, the śirīṣa acacia, Indian nightshade, bitter oleander, the Indian laurel, wax gourd, and the bayur tree.

In the Vāmana Purāṇa:

And other fragrant blooms, except kewra. 

From this text, one can see that the kewra flower is prohibited for Viṣṇu in the form of Narasiṁha or for optional pūjā, because of the rule given above.

Viṣṇu says:

Neither a strong-smelling flower, nor a scentless or thorny one.
A thorny plant with white fragrant flowers may be given, but the red should not. Red saffron may also be given. 

For Śiva these are to be avoided, according to the Bhavisya Purāṇa:

Avoid kewra, pearl bush, oleander, amaranth, thorn-apple, śirīṣa, sal, and scarlet mallow blooms.
 Avoid the blooms and leaves of the Indian beech, the karaṇja or Indra tree, the flowers of the bahīra tree and the chaste tree.
Avoid unscented and unpleasant-smelling flowers. but pure and sacred plants such as kuṣa grass may be picked.

The Indra tree is the girikarnika (chaste tree).

In the Prāśādadīpikā:

One should not offer the Chinese rose, thorn-apple, kewra, amaranth, white jasmine and mura, saffron, oleander, basil, laurel, and waterlilies, nor buds, fading and fallen blooms.
One is at fault if, even inadvertently, one offers wild flowers that are strong-scented, have bugs in them, or are brought by vile persons with unclean leaves, vessels, hands, limbs, or clothes.

For Sūrya, these are to be avoided, according to the Bhavisya Purāṇa:

No gunjā, thorn-apple, and girikarnika, no silk-cotton flowers, nor any others sans fragrance.
Not by hogplum flowers should the day-making Sun be worshipped.

So, any fragrant, colorful flower not prohibited may be offered to Bhanu, the heavenly Bhanu.
Do not offer to Devī unblown buds.  
Exclude the heat-ripened and the out-of-season.  
For Śiva avoid jasmine, and for Hari, thorn-apple.  
For the Goddesses, the calotropis and coral tree flowers,  
and for the Sun, tagara (Indian carnation).

In the text that begins:

And with bakula, coral tree, jasmine flowers, śirīṣa blooms,  
oleander flowers, rosewood, and aparājita,  
calotropis and coral tree flowers are prescribed for Devī. The prohibition of them in the text “for the Goddesses, the calotropis and coral tree,” one must infer, refers to others, not to Durgā. In the same way, since tagara is prescribed for the worship of Śūrya in the Bhavisya Purāṇa in the text:

gunjā, tagara, bayur, and yellow amaranth,  
the prohibition of tagara in the phrase, “for Śūrya as well,” refers to wild tagara.

Others say that both the positive and negative injunctions apply. In this case, the meaning of the śāstra is this: in pūjā, the prescribed flowers and the like must be given first. If these are not ready at hand, one can give prescribed or prohibited ones. If these are absolutely unavailable, then one can give those that are neither prescribed nor prohibited.

**Offences**

In the Varāha Purāṇa:

There are 32 main ones, which Viṣṇu enumerates as Varāha.  
He who wears a sectarian mark crosswise and does not honor the gods.  
He who honors me with leaves, flowers, etc. that are begged.  
He who enters my temple with unwashed feet.  
He who chews betel nut in my sight.  
He who serves me and eats the vegetables cooked with saffron  
He who worships me with palāśa or white, scentless amaranth flowers.  
He who dim-wittedly worships me at nighttime.  
He who offers me the cooked food of non-Vaiṣṇavas.  
He who offers pūjā to me while non-Vaiṣṇavas are watching.  
He who offers me food from the day before yesterday.  
He who offers me clothes that are dyed black.  
He who offers me clothes that are new and unwashed or not fresh.  
He who offers pūjā to me while talking and sweaty.  
He who offers pūjā to me holding in gas and urine.  
He who bathes me with uncut nails.  
He who passes wind and does not do ācamana or wears a woolen cloak.  
He who offers pūjā sitting on a seat or stool or with no seat.  
He who burns dhoop in a clay lamp.
He who does *anantapūja* and does not tie the string.
He who is an anti-Śaiva, or while my devotee, is zealous for Śiva.
He who eats during the day on the 8th of Bhūta or the 11th and 12th of Viṣṇu.
He who worships me wearing someone else’s cloak.

156
He who has not offered *pūjā* to Gaṇeśa but honors Śaiva ascetics.
He who performs a rite while angry and disturbs worship at the three times.
He who touches and has converse with a menstruating woman in the dark.
He who dim-wittedly bathes me holding me in his left hand.
Know that these are 32 great offences for which there is no expiation. 229

Agasti mentions some others:

- Going to the Lord’s house with shoes on or in vehicles.
- Praising the Lord and so on after eating and not cleaning
  or in a state of impurity after a death.
- Attending festivals for a god etc. and not bowing before him.
- Stretching your feet out in front of you and sitting with legs crossed.
- Bowing with one hand and circumambulating counter-clockwise.
- Lying down, eating, and improper talk.
- Wearing a woolen cloak, blame or praise of others.
- Coarse and improper talk.
  *(Breaking wind.)* 230
- Giving away the remains of food dedicated to others;
- Using spices, condiments etc.
- Offering less than one is able, consuming what has not yet been offered.
- Not offering fruits in season.
- Leaving your seat and greeting others.
- Silence before the guru while praising oneself and blaming the gods.

These are declared to be the 32 offences for Viṣṇu. The rest of the details can be found out from
the rules laid down in various Purāṇas and Āgamas. Out of fear of diffuseness, I do not write about
them.

**The Five Great Sacrifices** 231

Of these, Vedic recitation and *tarpaṇa* have already been reviewed. Now the *viśvadeva*. 232

On this topic the *Narasimha Purāṇa* states:

> Then worship Viṣṇu with the Puruṣa Sūkta hymn;
> next do *viśvadeva*, and, after that, the rite of *bali*.  

NsP 58.13

"*Vaiśvadeva*" 233 is sacrifice to the gods, and “rite of *bali*” is sacrifice to the *bhūtas*.

---

229 The list of offences in the critical edition of the *Varāha Purāṇa* (116.1-36) are, for the most part, quite different from those *Kṛṣṇa Seṣa* gives here.

230 The edition oddly inserts this second or fourth pāda of a śloka.


232 Line 5 in the edition is misplaced from the enumeration of offences: “He who breaks wind or urinates during my worship.”
In the Vasiṣṭha Dharmaśūtra:

One should give offerings to the pitṛs, then feed the guests. V 11.5-6

This indicates that the sequence is bhūtayajña followed by pitṛyajña, then manusyayajña. These are the five great sacrifices. They are obligatory for Śūdras, too, since Yajñavalkya asserts regarding the Śūdra that:

Devoted to his wife, pure, support of men, faithfully performing śrāddha, he should not omit to offer the five sacrifices with the namaskāra mantra, Y 1.121

and according to the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

The Śūdra too should offer gifts and domestic sacrifices with cooked grain. VP 3.8.34

Vyāsa says:

Offer homa with clarified butter, without sesame oil or salts, with curd or milk; or, in the absence of those, simply with water.

In the appendix to the [Āśvalayāṇa] Grhya Śūtra it is said that:

He who intends to offer vegetables, leaves, roots, or fruit, should make an offering of food and water for abhiṣekā.

Gautama says that if performance of all five is not possible:

Vedic recitation and giving water to the pitṛs are constant, meaning that brahmayajña and tarpana are both always required.

Vyāsa says:

Then perform vaiśvadeva as prescribed in one’s own branch of the Vedas with foods prepared with different kinds of offerable condiments. Give bali with these foods only, putting the remains in water. Offer it all to the south with the sacred thread on the right shoulder with “svadhā.”

“Then” means after worshipping the gods.

Kātyāyana says:

Now in the evening and morning one should offer some ready, fit food.

AGS 1.2.1

“Ready” means cooked. When there is no cooked food available, unhulled rice is regarded as an

---

233 Food from the morning and evening meal, cooked in the aupāsana or worldly fire, offered to “all the gods.” It is allowed to Śūdras under the supervision of Brahmans according to Āpastamba (2.3,4) and to women without mantras (Bhāradvāja Grhyasūtra 3.12).

234 Svadhā is the exclamation that accompanies an oblation to the ancestors.
alternative:

When there is no cooked food, or when traveling, offer unhulled rice, milk, curd, ghee, root vegetables and fruit. If he offers water in the sacrificial fire or in water, doing so is reckoned as pākayajña.

In the Kūrma Purāṇa also:

If food is cooked in the domestic fire it should be offered there; if cooked in the sacred fire, there—this is the eternal law. KP 2.18.104

Aṅgiras says:

Should food be cooked in the sacred or domestic fire, always offer homa in whichever fire it was cooked.

Manu says:

A householder should perform the domestic rites in his nuptial fire according to rule, as well as the five great sacrifices and the daily cooking. M 3.67

Yājñavalkya says:

The householder offers domestic sacrifice each day in his marriage fire or the fire brought at the time of inheritance; śrāuta rites are performed in consecrated fires. Y 1.97

Śatātupa gives a second rule:

The vaiśvadeva should be offered for the removal of the five injuries in a common or sacred (vaidika) fire, thrown into water, or on the ground.

One throws into water or on the ground what is left after performing homa.

Even though he does not have a śrāuta or smārta fire, a Śūdra, too, should perform this homa in his common fire etc., since, when texts are limited without distinction, there is no way to prefer one rather than another.

Thus, because the statement that “he should offer ready food” is claimed by some to include vaiśvadeva as a domestic rite, and since its sense is non-specific, homa with cooked food is also the main one for the Śūdra to offer. In the absence of that, the sentiment of the śāstras inclines to offering it with unhulled grain etc. since the Śūdra is not specifically prohibited homa with cooked food. But because of the rule that “a Śūdra offers raw food in śrāddha” there is no śrāddha with cooked food, and because of the contradiction involved in gifts of food to Brahmans, since they are prohibited from eating the food of Śūdras in the Kaliyuga.
Thus, wherever cooked food is commonly accepted and not prohibited, it is also not forbidden to Śūdras. Therefore, offering cooked food in fire is not in contradiction with opinion respecting what is to be done. In doing it with raw food respect for Brahmins is not contradicted. On this point all the nibandhakāras are fully in agreement. However, because of popular disapproval, the righteous regard rites with cooked food such as vaiśvadeva as inappropriate for Śūdras. For this reason, in the verses:

Among the three varṇas and for Śūdras who diligently serve, there are rites of cooked food, Lovely One.

On day thirteen they shall feed the twice-born with cooked food. The five rites should be performed by Śūdras without mantras.

In the Vārāha Purāṇa, śrāddha with cooked food is confined in its applicability to another yuga because of it popular disapproval. Also, the use of the exclamation “svāhā” in the formula “svāhā to the gods,” is not for them, as explained earlier.

In the Appendix it is said:

Make an offering with the hand flat and palm up, thumb pressed in, and fingers together, in silence.

Śaunaka says:

In the evening and morning offer some ready, fit food in fire to the agnihotra deities. Svāhā to Soma, Vanaspati, Agni–Soma, Indra–Agni, Dhanvantari, Heaven and Earth, Indra, the Viśva Devas, and Brahma.

“Fit food” means suitable for homa. The agnihotra deities are Śūrya, Agni, and Prajāpati.

But Kātyāyana says of the five sacrifices:

Sprinkling around from the vaiśvadeva food, one should sacrifice with “svāhā” to Brahma, Prajāpati, the Rṣis, Kaśyapa, and Anumati.

Śaunaka says of bhūtayajña:

Offer baliharana to these deities: To Water, the Lords of the Herbs, to Home, the deities of the Home, the deities of Vāstu, Indra, Indra’s followers, Yama, Yama’s followers, Varuṇa, Varuṇa’s followers, Soma, and Soma’s followers in all the quarters, to Brahma and Brahma’s followers in the center, to the Viśva Devas, all beings and creatures of the day in the day, to creatures of the night at night, to the Rakṣasas on the left. Offer the rest to the Pitr̥s on the right with the sacred thread over the right shoulder pronouncing “svadāh.”

These are the deities of vaiśvadeva homa.

Bali is explained differently in the Vājasaneyi Gṛhya Sūtra. Consult it there for further informa-
tion. In the Chandogaparśīṣṭha\textsuperscript{235} one is told to offer bali while pronouncing “reverence to such-and-such.”

He who intends to offer bali should sacrifice to the pītrs with “svadā.” Some also do it with namaskāra. Not so says Gautama.

“Some” means other branches of the Vedas. Balis should be duly offered according to ones’ own branch of the Vedas, but there is not one way of doing it.

The Mārkandeya Purāṇa states:

After offering bali in his house the householder, purifying himself, should make offerings to beings for their gratification, respectfully placing it out.

MkP 26.23-24

Supply placing “the food” out. The mantras for placing it out are presented in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

“May the gods, men, animals, birds, saints, yakṣas, serpents, demons, ghosts, spirits, trees, all who want food given by me,

may ants, worms, moths, and other insects, hungry and bound in the bonds of action, may all obtain satisfaction from the food left them by me and enjoy happiness.

May they who have neither mother, father, family, food, nor means of procuring it, be satisfied and pleased with the food placed on the ground for their contentment.

Inasmuch as all beings and this food, I, and Viṣṇu are not other than it, I offer this food produced for the welfare of beings for their sustenance.

May all beings in the fourteen species of existent things in the whole world be satisfied with the food bestowed by me for their gratification and delight.”

After saying this prayer, a man should faithfully put food on the ground for the benefit of beings, for the householder is the support of all. Let him put food on the ground for dogs, outcastes, and birds.

VP 3.11.50-57

All this is optional because of the words, “as he wishes,” in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

\textsuperscript{235} Kātyāyana’s supplement to the Gobhila Grhyā Sūtra. See Kane 1: 1028 and 1007.
Then taking some more rice let the householder on a clean spot
give it to all beings, as he wishes, with a collected mind.

VP 3.11.50

Note that the text begins with “give it to all beings,” then enjoins the specifics consisting of a
mantra of five ślokas, and ends with “after saying this prayer.” Consequently, only this mantra can
be meant, and only one bali should be given after reciting the five ślokas.

Then, Manu speaks of bali for dogs and other creatures:

He should also gently lay on the ground offerings for dogs,
outcastes, dog-cookers,236 people with maladies, birds, and worms. M 3.92

“On the ground” is a synecdoche for any place fit for dogs, crows, etc., to eat. Lay it out say-
ing “reverence to dogs,” and so on, respectively.

Then Vyāsa says:

May birds of the eastern, western, southern, and southwestern
directions receive this pinda I offer on the ground.

To the two dark, spotted hounds of Yama Vaivasvata,
to them I offer a pinda. May they be harmless.

Offer them with this rite and, afterward, sprinkle the balis.

Two balis should be given each time with these two verses. Then, one should sprinkle all the balis
by hand.

Here too, vaiśvadeva homa should be performed in the evening and morning according to Śau-
naka. “Evening and morning make offerings of cooked food.”

Manu also states:

The vaiśvadeva and rite of bali should be performed evening and morning,
always without eating, otherwise one becomes sinful.

He tells how to do it in this text:

At evening the wife should offer a bali of prepared food without mantra;
it is called vaiśvadeva and is enjoined evening and morning. M 3.120-121

Observe in this verse the agency of the wife in the absence of the sacrificing husband. Elsewhere
the husband himself should do it, as, for instance, in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

Having again prepared food in the evening, he should give food
together with his wife without mantras to outcastes and such

236 Śvapaca, also the name of a mixed caste (SAS 29).
to obtain the fruits of \textit{vaśvadeva}. 

\textbf{VP 3. 11. 105-106}

166 \hspace{1cm} Manu remarks:

Those who live sharing one fire and meals should honor the fathers, gods, and Brahmans together, those living separately, in their individual houses.

From the subsequent mention of “those living separately,” “sharing one fire and meals” means those whose property is undivided when performing \textit{vaśvadeva} and other such rites.

In the \textit{Gobhila Grhya Sūtra}:

When, in a single family, food is cooked in multiple kitchens, one should offer a single \textit{bali} from the kitchen of the head of the family only. But of the food that was cooked in the presence of the other members of the family, one should make the required \textit{homa} in the fire, serve a Brahmin, and eat. \textbf{GGS 1.4.24-25}

When the cooking is done in the house of the eldest, among those who do not live separately, the eldest alone should do \textit{vaśvadeva} and such rites with food cooked in his own house. The younger ones should do nothing but eat. But if the \textit{vaśvadeva} is done by the eldest, and cooking is done in the house of the younger, they should silently throw some food into the fire, give some to the Brahmin, and eat.\textsuperscript{237}

Atri speaks of those who are secondarily qualified to perform \textit{vaśvadeva homa} and other such rites:

A son, brother, priest, pupil, mother and father-in-law, maternal uncle, wife, Vedic expert, and friend are the preferable people for the rite of \textit{bali}.

That means that they, too, can perform it in the house, when the primary person is away.

\textbf{167} \hspace{1cm} Therefore, Baudhāyana says:

When he goes away and there is no one to perform the rite in the house, the five great sacrifices go with him.

Jamadagni says:

Offer \textit{vaśvadeva} at night and the rite of \textit{bali} as well. But the five great sacrifices are in the day only say those who know dharma.

The \textit{Āśvalāyana Grhya Sūtra} states:

The man who knows dharma does not perform bathing and the daily rituals twice over; nor should he perform \textit{tarpana}, Vedic recitation, and \textit{vaśvadeva}.

The sense is that one should not perform each twice in the day or night.

\textsuperscript{237} The text is bad. It oddly quotes one version of Gobhila and comments on another in Ludo Rocher’s view. \textit{Gobhila-grhyasūtram} with Bhaṭṭanārāyana’s commentary, critically edited from original manuscripts with notes and indices by Chintanmani Bhattacharya (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1982): 126.
The procedure may be modified in accord with one’s branch of the Vedas and the way it was taught. Since the Purānic procedure for vaiśvadeva is common to everyone of these, I will describe it now:

Put suitable food into a bowl and, if available, into another bowl; if not, mix the food for sacrifice into the first bowl, then offer it in the household fire or in water. Sit on the west side facing east. Control the breath or sip water without Vedic mantras up to a time appropriate for pronouncing the fifteen two syllables.\textsuperscript{239} Meditate on Viśnū with “nāmaḥ.” Offer puṣjā to Agni with “nāmaḥ.” Sprinkle water and pronounce “svāhā” and “nāmaḥ” to Brahma, Prajāpati, the Īr̥hyās, Kaśyapa, and Anumati. Offer five oblations and pour water on them.

The Balis\textsuperscript{240}

Reverence to the Earth. Reverence to the Rain, Reverence to the Water. Reverence to the Creator. Reverence to Brahma. Then to the east of the place for the bali for Brahma leave a place for balis. Put six balis in a line ending on the east. Above this line, leave a place for seven balis ending on the east, and a row around the two lines.

Offer balis to Indra and the other gods. “Reverence to Indra. Reverence to Agni. Reverence to Yama, King of Dharma. Reverence to Nṛṣṭi, Reverence to Vāruṇa. Reverence to Vāyu. Reverence to the Moon. Reverence to Dhanvantari.” After offering balis to the deities of the directions in this way, to the east of the place for Brahma’s balis, as before, while saying, “Reverence to Brahma,” offer a bali. Then seven balis should be placed above this line ending on the east. While saying “Reverence to the Sky. Reverence to the Sun. Reverence to the Viśva Devas. Reverence to all the Elements. Reverence to the Lords of All Things. Reverence to the fourteen companies of the gods, etc., Reverence to the Dawn,” offer seven balis. Give a bali to the Lord of Beings above all the balis on the north, one to the fathers on the south while wearing the sacred thread over the left shoulder with the pitrīṭṭha gesture, and one to Vāyu on the north-east of all the balis wearing the sacred thread over the left shoulder. Give water mixed with the remains of the food to Yakṣa (Disease), saying “this anointing is for you.” So there are 25 balis in all.

After giving balis in this manner, offer water to them to sip on their bali places. In this case, daily śrāddha and pitrṛjayāṅa are contained in the rite of bali for pītrs. With the exception of daily śrāddha, pitrṛjayāṅa is accomplished even by the verses for giving balis to the pītrs. After giving bali, while wearing the sacred thread around the neck, dedicate four bites of food for Sanaka and so on, and say “Reverence to Sanaka and the sages, this food is for you.” This is manusṛiyayajāṅa.

\textsuperscript{238} The text has maṇḍalesu ca here, which is not clear. Perhaps maṇḍala has already acquired its modern sense of society, circle, or community.

\textsuperscript{239} divyakṣara, a disyllabic word or saman.

\textsuperscript{240} The second of the daily mahāyajñas, baliharana, is the propitiatory sharing of portions of one’s food such as rice as offerings (balis) to gods, semi-divine beings, spirits, household divinities, animals, birds, plants, beings, elementals, even objects such as a door-post and water pot. Therefore, it is also called bhūtayajña. The balis are placed in a circle on the ground or thrown into the air outside the house before the daily meal.
If offering food measured into four bites is not possible, on the authority of good people, one or two bites should be offered following the rule of $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$. After manusyañā, take previously prepared food and while saying, “this is for svapakas, birds, and so on,” put it on the ground outside the house, as much as you can and wish. Then after washing your feet and sipping water, perform daily śrāddha. If a guest is present, honor him hospitably to the extent possible.

There is a peculiarity here regarding the offering of food. When a Śūdra offers cooked food, he should give it to a cow or throw it in water, but not give it to a Brahmin. This is so because in the Kaliyuga Brahmins are forbidden to eat food cooked by Śūdras. That the four varṇas should go begging their food belongs to a different age than the Kaliyuga. This method applies to other balis as well. But there is no problem as far as raw food is concerned. The better view is that even vaiś- vadeva and such rites should be performed only with uncooked food. It is not opposed to popular custom and is how people of good breeding do it.

**Daily Śrāddha**

This is the procedure for doing it. On the south side of the vaiśvadeva circle place the materials for śrād- dha and prepare them. Take a bunch of kuṣa grass in your hand with sesame seeds. Repeat inwardly the Brahmin’s petition for “total prosperity” or have a Brahmin say it for you. Place the kuṣa grass in your hand on the ground with gold before the Brahmin and have the Brahmins say, “May your honors say ‘let the treasure of entitlement be bestowed on me.’ ”They answer, “May you have a treasure of entitlement to śrāddha.” Sip water. Control the breath. Call to mind Viṣṇu. Call to mind the time and place and express the intention, “I will perform daily śrāddha for my paternal grandfather, and paternal great-grandfather, of such-and-such gotra, servants of so-and-so, with their wives.” Then perform śrāddha as instructed the best you can with the customary offerings such as water for bathing the feet. Do it with the namaskāra mantra for each offering in this manner, “Reverence to you, this water is for you.” But a Brahmin sitting nearby should recite other domestic or Vedic mantras, or not, as the case may be. The rest should be done like pārvatā śrāddha.

---

241 E.g., pītyajña. Some authors divide śrāddhas into nitya, naimittika, and kamya. Nityaśrāddha is obligatory at certain fixed times, such as on the new moon or, as here, everyday as part of the five mahāyañās. As described by KS, it seems not entirely distinct from pārvatāśrāddha and the year-long character of ekoddīṭa śrāddha.
The things to be avoided here are described in the *Matsya Purāṇa*:

> Of these, daily śrāddha will I first impart to you. It is without arghya, invocation, or a specific deity, and is called pārvana. MP 16.5cd-6ab

In the *Kāśīkanḍa*:

> No invocation, no burnt offering, no pīṇḍa, no visarjana.

Daily śrāddha is to be without argha and pīṇḍa, free from gifts, the austerity of the giver and guest set aside.

The “austerity of the giver and guest” are the rules of chastity, sleeping on the ground, etc. Here the prohibition of gifts means that one does not have to make gifts as they are generally prescribed.

According to text of Vyāsa:

> One is to set aside the rules for chastity, etc., and the vaiśvadevas when performing daily śrāddha and offer food. After giving gifts as he can, he should send them on their way with namaskāras.

Then with the sacred thread over the right shoulder give the statement of intent, water for bathing the feet, a vow to offer food, and water for sipping. Then, with the sacred thread over the left shoulder, recite the verse that begins, “May the water be beneficent,” and ends with the granting of a boon, “May our family prosper.” Give a gift as one can, small coins or fruit. Give reverence to Viṣṇu and bow to the Brahmans and the sun. If sufficient means are lacking, give fruit, root vegetables, fluids, or whatever is on hand daily to the fathers. If even these are not available, the merit of śrāddha is attained simply by faithfully offering water.

Any offering of water made to the fathers with faith yields all the merit of a sacrifice to them.

Daily śrāddha is required for a year; beyond that, it is optional. If performed then, it brings prosperity, un-performed, merely no loss. Āpastamba says something similar in the text beginning, “daily śrāddha,” going on to say, “receive this food;” “after a year the last of them should be done with red food;” “afterwards, it is optional;” and “the fathers announce that they are contented with this śrāddha.” This means that the

---

242 The edition has *phala*, which may be a misprint for *pala*, another small coin or a measure.

243 A 2.18.5-18. The text of Āpastamba has *lohenājena*, “red goat,” not the *lohenānnena* here, “red food.”
last daily śrāddha performed, i.e. at the end of the year, should be done with “red food,” i.e., chiefly red goat meat. After the end of the year, following this prescribed śrāddha, daily śrāddha is optional.

After that:

May the cows of plenty, all-beneficent purifiers and removers of sin, the mothers of the three worlds accept my mouthful of grass.

Receive the food I give, daughter of Surabhi, as my homage to you.

While repeating this mantra, give a handful of grass with food to another’s cow as an offering.

He who gives a handful of grass to another’s cow as food, not eating himself, goes to the heavenly world.

Then he should stand in his yard and wait for a visitor for the length of time it takes to milk a cow.

If he sees a visitor asking for food of unknown family, conduct, name, religion, and moral character, he should receive him hospitably, offer him a seat, and honor him with incense and the like, giving water and whatever is at hand saying, “I have prepared this food for you with all the trimmings.” When he has satisfied the guest, he should consider himself to have done his duty. He should feed even a Śūdra guest as much as he is able.

In the Kūrma Purāṇa:

A twice-born who offers a guest a hantakāra, agra, or bhiksā as he is able, constantly recognizes the Supreme Lord.

KP 2.18.113

Manu defines them:

A bhiksā is one mouthful, an agra four mouthfuls, four times an agra is a hantakāra.

In the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa:

A meal is sixteen, four, or one mouthful of rice.

Do not eat oneself until this is given according to one’s means. MkP 26.38

In the Nārasiṁha Purāṇa:

A mendicant who comes to your house when vaiśvadeva has not yet been done should be given a mouthful taken from what is meant for it and sent on his way.

NrP 58.100-101

Parāśara gives the reason for this:

A mendicant has the power to ward off the sin committed while performing vaiśvadeva. but vaiśvadeva cannot drive away the offense done a mendicant.

P 1.44
Devala says:

In the evening and morning he should not shut the door of his house to giving alms.

D 2.291

The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa states:

The unbathed eats filth, the non-praying pus and blood, the non-sacrificer eats worms, the non-giver poison. If a man has cooked food only for himself, if he has intercourse for pleasure, and if he studies only for prosperity, his life is fruitless.

Viṣṇu says:

A visitor who turns back disappointed from someone’s house goes taking his merit and leaving him his sin.

VP 67.33

Yājñavalkya says:

The sin incurred when a visitor is turned away in the daytime is declared eight times greater when he is turned away at sunset.

Even if one is cooking greens and living on gleaned corn, a visitor should not be turned away in his own or a foreign country.244

Manu says:

A Kṣatriya is not called a guest in the house of a Brahmin, nor is a Vaiśya or a Śūdra, a friend, or an elder. If, however, a Kṣatriya comes to his house as a guest, he should gladly feed him as well after the Brahmins have finished eating. Even when a Vaiśya or Śūdra comes to the house, he should show kindness and feed them with the family. When others, such as dear friends, visit, prepare a special dish and serve them with your wife.245

“Family” means members of the household or servants and “prepare” means to cook.

In the Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa, it is said:

I think a candāla, a sinner, an enemy, or a patricide, if he comes at the right time and place, should be provided for.

The words “should be provided for” indicate that the other rules for the reception of a guest such as rising from your seat to honor him, and so on, are set aside. Other details on this can be seen in my work, the Govindārṇava.246

244 These two verses are not in Yājñavalkya.
245 Not in Manu.
Manu says:

The man who does not fail to perform the five great sacrifices, though living in a house, is not stained by the sins of doing harm. M 3.71

A householder has five places where killing occurs—fireplace, grindstone, mortal and pestle, broom, and water pot—by which human beings are bound. M 3.68

Therefore, he should give alms to dharmabhikṣus, but also to other beggars (M 3.94-96). Dharmabhikṣus, i.e. mendicants who meet the conditions, are:

an ascetic, a student, a pursuer of higher studies, the supporter of a guru, a traveler, the unemployed. These are the six dharmabhikṣus.

The Rite for Meals

In this rite, after doing the daily observances, purifying himself, and focusing the mind, draw a half moon maṇḍala and place on it a couple of dishes or pots with “whatever is on hand.” With damp feet and hands, with kuśa grass in hand, and sitting on a stool facing east, in silence hold the cup between the fingers of the left hand and thumb and sprinkle water consecrated with the mantra “Reverence to Nārāyaṇa” on the food. Then give balis to Yama, King of Dharma, on the right side of the dishes and reverence Citra and the dead. Some say that one should offer as many balis as the number of great Rśis in the gotra. Next, silently drink a handful of water. Then take five lumps the size of small, fresh gooseberries, and without biting them, with a calm mind, while chanting the prayer that begins “Reverence to Prāṇa,” eat them. The Bengalis say that Brahmins should only recite the mantras for drinking water, offering bali, and making oblations to Prāṇa ending with “svāhā.” Śūdras should perform the various rituals either in total silence or muttering “namaḥ.”

On this topic Vyāsa says:

Make a square, triangular, circular, or half-moon maṇḍala for a Brahmin, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra respectively.

Śaṅkha says:

246 Govindārṇava asmakrte. This is the single instance in the SAS of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa claiming to have written the Govindārṇava himself.

247 The edition has (yena jantavah) which is not a reading found in any MS. Olivelle has yāstu vāhayan. Olivelle, Manu’s Code of Law (2005): 459.

248 Bhojana.
A square manḍala is advised for a Brahmin, a triangular one for a Kṣatriya; a circular one for a Vaiśya, and a sprinkling of water for a Śūdra.

In the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa:

From his meal he should offer first some food as a bali to Dharmarāja. By giving a bali to Citragupta, he destines it to the dead.249

Manu says:

Once the Brahmins, dependents, and servants have finished their meal, only then, should the husband and wife eat what is left over.250 M 3.116

Pracetās explains the seats to be avoided:

The knowing man always avoids a seat made of cowdung, clay, brass, palāśa, or pipal wood, iron or copper.

Atri says:

Whenever a Brahmin eats putting his feet up on a seat, or blows on his food with his mouth it is as though he was eating cow meat.251

178 Hārīta says:

Do not eat on a black metal, clay, broken, or stained plate.

“Black metal” is iron; “stained” means defiled by the food of Śūdras, etc.

The Vṛddhā Manu says:

A householder should not eat in a bowl of copper, broken bell-metal, or a polluted one, nor offer vaiśvadeva on palāśa or lotus leaves—thus he will achieve the merit of a brahmacāri’s or ascetic’s cāndrāyaṇa fast.

In the Padma Purāṇa:

From eating on palāśa leaves or drinking a brown cow’s milk without a vow, a Śūdra goes to a place of torment. A Śūdra who unintentionally eats food on palāśa leaves, O best of Brahmins, even without a vow, is purified by giving a cow.

In the Great Ocean of Nṛsiṁha:

Karaṇja, pipal, fig, kumbhī, rui, and ebony trees—on the leaves of these he should not eat, nor on the mango or sweet-mango.

If a householder without prayer consumes food on upside down leaves, on slanted leaves, on the deodar pine, on palāśa leaves, in a bowl woven together by Śūdras, or brought by them, or sewn with thorns or with bamboo, on creeper or blue lotus leaves, he should perform a cāndrāyaṇa fast for purification.

---

249 This verse was corrected by Ludo Rocher to the version in Smṛticandrikā II: 608.
250 This is Olivelle’s translation. The text has vai bhāhī a misprint for vaiva or caiva hi. Manu (2005): 469.
251 The mukhena ūnāti of the edition makes no sense. Smṛticandrikā 616 has mukhena dhāmatma cānnam.
But only the one who eats in a stainless copper bowl,
for him four things prosper: health, wisdom, honor, and strength.

This is forbidden to renunciate ascetics according to a text of Pracetās:

The ascetic, Vedic student, and widow should avoid
betel, lotions, and eating in a copper dish.

Vyāsa says:

He should sit down to eat facing east in silence,252 with his hands,
feet, and mouth damp. These five are supposed to be wet.

Manu says regarding the wishes that go with it:

Facing east he enjoys longevity, facing south honor,
faceing west he enjoys prosperity, and facing north righteousness. M 2.52

In the Brahma Purāṇa:

If he eats on the palm of his hand, blowing on it,
or with his fingers stretched out, it is like eating cow flesh.

In the Saṁgraha, it is stated:

A man with sons should never eat at home facing north.
The wise man always avoids anointing on Monday.

In the Brahma Purāṇa:

Looking at the food, first bow to it, then with the hands in āñjali
fervently venerate it as you say “May this be ours for ever.”

In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

He should first, with absorbed attention, eat sweet flavors,
in the middle, salty and sour foods, then pungent and bitter.
The person who starts with fluid, takes solid food in the middle,
and finishes with fluid again is never unhealthy. VP 3.11.87-88

In the Brahma Purāṇa:

He should never eat food with his fingers or shake it off his hand.
He should take milk at the end of his food, and not afterwards drink sour milk.
He should fill his stomach half with food and a quarter with water.
Moreover, he should not dine seated in one row with all his relation—
for who knows what great degradation lies hidden there.

If it is unavoidable, arrange the seating differently and then eat. Brhaspati describes seating ar-

252 Smitacandrikā 601: maunam āśthitaḥ.
rangements other than in a row:

The learned recommend dividing the seats by a fire, ashes, a pillar, water, a door, and a passageway.

Other details and the part dealing with such matters as who is entitled to eat what and with whom can be seen in the chapter on āhṅika in the Govindārṇava.

181 Paitṛṅaśi says:

He should not eat salt, spices, ghee, sesame oil, things to be licked or drunk, or anything handed to him; cooked food and sauces should be served with a ladle. The man who won’t serve water or cooked food with a ladle is a Brahmin-killer, a drinker of alcohol, a thief, a violator of his guru’s bed.

Manu says:

He should avoid these seven things as enemies: drinking spirits, meaty and milky foods, eating at night, food given again, bitten into, or hot. ²⁵³

In the Āśvamedhika:

If he sees a menstruating woman, a caṇḍāla, a dog, or a cock while eating, he should give up that food.

Gautama says:

Unbecoming talk, a potter’s wheel, a grindstone, a mortar—he should not eat for the time the sound of these lasts.

Āpastamba says:

One can take food brahmacārins and householders, but not munis and all līṅgins. ²⁵⁴

“Munis” here means forest dwellers and ascetics. ‘With religious marks” means Kāpālikas and the like.

182 Aṅgiras says:

If a Brahmin eats the food of Śūdras for six months, while living he becomes a Śūdra, and dead, he is reborn as a dog. He should take no interest in the cooked food of others without a blameless invitation. He should avoid agitation of speech, hands, and feet, and overeating.

And also:

The food of Brahmins is nectar, of Kṣatriyas is milk, the food of Vaiśyas is rice, and the food of Śūdras is blood.

²⁵³ Not found in our texts of Manu.
²⁵⁴ Līṅgins are persons bearing sectarian religious marks. It is not clear which ones KS intends. The verse, in any case, is not in Āpastamba and strangely worded, seeming to say “students and householders should be fed, but not ascetics and sectarians.”
Thus, generally speaking, any cooked food of Śūdras should not be eaten, but Yājñavalkya allows some:

Among Śūdras, a dāsa, a cowherd, friends of the family, a half-sharecropper, employees of the house, or anyone who offers himself in service are persons whose food can be eaten.

Y 1.166

By “dāsa” is meant a servant from birth. A “half-sharecropper” is a cultivator who takes half of the harvest. The cooked food even of these should not be eaten when they have totally abandoned their caste duties.255 Manu says:

The learned twice-born must not eat the cooked food of a non-śrāddha Śūdra; he may accept raw food from him as subsistence for one night. M 4.223

“For one night” means sufficient for one day and night.256 “A non-śrāddha Śūdra” implies anyone who has abandoned his appointed duties. One infers from the adjective “non-śrāddha” that even cooked food of a Śūdra who is devoted to his duty can be eaten.

A “kandu” is a metal frying pan.

In the same way, according to Sumantu:

He may eat cakes made with milk, barley, sesame oil, oil seed cake, and things made with milk.

The statement in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa that “after consecrating it with a sprinkling of water, a Brahmin may take the food a Śūdra brings to his house,” refers to the Śūdras noted above. The statement with the prohibition “the food of a Śūdra never,” and so forth, refers to other Śūdras and when there is no emergency.

Likewise, Yājñavalkya says:

He should not eat the food of the fireless when there is no emergency. Y 1.160cd

The “fireless” is a Śūdra.

On this topic, in the Kalpataru the overall final statement is this:

255 Their raw food may be eaten, not cooked food. Accepting raw or cooked food is another of those distinctions where the difference between sat- and asat-Śūdras, i.e., those who abide by or have abandoned their svadharma duties, comes in to play.

256 A nychthemera.
In general, the cooked or uncooked food of a Śūdra should not be eaten. But, in an emergency, only raw food for a day may be taken. Even when there is no emergency, raw food may be taken from dāsas, etc., and in an emergency, cooked food as well. But by any Śūdra pan-fried food, etc., may be eaten. These rules on eating food apply in a different yuga.

According to the statement by Kratu in the chapter of the Kālakhanda on things to be avoided in the Kaliyuga, eating the food of “among Śūdras, a dāsa, a cowherd, friends of the family, a half-sharecropper,” is restricted to the householder.257

In the Āśvamedhika:

The cup with which he drinks, excellent Brahmin, is not refuse until he puts it on the ground.258

On this point smṛti says:

If a Brahmin drinks water in a cup after eating clarified butter in it, or eats in a water-cup, that is proclaimed infernal.

Observances After Eating

Devala says:

After eating, collect the leftovers, something from everything, and sip water. Spread along with water some portions of leftovers on the ground.

This is the mantra:

May the prosperity of all living beings from heaven to hell, from an eyelash to Mount Abu, be imperishable.259

Vyāsa says:

Drink half and leave half of the porridge on the ground. ‘May the Nāgas in their subterranean realm be pleased with it eternally.’

and similarly:

Sip water right there on the plate on which you have eaten, If you have risen from the table after finishing your food without sipping, do it then, and immediately bathe, otherwise you become a sinner.

Eating inside in this way and sipping water outside is a local custom only, but it is not appropriate.

In the Kurma Purāṇa:

257 Quoting Y 1.166 ab above on page 182.
258 This verse is found in MB 14, appendix 4.2344-5.
259 The many variant readings show that the mantra was poorly understood throughout its scriptural transmission. By spreading parts of the leftover food on the ground, the living beings appear to be underground. One reading of pāda a confirms this: rauravapūṣṇilaye, “in the den of purulent matter of the Raurava hell.” Pāda b with its variant readings remains unclear.
After sipping water, drip water from the thumb on the big toe
of the right foot, with the hand raised and the mind focused,
and consecrate the offering with the mantra that goes “in faith…”

Baudhāyana gives the mantra for dripping water:

The Person, the size of a thumb, resting on the big toe,
the Lord of All the World, the Universal Enjoyer, may He be pleased with this.

This mantra is not for Śūdras, because it belongs to smṛti.

Vyāsa says:

Sprinkle the knees with water, Majesty, if there are many persons
to be supported in the house.

In the Brahma Purāṇa:

By sprinkling the knees and arms he gains the merit of giving a cow.

In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

Then with a calm mind a man should take a seat
and meditate on his chosen deities.

In the Brahma Purāṇa:

Although he has sipped water, he is still impure until the plate is removed;
even when removed, he is still impure until the earth has been wiped with cowdung.

Atri says:

Even though the earth has been smeared with dung, a man is still impure until,
rising from his seat, the earth is sprinkled with water.

186

The Rules for Betel

The Märkaṇḍeya Purāṇa states:

After many sips of water he should then eat betel.

Vāśiṣṭha says:

The wise man does not chew betel before giving
good areca nut and good betel with lime to the gods and Brahmans,
One areca nut gives health and happiness, two is useless,
three is superior, more than that is bad.
The stem on the leaf brings sickness and the tip is harmful.
The leaf with lime takes away health, the veins destroy intellect.
Therefore, the sensible man chews betel,
avoiding the tip, stem, veins in particular, and the leaf with lime.  
The tip of a leaf, the stem from a leaf, a crushed leaf, a double leaf,  
and an unashed leaf take away even the glory of Indra.  
The man who chews areca nut before putting a leaf in his mouth  
will live seven lives of poverty and, at the end, forget Viṣṇu.  
He should not chew betel with the lime on his forefinger.  
The dullard who does so goes to one of the hot hells.  
If he chews betel carelessly prepared with katechu (khadira) at night,  
he will be poor his whole life, you can be sure of that.  
Each bite a student, ascetic, widow, or menstruating woman takes  
of betel mixed with katechu is like meat mixed with liquor.

Next, Dakṣa says:

After eating, relax and let the food digest.  
Spend the sixth and seventh hours of the day reading history and Purāṇas.  
At the eighth, take care of business matters outside, then sandhyā.

Yājñyavalkya also says:

The rest of the day one should sit with honored people, friends, and family.  

Finishing the day in this way, when the time for sandhyā has passed, perform the vaiśvadeva at night, and if the occasion arises, worshipful reception of guests. If one is hungry, then he may eat at night. Some are of the opinion that the vaiśvadeva should not be performed at night.

Then, after finishing his duties, he should go to bed. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa states that:

After washing his feet, etc., and eating dinner, a householder should rest on a bed made of wood that is not cracked, my king.

Śaṅkha says:

Not on a cot that is broken or has been used by other castes, not sprinkled with water.

Paiṭhīnasi says:

He should sleep without oiling his head. The uninitiated should not sleep on a hide.

Viṣṇu says:

He should not sleep in wet clothes, nor should he lie on a bed made of palāśa wood, the five timbers, broken tusk, wood struck by lightening, burnt by fire, made of bristle, or without a cover.

The “five timbers” are five various kinds of wood. “Broken tusk” is ivory.

Also:

If he is not falling asleep well, he should take the betel out of his mouth,  
A woman off the sofa, a sectarian mark off the forehead, flowers off the head—these are at all times the demons of disease, madness, and fear.
In the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*:

> With his head to the east in bed he finds wealth, to the south, long life, to the west, a strong mind, and to the north, loss and death.

Gārgya says:

> At home, he sleeps with his head to the east, at his father-in-law’s house, to the south, when away traveling, to the west, but never to the north.

In the following verse, he is instructed what to do when observances prescribed for the daytime were accidentally neglected:

> Even if he has missed performing the designated daytime observances, he can do them in their proper order at the first watch of the night.

In the *Saṁgraha*:

> At the first watch of the night, he should do the daytime observances.

> He should particularly avoid reciting the Vedas and sun worship.

> “Sun worship” is chanting the Vedic hymns to Śūrya.

Similarly:

> Gautama said that one may do *vaiśvadeva* and *bali* at night, but the five great sacrifices only in the daytime.

Further information on this point may be seen in the *Govindārṇava*.

> This concludes the rules for daily observances

The celebrated Pilājī, limit of the learned, the one ocean of virtue, the treasury of good fortune, born from Śrī Keśavadāsa, on account of him the learned Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa has investigated daily ritual acts in the *Gemstone of Śūdra Conduct*.

> Thus is concluded the inquiry into daily observances in *The Gemstone of Śūdra Conduct*
Baudhāyana says:

A Brahmin is purified in ten days, a Kṣatriya in twelve days, a Vaiṣya is purified in fifteen days, and a Śūdra in a month.

Viṣṇu says as well:

The impurity of a Brahmin on a birth or death lasts for ten days, a Kṣatriya for twelve days, a Vaiṣya for fifteen days, a Śūdra for a month.  VS 22.1-4

Devala says that “a Śūdra is purified in 30 days.”261 This applies to the asat-Śūdra, because of a text in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, “a Śūdra should cease doing his own duties for a month.”262 The “duties” are the five mahāyajñas: serving the twice-born, eating the leftovers of their food, monthly shaving, etc. However, for a sat-Śūdra living dutifully, the period of impurity expires in fifteen days.

Yājñavalkya says this:

For a Kṣatriya twelve days, for Vaiṣyas fifteen, for Śūdras 30 days, and half that for Śūdras living dutifully.  Y 3.22

Manu also says:

Śūdras living dutifully should shave their head once a month, follow the rules of purification laid down for Vaiṣyas, and eat the leftover food of the twice-born.  M 5.140

“For Vaiṣyas” means for fifteen days.

Śātaṭa’s statement that “a Śūdra is purified in 20 days on a death or birth,” however, should be taken as referring to a sat-Śūdra who has been slightly degraded. The degradation is a matter only of dutiful service to the twice-born, not of things such as the performance of the five great sacrifices. As to what Aṅgiras has said, this applies to a sat-Śūdra who is endowed with extraordinarily virtuous conduct, good behavior, detachment, and so forth.263

Some view the alternative of 20 days as applying to an ordinary Śūdra in a state of misfor-

260 Aśauca, the contamination contracted by childbirth or the death of a relation. The impurity may last for varying periods of time, as Kṛṣṇa Seṣa here sorts out, during which a person so contaminated is not to touch anyone, eat with others, or perform sacred acts.
261 D 10.11436.
262 MkP 32.41.
263 A text of Aṅgiras has been omitted in the edition. It must have prescribed a shorter period than 20 days, as does Śātaṭa, or 15 days, as does Yājñavalkya.
tune and ten days to a sat-Śūdra in a state of misfortune. Others see it as a matter of local custom.

Note that this mixture of periods of impurity for all castes pertains to other ages, as is discussed in a passage of the Āditya Purāṇa quoted by Hemādri. In the chapter on things to be avoided in the Kaliyuga, he discusses the contraction of sin depending on behavior and Vedic learning, and after the word “thus,” he quotes, “In the Kaliyuga, these rules should be avoided.” That means this contraction of the period of impurity spoken of by Devala and others is not feasible in the Kaliyuga.

A Brahmin who has mastered all the sacrifices and Vedas is purified in one day, in three days if he has only the Veda, and in ten if he has neither.²⁶⁴

And:

Four days of impurity are laid down for those who has completed the Vedas, Three days of impurity are laid down for the Brahmin who has the sacrifices and Vedas. One day only of impurity is enjoined for one who is learned beyond these two, One who has accomplished all religious duties plus these is purified on the same day. A Kṣatriya is purified progressively in twelve, eleven, and ten days. A Vaiśya is purified in fifteen, twelve, and eleven days. Half a month of impurity is laid down for the Śūdra of dutiful service.

The reason for this is that virtuous conduct has no tomorrow—such things as offerings in the fire, and service last only three days and Vedic study is but learning by rote.²⁶⁵ Therefore, in the Kaliyuga, there is only a period of impurity of ten, twelve, and fifteen days, and one month respectively for the four varṇas.

As Hārīta stipulates:

Ten days only for a Brahmin on the death of a sapinda²⁶⁶ — the man who in the Kaliyuga applies the rules for other ages, is confused and culpable.

“Brahmin” implies everyone according to the respective varṇa. Consequently, Śātātapa remarks:

Some hold the view that since a Śūdra is necessarily excluded from the use of mantras, there is neither authorization nor prohibition for a month.

However, the impurity of the kadarya and such persons is just like that of Brahmins, etc., as Dakṣa says:

²⁶⁴ Reading nirguṇo for a misprinted nirguṇā.
²⁶⁵ This seems to be a proverb. The curious words aśvastanika (not of tomorrow, of today) and tryahaihika (lasting three days) appear in Manu 4.7cd in a different context.
²⁶⁶ Sapinda: “having the same pinda” or rice-ball offering; kin who offers śrāddha to the same ancestor through six generations in an ascending or descending line.
The ill, the *kadarya*, the debtor, always,  
the irreligious, the stupid, and uxorious in particular,  
the vice-ridden, servile, and faithless man  
has unbounded impurity.  
He is never purified of birth pollution as long as he lives.

“Ill,” i.e., with an illness that cannot be cured. Devala defines the *kadarya* as:

One who neglects himself, the performance of his duties, his wife and children,  
his ancestors and dependents out of avarice is called a *kadarya*.

A “debtor,” i.e., one with unpayable debts.

The *Brahma Purāṇa* states in the context of mixed castes:

Mixed Śūdra castes should follow the purity/impurity rules.

When there is birth pollution, a Śūdra is ineligible to perform his duties as long as the impurity lasts. The untouchability of the mother herself lasts ten days. But the father becomes touchable simply by bathing.

As Aṅgiras says:

In birth impurity, bodily contact, except with the mother, is not polluting,  
and nothing but a bath is prescribed for contact with the mother.

Samvarta also says:

On the birth of a child, a bath in clothing is prescribed for the father.  
The mother is purified in ten days, the father’s touch by a bath.

“Purified” means that she becomes touchable. The father is authorized to do his duties at the end of a month. The father maintains his touchability if he has no contact with the mother. If he does, like the mother, he is purified after ten days.

Parāśāra says this:

If a twice-born seeks contact with a wife who has given birth,  
the pollution becomes his, even if a Brahmin learned in the six Vedāṅgas.  

“Twice-born” implies the other varṇas. If this is the case for a learned Brahmin, *a fortiori*, how much more so for the others. Therefore, this also applies to a Śūdra, since the rationale is the same.

The *Brahma Purāṇa* also says regarding the mother’s co-wives:

Now, if other mothers do not enter her room like him,  
though members of the family, their touch is never polluting.
‘Like him’ means like the father. This means that if they go into her room and touch the men, then they become touchable again simply by bathing. But, if they touch the women, then, exactly like the father, they are touchable again after ten nights.

Pracetās, however, says about the touchability rights of women who have given birth:

Birthing women of every varṇa are purified in ten nights. 
And there are no separate rules of impurity for menses.

Since it is “for every varṇa,” a Śūdra woman too is purified after ten nights. The period of impurity due to menstruation is no different—three nights as for a Brahmin woman et al.

However, as for the Brahma Purāṇa:

A Brahmin, Kṣatriya, and Vaiśya woman who has delivered is touchable after ten days have gone by, a Śūdra woman only after thirteen,

this is referring to an asat-Śūdra.

Paiṭhānasi, discussing her rights to ritual, says:

She may be permitted to perform rituals upon bathing in 20 days after giving birth to a boy, in a month after giving birth to a girl.

The “rituals” are those for the gods and for ancestors. Madanapāla, however, says that it is only proper for her to perform rituals on the birth of a son or daughter after a month has elapsed. And this is logical, since it is contradictory to be allowed to perform rituals in 20 nights when the period of impurity lasts a month.

Regarding touchability after a death in the house, Āṅgiras says:

The wise must not touch a Śūdra for ten days, but only after a full month is he cleansed of birth or death pollution.

Sarṇvarta says:

In four days a Brahmin, in six days a Kṣatriya, in eight and ten days a Vaiśya and Śūdra may be touched.

Devala says:

As śāstra shows, a Brahmin, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra are touchable after three periods of impurity—thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen days. A Brahmin’s food may be eaten after ten days, and that of the others in twelve, thirteen, and sixteen days respectively.

D 10. 1147, 1150

In this text, the sixteen days apply to a Śūdra conducting himself by the rules. Following the rule
of three periods, the untouchability of a Śūdra should go beyond the first period if we accept a
series of twelve, thirteen, and sixteen nights of impurity.

Marīci explains the difference between the impurity of miscarriage and abortion:

When a mother miscarries, she is impure for three nights, 
without any impurity attaching to her family.
When she has an abortion, she is impure for a month, 
the father and others for three days.

This means that if a mother has a miscarriage or loss of the pregnancy in the first trimester she is
impure for three nights, but her family and the father have no impurity. Vṛddha Parāśāra, however
says the father takes a bath:

When a pregnancy is lost, women are impure for a month of nights. 
A man just has to bathe.

The “man” is the father. “A month of nights” is for an abortion.

The Short Parāśāra defines miscarriage and abortion:

A miscarriage is within the fourth month and an abortion up to the fifth 
or sixth month; after that is parturition with ten days of impurity. P 3.18

Marīci’s statement of three nights in the case of miscarriage refers to Brahmins, since he him-
self mentions different periods for others. Thus…

The text appears to be torn here. Although two original manuscripts were obtained, because of the un-
availability of that part, the text is published as found. [Editor’s note]

If a father of a certain varṇa has sons by women of other varṇas in the anuloma direction,
the sons are brothers, but of different varṇas. When one of these brothers in one jāti has birth or
death impurity, and their father is alive, a brother in another jāti and his sons follow the form of
śrāddha and the rules of impurity—ten or sixteen nights, etc.—prescribed for the father’s varṇa.
If the father is deceased, the rules appropriate for the mother’s varṇa apply. If both parents are de-
ceased when birth or death impurity occurs, the rules appropriate for his own jāti apply for all the
brothers. So says the Viṣṇu Smṛti. “When a master dies his anuloma wives and dāsas follow the
same rules of impurity as the master.”267 This means that anuloma wives and dāsas of a lower
varṇa follow the master’s rules of impurity, those of a higher varṇa in the pratiloma direction fol-

267 VS 22.18-19.
low their own *varṇa* rules. This applies when they reside in the same community with the master, as Bṛhaspati says:

*Dāsas*, students-in-residence, servants, and students living in the same place follow the same purity rules as the master on a birth or death.

“Students-in-residence” refers to perpetual *brahmacārīs*, since “students” are mentioned separately.

Śaṅkha says:

When an outcaste woman carelessly becomes pregnant, 
the impurity she engenders by giving birth or dying does not cease.

An “outcaste woman” is a Śūdra. “Carelessly” means out of adulterous passion. This is the sense: if an unmarried Śūdra woman has relations with a man of the lowest *varṇa*, i.e. a Śūdra man, and becomes pregnant, her birth and death impurity lasts the life of the begetter of the pregnancy.

On the subject of multiple children born to women not of the same *varṇa*, Śaṅkha says:

If there are many individuals born to the same father and different mothers, they have the same *piṇḍas* but follow different purification rules. They are *sapinda* for three generations.

For instance, the sons of one Brahmin father with individually different impurity rules follow their mothers’ impurity rules. And they are *sapinda* for three generations. Hence, they do not follow the impurity rules for *sapinda* at a birth or death from the fourth generation on. Some read “persons with separate property” instead of “individuals.” In which case, “persons of separate property” means persons who have partitioned their property.\(^{268}\) That is why Baudhāyana says:

Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra *jātis* follow the paternal impurity rules at a birth or death, but, if they are not partitioned, the maternal.

In the *Brahma Purāṇa* too:

Sons of the Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra *jātis* are *sapinda* for three generations, the sons of Brahmans, too, if they share in an undivided property. Those with divided property are all definitely of the mother’s *jāti*.

By “mother’s *jāti*” is meant the impurity rules customary for the mother’s *varṇa*. And so, those with undivided property follow the impurity rules customary for the father’s *varṇa*. There is no birth impurity for those of *pratiloma* order, since *smṛti* says they are dharmeless.

\(^{268}\) *Vibhakta* in its technical legal sense.
Dattaka, svayamatta, kṛtrima, and kṛta sons are regarded as being of different gotras, offering pīndas separately, and producing separate family lines. On a birth or death they have three days of impurity.

Next, there is sapinda impurity only for three generations for females secluded at home, irrespective of whether they are of the same or different jātis.

Vasiṣṭha says:

Authoritative sources state that unbetrothed females are sapinda for three generations.

Note that this is the case for all four varṇas.

In the Brahma Purāṇa:

Śūdras living as dāsas with daily bread and bodies subject to another do not have any sons. Therefore, the son of a dāsa and a dāśī is a dāsa himself.

The son of a dāsa male and female is a dāsa. “Himself” means that is his name, because if he is born of a married woman, he is an aurasa son. For the same reason, he is not a kṣetraja, etc.

The text expands on this as follows:

Those who break out of this boundary of mine and live as Śūdras, then have the twelve kinds of son.

Madanapāla explains that service, i.e., subjection to the twice-born is the chief way of life for Śūdra jātis. Śūdras who break out of this boundary of me, Brahmat, i.e., who abandon their duty of service, and adopt the life of householders, they have the twelve kinds of son, i.e., aurasa, kṣetraja, and so on.

Also:

If there is neither an aurasa nor a putrikāsuta, they can have a kṣetraja, etc.

These eleven kinds of son are of different gotras and simply carry on the family line. They do everything, śrāddhas etc., like them as if they were dāsas.

When there is a birth or death, they share the three-day impurity.

The three days of impurity are specified in the verse:

Twelve days for a Śūdra, nine for a Vaiśya, and six for a Kṣatriya.

---

269 These are four of the twelve kinds of son once recognized in Hindu law: adopted, self-offered, affiliated grown up, and purchased, respectively


271 Putrikāsuta: when a father has no son to perform his śrāddha and other such rites, the son of his daughter can be declared to be his son.
Likewise, three nights are prescribed for *samānodakas* on the basis of the statement, “but for water-givers three days,” which becomes twelve days when suitably adapted for Śūdras.

With “three nights of impurity” taken from a previous verse, the *Viśnu Smṛti* says:

> for the current or previous husband in whose house they are when previously married wives give birth or die.  

VS 22.42

“Previously married wives” means women who have abandoned their consecrated husband and attached themselves to another man.

201 Bṛhaspati says that:

> When such women bear a child or die, there are three days of impurity for the present or former husband in whose house she herself is living at the time.  

> When wives who have lived with another man and children of women by another husband die, the highest twice-born men are purified in three nights after bathing.

“The children of women by another husband” are *kṣetrajas*, etc.

Maṛici says:

> When a woman gives birth or dies, there are three nights of impurity for the earlier and later husbands, but one day for the *sapiṇḍas* when it is three nights for the father.

This means that when the father has three nights, his *sapiṇḍas* have only one night.

But in the *Brahma Purāṇa*:

> When a woman given away in marriage by her father goes and lives with another man by her own free will, whomever she lived with has the higher impurity of three days when she dies or has a child, no one else. This is certain.  

> But, if she is abducted after the marriage has been consecrated by the seven steps, the *gotra* of her master becomes hers.  

> The higher impurity varies, thus:  

> If she had given birth, the father’s, next the earlier husband’s;  

> if she is a virgin, the other’s; if she is a virgin, the husband’s *gotra*.  

> She is of the same *gotra* as he with whom she has lived of her own accord.

The first sentence means that whomever she lives with, he alone has three nights of impurity on the death, etc., of a “free” woman, but his *sapiṇḍas*, i.e., his sons, etc., do not. “Varies” means is shared. How it is shared is explained in the next sentence. “Virgin” means if she goes with another man without him having been her husband, she takes the former’s *gotra* alone. In this case, there are two alternatives for *sapiṇḍas*: no period of impurity at all or one day, depending on the

---

272 *Samānodakas* are the kin of common ancestors of the seventh to fourteenth generations who receive only offerings of water. The first seven are *sapiṇḍas* receiving both *piṇḍas* and water. Monier-Williams.
difficulty of the circumstances.

When the period of impurity for a father of Brahmin caste is three nights, that of a Śūdra father is twelve days. Accepting the view that for a Brahmin’s relatives it is one night, it follows then that for a Śūdra’s relatives it is four nights.

In the Brahma Purāṇa, on the death of a young daughter:

When a girl dies in the time from birth to tonsure, her father attains purity on the very same day for all varṇas. From then to betrothal, in one day. After that, when she has married, in three nights. After betrothal, it is three nights for both the father and husband-to-be. After marriage, three days for the husband alone. When she gives birth or dies, let impurity be determined by their own jātis.

Aṅgiras also says:

Irrespective of caste, before any sacraments are administered, purity is attained in three nights. In the case of girls, it is one day.

And:

When a girl, who has been given in marriage, has a child or dies in her father’s house, he should follow the purity rules for his own caste completely. If she was in a different place, all the relatives are purified in one day, the begetter in three.

“In a different place” means other than the places in which the father eats, sleeps, worships the gods, etc. In the Hāralatā of Aniruddha, when she bears a child or dies, the father does a full purification, but his relatives for three days.

Here, too, it is proper that when the father has three nights of impurity, a Śūdra has twelve, and instead of one day, relatives have four, but, instead of ten days, a month.

With regard to the impurity from the death of a young son Aṅgiras says:

When a Brahmin boy less than three years old dies, purification is for a day and a night. When a Kṣatriya dies, purification is in two days, for a Vaiśya in three. If a Brahmin dies after tonsure, purification for three nights is approved. For a tonsured Kṣatriya, six days, for a tonsured Vaiśya, nine are approved. When a Śūdra less than three years old dies, there is purity in five days. Beyond that twelve days are ordained when a Śūdra dies. If a Śūdra past his sixteenth year dies, the period of purification is a month. So says Aṅgiras.

Another digest gives a period of a month for a twelve year old. The author of the Mitākṣarā, however, disregarding the opinion of Aṅgiras, says that the impurity based on age for youths is
the same for all of them. Vyāgra says.

It is same for all when there is an age and also when there is delayed purification.
When an initiate dies, it differs; but in this case too, the delayed purification is the same.

This means that the period of delayed purification is the same, not different, for all varṇas when an age is mentioned in such texts as “up until teething, etc; it is immediate;” when there is what is called delayed purification in such texts as “after three months, it will be three days and nights,” “after six months, one day and two nights” “one day before the ninth,” “after that, he is purified by bathing,” etc.; and even when there are texts prescribing different periods of impurity for different jātis on the death of an initiated boy.

To be sure, for a Śūdra, initiation with the sacred thread is replaced by marriage.273 Even if unmarried after sixteen years of age, there is only one month of impurity for a deceased Śūdra. As Śaṅkha says:

If an unmarried Śūdra expires after sixteen years, his relatives attain purity in one month. No distinction is made.

But up to tonsure, the parents have three nights of impurity. If the deceased was less than two years old, the parents have no impurity.

According to Pāraskara, “the impurity for another is one and three nights,” meaning three nights for the parents, one night for other people.

Manu also says:

A man who emits seed without issue is purified by a bath; the sin of sexual intercourse that begets a child binds for three days.

Because of the cause and effect character of sexual intercourse and begetting, there is a period of impurity of three days This impurity is twelve days for a Śūdra.

Special Rules for Śūdras Carrying Out the Dead

Manu says:

Carry a dead Śūdra out via the southern gate of town, the twice-born by the western, northern, and eastern gates, as feasible M 5.63

273 As it was for women.
Viṣṇu says:

One should not allow a twice-born to be carried out by a Śūdra, nor a Śūdra by a twice-born. Sons should carry out the father, Śūdras should not carry out even a twice-born father and mother. VS 19.1-3

“Nor a Śūdra by a twice-born” is referring to people other than the son, since he explicitly says that “Sons should carry out the father,” meaning, even if he is a Śūdra. The statement that “Śūdras should not carry out even a twice-born father and mother” is an exception to the rule and applies when twice-born are present at the obsequies, as Yājñvalkya says:

One should not let a dead Brahmin be carried out by a Śūdra when his own people are present.

In the *Brahma Purāṇa*:

The corpse of a man is picked up and placed on the pyre face down with the feet to the south by those born in his own *gotra*.

A woman is laid out face up even by *sapinda* relatives.

This pertains to Śūdras and twice-born without a sacred fire, because with respect to one who has lit a sacred fire at home, Kātyāyana says:

He should be placed on the ground spread with *kuśa* grass, his head to the south.

In the *Brāhma Purāṇa*:

Even a poor man should not be cremated naked in any kind of distress—cover him carefully with a some piece of clothing.

This applies to all *varṇas*.

Yama says:

A Śūdra is not to pick up and carry a deceased sacrifice-performer. The man whom a Śūdra brings fire, grass, wood, and burnt offerings will remain ever in the condition of being dead, and he will be filled with unrighteousness.

“And he” is the Śūdra. Cremation of Śūdras is without any Vedic mantras, as is evident in the exclusion of *mantra* by Manu in the text that goes:

from conception to cremation, the performance of rites with sacred verse is prescribed for him...

On the subject of *añjalis* of water, the *Brahma Purāṇa* states:

First washing the garments in which the deceased is shrouded, the mourners are to bathe in their clothing washing away all impurity. Then, everyone should put water and sesame on a flat stone
and offer ten añjalis, one by one, for a Brahmin,
twelve for a Kṣatriya, fifteen for a Vaiśya,
and thirty for a departed Śūdra

This is the single series offering of añjalis. In the increasing series of añjalis, this restriction
of the number per varṇa does not apply. The same text explains this as follows:

One pinda only should be offered on each successive day.
One añjali of water and one bowl is offered.
On the second day two añjalis and two bowls,
on the third day, three, on the fourth day, four,
on the fifth day, five, on the sixth day, six, on the seventh day, seven,
on the eighth day, eight, on the ninth day, nine, and on the tenth day, ten.
In this way there should be 55 añjalis in all
and as many bowls of water filled with sesame etc.
Offer pīṇḍas for the pretas following regional custom.
The tenth pīṇḍa should be given on the tenth day for Kṣatriyas
and on the fifteenth day for Vaiśyas.
For Śūdras, the tenth pīṇḍa is given in a full month.

That is, on the day at the end of a complete month. This is the ten-pīṇḍa-offering.

Pāraskara gives a similar number of pīṇḍas:

For a Brahmin ten pīṇḍas are recommended, for a Kṣatriya twelve,
for a Vaiśya fifteen, and for a Śūdra thirty.
Offer at least ten pīṇḍas for the pretas of all varṇas.

Even if the period of impurity happens to be three nights, at least ten pīṇḍas are offered for a
Śūdra, no less than that, beginning with the bringing of pālāśa wood, kuśa grass, and fire.

As Śātātapa says:

Although the period of impurity is shorter, he should still offer ten pīṇḍas.

Pāraskara explains the manner in which to offer them:

On the first day, those gathered together should offer three pīṇḍas.
On the second day, offer four and collect the bones.
On the third day, offer three and wash one’s clothing.
Afterwards, the rite of ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha is done.

“Afterwards” means on the fourth day.

In the Brahma Purāṇa:

Even in immediate purification, all the pīṇḍas are given simultaneously.
In the case of three-day impurity, on the first day one is bestowed,
on the second day, four, and on the third day, five.

Ten pīṇḍas must be given in all periods of impurity, because they complete the body. We should
infer from this that offering more pīṇḍas than ten is an excess or superabundance of benefit to the
deceased, and recognize that in a state of misfortune, the body of the deceased may be consummated and perfected even with zero piṇḍas, as we learn from the teachings of śāstra. I do not go here into non-specifics, since they are common to other varṇas. They can be consulted in the Govinda-ārṇava.

Decisions about Ekoddīṣṭa

Some say the first śrāddha is on the eleventh day, according to the Vṛddha Vasiṣṭha:

This śrāddha offered on the eleventh day is the same for all four varṇas, but the period of impurity varies for each.

One should not raise the question how is someone in a state of impurity qualified to offer it, because Śaṅkha says:

Even the impure should do the first śrāddha on the eleventh day.
The performer is pure while doing it and becomes impure again.

Others say that one offers śrāddha at the end of the period of impurity on the basis of the statement in the Viṣṇu Śmṛti:

Now, when impurity is over.

In this case, it is determined by local custom, as at vrṣotsarga. Although a Śūdra is not eligible for vrṣotsarga homa because of its close connection with Vedic mantras, he may perform vrṣotsarga without homa. If he does, he should invite the Brahmins, etc., on the day before or the same day.

The way to do it is common to all varṇas and has been explained elsewhere. But the difference is:

A Brahmin takes hold of the right foot, a Kṣatriya the left, a Vaiṣṇya two feet, and a Śūdra after bowing.

If, in some Vedic school, the invitation also includes the recitation of a mantra, then when the invitation is made by a Śūdra instructed in that branch, the word namah instead should be considered as the mantra. For those, however, in which there is no mantra, but a simple expression of invitation, a Śūdra instructed therein should recite the expression, and also the word namah. So too, when offering water for the feet, seats, etc., a similar use and non-use of the namah mantra should be recognized. After the offering of foot-water, the Brahmin should present his left foot to the Śū-

---

274 The śrāḍḍha ceremony for a one recently deceased individual (preta), not including the ancestors. It is a modification of pārvanarāḍḍha for three generations of pīrs and performed at times varying in the śṛtis, perhaps reflecting regional customs for last rites.
dra for washing according to the text “the left foot to the Śūdra.” The rest is the same.

The main time for the rite of sapindana is at the end of a year, according to a text in the Bhavisya Purana:

A sacrificer without sacred fires should perform sapindana for the dead without sacred fires in a full year, O prince of the Bharatasā.

The ceremony may also take place in twelve days, six months, three fortnights, three months, or in eleven months.

If a year is not possible, according to the essential meaning of the Bhavisya Purana, the best time is the eleventh month, because of its closeness to a year, and because it limits the series of times. If that is not possible, Paiṭhānasi says the ninth month. If that is not possible, half a year, according to the text in Gobhila, “at the end of a full year, or in six months, or three fortnights, or when a day of good fortune such as a birth occurs.” If that not possible, then in three months, according to the text quoted above from the Bhavisya Purana. Then three fortnights. In this case, after the period of impurity is over, in twelve consecutive days make the twelve monthly śrāddha offerings, completing the twelfth on day twelve. Some do sapindana on day thirteen. If this procedure is not possible, make all twelve offerings on the same day, and then do sapindana. As Mārāci says:

If he is unable to repeat śrāddha monthly he may do it either in twelve days or on one day on the twelfth.

This is so as well with regard to a day of good fortune, for as Gobhila says, “a day on which good fortune occurs, is the day.”

Of all these times, Vyāgra says that twelve days is the recommended one:

The lives of mortal men decay and family duties are endless; because of the instability of the body twelve days is preferred.

The Vṛddha Manu says:

Sapindana is on the twelfth day for Brahmans, at the end of the period of impurity for Kṣatriyas, and after three fortnights for Vaishyas.

The twelfth day is the Śūdra’s best time for sapindana. The Viṣṇu Smṛti says so with the word

---

275 Sapindikaraṇa, the ceremony of reception after a year of the deceased into the community of pīṭras who receive pīṭ-das. See Kane IV 520 -25.
276 A vṛddhiśrāddha. See Kane IV: 526-528.
The twelfth day without mantra is recommended for Śūdras. VS 21.20

Because of the text that one becomes pure at the time one performs the rite, it is not inconsistent to perform it in the midst of the period of impurity. Such is the practice in Madhyadeśa.

Easterners, however, say that sapinda is only at the end of the period of impurity because of the statement in the Viṣṇu Śrīmṛti, “Now when impurity is over,” and in consideration of the rule that:

The tenth pinda for a deceased Śūdra is offered at the end of a full month.

Sapinda has the character of both ekoddisa and pārvana śrāddha. In this case, after inviting one Brahmin in the place of the deceased for ekoddisa with a gift of betel and other things, at the same time invite Brahmins for pārvana śrāddha for the grandfather etc., one Brahmin for each or together, first performing the vaiśvadeva. The formula of invitation to be used by a Śūdra goes: “Please take a moment, honorable sirs, and favor us by standing in for our grandfather who is of such-and-such gotra,” and so forth. When the father of a Śūdra is of a twice-born caste, or even when the father is Śūdra, but the latter’s father and grandfather are of twice-born caste, then the names, Sharma, Varma, and Gupta should be used respectively for Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiṣyas. When the father, etc., in a family is of illicit birth, even though the father is impure, the son should be associated with grandfathers, etc., who are born of legitimate marriages, because there is a relation of progenitor and progeny.

Kātyāyana says that ekoddisa should be done this way:

Now ekoddisa—one cup, one argha, one pinda, no invocation, no burnt offerings, no vaiśvadeva offerings. The question of satisfaction is, “Was it alright?” The answer of assent is, “It tasted very good.” Spread the food on the ground for birds.277 The conclusion is, “Come, be delighted,” to which the others reply, “We are delighted.”

Śrāddhasutra, khaṇḍaka 4

Yājñavalkya says:

Ekoddisa is offered without the Viśvadevas, with one argha, one pavitra, no invocation or sacred fire, and the thread over the right shoulder.

Śrāddhasutra, khaṇḍaka 4

Yājñavalkya says:

Ekoddisa is offered without the Viśvadevas, with one argha, one pavitra, no invocation or sacred fire, and the thread over the right shoulder.

Y 1.256

277 This is my loose conjecture for pakṣasthāna. But a pakśa is not a bird—that would require pakṣi. The text may need emendation.
In the *Matsya Purāṇa*:

Say “It tasted good” at the scattering of food and at the send-off, “Be delighted.”

Meaning he is only to say “It tasted good” in the place of scattering *pindas* and should not scatter *pindas*.

As for what is said in the *Āśvalāyana Grhyā Paripṛṣṭa*, beginning with “as to ekoddiṣṭha śrāddha however”:

He should scatter the remains of food on the ground, a watery remnant, for those among the previously deceased (anupretesa) without progeny and without life. And without mentioning by name the deceased, one *pavitra*, one *pinda* is used at all times, but no offerings in a sacred fire, no *svadhā*, and no “abhiramayatām” (“Be delighted”).

Saying “May it be well,” he should spread the food once avoiding the sacred syllable. For the *pinda* of ekoddiṣṭa the prefix “anu” is not used. Nor should he use the word “pitr.” The one who does so becomes a parricide.

“A watery remnant” means the particles of food and water wiped from the hand with *darbha* grass. The prefix “anu” in the word *anupretesa* has the sense of anteriority. He should spread the food for those among the previously deceased without progeny. The phrase “without life” implies the *saṁskāras*, and therefore means those who have died without the *saṁskāras*. And the *mantra* proves it:

To those deceased without the sacraments, I will give this scattering of rice, and to women who have deserted their family, the paternal offering.

“Without mentioning” means that the deceased are not mentioned by name, but addressed as *preta*. Wherever in ekoddiṣṭa for one or in *pārvana śrāddha* food offerings are spread, scatterings of food remnants should be offered everywhere for the previously deceased. They interpret it this way: For the eleven days which precede *sapiṇḍana*, instead of spreading foods offerings, the word “svāhā” is exclaimed and “svadhā” is prohibited, and there is no “abhiramayatām.” By the word “anu” is intended the mantra “ye ca tvām atra anu,” which is not used. “The word pitṛs” means that the *pitṛs* are divine and their names have the form of Vasu, Rudra, Āditya, and so forth, and are not to be uttered. The other requirements of śrāddha are common to all and well known everywhere, so I will not describe them here.

This raises the question how does a Śūdra have any connection with *gotras* and *pravaras*, of
Accordingly, in the Matsya Purāṇa Manu asks:

Recount in detail the names and gotras of the Rṣis, their lines of descent and the similarities and differences of their pravaras.

To this request Matsya replied:

Bṛgu took to wife the divine daughter of Loman, and she bore twelve divine sacrificers:

- Manava, Bhānava, Sujanya, Sujana,
- Kratu, Śuci, Mūrdhan, Janya, Vasava,
- Prabhava, Avyaya, and Dakṣa the twelfth.

These are regarded as the twelve Bṛглас.

The son of Pulastī begat the youngest of the divine ones, the blessed and blind Cyavana.

In this passage the promotion of gotra is entirely attributed to dvijas alone. For this reason the authors of the Kalpa Sūtras mention gotras for the twice-born only. Although ancestral Rṣis are not directly mentioned for Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas, they obtain them by extension. As Āśvalāyana says:

He chooses priests who are in the sacrificer’s line of venerable forbears, for Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas.

Since venerable forebears are attributed to them when setting a sacrificial fire and so forth, the family name is also attributed to them by extension: venerable forebears imply a gotra as in the phrase “for such-and-such gotras, such and such illustrious forbears.” The Śūdra, however, having no contact with yajña, does not obtain them even by extension. That the Śūdra has no connection with sacrifice is shown in the Kūrma Purāṇa:

The Lord created Brahmins from his mouth, Kṣatriyas from his arms, The Grandfather created Vaiśyas from his thighs and Śūdras from his feet. Brahmā created them to perform sacrifice, excepting the Śūdra.

On this question some say that a gotra is the name one adopts by extending the name of some famous person born in a good family. Commonly Śūdras born to legitimately married Śūdra women and dvijāti father use the gotra name for seven generations, until the end of pīṇḍa offerings, and even in succeeding generations continue to use that gotra name. In line with this opinion is

---

278 Pravaras are the three (sometimes two or five) illustrious ancestors, especially the seven rṣis, from whom the 42 gotras descend and after whom they are eponymously named. They function exogamously, since marriage is avoided between those with the same gotra and pravaras. See Kane IV: 483-500 for details.
Baudhāyana when he remarks:

For the fathers of all four varṇas according to the gotra of the father…

But others say that his gotra is the gotra of the Brahmin who instructs him. For this reason experts on this define Śūdra thus:

Those who have no relation to gotra and venerable ancestors either by specific designation or inferential extension are considered Śūdras among the varṇas.

Hemādri, however, says: “Since Śūdras have no gotra the phrase ‘according to gotra, pīṇḍa-dāna’ must refer to a Śūdra born to a dvijāti. Or, on the basis of the scriptural text ‘therefore they say that all the offspring are Kāśyapas,’ all Śūdras must be of the gotra of Kāśyapa.”

Similarly, Vyāgrapad says:

If gotra is lost, then it is Kāśyapa.

---

**A Discussion of Śrāddha**

“Devoted to his wife, pure, supporting his family, diligently performing śrāddha.”

Yājñavalkya shows by this text that a Śūdra is eligible for śrāddha in general. In the Matsya Purāṇa it also says with regard to śrāddha:

The Śūdra should do it by this rule without Vedic mantras.

Thus, even a wise Śūdra should always perform general and vṛddhi śrāddha with the namaskāra mantra and with raw food.

“General” means applicable to all. Since distinctions of caste are not mentioned, the rite should be performed by those without fires, students, the afflicted, widows, and Śūdras. Obligatory, occasional, or optional observances should be performed on days of the new moon, yugādi, manvādi, eclipses, and vyatīpāta—all this is included. “With raw food” means with uncooked only.

Uśanas says this:

A twice-born should do śrāddha with uncooked offerings in adversity, in the absence of a fire, at a tīrtha, and during a lunar or solar eclipse. A Śūdra always should.

As for the view expressed in the Varāha Purāṇa that the sat-Śūdra is permitted śrāddha with
cooked offerings:

Men in the three castes should make cooked food offerings, and Śūdras, who are devoted to service, O fair one.

On the thirteenth day, Brahmins should be served cooked meals.

Śūdras should follow a rule of this kind without Vedic mantras. The mantraless Śūdra takes a Brahmin with the mantra.

Some commentators say that this is concerned with another yuga because of its absolute detestability.

In the Matsya Purāṇa:

When properly offering ordinary śrāddha with uncooked grain, perform agnaukarana with it and offer piṇḍas with it as well (eva).

This when/then conditional phrase refers to the twice-born, since Śūdras are always enjoined to do śrāddha with uncooked grain. Or it may refer to another yuga, since piṇḍas of things such as rice pudding and barley meal are also enjoined. The word eva means “as well.”

Agnaukarana is for Śūdras too, as we see from verses in the Bhavisya Purāṇa quoted by Hemādri:

If a Śūdra is a seeker and knower of dharma, the agnaukarana mantra and namaskāra are prescribed. Here is how a Śūdra should perform invocation—He should offer the piṇḍas and so forth to the gods with their divine names and to the pīrs with their names and gotras.

It should be done in water, and so on, according to the Matsya Purāṇa:

Although generally in this text the Śūdra is said to be entitled to śrāddha, nonetheless, he is not entitled to those rites that cannot be performed without sacred fires, such as the monthly śrāddha.

---

280 In the Grhyasūtras, agnaukarana is the casting of offerings (āhūtis) of the food prepared for the śrāddha dinner and clarified butter into the fire after the Brahmins have been invited. See Kane (IV 438, 478.
281 Emending satkva to saktu “barley meal.”
282 piṇḍānvaṁkāryaka. This is the monthly śrāddha for ancestors offered on the day of the new moon. Cf. Manu 3.123.
The bringing of clay, shaping the image, its consecration, bathing, for the sake of pūjā, nama-skāra, at the final prayer of dismissal-farewell.

*Om. Adoration to Hara. I bring clay.*

*Om. Adoration to Mahēśvara. I mold it into an image.*

*Om. Adoration to Śvayambhū. I consecrate the image.*

*Om. Adoration to Śūlapāṇi. I invoke you.*

*Om. Adoration to Pīnākidhṛk. I bathe you.*

*Om. Adoration to Mahādeva. I offer pūjā.*

*Om. Adoration to Paśupati. Namaskāra.*

*Om. Adoration to Mahādeva. Grant us farewell.*

*Om. Adoration to Śiva in the form of earth.*

*Om. Adoration to Bhava in the form of water.*

*Om. Adoration to Rudra in the form of fire.*

*Om. Adoration to Ugra in the form of air.*

*Om. Adoration to Bhīma in the form of space.*

*Om. Adoration to Paśupati in the form of the sacrificer.*

*Om. Adoration to Mahādeva in the form of the moon.*

*Om. Adoration to Iśāna in the form of the sun.*

*Om. Adoration to Dakśināmūrti in the form of Śrī Guru.*

The images should be dismissed in the water at a tīrtha.

Do not perform *tarpana* with sesame seed on a Sunday, Tuesday, or Friday falling in the constellation *Maghā*, on the seventh day of *Anaṅga*, in one’s house, at night, on birthdays and felicitous occasions, or at dawn and twilight. Perform it only with water.

One should not incur pollution on the occasion of a marriage, vow, tonsure, and good fortune, on the thirteen, first, sixth, and eleventh lunar days, and on a death, *Mahālaya śrāddha*, pilgrimage to Gayā, an auspicious day, and on arriving at a tīrtha.

On an occasion of prosperity face east, with the sacred thread over the left shoulder, with *darbha* grass cut even, with barley instead of sesame; *piṇḍas* are optional; pray without *pīṭmantras* with an even number of Brahmins present, not saying *svadhā*, but *svāhā*.

With jujube berries, curd, and unbroken rice chant “in perfect joy they enter the divine tīrtha and may they be comforted forever.”

This is said merely as a pointer. The rest is all explained at length in the *Govindārṇava*. Therefore I stop here.

The great Pilājī, most honorable of men, the one ocean of virtue, treasure of good fortune, born from Śrī Keśavādāsa, it is on his account alone that this inquiry was made into the rites for the fathers in the *Gemstone of Good Śūdra Conduct*, composed by the learned and accomplished Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa.\(^{283}\)

King Pilājī, at every moment in a moment clear-sightedely discerning the good and non-good, liberal patron of Brahmins, alert protector of his people, lighting up the face of the south with a blaze of unequalled valor,

---

\(^{283}\) This stanza in *sārdūlavikṛṣṭa* meter concludes the last chapter as it does the first section (32) and chapters 1 (78) and 2 (189) of the second section.
defeating his enemies over the land, he is victorious.
Receiving life from the lotus feet of Hari,
bestowing munificence upon the twice-born,
child of the heavenly Ganges in his earlier life, son of Keśava,
he commissioned with the greatest care the composition
of this short but complete treatise, entrusting the task to Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa.²⁸⁴

And so is concluded the Gemstone of Śūdra Conduct, composed by Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa at the urging of Śrī Pilāji, great devotee of Viṣṇu, jewel of his family and varṇa, sprung from the lotus feet of Śrī Hari and the Yādavas.

²⁸⁴ With these two stanzas the first in prthivī meter (17 syllables x 4), and the second in mālinī (15 syllables x 4), Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa concludes the book.
Śūdradharma: The Brahmanization of the Śūdra

A Short History of Śūdras

D.D. Kosambi and R.S. Sharma are of the view that the Śūdra originated as the laboring class when Āryan society shifted from pastoralism to agriculture during the late Vedic period (1000-500 BC). For Kosambi, Śūdras were the helots of India. Enslavement through war played a role, but both regard the view common in colonial literature that the Śūdra varṇa was made up of indigenous, pre-Ārya, racially (e.g., krṣṇa anāsa dasyu) and ethnically alien peoples conquered by the Āryans as one-sided and partial.

To be sure, an Ārya conquest has itself become a sensitive subject in recent scholarship. Sharma, like Asko Parpola and others, thinks both Ārya and non-Ārya peoples were subjugated as the fourth varṇa through a process mainly of internal domination and exploitation. There is no evidence that they spoke anything but Ārya languages in the early Vedic period and much that they did in late Vedic times (e.g., Vedic Sanskrit formulas addressed to them, etc.) The emergence of the Śūdra varṇa is a later development: there was no such class of laborers in Ṛg Vedic society. There are no Śūdras in the Ṛg Veda. Vedic society was tribal and relatively egalitarian, without sharp class divisions.

The Vedic people at first had only two varṇas: their own, which they called the Āryas, and Dāsas (or Dasyus). The Dāsas may have been another Vedic people who had migrated earlier into the northwest, or some other branch of Indo-Iranians who spoke a non-Sanskritic language or had a different religion. “Śūdra” was also very likely the name of another such Indo-Aryan tribe. After the Dāsas and Śūdras were subjugated by Vedic-Sanskrit-speaking

---

peoples, “Dāsa” came to mean slave or serf and, when the cāturvārya classification came into use in post-Vedic times, Śūdra was used to designate a large number of peoples forced into subject status.² Other marginal groups outside of mainstream Ārya society—wandering bands of warrior ascetics—the Vṛāyas—and tribal peoples like the Niṣādas with their own religious practices were put into this class. “Dāsa” eventually comes to mean Śūdra, and both to mean servants and laborers, and generally those of low social status.³

This set the pattern thereafter for the induction of peoples into caste. Tribal and indigenous peoples of diverse ethnic, racial, and cultural character, but also later occupations, guilds, and religious sects were absorbed into caste as Śūdras. The many groups assimilated as Śūdras were marked by their segregation from Vedic ritual and often had their own rituals and gods. The central dynamic setting caste formation into motion was the transition from jāna to jāti converting tribes, hunter-gatherers, shifting cultivators, pastoralists, and forest dwellers into castes segmented by inherited livelihood, endogamy, common customs, religion and sect. Segmentation and stratification slots multifarious peoples into the social scale, mostly at the bottom as Śūdras and antyaja sub-castes, but the ruling and martial elements as Kṣatriyas. To function smoothly, such a system needs a convincing explanation. Dharmaśāstra was that explanation. For Romila Thapar, jāti precedes varṇa.⁴ Varṇa is an ex post facto justification. One of the main, if not the main, functions of Dharmashastric varṇa was the production and control of labor power.

The “Puruṣasūkta” (RV X.90),” thought to be a late interpolation in the tenth book of the Rg Veda, reflects the late Vedic period (ca. 800 CE) when tribal pastoral society was breaking down into classes and new populations where incorporated. The “hymn of man” with its derivation of the four varṇas from the cosmic body of Puruṣa—Brāhmaṇas from the mouth, Kṣatriyas from the arms, Vaiśyas from the thighs, and Śūdras from the feet—is the earliest theory of the origin of the four varṇas. Through replication in later Vedic texts, Purāṇas, epics, and Dharmaśāstras, it became the locus classicus on the topic. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa duly begins his account of the origin of the Śūdras with it.

The strained etymology of Śūdra from “śuc” in the Brahma Sūtra was a rationalization of the fourth varna’s increasing exploitation and immiseration in post-Vedic times. Ideas of untouchability and the Śūdra’s impurity were now introduced. Kosambi believed that the effect of these was to sanction a class structure in clan and tribal socie-

---

² Kosambi 51.
⁴ Early India, 62-67, 122-25, 422.
ties. The Śūdras’ deprivation was also now justified by the theory of *karma* in addition to divine creation, as in these verses in the *Śāntiparvan*:

> Sarasvatī, consisting of the Veda, was formerly designed by Brahma for all four *varṇas*; but the Śūdra, having through cupidity fallen into ignorance, a condition of darkness, lost the right to the Veda.
> ŠP 181.15

On this view, Śūdras had once enjoyed a right to the Vedas but had lost it through their immorality and ignorance.

The following is a rough periodization of Śūdra disqualification. For Vedic times, there is some evidence of more equal participation in ritual, as discussed below. Even women may have enjoyed greater freedom and status and received forms of *upanayana* in Vedic times. In late Vedic times with declension into increasing inequality, Śūdras lost their earlier community and tribal rights. Once dignified *viś* occupations—smithing, carpentry, and tanning—were downgraded to the work of Śūdras. The line between *dvijas* and Śūdras sharpened. Vaiśyas and Śūdras, as the classes producing the surplus and paying taxes, feature more prominently in the *Brāhmaṇas* with the rise of prosperous kingdoms.

In the Dharmasūtra period (600-300 BC), we see the imposition of more severe exclusions and punishments and the piling on of disqualifications and purity rules relating to food, contact, and marriage. The *sūtrakāras* reflected and ideologically enforced the increasing subjection of Śūdras as exploited labor in the period of Mauryan state formation and forced labor. They now declare that the chief duty of Śūdras is service to the twice-born. Buddhism and Jainism, for all their critiques of Vedic Brahmanism, work effectually to stabilize the emerging caste order. The Buddhists critiqued Brahmanical *varṇa* distinctions while accepting the class inequalities between Kṣatriyas, *gahapatis* (landed householder), *sethis* (merchants), members of *śrenis* (craft guilds) and the laboring castes. The ideas of *karma* and rebirth developed by the *śramama* movements become a doctrinal plank of the Brahmanical social order, justifying inequality, most notably in the *Bhagavad-Gīta*.

Free peasant production by landowners employing landless Śūdras and *antyajas* as labor was established as the primary mode of agriculture in post-Mauryan times. The Greek ambassador to Chandragupta’s court (ca. 300 BCE), Megasthenes, corroborates the role of free peasantry. He observed seven social classes (*genea*) but no slavery as in Greek lands. Kosambi takes his class of *georgoi* (independent farmers, landowners) to be Śūdras, but they were probably Vaiśyas in Brahmanical terms, or the *gahapatis* in Buddhist texts. Vaiśyas were only supplanted by Śūdras

---

5 It was now in Sharma’s view that Śūdras were excluded from *upanayana* and, consequently, Vedic education. *Śūdras in Ancient India*, 75.
in agriculture in Gupta times. The main bulk of the Śūdras were still employed as field hands, but many were artisans and performing artists (dancers, musicians, actors, etc.). Some wealthy Śūdra artisans, no doubt, became gahapatis.

Disqualification reaches its peak in the following period (200-300 CE) in the law-book of Manu, notorious as the epitome of Brahmanical prejudice. Its reactionary tone reflects the crisis of varṇa in an age of political and social turmoil as distinctions between Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras broke down under the impact of invasion and rule by foreigners—Greeks, Huns, and Kushans—whom orthodox Brahmins regarded as Śūdras. Manu confirms the injunctions in Āpastamba, Baudhāyana, and Gautama restricting Vedic study to the twice-born. The function of the state is to enforce Śūdra servitude. This demand becomes explicit in the Dharmasūtras with their insistence that the chief duty of the fourth varṇa is to serve the three higher. Brahmins applied the disparaging term “Śūdra” to kings of non-Kṣatriya origin or non-Vedic practice such as the Nandas and Mauryas. While Buddhist texts called the Mauryas Kṣatriyas, using Brahmanism’s language, Brahmin texts called them Vaiśyas or Śūdras.

Sharma describes a marked betterment in the lives of Śūdras in the Gupta period. Wages for hired laborers and craftsmen rose, and hired laborers became peasants and tenant-cultivators. Guilds of Śūdra artisans throve. Śūdras paid taxes and their wage rates and conditions of work were regulated. Slavery diminished. While most Śūdras continue to be agricultural laborers in the country and wage earners, servants, and menial laborers in town serving upper castes, the social standing of some Śūdras improves appreciably as they take up occupations in arts, crafts, manufacture, trade, and intermarry with Vaiśyas in commerce and trade. Demographically, their numbers begin growing as tribal peoples are absorbed into the caste system as peasants and laborers. 7

The law gave them some measure of protection from violence and security of property. The nibandhas show that legal discrimination, certainly of the severely punitive kind, virtually disappeared by the 12th century. Arvind Sharma cites three nibandhas as evidencing this effective doing away with real discrimination on the basis of caste: the Smṛticandrikā of Devaṇa Bhaṭṭa (ca. 1200 CE), which Krṣṇa Śeṣa quotes from twice, the Mandanaratna of
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7 The śūdravarga of the Amarakośa, a dictionary of commonly used Sanskrit words, gives us a vivid snapshot of working class life in the Gupta age. Amara shows Śūdras engaged in a great variety of livelihoods as craftsmen, artisans, and performing artists in the classical categories of occupations and jātis found in Manu. The jātis are engendered by miscegenation by the standard varṇasampradāya combinatory and are, essentially, as they will remain up to Krṣṇa Śeṣa, by which time they are entirely outmoded as descriptions. The occupations are ranked from tradesmen and craft guilds down to performing artists, trappers, hunters and butchers, and below them, unskilled laborers (antyajas). Craftsman employed by the village are distinguished from independent workers. D. D. Kosambi, “The Working Class in the Amarakośa,” in Combined Methods in Indology and Other Writings, 283-294.
Madanasiṃha (1425 CE), and the Sarasvatīvilāsa of Pratāparudra (1496-1539 CE).\(^8\) Certainly, by Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s day, the savage penalties in Gautama are a dead letter, if, indeed, they ever had any force beyond the symbolic.\(^9\)

The improvements in the social position of Śūdras in the Gupta period, riding on the wave of popular Vaiṣṇavism, led to a mitigation of the disqualifications of Śūdras. When some Śūdras became prosperous peasants, artisans, and tradesmen rather than slaves, servants, and agricultural laborers, the degraded status laid down for them in the Dharmasūtras (500-200 BCE) became too incongruous. This state of affairs was remedied by the emendation of their religious rights. Vaiṣṇavism was the vehicle for this reformation, bringing Śūdras within the community of worship; although, practically speaking, Vaiṣṇava devotional salvationism, as both challenge to and tool of orthodoxy in the competitive space between Buddhism and Brahmanism, threatened the caste order no more than Buddhism and Jainism had, or Bhakti would.

These improvements in the social and religious position of Śūdras were registered in the smṛti sections of the Śānti and Anuśāsana parvans and in the chapters on the duties of the varṇas in the Purāṇas written in this period—the Viṣṇu, Mārkaṇḍeya, Bhaviṣya, Bhāgavata, and Padma. The Mahābhārata and Purāṇas promote the spiritual equality of the varṇas: all people go to heaven by devotion to the Lord and compassion for all beings, but white out social inequality. The smṛtis of Yājñavalkya (100-300 CE), Viṣṇu (100-300 CE), Nārada (100-400), Brhaspati (300-500 CE) and Kātyāyana (400-600 CE), exhibit a more moderate attitude allowing some sacrifices and sacraments to Śūdras and are favorite authorities for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa.\(^10\) Śūdras were conceded the right of hearing the Itihāsas, epics, and Purāṇas and, Sharma believes, sometimes even the Vedas.\(^11\) For all its traditionalism and absolutism, Dharma-śāstra, nevertheless, managed to resiliently absorb and domesticate the challenges to caste expressed in Vaiṣṇavism, as it had those of Buddhism, and will those of Bhakti.

During the early medieval period (600-1200 CE), trade contracts, cities decline, and village India comes into its own, giving its distinctive stamp to caste. The classical caste system takes form and works deeply into the fabric of Indian life. Śūdra jātis proliferate and differentiate more sharply into sat and asat.\(^12\) Medieval commentators grant

---

\(^8\) A. Sharma, *Modern Hindu Thought*, 151.

\(^9\) G. XII.4. “If a Śūdra intentionally listens to memorize the Veda, then his ears should be cut off; if he utters the Veda, then his tongue may be cut off; if he has mastered the Veda, his body should be hacked apart.”

\(^10\) For instance, the Brhaspati Smrti allowed the sacraments of karṇavedha, dāna, and cīḍākaraṇa, restricted by Manu to the twice-born. Brh., sanśkāra, verse 101, 154a; Manu II.35.

\(^11\) ŚP XII.328.49 declares that all four varṇas should hear the Vedas: śrāvye ca caturṣ vaṇāṁ. Quoted in Sharma, Ṣūdras, 293.

\(^12\) The sat/asaṭ distinction is found in earlier smṛtis (Atri, Laghuviṣṇu, and Yājñavalkya, but becomes pronounced in the medieval period. Ghurye (1961), 90.
sāṁskāras to the sat.\textsuperscript{13} Vaiśyas and Śūdras had assimilated socially, as Al-Biruni observed when he traveled to India in the eleventh century; Śūdras replaced Vaiśyas in agriculture and Vaiśya artisans and merchants are confined to certain locales or reduced to the level of Śūdras. In the north the Brāhmaṇa, Rajput, and Śūdra, and in the south, the Brāhmaṇa, sat-Śūdra and asat-Śūdra become the three main social strata.\textsuperscript{14} Beneath them, the landless poor are converted into untouchables and the number of impure Śūdras and untouchable sub-castes (doing the most unclean jobs as menial laborers, scavengers, keepers of cremation grounds, and filth collectors) rises steeply.\textsuperscript{15} Nevertheless, there was resistance to encroaching caste, as we see, for instance in the rebellion of the Kaivartas.\textsuperscript{16}

The Kaivartas were tenant farmers in north Bengal, listed as an outcaste community fishermen and boatmen in the Manusmṛti, who revolted against the Pālas in the eleventh century and won recognition as a “clean” caste.\textsuperscript{17} Similarly, the pastoral Jats of Sind fought Mahmud of Ghazni (998-1030 CE) and won Śūdra status in a prequel to the Sikhs.\textsuperscript{18} Such vertical shifts in caste were always occurring, driven in these two instances by peasant uprisings, even in the depressed era of the early medieval and were only accentuated in periods of dynamic change and expansion like the Mughal.

Kosambi and Sharma are the best known exponents of the view that an Indian form of feudalism developed in the early medieval period between the North Indian empire of Harṣa (d. 648) and the founding of the Delhi Sultanate (1206). Others question the applicability of the term “feudal” to the unique social complex of regional monarchies, sāmanta (princely tributaries), brahmadeyas (land grants) to pioneering Brahmins, and self-sufficient villages in India at this time.\textsuperscript{19} Although subjected to serious critique, the feudal model is still adhered to in a modified form by some Indian historians who want to emphasize the congruencies with western political forms—caste does not make India a special case.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{13} Ghurye (1961), 90-92
\textsuperscript{14} Jaiswal, Caste, 73.
\textsuperscript{15} The depressed status of Śūdras in Gujarat can seen in the Lekhapaddati, a collection of fifty model letters and a mine of information about civic life. It mentions Śūdras only once in Letter IV, a royal charter of land to a rānaka (a local feudatory), dated to 744-745 CE that lumps them in with rogues, thieves, and other calamities to be guarded against. Pushpa Prasad, Lekhapaddhati: Documents of State and Everyday Life from Ancient and Early Medieval Gujarat, 9th to 15th Centuries (Oxford University Press, 2007), 64-65.
\textsuperscript{16} R.S. Sharma, Indian Feudalism, AD 300-1000, 220, 228
\textsuperscript{17} S.D. Banerji, The Pālas of Bengal, reprint (Varanasi, 1973), 44-51.
\textsuperscript{18} Irfān Habib, “Jats of Punjab and Sind,” Essays in Honour of Dr. Ganda Singh, ed. H. Singh and N.G. Barrier (Patiala, 1976), 94-95; and, Medieval India: The Study of a Civilization (New Delhi, 2008), 9
\textsuperscript{19} See, for instance, “Harbans Mukha, “Was There Feudalism in Indian History?” in The State in India 1000-1700, ed. by Hermann Kulke (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995), 86-133.
\textsuperscript{20} Still determinedly defended by Sharma himself in “How Feudal was Indian Feudalism?” also in The State in India, 48-85.
There are several other competing models of medieval state formation: the Asiatic mode of production, the unified imperial state, the segmentary of Burton Stein, the processural-integrative model of Hermann Kulke and the Weberian patrimonial-bureaucratic. There is much debate about their relative merits for different formations as they vary over region and period, which I can only skim lightly over here. The indefinable and complex development of Indian states makes it difficult to generalize or specify the place of Śūdras in them.

The Asiatic mode is now mostly regarded as an Orientalist projection along with Asiatic despotism. The Delhi Sultanate, Vijayanagara, and the Mughal states display features of both the military-feudal and patrimonial-bureaucratic models. Kulke’s three-phase model seems best to describe the post-Gupta, agrarian Hindu kingdoms with their expansive, organic growth from small chiefdoms into kingdoms and empires, rather than the decentralizing, fragmenting feudal model. It flexibly includes elements of the other models. And Brahmins perform an essential enculturating and integrative role in the hinduization and śūdrafication of the peasant.

Burton Stein’s segmentary model of nuclear areas and concentric zones (core to periphery) naturally best fits the Tamil country on which it was based. In this model, the state arises from the network of communities: the brahmadyeya, “Brahmin-controlled circles of villages,” and the nādu or “sat-Śūdra controlled extended localities.”

In many regions “Śūdras” became the socially dominant castes, e.g., the agro-warrior Vellalas in Tamil Nadu, the Reḍḍys in Andra Pradesh, the Jats in Uttar Pradesh and Punjab, the Patels in Gujarat, the Nayars of Malabar, and the Marathas in Mahārāṣṭra. In Bengal and Orissa, Brahmins and Śūdras were the castes that mattered. Kāyastha scribes and bureaucrats in Bengal saw themselves as equal or second best to Brahmins. These groups may have counted as Śūdras in the caste hierarchy and been described as such by Brahmins, but they exercised the social and

---

21 For a useful survey of these models, see Hermann Kulke, “Introduction: The Study of the State in Pre-Modern India,” in *The State in India*, 1-47.


24 Sharma believes that the milder views of Baudhāyanas and Apastambins on Śūdras may reflect their own southern origins or associations, *Śūdras in Ancient India*, 145.

25 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa does not address the subject of Kāyasthas in any detail, but simply quotes the *Jātiviveka*, which rates them as the lowest of Śūdra mixed castes with the five *samśkāras* of Śrīvaśnava *dikṣā*: tāpa, punḍra, nama, mantra, and yāga. The son that a Māhiṣya woman bears to a Vaidēha man is called a Kāyastha. A Kāyastha should practice the occupations of writing the scripts of regional dialects, accounting, and calculation with algebra and arithmetic. He is the lowest of Śūdra *jātis* and has the five rites of tāpa, punḍra, nama, mantra, and yāga. Service to the four *varnas*, clerical work, business, and craft are stipulated as his livelihoods. Kāyasthas and others of that class must not wear a *śikhā*, receive Vedic initiation, wear garments of saffron cloth, or have contact with the images of the gods.
political power of Kṣatriyas, often claiming Kṣatriya origin. Moreover, they had their own internal class divisions as well. The Patels (Patidar, “village chief”), for instance, are today found from the top to the bottom of the social scale of Gujarati society, from landowners and wealthy business men, to professionals, village shopkeepers, and artisans.

Rich, landowning Vellalas and Reḍḍys separated themselves from the unclean Śūdras who worked their fields and served them. The Śūdra castes of the south were also divided horizontally by right-left hand (idangai-velangai) rivalries between peasants and artisans/traders/manufacturers. The Telugu Reḍḍys and Kammas were superior to the menial Śūdra castes of Kummaris, Chikalis, Mangalis, and Salis. The Jats were proudly and militantly Śūdra. Vellalas, Reḍḍys, Khatri traders in Punjab, and Maratha clan leaders contested the Brahmin designation of Śūdra. Exercising the power of Kṣatriyas, they claimed a lost Kṣatriya status.

As some epigraphs show, birth in high-ranking Śūdra castes were not everywhere considered a liability or degrading. Some Śūdra rulers were zealous patrons of the institutions of varṇa-āśrama-dharma and Brahmins, however much these things were warned against in Kaliyuga sections of the Purāṇas. Śūdra rulers, in a remarkable turnabout of the usual denigration and prejudice attached to the Śūdra created from the feet of Puruṣa, instead expressed pride in being born from the feet of Viṣṇu and assumed Brahmanical gotras.

Some enterprising Śūdras were never much impeded by formal disqualifications from performing sacrifices, or even receiving initiation, acquiring education, and gaining political power as kings and ministers to the scandal of Brahmins. Far from being an anomaly, rule by “Śūdra” kings was, in many parts of the subcontinent, the usual state of affairs. Every known royal family from the time of Mahapadma Nanda in the fourth century B.C. belonged to non-Kṣatriya castes. The Mauryas were Śūdra. The Guptas claimed to be Vaiśyas. The Palas were Śūdras. The Marathas claimed to be Rajputs, but their Rajput genealogy was a Brahmin invention. In practice, the distinction between Śūdras, Vaiśyas, and Kṣatriyas was often nominal or irrelevant.

Caste was never uniform over the subcontinent. It takes diverse regional forms. The uniformity is only in the Dharmaśāstras. A big factor, as Thapar stresses, in determining its form was whether landowning or commercial


classes were dominant. Wealth was often far more important than caste ranking in social position. As a rule, there was more social mobility at the top than at the bottom. In actuality, only the poles of Brahmin and untouchable had any broadly recognized uniformity, the intermediary castes were immensely varied. Dharmaśāstra provided the hegemonic language in which to conceive and speak of social identity. What did Punjabi Jats, Maratha chiefs, or Tamil Vellalas care, if Brahmin paṇḍits regarded them as Śūdras?

Phases of growing trade, urbanization, incursions of Western and Central Asian peoples, and the rise of new religious movements periodically created the conditions for Śūdra mobility and threw up challenges to the orthodoxies of Dharmaśāstra. Indeed, the orthodoxies are a reaction to the challenges. Thapar notes the reactionary impact on Brahmanical thinking.

There seems to be a counterpoint between the rigidity of social class within normative texts, and the greater flexibility in the functioning of society. The earlier Dharmsutras were written when urbanization in the Ganges Plain was upsetting the mores of the Vedas, and the ‘heterodox’ sects were questioning brahmanical norms. The Manu Dharmaśastra, perhaps the most conservative of these texts, dates to the period of the rule of the ‘degenerate kṣatriyas’ with the opening up of the subcontinent to trade and new ideas. The post-Gupta period saw the rapid emergence of new jatis, cults and states, challenging set ideas, which again produced a crop of normative texts and commentaries.

Periods of urbanization and expanding trade and commerce improved the conditions of Śūdras’ lives, destabilized caste structures, and opened opportunities for vertical mobility. With increased employment and wealth, artisans from Śūdra castes could aim at moving up socially. This was true of the Mauryan, Kushan, and Gupta periods. By the Sultanate and Mughal times, India was undergoing a new cycle of urbanization and globalizing trade and high Śūdra castes were again flourishing.

The Title of the SAS and Sat-Śūdras

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa proudly called his work a śiromaṇi, a “crown-jewel”, a “jewel worn on the head,” and metaphorically the topmost of anything. It is a title conferred on eminent paṇḍits like Raghunātha Śiromaṇi and the chief work in a field, e.g., the Siddhānta Śiromaṇi, an astronomical work by Bhāskara. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was claiming, therefore that his text on Śūdras was the best of its kind. Such grand titles were a literary convention and advertisement. It indicates that he wrote it as a concise, lapidary, and self-contained text, a brilliant little gem of a work, concentrated on the one subject of śūdradharma, and an independent work, not merely a section of the Govindārṇava. The śiromaṇi title is rare among Dharmaśāstras and is more often encountered in other śāstras, e.g., Jyotiṣa or Nyāya. The SAS is the

---

30 Early India, xxvii.
31 Thapar, Early India, 261.
only śirōmaṇi text on Śūdras of which we know. There are a few other texts with similarly bejeweled titles in the cintāmaṇi and kaustubha genres, the Śūdrācāracintāmaṇi of Vācaspatimiśra (fl. 1450-1480) and the Smṛtikaustubha of Anantadeva (c. 1675). Paddhati, prayoga, and tattva titles are more common.

While the editors entitled the work the Śūdrācāraśiromāṇi, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s own preferred title appears to have been SatŚūdrācāraśiromāṇi, “The Gemstone of Good Śūdra Conduct.”32 The difference is small, but significant, for the distinction between sat- and asat-Śūdras plays a key role in his arguments for when and to what degree certain ritual rights can be extended to Śūdras. In a dharma-based social order, ritual privileges are social privileges as well as the markers of status.

To recap, in the south and east, the social system consisted of three strata: Brāhmaṇas, sat-Śūdras and asat-Śūdras.33 In the north, too, a class divide between sat- and asat-Śūdras became more marked. This divide goes back to Gupta times, but intensified in the medieval centuries as Śūdra castes proliferated and stratified.34 Śūdras were no longer simply servants and laborers as they were in the Dharmaśūtras. Upwardly mobile Śūdras pursuing independent and respectable livelihoods as tradesmen, artisans, or professionals of various kinds rose above the great masses of hired laborers, menials, servants, agricultural hands, and the poor making a living in low and demeaned ways. Urbanized Śūdras attached to courts and temples, businessmen, religious leaders, land-owing peasants, artisans, and traders became pure or sat–Śūdras. Poor Śūdras in the position of servile labor became asat or impure Śūdras.35

---

32 Judging from the fact that he repeats it three times (on page 32 at the end of the first section, on 78, and on 221 at the end) to one time for the shorter title.
33 Suvira Jaiswal, Caste, 73.
34 Sharma, Śūdras in Ancient India, 299, 319, 323; R.S. Sharma, Social Life in Northern India in reference to Bihar cir. A.D. 1000-1300 (Patna, 2001); G.S. Ghurye, Caste and Race in India, 5th ed. (Bombay: 1969), 91, 102. With de-urbanization and feudalization, the medieval village became the self-subsistent center of Indian life. Śūdra and untouchable castes found their place in its division of labor. The medieval period saw a great expansion of untouchable strata with the influx of Ādīvāśis as agricultural laborers into the village economy. The ideology of purity and pollution spread as the regulator of caste relations. In ancient India, sub-Śūdra antyajas like the Caṇḍālas had been a small percentage of the population. See Gen’ichi Yamazaki, “Social Discrimination in Ancient India and its Transition to the Medieval Period,” in Caste System, Untouchability and the Depressed, Japanese Studies on South Asia No. 1, ed. by H. Kotani (New Delhi: Manohar Publishers, 1997), 10-17.
35 We see the sat/asat division emerging in late Purāṇas. For instance, the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa (Brahma khaṇḍa 10. 16-137) contains a long passage on varnasāṅkara in which eight castes are distinguished as sat-Śūdras: the gopa (cowherd, farmer, writer), kābera, nāpita (barber), bhilla (tribal), modaka (confectioner), sāmbālin (betel dealer), vanik (merchant), and svarnaṅkara (goldsmith). The karaṇa (scribe),ambaṣṭha (physician, pharmacist), and vaidya (versed in mantra and aṣṭādhi, i.e., village ritual and folk medicine) are described as of Brahmīn-Śūdra birth. These castes are not straightforwardly classified as sat by craft in the SAS, where good conduct is the determining factor.

The Brahmavaivarta was composed in its present form in the fifteenth or sixteenth century, probably in Bengal. It mentions a large number of mixed castes not attested in other accounts of varnasāṅkara that seem to reflect contemporary Bengali society. There is also a most interesting alternative creation myth for Śūdra craft castes (19-90) that honors some Śūdra castes and shows Brāhmaṇ hostility to others, intimating perhaps Brāhmaṇ-Śūdra social competition. The “divine craftsman” (surakāra), Viśvakarman, born as a Brāhmaṇ craftsman, planted the seed of knowledge in the Śūdrī/apsaras Gṛṛta and begat nine types of śilpakārī. Six are described as śilpināma varāḥ, the very best of all craftsman: the coppersmith, blacksmith, potter, weaver, gardener, and shell-worker. Three are cursed as pattiya and ayāya, i.e., fallen and without sacrifices: the painter, carpenter, and curiously, the goldsmith again. The eminent sāstrīs of the Bengal School—Bhavadeva, Aniruddha, Ballālasena, Halāyudha, and...
The distinction, therefore, reflects a class divide that was further complicated by the conflation of Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra castes in Sultanate and Mughal times. The social distinction between Vaiśya and Śūdra had largely disappeared and, in Kṛṣṇa Śeṣā’s day, even the existence of the Kṣatriya varṇa was in doubt in some shastric circles, reflecting the very real decline of Kṣatriya power under Muslim rule. In 16th century Bengal, new professional castes—Kāyasthas (civil servants) and Vaidyas (physicians and teachers)—were classed as sat-Śūdras and vied with Brahmans for social position or even claimed to be Brahmans. 36 Faced with such high caste Śūdras, Brahmans found it necessary to make adjustments in the Dharmashastric view. This can be seen already in pre-SAS works, such as the Maithila school Gṛhastharatnākara of Caṇḍēśvara (1310-1360), which relax the strict rules that forbid dealing in impure commodities by Śūdras engaged in trade in default of service, depending on their sat-asat status.37

The artisans of Vijayanagara illustrate the new significance of the sat/asat Śūdra division.38 After the reign of Kṛṣṇadeva Raya (1509-29), the kingdom slid down to defeat by the coalition of Deccani Sultans at Talikot in 1565 and lingered on into the 1600’s, but was representative of what was happening socially throughout the south.39

From the fifteenth century onwards, medieval South Indian society presented a picture of a social order in ferment. Far from accepting the theoretical notion of ‘my station and its duties’ [as endlessly preached in Dharmashastra], the Śūdra artisan castes, who described themselves as Sat-Śūdras, sought to propel themselves into higher echelons of society which commanded ritual superiority. When these artisanal and mercantile groups tried to crowd into the limited space offered by ritual and social privileges, the resultant pulls and pressures were reflected in contemporary medieval society.40

Goldsmiths, silversmiths, money-changers, weavers, cloth-makers, metal-workers, oil-pressers, masons, and carpenters were lifted up economically by the urbanization and burgeoning commerce of the temple towns of the south. Prospering sat-Śūdra artisans rose above tanners, potters, and others stuck in low statuses in the agrarian subsistence economy. Craftsmen and merchants organized into corporations and guilds (samayas) and sought ritual privileges and honors in community religious rites consonant with their social advantages. These were often no more than the right to hold the banners or blow the conch shell in a ceremony, or more consequentially, the right to silently (tūṣṇīṃ

---


37 Gṛhastharatnākara, ed. by M.M. Kamalakrishna Smtmitirtha (Asiatic Society, 1928), 479-80.


40 Ramaswami, 417.
eva iti) perform vaídika rites. Participation in the bhakti movements was an expression of these aspirations for caste exaltation. Sat-Śūdras and many poor Śūdras in large numbers became Vīraśaivas, Liṅgāyats, and Śrī Vaiṣṇavas. Some claimed Brahmanical origins and status and wore the sacred thread. While seeking to overcome ritual disqualification and raise themselves to the level of Brahmans, they enforced their own privileges and ceremonial purity in relation to asat-Śūdras.

A similar dynamic was occurring in the north as well. Irfan Habib discusses the participation of artisans and low castes in the bhakti movements in Northern India. The establishment of the Delhi Sultanate stimulated urbanization and social change with the introduction of new technologies and increased demand for crafts and services. The disparities between economic and ritual status were given expression by the bhakti saints—Kabīr, Dādū, and Guru Nānak, and others. The resulting social tensions and struggles motivated Brāhmin intellectuals to adjust the traditional theoretical framework of the Dharmaśāstras to better suit the power and prestige of artisan castes in the economy of the times.

Asat-Śūdras shade down into the antyajas (subcastes) and asprśyas (untouchables) with whom contact was unclean. In the Brahmanical view, by failing in obedient service to the upper castes and abandoning svadharma, sat-Śūdras would fall among the asat-Śūdras and antyajas. The danger of falling into the untouchability of the subcastes bound Śūdras, despite shastric disqualification, to the upper varṇas in oppressing those below them. In addition, the hope of rising to sat-Śūdras status could be held out to untouchables, if they lifted themselves up by their karmic bootstraps.

The division between sat- and asat-Śūdras co-developed with untouchability and ideas of purity and pollution. As the subcontinent was colonized, forest peoples, hunter-gatherers and other marginal groups at lower levels of culture were drawn into the caste system as the untouchable jātis. Animal-killing and -eating peoples could be looked down upon as unclean, even by respectable sat-Śūdras. According to Irfan Habib, the medieval proletariat was largely created out of these hunter-gatherers sucked into the bottom of the caste system. The formation of Śūdra caste peasancies in the medieval village rested on this division between land-owning peasants and landless laborers. Brahmanical doctrines of varṇasaṅkara and ritual impurity regulated and sanctioned these social arrange-

42 Dutt, Origin and Growth of Caste in India, 148.
44 Irfan Habib, Essays in Indian History: Toward a Marxist Perception; and “The Economic History of India: A Survey” (London: Anthem Press, 2002), 124-126.131, 166, 179, 245.
ments. In post-12th century law digests, the superior status of *sat*-Śūdras was recognized and their ritual privileges confirmed. The SAS epitomizes this development.

Kṛṣṇa Šeṣa’s list of mixed *jātis*, in addition to those originating as hereditary crafts, includes many tribal peoples: Ābhīras, Ugras, Andhras, Ambaṣṭhas, Kārāvaras, Kīnāsas, Caṇḍālas, Dombas, Dhigvanas, Niśādas, Pukkasas, Pulindas, Bandhulas, Bhuṣadas, Bhilla, Medas, Veṇas, and Sairandhras. Such lists of mixed *jātis* were becoming more and more abstract and anachronistic by the sixteenth century, but they were preserved in the amber of Manu and other Dharmaśāstras and respectfully reproduced in the *nibandhas*.

There is much confusion in Sanskrit texts, including the SAS, between Śūdras, untouchables (Dalits), and Ādvāsīs, partly due to the constantly mutating, regionally variable, and polyvalent nature of caste. Ambivalence in the caste status of people designated as *sat*-Śūdras, *asat*-Śūdras, *antyajas*, *Ati*-Śūdras, and *asprāyas* was functional. It moved people into and through the caste system and positioned them within its structures, simultaneously offering material and religious benefits with the possibility of upward mobility while enabling and legitimating exploitation. Kotani provides a study of how this ambivalence worked in the case of untouchable *Ati*-Śūdra castes in the medieval Deccan and was religiously expressed.\(^{45}\)

Here too, the *Ati*-Śūdras were partly composed of pre-Aryan Ādvāsīs (Mahars, Mangs, Chambars) and other indigenous hillmen, who were recruited by the Marathas as mountain troops and fort guards. Other *Ati*-Śūdras were engaged in unclean occupation such as skinners, bamboo workers, and shoemakers. They were associated with the earth and animism. As sons of the soil (*bhūmiputra*), they were seen as special devotees of the local *devī* and associated with her rites such as *śānti*, in which animal sacrifices were offered to her during festivals and in crises such as outbreaks of cholera and smallpox. *Ati*-Śūdras were also enthusiastic participants as *vārkari* in the Bhakti cult of Viṭṭhala, one of whose saints, the Mahar Chokhamela, had a shrine at Pandharpur.

*Ati*-Śūdras were discriminated against in many ways in daily life, but at the same time were the headmen of villages, mountain soldiers, and town policemen. They played an important ritual role in boundary disputes and the ceremonies of *devī*. There was much intra-caste struggle among *Ati*-Śūdras themselves over relative social ranking and associated rights and duties.

---

For Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, the distinction between sat- and asat-Śūdras is determinative. It is the principle that reconciles the many contradictions in the smṛtis regarding which sacrifices, saṁskāras, and devotional practices Śūdras are entitled to and how they are to be performed. The degree of impurity a Śūdra may have in matters of food and contact also depends on his sat or asat status. The rules for sat-Śūdras are adjustable; the full rigor applies to asat-Śūdras. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is in line with other commentators on this point. Gadādhara (16th century) prescribes twelve saṁskāras for pure Śūdras and only one, marriage, for the impure. The Nirṇayasindhu says something similar: conflicting views are adjusted by holding that the liberal ones apply to good (sat) Śūdras and the stricter ones to low (asat) Śūdras or that the rules are different in different countries.

Recognition that customs varied from country to country could be used to accommodate the diversity of actual practice while preserving the integrity of Dharma. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa points out the variations in aśauca (death impurity), sapinḍakarana, and Śūdra recitation of Purānic mantras prevailing in Madhyadeśa and Gauḍa and stresses the importance of following the customs of one’s own country.

A Śāṅgadhara prescribed sixteen saṁskāras for the twice-born, twelve for Śūdras, and five for mixed castes (miśrajātis). It is unclear if he is distinguishing between sat- and asat-Śūdras, or by mixed castes means untouchables. In actuality, asat-Śūdras and untouchables were effectively lumped together as the pool of lowest caste laborers. The pitting of Śūdras against untouchables with differentials in their socio-ritual status was a mechanism for maintaining the system of labor exploitation. Untouchables were variously regarded as the lowest Śūdras, a fifth varṇa, or casteless altogether (bāhya). The situation again is different in the south and east where asat-Śūdras were the culturally backward and untouchable tribal peoples who labored for the landowning sat-Śūdra peasantry.

There were other categories of uncleanness applied to low-caste jātis. In the north, Patañjali (Mahābhāṣya II.4.10) divided Śūdras into the aniravasita, i.e., those in gainful but dirty occupations such as carpenters and blacksmith, and the niravasita, those so low and unclean, such as Caṇḍālas, that their vessels had to be “thrown away” and not

46 The sat/asat distinction was already made by Yājñavalkya (1.95), where it is equivalent to anuloma/pratiloma. Viśveśvarabhūṭa (14th cen.) still uses it this way in the Smṛtikaumudi. Yājñavalkya (3.22) also speaks of Śūdras who are “living by the rules” (ṇyuṣavartinah), as does Manu (5.140). KS takes this to mean sat-Śūdras. By the 16th century, Raghunandana is describing Kāyasthas and Ambaśṭhas as sat-Śūdras in his Śuddhitattva—a significantly different use of the term.
47 Sharma, Śūdras in Ancient India, 299.
48 Kane, II, pt. 1, 199.
49 SAS 50, 212.
50 SAS 122, 212.
51 SAS 51.
52 Sharma, Śūdras in Ancient India, 299.
53 Manu (10.4) said there was no pānicama varṇa, but the term came into currency for all those outside the four varṇas: untouchables and tribals, the predecessors of the Scheduled Castes (Dalits) and Tribes (Aśvātis) of today.
used by any other caste for eating. There was also a distinction made between bhojāṇṇa and abhojāṇṇa. The first, according to Yājñavalkya (1.166) included servants, cowherds, barbers, and friends, i.e., those with whom one had close personal contact. The second were all other Śūdras whose food a Brahmin could not take. Brahmin rules of purity spread throughout Indian society as the hegemonic language for speaking about the lower castes.

The main condition allowing rules for participation in ritual and purity to be relaxed for sat-Śūdras is that they be good people, meaning well-conducted householders in good standing in their communities obediently serving the twice-born, their chief duty, and faithfully keeping to the svadharma of their caste. The test of sat-Śūdrahood, therefore, was following the baseline duty of obedient service to dvijas. In everyday life, sat-Śūdras would have been those who followed respectable occupations and trades and the religious leadership of Brahmans.

Krṣṇa Śeṣa cites as his smārta authorities Parāśara, Manu and the Mahābhārata.55

The highest dharma for a Śūdra is to serve the twice-born.
Anything else he does is fruitless,
since service to them is the cause of attaining the supreme good. PS 1.70

For the Śūdra, the highest dharma leading to happiness is simply to render obedient service to reputable Brahmin householders who are learned in the Veda.

M 9.334

Harmless, virtuous, worshipping gods and Brahmans,
a Śūdra is honored for following his own dharma
and garnering its approved fruits. MB 13. App. 15. 524-525

He quotes the Kūrma Purāṇa on the fruit of each one following his own dharma.

The place of Prajāpati is assigned to the Brahmans, who practice the rites,
the place of Indra to the Kṣatriyas, who do not run away from battle,
the place of the Maruts to the Vaiṣyas, who follow the duties prescribed for them,
and the place of the Gandharvas to the Śūdras, who follow the path of service.

KP 1.2.66-67

Krṣṇa Śeṣa makes exceptions for sat-Śūdras on a number of topics such as ācamana (sipping water), cūḍākaraṇa (tonsure), śrāddha (offerings to the dead), and aśauca (birth and death pollution). He follows other authorities in allowing Śūdras who are dutifully serving the twice-born and performing the five great sacrifices, to follow rites of Vaiṣyas, which, indeed, was often their real social status.56 He interprets Manu’s “Śūdras living by the rules” (nyāyavartinām) to mean sat-Śūdras.57

54 Kane, II. pt. 1, 92,121-2.
55 SAS 33.
56 SAS 38, 90.
57 Manu 5.140.
Śūdras living by the rules should shave their head once a month, follow the rules of purification laid down for Vaiśyas, and eat the leftover food of the twice-born. M 5.140

And, likewise, Yājñavalkya on the period of impurity:

For Kṣatriya twelve days, for Vaiśyas fifteen, for Śūdras thirty days, and half that for Śūdras living by the rules (nyāyavartinah) Y 3.22

Regarding ācamana, Gautama says that Śūdras should sip three or four times, but Yogi Yājñavalkya once. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa resolves the contradiction by taking three or four times as applying to asat-Śūdras and once to sat-Śūdras. Alternatively, we might prefer to follow Manu who lays down that sat-Śūdras should follow the Vaiśya rite and sip once. 58

As for wearing a śikhā, the Skanda Purāṇa may forbid it, but following Vasiṣṭha, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa allows it to a sat-Śūdra and forbids it to a “degraded” Śūdra. 59

Again, on the subject of birth and death impurity, the Brahma Purāṇa says that a Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, or Vaiśya woman who has delivered a child is touchable after ten days have gone by, but a Śūdra woman only after thirteen. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa says this applies to asat-Śūdra women, accepting the opinion of other authorities that a sat-Śūdra woman is purified in ten days. 60

Devala (10.114.36) and the Mārkandeya Purāṇa (32.41) say that a Śūdra is purified in a month. 61 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa says this applies to the asat-Śūdra and sets the period of impurity for a sat-Śūdra dutifully serving the twice-born, eating their food, and cutting his hair monthly, at half that, i.e., fifteen days.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa fastidiously insists that Śatātapa’s view that a Śūdra is purified in twenty days on a death or birth should be taken as referring to a sat-Śūdra who has been slightly degraded and now must now purify himself for twenty days rather than fifteen. 62 His dereliction is a matter of neglecting service to the dvījas (i.e., Brahmans), not observances such as the performance of the five great sacrifices. He cites the authority of Aṅgiras in construing this as applying to a “sat-Śūdra possessed of dispassion and all the virtues of an absolutely good Śūdra.”

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa then goes on to discuss the factors that may qualify the period of purity, giving us in the process a picture of his methods of argument and demonstrating how conditionally elastic Dharmashastric rules were in practice.

58 SAS 90.
59 SAS 37.
60 SAS 194.
61 SAS 190.
62 Ibid.
Some view the alternative of twenty days as applying to an ordinary Śūdra in a state of misfortune and ten days to a sat-Śūdra. Others see it as a matter of local custom. And there is the confusion of impurity due to the caste mingling that occurs in a different age. This is discussed in the Adivya Purāṇa in the passages quoted by Hemādri about the contraction of impurity depending on the degree of Vedic learning mastered and the dharmas the wise say must be avoided in the Kaliyuga.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa accepts the view of the Varāha Purāṇa that sat-Śūdras are permitted to perform śrāddha with cooked offerings, although other smṛtis he quotes specify uncooked grain as appropriate and cooked offerings as kalivarjya, i.e., something to be avoided in the Kaliyuga as detestable and fitting only in another, better age. Determining what was or was not kalivarjya or appropriate to a bygone age (yugāntara) is a frequently used resort for dealing with conflicting opinions on permissible conduct for Śūdras.

The Nārada Purāṇa prohibits Śūdras and women touching lingas, chanting prayers and mantras, performing austerities, going on pilgrimage to holy places, and worshipping the gods. Kāyasthas and such people are to abstain from the śikhā, investiture, wearing saffron clothing, and touching the images of the divinities, i.e., acting as though they were dvijas and not the mixed caste Śūdras they were in the eyes of Brahmin dharmaśāstrīs who represented their competition as a literate professional class. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s comment is typical of his approach:

"Inconsistency is to be avoided in so far as it is a matter, in the manner previously discussed, of the compatibility or incompatibility of things of this kind with service to the twice-born on the part of sat- and asat-Śūdras. The marks of sat-Śūdras are said to be shaving the hair each month, consuming the surplus food of the twice-born, making a living by service to them, and performing the five great sacrifices. These should be regarded as the dharmic duties of good Śūdras only—the others have those common to everyone, such as non-harm to living creatures."

Observance by sat-Śūdras, women, and Kāyasthas is contingent on the extent to which their practice is compatible with submission to the twice-born (Brahmins). In other words, the adhikāra for any particular ritual was a conditional privilege dependent on Brahmin assent.

**Śūdradharmā Texts and the Invention of Hinduism**

If the transformation of clan, tribe, and “backward” life-ways into caste was the formative process of Hindu society as more and more peoples across the subcontinent were drawn into the caste system as Śūdra peasants and artisans and landless laborers (antyajas), Sanskritization was the discursive image of this process as theorized and formalized by the Brahmin intellectual class. Sanskritization or Brahmanization had been going on for two millennia...

---
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before the British arrived on the scene and was itself a colonization of the hearts and minds of the people of the subcontinent as they were incorporated into the caste order. The result of this process was the emergence of modern Hinduism. It was ratcheted up to a new level during the Sultanate period. It is no coincidence that this is the period in which the *dharmanibandha* appears.66

Kane divided the history of Dharmaśāstra into three periods: prose *sūtra* and versified *smṛti* followed by the age of the commentators and digests from the seventh to eighteenth century. The first half of the latter was the golden era of the commentary. The general tendency after 1200 was the digest. *Nibandhas* are encyclopedic syntheses of the whole tradition of *dharmasmṛti* production. They testify to a need to conserve and protect the Dharma in a time of danger. They are monuments of tradition. Hindu kings sponsored and subsidized production of them as ornaments of their reign and as external defense and internal reinforcement of *varṇāśramadharma*. Pollock seems essentially right to connect the rise of the *nibandha* to the need of the times. Their totalizing character was an ideological counter-offensive against the threat of Islam, an alien and inassimilable politico-religious formation unlike the earlier Śakas, Kushanas, and Hunas or the absorbed dissidence of Buddhism.67 Dharma faced in the *Yavana rākṣasas*, the Afghan Turks, an unprecedented challenge.

Not surprisingly, bringing the productive classes of the population into line with Dharma also became a crucial concern of the state. The village caste order that had emerged and stabilized during 600-1100 CE in the agrarian kingdoms under conditions of de-urbanization was now theoretically consolidated in these voluminous court-sponsored lawbooks. They were a plan for the entrenchment of caste dharma, not a demographic description. Given the short reach and limited power of courts, this was more of an organic process than a matter of deliberate policy. This is the period of the “spate” of texts about Śūdras referred to in the introduction, because the subject was both of renewed concern and manuscript production increased with the royal patronage of the regional kingdoms.

The production of digests can almost be sequentially charted before the advancing wave of conquests to the east and south by Muhammad of Ghur, Bakhtiyar Khalji, and the Delhi Sultans. Lakṣmīdhara wrote the *Kṛtyakalpataru* (ca. 1125-1150) as chief minister for Govindacandra of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, which fell in 1193 with the capture of Kanauj and Vārāṇasī. In one of his inscriptions, Govinda was described as Hari himself born into the world to protect Vārāṇasī from the wicked Turks.68 The *Dānasāgara*, *Ācārasāgara* (1168) and other digests were compila-
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tions by the Senas (1179-1205), the Brahmanizing kings of Bengal who are reputed to have reorganized the caste system introducing the hypergamous caste rules of kulīnism among the Brahmins, Vaidyas, and Kāyasthas of Bengal.\(^{69}\) Bengal was overrun in 1202. Hemādri composed the *Caturvargacintāmani* (c. 1260-1270) as keeper of the imperial records for the Yādavas of Devagiri, which fell to Ala-ud-din in 1305. Caṇḍēśvara produced the *Smṛtiratnakara* as “minister for peace and war”\(^{70}\) and chief justice for the kings of Mithilā, routed by the mlechas in 1324. Mādhava compiled the *Parāśara-mādhavīya* in c. 1335-1360 as scholar-statesman and bulwark of the kingdom of Vijayanagara, which carried on a long struggle with the Deccan Sultanates. All of these kingdoms were engaged in fighting the *turuṣkas* and were eventually overrun. A magisterial corpus of dharma were one of means of moral and cultural unity in that fight and may have contributed to the stubborn resistance that made the Muslim conquest of India a relatively long, slow slog.\(^{71}\)

Lakṣmīdharā’s *Kṛtryakalpataru* (ca. 1125) is the first of the great nibandhas still extant and inaugurated a new phase in defining the place of the Śūdra.\(^{72}\) It is a vast digest in fourteen volumes commissioned by Govindacandra, whom, as we saw, T. H. Colebrooke confused with the patron of Śeṣa Nṛsiṁha. It repays a closer look.

In chapter II.16, Lakṣmīdharā deals with the ritual activity and livelihood of the Śūdra. He begins by confirming through authoritative citations, as do all śūdradharma texts, that the dharma of a Śūdra is obedient service to the twice-born. In that lies his salvation, too. His ritual life is simple. He should use the namaskāra mantra. He keeps the “five fires” of the *pañcamahāyajñas*. He may make gifts of charity (dāna). He must offer śrāddha to ancestors. He is permitted to make a living by all trades, arts and crafts. The rules in the *Kālikā Purāṇa* against selling honey, liquor, hides, lac, and meat are waived. Brahmins may accept from him articles of food: salt, honey, wine, curds, butter-milk, and clarified butter. He should listen daily to the Purāṇas in lieu of the Vedic study enjoined for the twice-born.

---


\(^{70}\) Kane’s title.

\(^{71}\) Most of these facts and dates are from Kane, HDS I.

\(^{72}\) *Gṛhaustakāṇḍa*, Book 2 of the *Kṛtryakalpataru* of Bhaṭṭa Lakṣmīdharā, ed. by K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, *Gaekwad Oriental Series* no. 101 (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1944). In his introduction to the *Dānakāṇḍa*, Bk. 5, pp. 1-130, Aiyangar provides much useful information about the evolution of the nibandha, Govindacandra’s battles with Muslims and rival Hindu kings, and Lakṣmīdharā’s predecessors and influence. Kings, whose grasp on power was recent or weak or kṣatriyahoood disputed, were spurred to take up the conservation of dharma and zealously promote digests as a component of policies of “Hindu” religious and social revivalism. Like the later kings of Vijayanagara, the Gāhādvālās were engaged in a campaign of cultural rearmament.

The topic of this book, dāna, was of material consequence, in Aiyangar’s view, because of the rise of non-kṣatriya dynasties and the increasing wealth of “devout Śūdras to whom the way of yāga was not open.” *Dāna* is about the ritual regulation of surplus wealth and its channeling into subsidy of Brahmins and public benefactions such as pūrṇas. The strict older rules on the eligibility of non-Brahmins as donors and donees were recalibrated with a stress on the virtue of charitable giving as a grace open to all. As we will see in the chapter on “Śūdras and the Vedas,” dāna was expected of Śūdras as a religious duty already in the *Śānti-parvan*. K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, *Dānakāṇḍa, Kṛtryakalpataru* 5 (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1941):1-130.
However, the *Krtryakalpataru*, four centuries before, does not come near the SAS in the meticulous ritualizing of the daily life of Śūdras. The Śūdra is largely free of the ritual obligations incumbent on the twice-born. In some respects, livelihoods for instance, Lakṣmīdhara appears more permissive, or more likely retains the minimal interest in Śūdras of earlier Dharmasūtras. Later writers of digests such Raghunandana and Kamalākara denied Śūdras (and even Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas regarded as now degraded to Śūdras) some of the rights they had enjoyed in the twelfth century. For instance, Lakṣmīdhara recognized the right of Śūdras to read the Purāṇas and recite Purānic mantras on their own.

The *Kalpatarukāra* also says that a Śūdra is qualified to recite Purānic mantras as part of the ritual. Others, however, are of the opinion that Purānic mantras should be recited by Brahmans only and a Śūdra should just say “nama” himself.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cites this view as an alternative, but concurs with Kamalākara that Brahmans should recite the Purāṇas to Śūdras: Śūdras should not recite or study them on their own. Lakṣmīdhara, however, rigorously maintains the old ban on Vedec education and mantras.73 Whoever teaches a Śūdra about dharma and vows is damned. (II.33). A Śūdra has no need to know Vedic rites since he is not entitled to sacrifice with its adṛṣṭa (invisible) fruits.

One can decipher the real significance of adṛṣta as the secret of power: the irrationality of its justification of inequality. Such knowledge would upset the settled order of varṇāśramadharma, which sacrifice maintains, and lead to varnasāṅkara (II.33). Thus, Brahmanical dominance was founded on and reproduced by the prohibition of vaidika to other caste groups outside the “cowpen” of the dvija.

One wants to see the humaneness and inclusivity of the SAS as reflecting the tolerant humane era of Akbar. But this conciliatory mildness is already present in the *Krtryakalpataru*. Lakṣmīdhara relaxes the regulations on livelihood, but keeps the Vedic prohibition in place. All the harsher punitive measures are now gone. What is different is that he neither elaborates the ritual and devotional practices the good Śūdra can and should follow, nor appears to be overly concerned with the Śūdra or the deep ritualization of his life. This kind of in-depth ritualization appears to be an entirely later development.

Śūdradharma texts represent a new cycle and intensification in Brahmanization, understood as the ritual regulation of the lives of the lower castes. While the early Dharmasūtras—Manu, Gautama, and Āpastamba—may have displayed a “politics of contempt” with their severity and punitiveness toward Śūdras, there is no overt contempt in later śūdradharma texts. On the contrary. Although the traces of discrimination remain in the cited authorities,

73 At II.29, he discusses, “things not to be given to a Śūdra.”
śūdradhārma texts themselves represent an effort at a more deeply embedded regulation of the Śūdra through inclusion and reconciliation. The harsher aspects in the tradition are passed over and replaced by a new attention to his qualification (adhikāra) and to explaining the rituals and devotions open to him. Śūdradhārma texts do not express so much an overt “politics of contempt” toward Śūdras as an outlook of paternalistic care.74

In them we see a new stage in the long process of converting Vedic sacrifices and rites into devotional observances open to all devout Hindus who demonstrated their goodness and qualification for them by living piously and conscientiously observing them, and, one must add, being able to pay for them. This trend was given great impetus by the spiritual universalism of Bhakti. We can see the resultant combination of Vedism with popular worship in the present day when morning sandhyā includes chanting the names of Viṣṇu. This syncretism is well under way in the SAS, although Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa still offers chanting prayers to the gods as a substitute for sandhyā for Śūdras. As performed today in many parts of India, sandhyā-vandana is a composite of Vedic mantras, namaskāra mantras like “Keśavāya namah,” “Anantāya namah,” Āgamic ritual, yogic prāṇāyāma, and tarpāṇa to non-Vedic deities and planets.75

*****

The critique of Orientalism has shown how Western Indologists developed a misleading but ideologically and administratively useful picture of Indian society, mainly based on the philological study of the Brahmanical tradition as preserved in Sanskrit texts.76 They did so in collaboration with Brahmin elites as their informants. The result was what Burton Stein calls “indologism”: the view that Brahmanical texts were a true representation of Indian society as a timeless and unchanging order in which Brahmins were the most important social group and their ideas of purity and caste were the prevailing principles of social organization.

What I am calling “indologism” is different in crucial ways. The ideology of divine hierarchy, varnāśramadharma, is an important part of the ancient knowledge of India, beginning with the post-Vedic Brahmāna texts, with their neat order of social differences within a moral unity, and continuing through medieval dharmaśastra

74 This bien pensant paternalism is seen in the conventional pairing of Śūdras with women in Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s sources. The Purāṇas are repeatedly recommended as the most suitable scripture for both Śūdras and women. The Bhaviṣya Purāṇa is quoted as saying that the wise regard Śūdras the same as women (SAS 47). Śūdras and women perform the same vows, fasts, penances, purifications, and cleaning. They are equally excluded from Vedic education, the use of Vedic mantras and the praṇava, speaking Sanskrit, and touching images of the gods and non-primordial lingas. They both are to use the namaskāra mantra and perform homa and other rites with a Brahmin priest officiating. They may receive Vaiṣṇava initiation instead of upanayana. Far more needs to be said about the patriarchal relation between caste and gender in Hinduism at work in this identification of the subject positions of Śūdras and women than I can here.

75 The Cultural Heritage of India, ed. Haridas Bhattacharya (Calcutta, Ramakrishna Mission, 1956), 7:446.

76 This is another controversial topic with a huge body of scholarship. I mention only the works that have shaped my own take on it—a middle way that sees the post-colonialist point made about the colonial construction of Hinduism and caste, but is closer to those who take a longer view of that process of construction and the part Brahmins and Brahmanism played in it: Bayly, Pollock, van der Veer, Lorenzen, Hiltebeitel.
texts, with their more messy, contingent, and regionally varied codes. These texts—particularly the former—received a new lease and legitimacy at the hands of European orientalists who constructed the knowledge we call “indology” and what I, polemically, call “indologism.” By the latter I mean the conversion of the findings of a valid knowledge and discourse, based upon ancient texts, into a social theory allegedly pertinent…to pre-modern societies South Asia, where it can have at best a partial validity.  

Caste in particular was seized on as the very essence of Hinduism. Louis Dumont’s Homo Hierarchicus is the purest epitome of this essentialism with its ahistorical valorization of hierarchy based on Brahmanocentric distinctions between the pure and impure, turning India into a land of static religiosity in a kind of inverted or structuralist orientalism which purports to see things from the Indian point of view.  

The problem with this picture is that it took Brahmanical ideology at its face value as descriptive rather than as prescriptive and normative. As Pollock and others have argued, the view of some post-colonialists that Hinduism was invented by western scholars and colonial administrators in the nineteenth century was an understandable but excessive reaction to the complicity of essentializing Orientalism with imperial rule. This reaction was pushed to such lengths even the distinctly Indian institution of caste was claimed to be virtually a product of colonial rule. If nothing else, Dharmaśastric texts like the SAS show that a fully elaborated discourse of caste was in place long before. Caste and Hinduism in the form westerners encountered them largely crystallized in the centuries of Muslim and Mughal rule, as David Lorenzen and others argue.  

The Indologists had this right: Brahmanization did not begin with the Raj, nor was caste simply a colonial construction. But the post-colonialists, for their part, were also right in rejecting the idea that Brahmanism and caste were the eternal essence and key to Hinduism. Brahmanical communalism and caste was a long and ongoing project. The colonialist view of caste as the essence of Indian culture was not pure invention, but it was based on the hegemonic discourse of varṇāśramadharma as most authoritatively stated in Dharmaśāstra. European scholarship and administration gave Brahmanism a new lease on life. The dharmaśāstras Brahmins were reading in their ashrams and councils arguably had little bearing on the lives of most Indians until the British decided to make it the law of the land. In a way, colonial Indology took up where Brahmanism left off and achieved it aims more thoroughly than ever before, but for its own purposes of rule and administration, misrecognizing and reproducing its ideological function. During the post-Mughal “Brahman Raj,” as Susan Bayly has called it, and continuing on into the Raj when

78 Bayly, Dirks, and Raheja. Bayly argues that Dumont's model is useful for certain states and periods, such as the “Brahman Raj” (1700-1830), as she terms it.
79 Who Invented Hinduism?, 1-36.
aligned with imperial rule, Brahmins achieved a new kind of pan-Indian cultural ascendancy they had only been able to dream about in previous eras in their “poetics of power” and “politics of contempt.”

There are deep problems with understanding the relation between an ideological discourse and the social reality, which I can only skim over here. Suffice it to say, Brahmanical caste ideology as a discourse of power had been at work for centuries shaping and inflecting the way Indians spoke about and conceptualized their lives. This process has been characterized with varying emphases as Brahmanization, Sanskritization, Hinduization, the Great Tradition, shastrification, internal Orientalism, and inner colonization.

M. N. Srinivas’ term for the process of deep ritualization I am describing here is Sanskritization. Sanskritization is a wider process than Brahmanization, since Brahmins were not always the agents. Low castes enthusiastically Sankritized themselves. Sectarian movements like the Liṅgāyats powered the process of Sanskritization among low castes. But upward mobility and caste struggle were the main forces driving Sanskritization. Śūdras no less than Brahmins found it in their social interest to adopt brahmanical rites, customs, and beliefs. The division between sat- and asat-Śūdras fostered by Brahmins further ratcheted up their adoption of high caste attributes such as the rituals and devotions in the SAS.

Sanskritization was the age old organ of caste formation and mobility. In the sixteenth century, it was taking place in new circumstances: the Mughal political economy of absolutist centralism, reurbanization, and economic expansion within the world system, the entrenchment of caste, the beginning of the end of frontier expansion and spatial mobility and its supercession by increasing competition among castes within narrow, localized ranking systems, the social and political success of many Śūdra castes, and a widening class hierarchy among Śūdra jātis from the rich and powerful at one end preoccupied with their own ritual status and marginally Hinduized poor laborers at the other.

Srinivas defines Sanskritization as the process by which a low caste, tribe or other group takes over the customs, ritual, beliefs, ideology and style of life of a high and, in particular, a twice-born caste. The Sanskritization of a group has the effect of improving its position in the local caste hierarchy. It presupposes either an improvement in

80 Susan Bayly, *Caste, Society and Politics in India from the Eighteenth Century to the Modern Age*, 64-96.
81 M. N. Srinivas, *The Cohesive Role of Sanskritization and Other Essays* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989), 56-72; *Caste in Modern India* (Bombay: 1962), 42-43. David Lorenzen points out the limitation in the concept of Sanskritization: it remains a view “from the top down” and so reproduces the normative upper caste point of view that the culture and folkway traditions of low caste groups were only poorly Sanskritized prototypes of upper caste culture. Krṣṇa Seṣa shows considerable respect for the local, family traditions of Śūdras and accepts some of them as valid counterparts to Vedic rites. *Who Invented Hinduism?: Essays on Religion in India* (Delhi: Yoda Press, 2006), 78.
82 Brahmanism itself undergoes change: Vedic Brahmins ate meat, drank alcohol, and made blood sacrifices, all of which later vegetarian Brahmins abhorred.
the economic or political position of the group concerned or a higher group self-consciousness resulting from its contact with a source of the “Great Tradition.” The social aspirations of low jātis led them to take on the customs and way of life of their betters and the symbols of high ritual rank. Concern with ritual purity was an upper caste preoccupation imitated by better off Śūdras.

The SAS perfectly epitomizes the two legal fictions that Srinivas saw as working to spread Sanskritized high culture among the lower jātis. First the ban on performance of Vedic rituals was circumvented by restricting the chanting of the mantras. Removing the mantras from the rituals and substituting Purānic prayers is the red-letter rubric of the SAS. Second, a Brahmin priest officiates. He does not chant Vedic mantras, but post-Vedic verses in Sanskrit, Purānic litanies, maṅgalas, stotras, and other family traditions. In this way, Vedic rituals were opened to Śūdras. Alternatively, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa finds a substitute for other rites such as birthday and parting-of-the-hair for which Śūdras were not qualified. At the time for them, the traditional family custom (maṅgalācāra) should be performed, not the rite itself. Note the acknowledgment that Śūdra families have their own traditions and invite Brahmins priests to minister them.

In actuality, the Brahmanical ban was never very effective in preventing socially ambitious, low caste people from adopting Vedic rites and customs, even chanting Vedic mantras and wearing the sacred thread. The jealousy and hostility of dominant castes was always the real and effective barrier to lower caste appropriation of the ritual symbols of high status. Late śūradharma texts catered to these aspirations for higher socio-religious status while preserving Brāhmaṇa priestly authority and vaidika charisma.

Deep Ritualization

It is often said in a general and loose way that śūradharma texts were improving the status of Śūdras. This is the view of Kane, Sharma, Vajpeyi, and Jaiswal. It is more accurate to say, as Sharma also does, that śūradharma texts were reacting to the improved and high status of many Śūdras with the age-old strategy of neo-Brahmanism—cooptation and modest accommodation, integrating them more fully into the ritual system. They pulled off the feat of reframing a tradition that radically excluded Śūdras in such a way as to invite them in and find a respectful place for them, while preserving the principle of inequality with pragmatic flexibility. Dharmaśāstra was to be for Śūdras too now, not just the twice-born. Sat-Śūdras, in a sense, had become the de facto third varṇa.
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This was the point of the enlargement of ritual “rights.” These enlarged ritual rights were, in reality, new duties that were now to be obligatory (nitiya) for respectable high status Śūdras and observed with the ministrations of Brahmin priests. Śūdras must now follow all the detailed rules minutely detailed in the sūtras, śāstras, and vidhānas about daily āhnikas, toilet, purity, and devotions in times past required only of the twice-born. Well-off, high status Śūdras were already observing many rituals. Late śūdradharma texts like the SAS were simply recognizing the fact and regularizing the practice. Brahmins were adapting to changing social circumstances of the degraded Kaliyuga by expanding their clientele and thus preserving their monopoly of fee for service.

Patronage was undoubtedly an incentive for Brahmins to expand the religious rights of Śūdras. G. S. Ghurye argued that self-interest motivated Brahmins to enlarge the ritual rites of Śūdras. There is no point in denying that this must have been an important consideration, given the connection between the ability to pay and perform Vedic sacrifices. By opening Brahmical rites to Śūdras, they enlarged their clientele. Improvement in the material conditions of Śūdras enabled them to pay priests to perform sacrifices and sacraments.

A minority view found in Raghunandana and others (there is no trace of it in the SAS) was that Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas were non-existent in the Kaliyuga and had become Śūdras through non-performance of their varṇa duties. Indeed, for Raghunandana, Brāhmaṇas were the only twice-born castes and there were only two varṇas: Brāhmaṇas and Śūdras. The implication was that proper performance by “Śūdras” of their varṇa duties, including of course gifts and fees to Brāhmaṇas, was the way to reclaim varṇa. The Brahmin fear that Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas were disappearing in the Kaliyuga leaving only Brahmins and Śūdras reflects the social realities of the day. Śūdras could “kṣatriyize” themselves by pious observance and recover their true but latent kṣatriyahood. In addition, in the age of Muslim domination, Kṣatriya power was understandably in doubt. In such circumstances Brahmins, not surprisingly, found it advantageous to cultivate better-off sat-Śūdras and instill a sense that they were within the pale of Vedic orthodoxy and not wholly shut out, as the letter of the law would appear to make them.

The “liberalizing” character the SAS displays was already in the sources, and to that extent the SAS is entirely conservative. So much so, that it is misleading to describe the SAS as liberalizing. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was merely citing well established views. As we saw, Lakṣmīdhara centuries before was in a sense more liberal on the question of Śūdra access to the Purāṇas. What we see in Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and the late medieval smṛtiśāstras is a new cycle in the con-
solidation of caste, relying on the reforms instituted in the *smṛtis* of the Gupta period, perhaps on the principle that the best way to control new social forces is to give them a large corral. Enhancement was consolidation. Rights are duties (and markers of status and privilege) in a ritually regulated social order. To be sure, genuine concern for the spiritual welfare of low caste people must certainly have been at work as well.\(^{87}\)

The process of enlarging the religious rights and duties of Śūdras, embedding them more fully in the fold of Brahmanism and rooting caste more deeply in their lives, reaches its culmination in late medieval śūtradharma texts: the *Śūtradhrnamabodhini* of Madanapāla (14\(^{th}\) c.), the *Śūdrācāracintāmani* of Vācaspatimisra (15\(^{th}\) c.), the *Śūdrācāraśiromani* of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and the *Śūdrakṛtyatattva* of Raghunandana (16\(^{th}\) c.), and the *Śūdrakamalākara* of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa (17\(^{th}\) c.). But it was based on a Brahmanism that builds on the achievements of an earlier upsurge of popular Vaishnāvism by further enlarging the religious rights of Śūdras and placing them on a level with people of the three higher varṇas in respect of many ceremonies. Sacrifices involving the feeding of Brahmans (pañcayajñas, pākayajñas), śrāddhas, vratas, saṁskāras, prāyaścittā, dāna, and pūrtadharmā (i.e., building wells, tanks, temples, parks, food distributions, and other works of charity and public benefaction), had long been permitted to Śūdras when administered without Vedic mantras.

A similar dynamic of cooptation and Brahmanization was at work in this second upwelling of Vaishnava devotion. In the first phase, Brāhmaṇas had put Bhagavatism to work maintaining the varṇa order, as we see in Manu and the *Bhagavad Gītā*. Devotion to Kṛṣṇa joined obedient service to the twice-born as a Śūdra’s svadharma: salvation was attained through performing the duties of one’s own caste. Vaishnāvism and theistic cult in general was Brahmanism’s exceedingly successful response to the challenge of the śramana sects. Disaffected Śūdras with new political and economic power were lured away from nāstika temptations into Vaishnava cult with its stress on devotional salvation outside the Vedas.

Similarly, the pressure of socio-economic change in the late medieval period as mediated through the Bhakti movements prompted a new round of accommodation in Dharmaśāstra. The task remained the same—to give room to these new aspirations within the Brahmanical order while preserving essential dvija, i.e., Brāhmaṇa, privileges. The increase in the number of saṁskāras allowed Śūdras is an index of their improving social position in late-medieval times. Through these repeated cycles of crisis and reform, relaxation and retrenchment, Brahmanical caste

---

\(^{87}\) “In the sphere of religion, the tendency is to forbid the Śūdra the use of the most efficacious formulas and rites on the one hand, and to exhort him to perform most of the daily rites and obligatory sacraments prescribed for the other castes.” Ghurye, *Caste, Class, and Occupation*, 90-91.
expands and deepens it systematic reach across the social landscape of the subcontinent. Although the dynamic in
the two phases is somewhat different, it is no coincidence that as Vaiṣṇavism arose in the wake of Buddhism, Bhak-
tism does so in the shadow of another spiritually equalitarian faith, Islam, again prodding orthodox Brahmanism to
concession and reform. During the centuries of medieval feudalization and Muslim rule, the caste position of Śūdras
had deteriorated and caste tightened its grip.

Śūdras and the Vedas

The Republic of India has made great progress toward removing the caste disqualifications that were enshrined in
Dharmaśāstra. This is most remarkable in the access gained by lower castes and women to Vedic education and
scriptures, from the study of which they were debarred for centuries. My two Sanskrit teachers at the University of
Pune, Nirmala Kulkarni and Manisha Phanasalkar, are exemplars as women specializing in Vedic, albeit of Brahmin
families.

The exclusion of Śūdras and women from the Vedas was the fundamental disqualification as far as Brahmins
were concerned, and virtually the only one that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa still unwaveringly sustains, while relaxing, qualifying, or
providing a substitute for many other rituals. Many modern Hindus came to see this exclusion of women and lower
castes in classical and medieval Hinduism as an unfair discrimination counter to the original spirit of the Vedas and
detrimental to its character and advancement. As K. Satchidananda Murty observes:

One of the great obstacles to the preservation and propagation of the Vedas has been denial of universal access to
it. For several centuries only the trivarnāika men (men of the upper three castes) have been generally considered
eligible to undertake Vedic study, but in effect it has been the exclusive privilege and prerogative of male Brah-
mins only. Even today most Brahmins who have learnt the Veda, either with or without meaning, generally do
not teach it to women, Śūdras and others. 88

And, so, in modern times there was a call to return to a supposed earlier inclusiveness, the historical evidence for
which is rather sketchy, resting mainly on selective reading of the Vedas. Hindu reformers wanted to bring the Ve-
das into accord with the liberal and nationalist sensibilities of the day. 89 Preparing the way for them, Ram Mohan
Roy, the Brahmo Samaj, Vivekananda, and the Theosophists proclaimed the Vedas to be not only the property of
high caste Hindus, but of all Hindus, and India’s spiritual gift to the world.

A few texts do declare that the Vedas were revealed for the sake of all people. Murty gives two of them:

88 K. Satchidananda Murty, Vedic Hermeneutics, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1993, 14-17, quoted in Arvind Sharma,
89 Rammohan Roy and Swami Dayananda began collecting smṛti texts in support of the abolition of Śūdra disqualifications, sati,
child marriage, caste based on birth, and widow remarriage. Sharma, Śūdras in Ancient India, 2-3.
The Veda itself does not say that it is meant for any particular sex, caste or race. On the contrary, it declares that it is meant for all. There is the following Yajurvedic text: ‘Just as I have revealed this auspicious word to all human beings, so must you. I have revealed the Vedic truth to Brāhmīns, Kṣatriyas, Śūdras, Āryas, personal servants (svāyā) and to the lowest of Śūdras (aranyā) also.’ There is also the following Atharvavedic text: ‘O Man, I, being of the nature of truth and being unfathomable, have revealed the true Vedic knowledge; so I am he who gave birth to the Veda. I cannot be partial either to a Dāsa (slave) or an Ārya; I save all those who behave like me (i.e., impartially) and follow my truthful commands. The Veda is a universal scripture.’\(^{90}\)

There was a strain of spiritual equality in the Vedas, and clearly so in the Upaniṣads, centuries before Vaiṣṇava Bhakti and Tantra more ardently promoted it. It is also notable that the two texts Murty cites are from the Yajur Veda and the Atharva Veda. Yajur Veda XXVI.2 is one of the passages that may have recommended the Vājasaneyin rite to later śrīvakas, including Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, as the default rite for Śūdras.

The Atharva Veda with its content of magical spells, charms, and curses was considered more appropriate knowledge for Śūdras and women than the sacred triad.\(^{91}\) R. S. Sharma interprets Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa III.12.9.2 to mean that the fourth Veda was regarded as belonging to the fourth varṇa.

Thus it is stated in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa that a vaiśya was born of the Rg Veda, the kṣatriya of the Yajur Veda, and the brāhmaṇa of the Sāma Veda. This obviously implies that Atharva Veda was meant for the Śūdra—a provision which is later vaguely repeated in the Āpastamba Dharmashastra.\(^{92}\)

Whatever one might think of this, it is clear that, although excluded from Vedic knowledge, the Śūdra was not without vocational and professional training of a sort.\(^{93}\) The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa permits a priest to instruct snake-charmers, lenders, fishermen, bird-catchers, and forest tribesmen and others performing Śūdra occupations in Itiharāsa, the Atharva Veda, sarpa vidyā (snake-charming), and devajana-vidyā (demonology).\(^{94}\) It is not clear that such instruction ever involved literacy.

Other texts suggest that in Vedic times, ritual was more open to the communal participation of people who would be later classed as Śūdras.\(^{95}\) In the post-Vedic period, as these Śūdras underwent increasing subjection, they suffered increasing shastric disqualification as well.\(^{96}\)

---

91 According to Āpastamba ii.11.29.
92 Sharma, *Śūdras in Ancient India*, 74-75.
93 Medicine and other arts were considered supplements to the Atharva Veda. Training in the sāstras of medicine, music, theatre, and the like was always more a matter of apprenticeship than literacy. A. S. Altekar in his *Education in Ancient India* assumed that all Śūdras were illiterate, but since most artisans, actors, and musicians were Śūdras, it is not improbable that some in later centuries could read manuals like the Nātyasāstra. See Scharfe on professional education and literacy. *Education*, 83-6, 263ff.
94 Śūdras in Ancient India, 75.
95 Kane (II. 1: 155-157) collected some of them. The Bhāradvāja Śravāṇa Sūtra (V.2.8) reports the view that a Śūdra could consecrate the three Vedic sacred fires. The liturgy of some Vedic rituals made provision for Śūdra participation. Why do so if they were excluded? According to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 1.1.4.2, in the ṛṣiṣṭapārṇāmāsa (new and full moon rites) the havishkṛt, who prepares the oblation, is summoned with an ehi (come here), if he is a Brāhmaṇa, āgahi, if a Kṣatriya, ādṛava (hasten here), if a Vaiṣya, and ādhāva (run up), if a Śūdra. Śūdras are even included in the Sanskrit formulae for drinking sacred soma.\(^{95}\)

There are fours castes, Brāhmaṇa, Rājānaya, Vaiṣya, and Śūdra;
Some non-Aryans and groups not classed among the three higher *varṇas* had recognized rights to *upanayana* and Vedic sacrifice. They are also examples of the many anomalies of caste status. The Rathakāras (wheelwrights) were ambiguously classified in the śāstras as a mixed or special caste with a right to initiation and a sacred fire. They may have been high prestige artisans in Vedic times who were degraded to quasi-Śūdra status. Niśādas were wild tribal hunters in Vedic literature, later normally classified as Śūdras, who had rights to some sacrifices. Such contradictions were common and inevitable given the arbitrariness and variety of *varṇa* classifications. Not surprisingly, from the beginning there were differences of opinion among *smṛtikāras*, compounded by the shifting statuses of castes, about who was or was not a Śūdra and what his ritual rights were.

Although later canonical texts such as the *Mīmāṁsā* and *Brahma Sūtras* confirm Śūdra exclusion, traces of suppressed strains of thinking survive in them as rejected *pūrṇapakṣas* that hint at alternative customs.

In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* IV. 1-2, we have the story of Jānaśruṭi Pauṭrāyaṇa and Raikva, wherein the latter addresses Jānaśruṭi as a Śūdra and imparts to him the *samvarga* (absorption) *vidyā*. The *Brahma Sūtra* (I.3.34-38) cites this text to prove that Śūdras are disqualified for knowledge of Brahman:

> The grief that he felt on hearing the disrespectful words made him run.  

\[Śūtra\ 1.3.34\]

In doing so, it cites an unnamed *pūrṇapakṣin* who argues that Śūdras have the right to *brahmanavidyā*, since they desire and have the capacity for that knowledge, and there is no scriptural prohibition as there is on offering sacrifices. This indicates, if nothing else, that such ideas were in circulation and called for refutation.

---


97 Kane HD (1974) II.1.45-46, 94. Ghurye 50 80. Dutt 83, 144-45. Sharma, *Śūdras in Ancient India* 76-9. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa (22) cites a version of Yājñavalkya 1.95: “A Rathakāra is begotten on a Karaṇa by a Māhīṣya. He lives as an artisan knowledgeable in all the *śīla* sāstras. All the sacraments such as initiation should be performed for him according to textual sources;” and Śālikha: “the Rathakāra is the secondary mixing of a Kṣatriya father and a Karaṇa mother and entitled to *upanayana*, to offer sacrifices and gifts, and to make a living by taming horses, building chariots and houses.”

98 Namely, *agnihotra*, *daśaśpurṇamāsa*, and an *iṣṭi* to Rūdra, according to some texts and authors. Kane HDS (1974): II.1.86-87. Sharma, *Śūdras in Ancient India* 77-79, 143-6, 225-7, 331-2. Yāska (6th-5th BCE) in the *Nirukta* (III.8) explains the “five peoples” (*pāṇcajaṇāḥ*) of Rg Veda X. 53-54 as meaning the four *varṇas* and Niśādas participated in sacrifice. Sharma thinks that this shows that in Yāska’s time, Śūdras and Niśādas took part in it.

The *Brahma Sūtra* excludes Śūdras from sacred knowledge on the grounds that they are not entitled to access it because: such knowledge is attained only through recitation of the Vedas; the right to recite the Vedas presupposes the right to initiation; and this right is reserved to the first three *varṇas* only by Vedic injunction.\(^{100}\)

As Kane, among many others, has pointed out, Śaṅkara’s etymology of “Śūdra” is far-fetched, derived from the sorrow (*śuc*) Jānaśruti feels hearing the contemptuous talk of the flamingoes about himself, then running off (*dru*) to Raikva.\(^{101}\) The argument goes that when Raikva addresses Jānaśruti as “Śūdra,” he means that he overcome by grief because deprived of knowledge and is not calling him a member of the fourth *varṇa*. Such a strained interpretation was clearly contrived to get round the scandal to Brahmin feeling in a low caste person presuming to hear the Vedas or understand their meaning.

The commentators on the *Brahma Sūtra* accept the exclusion of Śūdras from Vedic knowledge, finding alternative ways for them to attain *mokṣa*.\(^{102}\) The solution finally hit on by later *smṛti* is to allow the Śūdra to learn *mokṣadharma* from the *Mahābhārata* and *Purāṇas*, as does the SAS (56).\(^{103}\) Śūdras are unqualified for Vedic education, but this is no impediment to their salvation. They can learn about *mokṣadharma* through hearing the *Purāṇas* instead, which were revealed expressly to meet their need.\(^{104}\) Krṣṇa Śeṣa’s view on this matter is the same as Gāgābhaṭṭa’s several decades later:

> Just because the knowledge of the truth to be derived from study of the Upaniṣads is accessible only to the three higher *varṇas*, it by no means follows that Śūdras and so on are excluded from ultimate liberation. They can achieve liberation because they have access to the meaning of the Upaniṣads by learning those texts that reproduce it in another form, such as the *Purāṇas* and the like.\(^{105}\)

In his *bhaṣya*, Śaṅkara had already allowed non-*dvijas* to hear about *mokṣa* from the *Itihāsas* and *Purāṇas*.\(^{106}\) Liberation, however, through *brahmavidyā*, defined as knowledge of *śruti*, was strictly reserved to *dvijas*, which effectively meant Brahmins. Good karma could play a part.\(^{107}\) Examples are the sages Sūta Vidura and Dharmaśravas, who were born Śūdras, but attained knowledge of *mokṣa* as the fruit of their former deeds.

Rāmānuja concurred with Śaṅkara in disallowing Śūdras to receive instruction in *brahmavidyā* and perform sacrifices by reason of their incapacity. But for Rāmānuja, *bhakti* was the primary means to salvation. In the *Śrībhāṣya*

---

\(^{100}\) *Brahmasūtra* I.3.34.


\(^{103}\) HD (1974) II, pt. 1, 156; Śāntiparvan 328.49

\(^{104}\) SAS 56.

\(^{105}\) Quoted from the *Bhaṭṭacintāmani* in Pollock, “New Intellectuals in seventeenth-century India,” 13n18.

\(^{106}\) *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* I.3.38.

\(^{107}\) Ibid.
(I.3.39), he critiques the Advaita theory that āśrama is the main path of salvation, opening up a space for Śūdras as well to attain brahmavidyā through a gradual process of instruction and practice no different than that of Brahmmins. They too can attain release from bondage by the path of devotion and the teaching of those knowledgeable in the traditions of the Vedas and the Tamil scriptures of the Alvar Vaiṣṇavas.108

In this way the qualification of Śūdras for the knowledge of Brahman is perfectly clear. And as the knowledge of Brahman may be reached in this way not only by Śūdras, but also by Brāhmaṇas and members of the other higher castes, the poor Upaniṣad is practically defunct.109

The purification of karman was a prerequisite and auxiliary to attain ment of the Lord’s grace and consisted of following caste dharma and the practices of bhakti common to all āśramas and varṇas: prayer (japa), fasting (upavāsa), charity (dāna), and worship of the deities (devatārādhana).110 Rāmānuja practiced what he preached, welcoming Jains, Buddhists, Śūdras, and untouchables into his fold; his gurus were non-Brahmins or Śūdras.111

The Brahma Sūtra (200 BCE-200 CE) explains Pūrvamāṁśā arguments against the Śūdra’s entitlement to perform sacrifice, to disqualify him from hearing, and studying the Vedas.112 The locus classicus is the apaśūdrārdhikaraṇa section of the Mīmāṁsā Sūtra (completed ca. 400-500 CE).113 Jaimini and Śābara reject the pūrvapakṣa that all four varṇas are entitled to sacrifice by typically legalistic and circular reasoning, in this case, relying on a literalist interpretive strategy.114 The pūrvapakṣin, appealing to Bādari, argues that Śūdras too have a right to sacrifice because the Vedic injunction (yajeta, juhuyāt) makes no distinction as to varṇa. Since they are not explicitly excluded from sacrifice, they may perform it.

Śābara counters that the injunctions to install a sacred fire and receive initiation name only the first three varṇas. The omission of the Śūdra is not an oversight, but deliberate. Only the Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya can have a sacred fire or receive upanayana.115 The text must be read literally. As a sacred fire and initiation are the prerequisites to performing sacrifice, the Śūdra is therefore not qualified to sacrifice. Nor is the injunction that “desiring heaven, he should offer agnihotra” meant to apply to the Śūdra in any Vedic text, however much he too desires heaven. The Śūdra is not qualified to receive initiation because its purpose is Vedic study, and Vedic study is the
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108 Radhakrishnan, The Brahma Sūtra, 308.
112 For a useful discussion of this connection, see S. Pollock, “Deep Orientalism?: Notes on Sanskrit and Power Beyond the Raj,” 109-111.
115 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa bases his denial of the sacred thread and upanayana to Śūdras on this conventional reason: only the three dvija varṇas are explicitly granted the right (SAS 70, 71).
prerequisite to sacrifice. In the final analysis, therefore, the *Mīmāṃsā Sūtra* bases its denial of sacrifice to the Śūdra on his educational incapacity. The denial of Vedic education to Śūdras was so absolute that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa still bans them from studying the ancillary Vedāṅgas and Pāṇinian grammar since their sole purpose is the acquisition of *vaidika* knowledge.\(^{116}\)

This is a tautology of power. The Śūdra cannot sacrifice because he has no sacred fire or *upanayana*. He has no sacred fire or *upanayana* because the purpose of these is Vedic study. Because he has no Vedic knowledge, he cannot sacrifice. The ideological function of such a circular justification is to sacralize the subjection of the Śūdra through his enforced ignorance and deprivation and preserve upper caste privilege. On the other hand, Brahmans were only being pragmatic. Given the inaccessibility of Vedic learning to most everyone except Brahmans and the illiteracy, cultural exotism, and “backwardness” of many Śūdras, the argument of incapacity was realistic, however much the incapacity was a socio-historical facticity.

The categorical denial to Śūdras of *agnihotra homa*, the morning and evening oblation by the twice-born householder, especially of clarified butter (*ājya*), in the sacred fire, was a hard nub of scripturally sanctioned prohibition that could not be bypassed or relaxed. As time went by, the domestic rites for the twice-born—the *pañcāyajñas*, *pākayajñās*, *tarpaṇa*, *vaiśvadeva*, *balihaṇa*, *śrāddhas*, *vrataś*, and *saṃskāras*—were administered to Śūdras without the Vedic mantras. For instance, Yājñavalkya allowed the *pañcāyajña* and Āpastamba *vaiśvadeva* to Śūdras under the superintendence of twice-born men.\(^{117}\) But *agnihotra homa*, like all rites requiring Vedic mantras (e.g., *sandhyā*) or a sacred fire, could not be made so readily available.

The *saṃskāras* (perfectings) appropriate for Śūdras were also at issue.\(^ {118}\) As in the case of Rathakāras, even *upanayana* was not a straightforward matter. Although Dharmashastric authors strictly reserve *upanayana* to dvījas, there were forms of initiation for entering occupations associated with Śūdras. Maskarin in his commentary on *Gautama Dharmaśāstra* IV.26 says that Savanna (i.e., Śūdras “with varṇa status”) are initiated (*upānīya*) and taught archery, Ambaṣṭhas medicine, and Niśādas elephant training.\(^ {119}\) Suṣruta reports that some authorities allowed a well-qualified Śūdra of good family and character to admitted to the study of medicine, omitting *upanayana* and Vedic mantras.\(^ {120}\) Ambaṣṭhas practice medicine in Manu as well.\(^ {121}\) Initiation in these cases seems to be a form of

---

\(^{116}\) SAS 43.

\(^{117}\) Y. 1.121; ĀP. 2, 3, 4.

\(^{118}\) See Kane II, pt. 1, 198-199 for the differing *saṃskāras* permitted Śūdras in the sources. The number allowed to Śūdras increases over time.


\(^{120}\) Suṣruta, *Sārasthāṇa* 2.2-5.
professional licensing. Being a physician was a jīvīka “looked down on by the twice-born” in the sūtras and early śāstras that later elevates in status with the Vaidyas.

By the Gupta era, Śūdras had gained the right to some rites—śrāddha, some vows and sacraments, dāna, and the rites of the householder, i.e., the pañcamahāyajñas and pākayajñas—when performed without Vedic mantras, substituting “namah” in their place, in a domestic rather than a sacred fire.122 According to Yājñavalkya (100-300 CE):

A Śūdra should be attached to his wife, pure in conduct, a protector of his household, and devoted to śrāddha. He should perform the five sacrifices with the nama mantra. Y.1.121

The rites of śrāddha in the Grhyasūtras, like all the others in them, were not originally prescribed for Śūdras, but, as we see here, these were allowed to them.

The later Vaiṣṇavite parts of the Śanti and Anuśāsana parvans record this change in custom.123 There is the instance of the Śūdra, Paijavana, who performs the pākayajñas, the minor domestic rites, but without the Vedic mantras:124

Therefore, the Śūdra on his own, without the vows laid down in the Vedas, should offer
the minor sacrifices of the pākayajnas. A pūrṇapātra is the fee for them.125
We have heard the Śūdra, Paijavana, gave a hundred thousand pūrṇapātras
following the ordinance called aindragni.
Sacrifice, O Bhārata, is for all the varṇas, and the Śūdra too.
Devotion is laid down as the first among all sacrifices.
Devotion is a great divinity and purifies all sacrificers.
Brāhmaṇas are a Śūdra’s divinity. Śāntiparvan 60.38-41

Śāntiparvan 60.36 says that the Vedas allow the Śūdra the use of mantras with namah and svāhā, the exclamation accompanying an oblation to the gods, and the performance of the pākayajñas with them after being formally consecrated (yajñadikṣā). Śāntiparvan 60.39-43 allows sacrifice (yajña) to all varṇas (sarvarvarṇeṣu) with faith (śraddhā).

Similar views are found in the roughly contemporary chapters of the Purāṇas dealing with the duties of the varṇas.126 The Mārkaṇḍeya assigns the duties of making gifts and performing sacrifices to the Śūdra.127 The Brahmāṇḍa concedes the right to perform the five great sacrifices.128 The Nṛsiṁha declares that the great sacrifices
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121 Manu, 10.47.
122 Sharma, Śūdras in Ancient India, 296ff.
123 Sharma, Śūdras in Ancient India, 246.
124 Sharma (41-42) thinks that the story of Paijavana was a late thread of tradition in the Śāntiparvan and served as a precedent for Śūdras to perform sacrifices and make gifts.
125 A pūrṇapātra is a basket or vessel containing 256 handfuls of rice. An aindragni is a one-day sacrifice.
126 Sharma, 246. See R. C. Hazra, Studies in the Purānic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975) for the dating of Viṣṇu 175, Mārkaṇḍeya 74, Bhaviṣyā 188, and Bhāgavata 177.
127 MkP 28.7-8.
128 BrP III.12.19.
are for all varṇas, women, and untouchables. By the Gupta period, the pañcamahāyajñas are only metaphorically sacrifices; they are now simple domestic devotions, which could be opened to everyone like pūjā.

These allowances show up in the smṛtis, Purāṇas, and Mahābhārata at a time when Śūdras’ conditions of life were improving. What was going on before that is a fog. One has the sense, however, that in practice there was always far more variation in Śūdras doing Vedic rituals than the strictures of the smṛtikāras might lead one to believe, indeed, may be a reason for the stringency. The evidence of the Purāṇas, if only negatively, shows that Śūdras with the power and prosperity to do so adopted traivarṇika privileges and practices or simulacra thereof despite the objections of Brāhmaṇas.

As Sharma points out, the crucial development in this period is not the non-recitation of Vedic mantras, that was a given, but the increasing number of rites and saṃskāras, especially those concerned with child birth, Śūdras were following, provided the Vedic mantras were recited by a Brahmin. It was now accepted that the rituals of dvījas followed śruti and those of Śūdras followed smṛti. But, in practice, the distinction was not always of great moment.

The fact that the Śūdras were not allowed to utter the Vedic mantras does continue a religious hiatus between them and the twice-born, but this is more formal than real.

Caste and Karma

Still other texts can be collected expressing the view that caste is less a matter of birth than character. We find a current of protest, not only in expected dissident sources such as the Buddha’s pronouncements on true brāhmaṇatva, but in the more liberal threads of the Śāntiparvan and in Brahmanical texts such as the Vajrasūcika Upaniṣad, against the idea that birth solely determines caste and character.

That Śūdra who is always struggling for self-restraint, truthfulness and dharma is a Brāhmaṇa in my opinion, for a Brāhmaṇa is so by his character

Vanaparvan 216. 14-15

---

129 As quoted in Vṛddha Harīta VI.6.256.
130 This had been happening since at least the early first millennium on the evidence of the Vajrasūcī (p. 13) that, “along with Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas, Śūdras are seen doing the various acts connected with sacrificing and officiating at sacrifices, studying and teaching, and accepting gifts.” “Śudras are seen who are knowledgeable in all the śāstras of the Vedas, grammar, Mīmāṁsā, Sāṁkhya, Vaiśeṣika, and astrology.”
131 In the Vaijāvāpa Gṛhyasūtra, a new text composed to accommodate them, Śūdras have eight. Sharma, 298.
132 In the Padma Purāṇa (Dharmakosha III. pt. 1, 59). Kṛṣṇa Seṣa distinguishes between daiva and brāhmaṇa saṃskāras, the former being for Brāhmīns only (SAS 67).
133 Sharma, Śūdras, 300.
134 The Buddhist Vajrasūcī declares that there are Brāhmaṇas even in the families of Kaivartas, Rajakas, and Caṇḍālas for whom the saṃskāras of cidākaraṇa, muṇja, daṇḍa, and kāṣṭha are performed. The first is tonsure, the other three seem associated with upanyāsana: the grass girdle, staff, and a stick of wood as fuel for the fire. Vajrasūcī of Ṛṣabhaghoṣa, ed. with Hindi translation by R. P. Prasad Dvivedi, Harijivandas Prachyavidya Granthamala 3 (Varanasi: Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan, 1985): 28.
Great stress is laid on moral worth as the more important factor.

Truthfulness, restraint, tapas, generosity, non-injury to sentient beings, constant adherence to dharma—these always lead men to the fruition of their goal, not caste or family.

Vanaparvan 181. 42-43

Truthfulness, generosity, freedom from hatred and wickedness, humility, kindness, and tapas—he is know as a Brāhmaṇa where these are seen. If these signs are seen in a Śūdra and they do not exist in a Brāhmaṇa, then the Śūdra would not be a Śūdra and the Brāhmaṇa would not be a Brāhmaṇa.

Śāntiparvan 189.4, 8

Other verses in the Śāntiparvan declare that all four varṇas should hear the Vedas and one ought to accept knowledge even from a Śūdra. A verse attributed to Manu says that: 135

janmanā jāyate śūdraḥ sanskārāt dvija ucyate.
vedābhyaśāt bhavit vipro brahma jānāti brāhmaṇāḥ.

One is born a Śūdra; through the performance of rites he becomes a twice-born. By the study of the Vedas he becomes a vipra, but by the knowledge of Brahman he becomes a Brāhmaṇa.

Arguably, caste began as a division of labor that sorted men into classes by abilities and only later was combined with the karma theory of heredity. From a sociological point of view, the function of caste was to reproduce a subject class of exploitable labor. The practical function of Brahmanical varṇa theory was to validate it with sacred sanction. The foundational and sacrificial split, as it were, in the four varṇa system is between the three top varṇas, the dvija (“born again”) Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, and Vaiśya, and the Śūdra, the ekajati (“once-born”), who is deprived of the privileges of the dvija, including access to the treasures of education and the possession of elite culture, as markers of caste domination. A ban on the Vedas was the sign of the Śūdra’s subjection, although possibly making little difference in their day-to-day lives. Since the Vedas and Sanskrit learning were effectively a Brahmin monopoly, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas in practice probably had not much more to do with it than Śūdras. The means and opportunity to acquire Sanskrit learning, in any case, would be in short supply to the poor.

The problem that śūdradharma texts like the SAS addressed is that, by Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s day, many Śūdra castes were not part of the menial laboring classes. In many cases, they had attained power, wealth, and high social position and were not always distinguishable from Vaiśyas or even Kṣatriyas. Dharmashastra had to accommodate them with adjustments that did not endanger the structures of upper caste privilege while preserving the subordination of the lower jātis.

By the time of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, karma had long been established in Dharmaśāstra as the key to dharma. Not only was caste status improved or worsened (jātyutkaraṇa and jātayapakaraṇa,) by breeding up or down the varṇa hierarchy through marriage, the karmic effects of good or bad livelihood had the same result over five to seven generations, as Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa discusses. After seven generations of intermarriage and following a higher, more pure livelihood, even Śūdras turned into Brahmins. The theory of karma correlated occupation, jāti, and character, but not in some fatalistically inflexible way. There was room for character, as evidenced by achievement, to remake social position and find a new place in the varṇa system ratified with the blessings of Brahmins properly patronized. Karma was modifiable by conduct, knowledge, devotion, and grace. Caste status was renegotiable for powerful families and groups, their success being the marker of their merit.

137 SAS 30-31.
Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa on the Rituals for Śūdras

Most of the SAS is devoted to laying out the daily observances and worship for Śūdras. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa specifies the rules for the āhnikas at great length. These include venerating deities in the early morning, excretion, sipping water (ācamana), washing the teeth (dantadhāvana), bathing (snāna), applying sectarian marks (ūrdhvapūṇḍra), tarpaṇa, pūjā, upacāras (clothing, fragrances, incense, lamps, food offerings, circumambulation, bowing, flowers), the five great sacrifices (pañcamahāyaṇa), the rite for meals (bhojana), vaiśvadeva, and balihāraṇa. The many Śūdra-specific rules for aśauca (birth and death impurity), śrāddha and antyeṣṭi (last rites) are also laid out in detail. However expansive and inclusive his view of devotional practice, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa remains, nonetheless, unequivocally restrictive when it comes to anything involving the Vedas. He forbids Śūdras to receive Vedic education, speak Sanskrit, learn Pāṇinian grammar, study the Vedāṅgas, keep a sacred fire, receive the saṁskāras of birth (jātakarma), parting-of-the-hair (sīmanta) and initiation (upanayana), perform acts of worship, e.g., sandhyā, which require Vedic mantras such as the Gāyatrī. The prohibition on Vedic mantras is absolute and constant in the SAS. Everything else seems to be negotiable.

The pañcamahāyaṇa, śrāddha rites for the deceased, and dāna are clearly granted to Śūdras in Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s sources. These had been gained long ago by the Gupta period, as is evident from the Śāntiparvan and some Purāṇas.1 The restrictions on Brahmins accepting food and gifts from Śūdras except in an emergency in earlier Dharmaśāstra went by the way and dāna was popularized as one of the very best means of salvation or a better incarnation for Śūdras.2 This change no doubt had much to do with the simple fact that Brahmin priests were more and more the recipients of gifts and fees from the sacrifices, penances, śrāddhas, and saṁskāras they performed for people who might be categorized as Śūdras in Dharmaśāstra and in emulation of the donations to the Saṅgha by sons of “good family,” gahapatis (householders), setṭhis (merchants), and artisans.

There is much blurring of terminology, overlapping of rites, and alternative classifications in the sources. The interchangeability and variation of rites reflects the great irregularity in actual practice, the tolerant accommodation
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1 MrP 28.7-8 allows dāna and yajña to Śūdras. BnP 3.12.19 allows them the five mahāyaṇas. As we saw earlier, ŚP allow dāna and the five yajñas in the precedent of Paijavana. ŚP 60.3 says that the three Vedas allow Śūdras the pākayajñas with use of svāhā and namah. Dasyus are allowed the pākayajnas at ŚP 65.21-22
2 MkP 28.3-8; MP 17.71; Anuśāsana Parvan 217.13-15.
of diversity, the syncretism of Hinduism, or the Indian tendency to muddle, depending on your point of view. As Jan Gonda noted:

We cannot, on the other hand, expect the system to be perfect, the terminology used to be completely unambiguous and the differences with other ritual obligations, or overlaps and coincidences, to be clearly indicated. For instance, not only the five mahāyajñas are prescribed, but also the libations of water offered to gods, sages Fathers. Bali offerings are likewise given to various classes of beings. The daily worship or satiation of the Fathers is in later texts called a śrāddha and a bali. Various views are found of the time and nature of the pitṛyajña and the brahmavajña (before or after the vaiśvadeva). Nor does there in all our sources exist a hard and fast line between the vaiśvadeva and the devayajña.3

This is all true of the SAS. For Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, the “pākayajñas are the five great sacrifices.”4 “Vaiśvadeva is devayajña,” but it is also pitṛ-, bhūta-, and mānuṣya-yajña.5 Bali is bhūtayajña6 but also part of daily śrāddha and pitṛyajña. Tarpaṇa is not separate from deva-, pitṛ-, bhūta- and mānuṣya-yajña, or from śrāddha. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cites Yogi Yājñavalkya, Śātātapa, Manu, Baudhāyana, the Padma and Skanda Purāṇas to authorize offering refreshing libations of water with sesame seeds to the devas, pitṛs, rṣis, and guests, a whole array of beings from a blade of grass to Brahma: Gandharvas, Apsarases, Asuras, Suparṇas, Yakṣas, Nāgas, trees, evil spirits, birds, and creatures of air and water.7

The Rituals for Brāhmaṇas Recast

An odd feature of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s presentation is that he regularly cites texts from the Grhyasūtras, which were originally written with the twice-born in mind, leaving in the references to sacred threads and fires, although he has unmistakably ruled these out for Śūdras. Indeed, many of the rituals he describes were once only for Brahmins, but he simply cites them in a discussion of the rituals for Śūdras, tacitly overlooking their dvija character.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa rewrites some rituals plugging in namah in place of the sacred pranava and making other Śudra-appropriate substitutions. His description of tarpaṇa is a good example to look at as an interesting illustration of reworking a ritual meant originally for dvijas that opens it equally to all four varṇas while respecting the social distinctions.

He first recommends the rite in the Purāṇas as the best for Śūdras and women:

On this topic some say that as there are many views about tarpaṇa in the different schools of the Veda as well as a plurality of schools and an unlimited number of local traditions and customs, the best form of tarpaṇa for Śūdras is that presented in the Purāṇas in which old
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3 Gonda, Vedic Ritual, 414.
4 SAS 36. At least, he reads Gautama 1.50.65 as meaning this.
5 SAS 157.
6 SAS 157.
7 SAS 120-123.
Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa stipulates that Śūdras are to perform rites and observances according to the school (śākhā) of the Veda in which they have been instructed by Brahmins, and in default of that, according to the Vājasa-neyi Samhitā. We can assume, then, that some Śūdras were doing tarpana according to the rite of different schools of the Vedas and with many variants of local custom. Thus, some Śūdras had connection to the Vedas, or felt they did, through the intermediary of Brahmin priests. This must particularly have been the case in regions where Śūdras were high caste.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa then describes tarpana in the Padma Purāṇa. Earlier, however, he gives the litany for tarpana according to Baudhāyana, technically for the twice-born.

Then, wearing the sacred thread around the neck, say “I refresh the Ṛṣis beginning with Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana. I refresh all the wives of the Ṛṣis. I refresh all the sons of the Ṛṣis. I refresh all the grandsons of the Ṛṣis.” This is tarpana for the Ṛṣis. Wearing the sacred thread over the right shoulder, say “I refresh the pītras who are Soma, the sons of Pītra, Yama, the sons of Āṅgiras, the Agniśvāthas, the Barhiṣkṣas, and the Kavyavādīs. I refresh all the pītras. Namaha. I refresh all the sons of the pītras. Namaha. I refresh all the grandsons of the pītras. Namaha. I refresh all the companies of pītras. I refresh my father so-and-so by his dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Vasu. I refresh my grandfather so-and-so by his dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my great-grandfather so-and-so by his dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Vasu. I refresh my grandmother so-and-so by her dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my great-grandmother so-and-so by her dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Vasu. I refresh my mother so-and-so by her dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my great-grandmother so-and-so by her dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my maternal grandmother so-and-so by her dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my great-grandmother so-and-so by her dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my mother’s grandmother so-and-so by his dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my mother’s great-grandmother so-and-so by his dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my mother’s grandmother so-and-so by her dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my mother’s great-grandmother so-and-so by her dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my mother’s great-grandmother so-and-so by her dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra. I refresh my mother’s great-grandmother so-and-so by her dāsa name, whose gotra was so-and-so, and who has attained the form of Rudra.

Then, after giving tarpana to gurus and friends because of their special closeness one should offer three libations of water while repeating these verses:

May the gods, divine sages, and human beings
from Brahma to a blade of grass be refreshed,
all the pītras, the maternal grandfather and the rest.
May this water and sesame be for the kōtis of families past,
living on the seven continents, from the world of Brahma down.

Note that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa has not bothered to excise the reference to wearing the sacred thread. The Śūdra is to offer the refreshment of tarpana to Ṛṣis and gurus, just as a twice-born would, in addition to his ancestors. The pītaras of a Śūdra were called Sukālins in the Purāṇas and described as dark in color. Although he is not supposed to have
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8 SAS 121.
9 See my chapter on Vājasa-neyi-Samhitā and Śūdras for a fuller discussion.
10 BnP 3.10.96-99; VAP 2.11.90; MkP 96.23,36.
"pravaras," he has a *gotra.* “Dāsa” is suffixed to the name of a Śūdra, just as the name for a Brahmin ends in “sharma,” the name of a Kṣatriya in “varma;” and a Vaiśya in “gupta.”

What is one to make of this procedure? On the one hand, this may demonstrate the extent to which *sat-Śūdras* were practicing and participating in many rituals not very differently from the upper castes, as long as the Vedic elements were bracketed out. As a text written by and for Brahmins, it was no doubt simply understood that these were to be left out of rites personally performed by Śūdras or administered to them by a priest. On the other, it was part of the process of Brahmanization of the Śūdra. The ritual life of low castes was now to be formalized as much as that of *dvijas* had been. Heretofore, Śūdras had been exempt from much ritual regulation and benignly neglected as long as they kept their distance and did not interfere with their betters. The new *śūtradharma* texts concerned themselves with regulating the ritual life of the majority of the population as never before. To bring them all within the ambit of sacramental practice and, not least, Brahmin livelihood, the shastric rules originally meant for the twice-born were extrapolated to them.

Brāhmaṇas were traditionally sanctified by 40 sacraments: seven *pākayajñas,* seven *haviryajñas,* seven *somayajñas,* five *mahāyajñas,* four *vratas* for the study of the Vedas, and ten *samskāras.* Over time, the *pākayajñas,* *mahāyajñas,* *vratas,* and *samaskāras* were converted into observances open to Śūdras, while the strictly Vedic rites (*havir,* *soma,* and the *samaskāras* of Vedic education) were reserved to *dvijas.* Similarly, the daily observances (*āhnikas*) of *snāna,* *ācamana,* purification with sacred *kuśa* grass, *tarpana,* *vaiśvadeva,* *baliḥaraṇa,* and *śrāddha* were all rites for the twice-born in the Śrauta- and Grhya-sūtras. In the SAS, they are now simply rites Śūdras also do. The SAS and other *śūtradharma* texts are the culmination of this process of turning Vedic ritual into devotional practices and merging them with Āgamic rites and Purāṇic worship.

If a pious Śūdra performed all the rituals prescribed as *nitya* in the SAS, his day from morning to night would be nearly as full of ritual as that of a punctilious Brāhmaṇa. In the SAS, the *pañcamahāyajñas* are to be performed daily with *tarpana,* *pūjā,* *bali,* and *śrāddha.* On top of these are what a Freudian might regard as neurotically detailed acts of bathing, purification, personal hygiene, and eating (*bhojana*). This was not only time demanding, but

---

1 BmP 2.32.90, 121-22.
13 "In the sphere of religion the tendency is to forbid to the Śūdra the use of the most efficacious formulas and rites on the one hand, and to exhort him to perform most of the daily rites and obligatory sacraments prescribed for the other castes.” Ghurye, *Caste, Class and Occupation,* 90.
also confusing. What kind of Śūdra had the motive and means to do all this? Clearly, only the better off and socially aspiring, or the exceptionally pious.

It is very unlikely that even most Brahmins performed them all. If the ideal web of Dharmashastric rules were followed to the letter, it would paralyze life. Thus, we have the escape clause of āpad, as Wendy Doniger calls it, as a concession to reality. Āpaddharmaś were the relaxations of the rules permitted in an emergency. Since much of life is an emergency, every rule had ever ready exceptions, provisos, and loopholes. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa exploits these to the hilt. In any event, local tradition, not śāstra, was far and away the most important basis for deciding what to do.

Even Manu allowed Brahmins in difficult circumstances to engage in trade, money lending, and farming. Not a few even took up the profession of arms. In the days of the Raj, the Tailaṅga Brahmins, from whom the family of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa may have derived, were mostly engaged in commerce in the Carnatic. Some Brahmins were poor and found it necessary to trade on their ritual purity and prestige, serving at lowly occupations such as cooks or priests for Śūdras and other low caste people, even untouchables. Conversely, at the village level, many “Śūdras” were often the priests of the local cults and devas and the administrators of temples. There was a class divide between funeral priests (Mahābrahmans and Mahābappas), some of whom were untouchable, temple priests (pūjāris), chaplains (purohita) serving upper varnas, and high prestige acharyas and paṇḍits like Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. The services of inferior Brahmin castes—Ojḥās (healers and exorcists of bhuts and prests), Gaṅgā-putras (administrators of tirthas, wells, and tanks where pilgrims bathed), and Joshis or Bhanreriyas (astrologers and guides)—were much patronized by high and low castes alike.

When we speak of Brahmanical domination, therefore, it best to bear in mind that it was the discursive structure of caste that was dominant, not Brahmins per se. Brahmins were segmented by caste inequalities and differences of sect, custom, and practice (e.g., in marriage and diet.) like everyone else. Even their varṇa status was not always unequivocal. The social position of many Brahmins was often as precarious and low as the castes for which they officiated as priests. Most probably had only a smattering of Vedic and high Sanskritic learning, like village priests

15 Manu X. 116; Kane (1974), II. pt. 1. 122-134. In his fourteenth century commentary on Parāśara, (Parāśara-Mādhava I: 425-426, 435) Mādhava says that trades and crafts including agriculture belong to all castes in the distressful times of the Kaliyuga when a sufficient living could not be made from performing sacrifices, Kaliyuga having come to mean what people actually do now. Brahmins are entitled in particular to practice agriculture, thus sanctioning the facts on the ground and the role Brahmins had long played in the growth of the medieval agrarian kingdoms as farmsteaders.
17 M. A. Sherring, Hindu Tribes and Castes, 3 vols. (Cosmos Publications, 1974), II: 175
18 These are types of Brahmins in Benares as described by Sherring, I: 35-38. See also Bhupen Chaudary, Indian Caste System: Essence and Reality (New Delhi: Global Vision, 2001), 74-75.
with their Latin in medieval Europe. The discourses and debates of Brahmin paṇḍits in Vārānasi was another world altogether. Brahmins had to adapt and parley their relationship to local caste configurations and changing politico-economic circumstances. They were some of the threads weaving through the social fabric and not above the “caste struggle.” The more one studies caste on the ground, the more it becomes apparent that Brahmins and their ideas of caste were extraneous to most peoples’ lives. Many Śūdra castes had dealings with Brahmins as the providers of religious services and the bearers of sanctity, blessing, and auspiciousness for the events of live from birth to death. But they were not “dominated” by them or their rules of social purity.

For instance, many Śūdra families employed Brahmins to perform a great variety of rites, “sanskars” and “karamas,” as described in colonial ethnographic surveys such as those of H. H. Risley, M. A. Sherring, and R. E. Enthoven.19 These surveys come 300 years after Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and their picture of Śūdra-Brahmin relations may be anachronistic, but they show us what they would become and were very likely already coming to be by the sixteenth century. The most common ritual services were astrological fixing of auspicious times for marriage and other occasions, fertility rites, calculating nativity nakṣatras, performing marriage homas, funerals, and śrāddhas, and pronouncing prayers during pūjā of the Hindu gods.

Looking at the surveys for Bengal, Bihar, and the Deccan, the locales presumably best known to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, we see that in the nineteenth century employment of Brahmin priests had become the norm with little but class differences among Kṣatriyas, Vaiṣyas, and Śūdras. To pick out a few of the many interesting examples, the Chamars, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s carmakāras, were Rāmānandī tanners, leather-workers, and shoemakers.20 There are 62 subcastes of them in Risley.21 Although at the very bottom of the Hindu social scale because of their unclean occupation and eating of beef and pork, they employed Maithil Brahmins for worship and ceremonial. This is especially surprising in that Maithil Brahmins were known in times past for their traditionalism, ritual orthopraxy, and learning.22

Barhis, a carpenter caste, hired Tirhuti (i.e., Maithil) Brahmins for pūjā to the great gods, but worshipped Viśvakarman, the god of carpenters, and their local deities with gurus of their own caste.23 The Binds were farmers, fishers, hunters, and earth-workers, all low varṇa occupations in Dharmaśāstra, but employed Maithil Brahmins to

21 Risley 175.
23 Risley 66.
preside at the worship of Śiva Bhagavat and Jagadamba, while still worshipping the village gods. Telis, oil press-
ers, had Rashi Brahmins in the North and deshi Brahmins in the Deccan. and some of the higher castes among the
great variety of Malis, Kṛṣṇa Śeśa’s mālākāras, “temple garland makers and florists,” had Brahmin priests.

The Kamars of Bengal, Kṛṣṇa Śeśa’s karmakāras, and the Kansaras of Gujarat, his kamṣāras, were braziers, met-
alworkers, and smiths, clearly low caste occupations, but employed Brahmin priests to perform pūjā and vrata.

Khatiks or Kasais, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s khaṭīkas, vegetable sellers and butchers, employed Tirhuti Brahmins in the north
and Havik Brahmins in the south, who also made their living as palm and spice gardeners growing peppers, car-
damon, and betel nut.

The case of the Mochis of Gujarat underscores many of the ambiguities of caste I have sketched out. They
claimed descent from Rajputs, but, like the Chamars of Northern India, were engaged in artisanal occupations as
tanners, shoe-makers, armor-makers, saddlers, painters, enamellers, and bricklayers that high caste Hindus regarded
as low and polluting. They seem to be Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s Dhigvanas, who were popularly known as Mocīs. They prac-
ticed witchcraft, drank alcohol, and ate meat, but kept all the Hindu fasts and feasts. Some had become Swaminara-
yans or took up a religious life as bhagats. But for ritual ceremony, they employed Brahmin priests called Mochi
Gors who were despised by other Brahmins. Some Cutch Mochis even wore the sacred thread, but without the
thread-girding ceremony.

Nilaris (also know as Rangaris and Nilgars) were cloth dyers and similar to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s nīlīkārtas and rajakas in
color and status. Scattered throughout the Bombay Presidency, some were Liṅgāyats and some Smārtas. They
worshipped all the Hindu gods and observed all the Hindu holidays. They believed in sorcery and oracles and fol-
lowed gurus of their own caste, but also made use of Deshastha Brahmins.

The Kumbhars of the Deccan, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s kumbhakaras, made pots, bricks, tiles, and toys. Some officiated as
priests in local temples and performed last rites for Śūdras, but they also employed Brahmins. Maratha Kumbhars
employed Deshastha Brahmins, Konkani Kumbhars employ Chitpavans, and Kanada Kumbhars Haviks.

---

24 Risley 131-32.
25 Risley 305-309; Enthoven 3: 371-74.
26 Risley 60-61; Enthoven 3: 422-426.
28 Risley 477. Khatiks are no different from “middle class Hindus” in diet. Haviks were Kanarese Brahmins. Enthoven 1: 252-54.
29 Enthoven 3: 56-59.
31 Enthoven 275-284.
Surprisingly, even those classified as untouchables and outcastes in Dharmaśāstra were served by Brahmin priests, albeit of a low repute. The Namasudras (aka Chandals and Nishads) of Bengal, were once candālas but had risen in status to second class Śūdras, and now made their living as respectable carpenters, artisans, goldsmiths, shopkeepers, and oil dealers. They had Brahmin priests in to officiate at their religious and social occasions. These were popularly known as Barna (varṇa) Brahmins, Candala-Brah-mins, or Patita (fallen) Brahmins, a set of Brahmin sub-castes who served Śūdra castes as priests and were not received on equal terms by other priestly castes. They also served some Doms, a Dravidian menial caste in the North, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s carrion-removing Ṇombas. Most Doms, however had no Brahmin priests and so had “no authority to mould their religious usages into conformity with a uniform standard,” as Risley observed. The Haris, another scavenger caste, engaged for ritual purposes Brahmins of as poor status as themselves. The Maratha Buruds, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s Buruḍas, bamboo workers and basket weavers, were antyajas in śāstra, but had Deshastha Brahmin priests who were on an equal social footing with other Brahmins.

The Rev. Sherring described these Brahmin-employing Śūdras as “middle class.” The British in their keenness to promote an English style middle class in India to undermine Brahmin and Rajput pride discovered it, as they thought, in Vaiśyas and Śūdras. Vaiśyas and “upper Sudra tribes” were the class of Indian that exhibited middle class enterprise, vigor, and practical intelligence.

Sherring recognized what must have been plainly evident in 1872: that Vaiśyas and Śūdras had blended into one class divided now into the sat and asat, the respectable and the not.

As a fact, the Vaiśyas are now scarcely at all an agricultural people, while the Sudras have stepped into the position which they once occupied in the cultivation of the soil. At the same time, in the social and political revolutions that have at times passed over the country, the two great races of Vaiśya and Sudras have become so intimately blended that it is hard to point with precision to any leading distinction between them. All indeed that, for the most part, can be said respecting them, amounts to the statement merely, that certain castes are purer Vaiśya or purer Sudra than certain others. The dominant Brahman and Rajpoot tribes have lost all their authority and much of their influence. The Sudra no longer thinks it a sin to read; on the contrary, he conceives it possible to become as wise as the Brahmans and does not hesitate to endeavour to surpass him.39

---

32 Risley 183-89.
33 Risley 70.
34 Risley 240-249.
35 Risley 245. In the Deccan, Doms or Dombs were an endogamous subcaste of Mahars. Enthoven 2: 401-405.
36 Risley 314.
37 Enthoven 1: 254-260.
38 Sherring 1: 250.
39 Sherring 1: 248.
This leveling out of ritual status was already becoming evident in the SAS, where Vaiśya rites are recommended for sat-Śūdras. Sherring notes that last rites for Śūdras were the same as those for higher castes: the ten days once only for Brahmans.⁴⁰ Many upper caste Śūdras—Bhats, Barhais, Kumbhars, Kāyasthas, Sonars, Kunbis, and Kurmis—claimed Kṣatriya or Brahmin origin and had taken to wearing the sacred thread.⁴¹

**Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa and Vedic Mantras**

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, like all writers on dharma of the time, absolutely forbids Śūdras to recite Vedic mantras.⁴² On the question of Śūdras reading the Purāṇas or reciting Purāṇic mantras, he concludes, as does Kamalākara, that they may listen in the company of a Brahmin.⁴³ He cites the author of the Kalpataru, Lakṣmīdhara, in support. Śūdras are unqualified:

> for Vedic mantras only, not for Purāṇic.  
> Since Purāṇic dharma was specifically laid down  
> for Śūdras and women and particular mantras were  
> produced as a special resource for them,  
> they can recite Purāṇic mantras as part of ritual observances. SAS 50

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa mentions the opinion of some authors that Śūdras may recite the Purāṇic mantras themselves, but seems to settle on the position that the officiating priest should recite these for him.⁴⁴

Although he allows many rites to be performed as long as the Vedic mantras are left out and namah substituted,⁴⁵ there are some rites, however, that cannot be performed by Śūdras even without the mantras, such as sandhyā, which requires the Gāyatrī.⁴⁶ Without the mantra, the ritual would not be perfect in performance.⁴⁷ Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is strict on this point⁴⁸ and recommends, as pointed out above, that instead of sandhyā, Śūdras venerate deities in the morning.⁴⁹

---

⁴⁰ Sherring 1: 254.  
⁴¹ See the entries for each in Enthoven.  
⁴³ SAS 47-48.  
⁴⁴ SAS 42-50.  
⁴⁵ See my section on nama.  
⁴⁶ SAS 51.  
⁴⁷ SAS 66.  
⁴⁸ SAS 73-74.  
⁴⁹ SAS 51, 79.
Astonishingly, demonstrating how long religiously based discriminations can last, it has been only in recent years that lower caste Hindus acquired full legal rights to Vedic mantras such as the Gāyatrī.\textsuperscript{50} In 1992, the Madras High Court handed down a ruling that the Gāyatrī mantra did not belong only to the upper castes, but to all Hindus, and indeed to all humanity. As the Times of India reported, the judge found that:

It will be anachronistic for any one to contend that the mantra signifies or relates to any particular religion. The Vedas have always been considered to belong to all mankind and are not limited to any particular religion, race, caste or community.\textsuperscript{51}

Of course, the judge is himself being anachronistic. The idea that the Vedas were always considered to belong to all mankind, religions, and races was, in point of fact, never historically the case, but reflects a modern age of universal human rights. The whole point of Dharmaśāstra was that the Vedas were for upper caste persons only and a jealously guarded privilege. In fact, by Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s day the Vedas were largely the property of Brahmins alone, and dvija meant primarily Brahmin.\textsuperscript{52}

**Comparison with the Śūdrakamalākara**

On the issue of Vedic mantra, the SAS is close to the Śūdrakamalākara, the best known of the śūradharma texts. In his section on adhikāra for mantra, Kamalākara upholds the view that the Śūdra is not eligible to study the Vedas, but can listen to the recitation of smṛtis and Purāṇas and receive instruction by Brāhmaṇas (SK 13-14, 17).\textsuperscript{53} He cites several passages from the Purāṇas to this effect. This agrees more or less with the position Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa reaches.

In his usual way, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa (42-48) cites a number of opposed and alternative opinions, from the restrictive Gautama (xii.4) to the more permissive parts of the Kalpataru, but ends up in this case arguing clearly for the moderate position that Śūdras are entitled to listen to the Purāṇas.\textsuperscript{54} He observes that a Śūdra is not qualified to hear the Vedas, study the Vedāṅgas, or hear the Purāṇas recited according to some authorities, but other texts say he may listen occasionally when the twice-born recite. The Bhavisya Purāṇa also says that a Śūdra may listen in the company of a Brāhmaṇa. Therefore, a Śūdra is allowed to hear, but not recite or study the Purāṇas when he is engaged in serving Brahmins, which in practice must have meant for the sat-Śūdra following their religious leadership.

\textsuperscript{50} See SAS 36, 50-51, 61, 67,102, 218-219 for prohibitions of Vedic mantra in general for Śūdras and 72-72 for restriction of the Gāyatrī mantra in particular.

\textsuperscript{51} The Times of India, 31 August 1992, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{52} That “twice-bomr” often denoted just a Brahmin was already the case in the early centuries. With the decline in the number of “authentic” Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas, the practice of initiation and Vedic education lapsed for everyone except Brahmins. C.E. See Scharfe, Education in Ancient India, 101.

\textsuperscript{53} Kane (1941), I. 436; II. pt. 1, 155-156.

\textsuperscript{54} SAS 46-48.
An examination of statements prohibiting hearing shows that hearing and reciting are prohibited as a principal occupation. The rules about hearing apply to Śūdras as they perform their duties to the twice-born when they sit engaged in listening to the Purāṇas. For this reason, the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa speaks of the special manner of hearing them.

While attending to images of the gods or to Brahmans, the Śūdra is fully free to listen, and so are the other twice-born. Indeed, duties concerning śruti and smṛti are proclaimed for the Brahmin, great king. Therefore, Śūdras should never hear them without a Brahmin.

“Attending to images” means that is the main occupation while listening,” because he can listen freely on the occasion of worshipping them, but he cannot do so on his own. That is said in “without a Brahmin the Purāṇas, etc., should never be heard.” That means by being a listener while attending to a Brahmin. SAS 47

Kamalākara says that religious rites are to be performed for Śūdras with Paurāṇic mantras. Again, after citing divergent views on their qualification to hear or recite Vedic and Purāṇic mantras, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa closes with a citation from the Kalpataru that allows a Śūdra to read and recite Paurāṇic mantras on his own. Since Purāṇic dharma was specifically laid down for Śūdras and women and particular mantras were produced as a special resource for them, they may recite Paurāṇic mantras as part of ritual observances. The Purāṇas are the fifth Veda.55 Are we to infer that this is Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s final judgment on the matter? He keeps his options open.

The question of whether Śūdras could read the Purāṇas themselves turned particularly on the matter of mantras. All writers of digests and commentaries agreed that the Vedic mantras in them were off-limits—Śūdras should not read or listen to them. The argument went that the Purāṇas were for the benefit of all varṇas and, so, contained Vedic mantras for dvijas, but these were not for the fourth varṇa. Some smṛtikāras, however, consented to Śūdras reciting the Paurāṇic mantras citing the sanction of the Padma Purāṇa. Other, including Kamalākara and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa (47), held that Paurāṇic mantras had to be recited for a Śūdra by a Brāhmaṇa citing the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa. As Kane shows, the position Kamalākara and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa take on this matter is, on this particular point, more restrictive than that of some earlier smṛtikāras such as Śrīdatta (1275-1310 CE) and Laṅkamīḍhara in the Kalpataru (ca. 1125 CE).56 The Kalpataru permitted a Śūdra to read and repeat Paurāṇic mantras himself, although he should not read the Purāṇas, only hear them read by a Brāhmaṇa. All smṛtikāras were united, not surprisingly, in wishing to preserve Brāhmaṇ control of access to the Vedas. It was their cultural capital. That later authors were more conservative than earlier ones Kane interestingly explains as due to the decline of Buddhism in India requiring a change in the strategy of Brahmanization:

Therefore, the learned brāhmaṇas who wanted to wean sections of the masses (including Śūdras) away from Buddhist teachings composed new Paurāṇika mantras by the thousands and employed them in all religious rites.

55 As Sumantu says in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa (SAS 45).
like śrāddhas, vratas &. It was, therefore, that earlier nibandha writers like Śrīdatta were prepared to allow Śūdras to recite Paurāṇika mantras. But when centuries had elapsed after Buddhism had disappeared from India, orthodox writers like Kamalākara (who wrote his Nīrṇayasyaṇḍhā in 1612 A.D.) showed a stiffer attitude by confining Śūdras merely to listening to Puraṇas read by a brāhmaṇa and by not allowing them even to recite a Paurāṇika mantra.57

Namaskāra

The namah mantra for the use of Śūdras in place of Vedic mantras seems to have become common already by the Dharmaśātra period, as we see in Gautama X. 66. “The namaskāra mantra is permitted to him.” Both Raghunandana and Kamalākara support the view that Purāṇic mantras with namah should replace the Vedic mantras and be repeated by a Brāhmaṇa priest.58 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa more or less concurs. Śūdras are to substitute namah for Vedic mantras when performing the five mahāyajñas, vaisvadeva, agniharana, ācamana, tarpāṇa, balihaṇa, bhojana, vrṣotsarga and the śrāddhas and when welcoming Brahmins who are paying a house-call to perform a ritual.59 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cites Yājñavalkya as his main authority:60

Devoted to his wife, pure, support of men, faithfully performing śrāddha,
he should not omit to offer the five sacrifices with the namaskāra mantra. Y 1.121

Another important and repeated citation is from the Varāha Purāṇa:61

A Śūdra being without mantra, a Brahmin should be taken for the mantra. VrP 188.48

These two citations define Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s basic position. Śūdras are to use namah in their daily devotions and a Brahmin priest should be invited to officiate and recite the mantras when Śūdras perform śrāddhas and other occasional rites. The mantras should be Purāṇic, but in practice, the distinction between Purāṇic and Vedic mantras may not have been so hard and fast.62

Mahāyajñas/Pākayajñas

Judging by the evidence of the Mahābhārata, smṛtis,63 and Purāṇas,64 the pañcamahāyajñas appear to have been the first major, formerly Brāhmaṇa ritual adapted for the sake of Śūdras.65 Earlier than that, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa quotes

57 Ibid., 926.
59 SAS
60 SAS 43, 48, 112, 157, 217.
62 Sharma, Śūdras, 300: “For in early medieval times some Smārta mantras find their way into the Vedic mantras.” Kane, V. pt. 2, 920; IV. 440n984.
63 Y. 1.121.
64 SAS 157; SAS 161: “The five rites should be performed by Śūdras without mantras according to the Vārāha Purāṇa.”
65 And expands the farthest and are the most amalgamated with general devotional practices. By the 17th century, Kamalākara (55), commenting on Śāntiparvan 65.13-21, will liberally allow even mlecchas, i.e., Muslim foreigners, to perform pitṛyajña.
Manu as allowing *tarpaṇa* to Śūdras. Gautama quotes authorities who allowed Śūdras to do some of the *pāka*yajñas. In the *Manusmṛti* (III, 69-71), the five great sacrifices are *brahmayajña*, *pitrayajña*, *devayajña*, *bhūtayajña*, and *nṛya’yajña*, respectively, the teaching and study of the Vedas, sacrifice to ancestors, sacrifice to the gods, sacrifices to beings, and reception of guests.

When reworked for Śūdras, with the Vedic sacrifices and mantras removed, the *mahā*yajñas became five devotional acts: Purāṇic worship, worship of the fathers, worship of all the gods (*vaiśvadeva*), and offerings (*bali*) to beings, and honoring guests (*atithi*). For Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, they are now obligatory (*nitya*) as daily observances for Śūdras. One should perform them in the sequence: *devayajña*, *bhūtayajña* followed by *pitrayajña*, then *manusyayajña*. *Brahmayajña* comes after *tarpaṇa* or *vaiśvadeva*.

*Brahmayajña* is no longer Vedic recitation, but prayers, mantras, and verses from the Purāṇas and Itihāsas “or any verses, hymns of praise, and the like, clearly permitted to Śūdras in the Purāṇas.” It is to be done as follows:

After bathing, he sits down facing east, sips water, and sprinkling himself with water, forms the resolve, “I will perform *brahmayajña*.” Seated on *darbha* grass with two blades of *darbha* grass, he takes other blades in his cupped hands, with his lap in *padmāsana*, crossing his hands and feet, or as instructed. He says the *namaskāra mantra* three times or more. When he has said his chosen form of *brahmayajña*, putting aside the *darbha* grass and sprinkling himself with water, let him sip. Moreover, he may perform *brahmayajña* by reciting any verses, hymns of praise, and the like, clearly permitted to Śūdras in the *Purāṇas*.

SAS 113

Note that this version allows the Śūdra worshipper to choose and recite his own prayers, mostly not the case in other authorities. As discussed before, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cites conflicting smṛtis, some allowing a Śūdra to recite Purāṇic scripture himself and others reserving this to the Brahmin priest, but does not come down indisputably on either side of the issue. One can take it as another example of his straddling where the *sat* or *asat* status would be the decisive factor.

For Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, Śūdras have a special instruction to perform the minor domestic sacrifices (*pāka*yajñas) of cooked food offerings and *homa* oblations of clarified butter (*ājya*) in the domestic fire. The terminology Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa uses for the domestic fire is not clear. His cited sources distinguish between the *laukika* (common) fire and the *śālāgni* (hall) fire. The latter is also called a *vaivāhika* or marriage fire, since a Vedic householder lights it when he marries and sets up house. Śātātapa call it a *vaidyika* fire. And that seems to be the point of difference for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa.

---

66 Manu says, “*Tarpaṇa* is always for all four *varṇas*; therefore he should perform it for the fathers and gods for self-purification.” This, however, is one of the citations Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa attributes to Manu that cannot be found in any of our editions. SAS 114.

67 Gautama DS, X.65.

68 SAS 37, 68-9.

69 SAS 159.
The śālāgni or vaivāhika fire is where the twice-born do their domestic sacrifices. It is not a consecrated śrauta fire. The implication is that Śūdras do their domestic rites in a laukika fire. Thus, Śūdras had a domestic, non-Vedic fire nominally different from the domestic fire of the twice-born. But both are doing the same rituals in a domestic fire, only the Śūdra technically without vaiddika mantras.\(^{70}\)

A recurring problem is examined: when do Śūdras make offerings of cooked grains such as rice and barley with milk and ghee or uncooked food and can their cooked food be accepted?\(^{71}\) The pākayajñas are done with cooked food offerings, but some of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s authorities regard cooked offerings as inappropriate for Śūdras, in śrāddha for instance. He refers to the customary distaste for Śūdras offering anything but raw food in śrāddha.

The problem was compounded by the question of the propriety of offering Brahmins cooked food. The offering of cooked and raw foods in ritual is tied to the purity rules for the foods which Brahmins may accept and the persons from whom they may accept food. These purity rules, in turn, represent prevailing local caste rules regarding the acceptance of cooked food from lower castes by higher—who dīnes with whom, who serves whom—that regulate caste relations. In this way, caste is encoded in the very form of the ritual and is arguably its real content. As Romila Thapar puts it, sacrificial ritual is a “form of social exchange.”\(^{72}\)

The preoccupation of the orthodox Brahmins with the preservation of their purity through social distance provided the upper castes with the forms and concepts with which they regulated their contact with social inferiors, especially unclean aboriginal tribals. The purity rules function as the markers of caste hierarchy. This was the role the Brahmanical ideology of ritual purity had performed since Vedic times. In the SAS, the purity rules are reconstituted in favor of upper caste Śūdras.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cites various sources on accepting food from Śūdras and interprets them in the direction of allowing a Brahmin to take food from a Śūdra when he is a sat-Śūdra who keeps śrāddha and follows his dharma.\(^{73}\) He allows the cooked food of a Śūdra who is devoted to his duty to be eaten by a dvija, although there are many contradictory strictures about this in the smṛtis. Yājñavalkya allowed the twice-born to accept and eat the food of the fireless” i.e., Śūdras.\(^{74}\)

He may accept and eat the food of the fireless when there is no emergency. \( Y 1.160 \)

---

\(^{70}\) This view of the matter was already being defended earlier as we see in the Madunapārijāta of Viśeṣvaraṇabhata (c. 1360-1390). In his discussion (231) of the argument that a Śūdra is disqualified from rites performed with offerings in a sacred fire, Viśeṣvaraṇa says that he is entitled to make them in a domestic fire instead.


\(^{72}\) Early India, 126f.

\(^{73}\) SAS 176, 182, 217-18

\(^{74}\) SAS 183.
Again, it is a case of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa citing the more lenient views of Yājñavalkya, who undid or ignored the extreme measures against Śūdras in Manu. In early medieval times, the rules about taking food from Śūdras and having contact with them became stricter.

The Four Āśramas

On the subject of Śūdras and the four stages of life, most smṛtikāras maintain the view that they are eligible only to be a householder.75 The Mahābhārata has contradictory material. Some passages permit the Śūdra only the āśrama of householder. Others assure the Śūdra that he acquires the fruit of all the āśramas by fulfilling his svad-harman. The following denies (MB 12.63.11-14) him only the last, sannyāsa:76

If anyone of the three non-Brahmin varṇas wish to live according to the āśramas hear, Pāṇḍava, the laws for the āśramas. All the āśramas, except for desirelessness, are prescribed for the Śūdra who has fulfilled his duty of obedient service, completed the task of extending his lineage, has the permission of the king, Lord of the earth, and has followed his own dharma and the customs of his country. The life of begging is not for him who is following his own true dharma. SAS 52

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa comments that the Śūdra who is living responsibly is eligible for the three stages of student, householder, and retiree, only “desirelessness” i.e., renunciation, is excluded. This raises the interesting question, what kind of education did Śūdras have as the equivalent of brahmaṇacarya?

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa does not enunciate a clear position, but his basic sentiment seems to be that although Śūdras are not permitted the last āśrama, they are not deprived of the knowledge of the renunciates. They have access to mokṣadharma in the smṛti parts of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas when heard from the twice-born. This is in line with the view of the Mīmāṁsā and Brahma Sūtras, as discussed earlier. Texts from the Skanda Śūta Samhitā and Mahābhārata are cited to confirm this view.77

Saṁskāras

It is difficult to say exactly how many of the saṁskāras Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa approves, since he steps gingerly around the various authorities on the subject.78 There is much difference of opinion among them about whether Śūdras had

---

75 Kane (1974): II.1.163.
77 SAS 56-57.
78 SAS 67-71. The number even for the twice-born varies in the sources, 16 being the most favored. Gonda, Vedic Ritual, 366.
saṃskāras, and if so, how many. In the standard sixteen without the Vedic mantras came to be the most common view (Śaṅkha, Yama). Manu is contradictory. Manu X.126 permits none. Manu II.32 prescribes the naming ceremony (nāmakarana). Manu IV.80 allows vratas without homa and mantras to Śūdras not working for upper varṇas. But then Manu X.127 allows religious Śūdras to perform all religious acts which dvijātis do without Vedic mantras. The Laghu Viṣṇu (I.15) allows no saṃskāras. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cites the Brahma Purāṇa and Kalpataru as entitling the Śūdra to the sacrament of marriage. Veda Vyāsa (I.17) allows ten without the Vedic mantras, as does Kamalākara: garbhādāna, puṇsavana, simantakarana, jātakarma, nāmakaraṇa, nīkramaṇa, annaprāśana, caula, karṇavedha, and vivāha.

By Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s day, the householder saṃskāras dealing with the prenatal, childhood, marriage, and death were largely open to Śūdras, on condition that a Brahmin priest officiated with Purāṇic substitutions for the Vedic mantras. The educational saṃskāras remained off limits. Given that even Manu X.127 permits Śūdras to perform all religious acts provided they do not use Vedic mantras, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was not revolutionary in granting some saṃskāras outright (vivāha and antyeśṭi) and others conditionally. He makes a case for nāmakarana, nīkramaṇa, annaprāśana, and karṇavedha by resorting to his kit of arguments— substitution of alternatives, the optional nature of a rite, a special rule or counter-excepti on, general statements that do not specify varṇa and, thus, apply to everyone, and the distinction between sat- and asat-Śūdras—to wriggle around the restrictions.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s basic working principle is that a counter-exception (pratiprasava) can be made for some, i.e., respectable sat-Śūdras. As Khiste encapsulated it, “Although there is a prohibition of some rites for Śūdras, in general there is an exception for some, for example, the five great sacrifices, rites for the deceased, the rites of concep-

---

80 According to the Mitākṣarā on Yājñavalkya III. 262.
81 SAS 69. Sharma, Śūdras, 299.
82 Kane (1975) I. 2, 930-931.
83 For instance, SAS 104-5, allowing kuśa grass to Śūdras:

The demons, seizers of japa and homa, manifest in incarnate form, run away from the man with purifying kuśa grass in his hand, scattering to the ten directions.

Statements like this are made in general terms. They also apply to Śūdras.

84 SAS 68-69. A pratiprasava is an exception to an exception. An injunction (vidhi) is negated by an apavāda, an exception that restricts or sets aside a general rule: Śūdras cannot do this. Then a counter-exception says the general rule is applicable to cases falling under the exception: sat-Śūdras can do this.
tion, naming, baby’s first steps, first cooked food, and ear-piercing.” The implication is that for other saṃskāras, too, the rules are more pliable for sat-Śūdras.

Suvira Jaiswal, referring to this summary by Khiste, writes:

The process of improving the status of the śūdras reached its culmination in such medieval texts obviously meant for the guidance of the śūdras as Śūdracārā Śiromani, written by Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, who states that although ordinarily the śūdras are not allowed saṃskāras, an exception is made to this general rule (pratiprasava) by allowing them the right to perform the pañcamahāvajīnas, śrāddha, garbhādhāna, nāmakarana, niśkramaṇa, annaprāśana and karnavedha. It is further added that the karnavedha takes the place of the yajñopaviṇa in the case of Śūdras. She has mistakenly read a reference to karnavedha into the Sanskrit (SAS 79). Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is not saying that karnavedha takes the place of yajñopaviṇa. The passage in question has nothing to do with it, but is in fact a discussion of whether a garment should be put over the ear in lieu of a sacred thread when excreting. This is ruled out in a typically roundabout way as inapplicable to the Śūdra: since he has no sacred thread, no substitute for it is possible. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is uncompromising on points of Brahmanical privilege. Elsewhere, he says that marriage takes the place of initiation in the case of Śūdras or a family tradition of benediction may be substituted. Substitutes are found for other saṃskāras as well. Although a Śūdra is ineligible for the birth ceremony (jātakarma) and parting-of-the-hair (śīmanta), at the time of the sacrament, the benedictions (maṅgalacāra) current in his family line should be given instead. Although, still accepting the prohibition of caula for Śūdras, which Kamalākara will later discard, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa works around it. The tonsure may be forbidden to Śūdras in general, but sat-Śūdras, “good Śūdras” may wear a śikhā and be tonsured in the traditional fashion passed down in their family without the Vedic rite. Thus, in a circuitously scholastic way, he authorizes an equivalent to tonsure.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa argues that the optionality of some saṃskāras opens them to Śūdras. Commenting on a verse from the Brahma Purāṇa, he sets aside the implication that a Śūdra has no other sacraments but marriage by quibbling about the word “simply.”

In the Brahma Purāṇa we also see the following:

The Śūdra has simply the sacrament of marriage always.

By the word “simply” is expressed the denial of the other rites to Śūdras. Similar is the explanation in the Kalpataru:

---

85 Khiste, Table of Contents, 50; SAS 68-69.
87 I make this correction having seen this passage quoted erroneously in support of the idea that karnavedha takes the place of yajñopaviṇa for Śūdras and explains why many Hindu males proudly undergo an ear-piercing ceremony.
88 SAS 204.
89 SAS 71.
90 SAS 69-70.
91 SAS 69.
The word “simply” means that the other saṃskāras are denied. But it is not because of the term “simply” that mantra is denied. It is because of ignorance only, “because mantra is inapplicable to a Śūdra.” So we understand this to mean that the performance of the rites such as naming, ear-piercing, first walk and first solid food are optional. And there is no contradiction with smṛti since smṛti achieves its aim in laying down the rites of naming, and so on, as optional.

He rejects the reading made of this word by the Kalpataru that it excludes the other saṃskāras and arrives at the conclusion that naming, ear-piercing, first walk, and first solid food are optional for Śūdras, since smṛti has ruled them optional and so overrules the interpretation of the Brahma Purāṇa. In this less than convincing way, he extends the optionality of these four saṃskāras from the twice-born to Śūdras. Or to be more precise, to sat-Śūdras. The good Śūdra overcomes the bar of ignorance by devoted observance of dharma.

Discussing a verse from Manu, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa deploys another favorite argument—if a specific varṇa is not expressly indicated, then the rite is open to Śūdras, too—to argue that Śūdras have the rites of first solid food and first steps because no specific varṇa is mentioned.

In the fourth month the ceremony of taking the infant out of the house is done.
In the sixth the ceremony of first rice, and any other dear to the family. M 2.34

Śūdras have the rites of first appearance in public and first solid food, because no specific varṇa is referred to. The word “infant” is used to include Śūdras. The rite of ear-piercing is also for him, since no particular varṇa is cited. He does not have the other rites, as they are done with mantras.

Likewise, Śūdras have the rite of ear-piercing because no particular varṇa is specified in the smṛtis and the use of the word “infant” includes all without distinction.92

Penances

Although the severe corporal punishments for violating the ban on the Vedas were a dead letter, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa keeps the proportionally harder penances for Śūdras who commit the five great offenses (killing, verbal abuse, etc.).93 For instance, for offenses against a Brahmin the penance is four times as much as for a Brahmin, three times as much as for a Kṣatriya, and two times as much as for Vaiśya. For “good” Śūdras of anuloma birth it is less, and for bad Śūdras of pratiloma birth, more. For Śūdra women, the old, young, and sick it is half as much.

Śūdras should have no part in determining penances in an assembly (pariṣad). This is in line with Manu et al. for whom Śūdras are not eligible to be judges and kings are advised not to appoint them.

The determination of a penance by a Śūdra in council is forbidden in the Explanation of the Law:

92 SAS 69.
93 SAS 58-60.
Now a Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, or Śūdra should on no account make a determination of penance, in the view of the learned.

In the *Opinions of the Twenty-Four Sages* we read:

Just as Brahmins should not drink milk in a dog skin, like that, speech from a Śūdra’s mouth should on no account be heard. The words even of an educated Śūdra, knowledgeable in the śāstras, should not be heeded, like food offerings thrown out for the dogs. If a Śūdra in his pride of knowledge speaks to a Brahmin, he goes to a terrible hell until the end of creation.

Brahmin consternation about educated and ambitious Śūdras encroaching on Brahmin prerogative and presuming to practice Dharma śāstra as advisers in courts and assemblies is palpable in such passages. Because of his lack of education (denied to him by Dharma śāstra), a Śūdra should not open his mouth in a community assembly, but should be instructed instead in the forms of giving and making vows such as for the kṛcchra fasts, exclusive of chanting mantras and fire oblations.

Kamalākara allows a Śūdra to perform vows, fasts, great gift ceremonies (mahādāna) and penances (prāyaścitta) but without *japa* and *homa*.  

Śrāddha

In the SAS, Śūdras perform ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha, sapinḍikaraṇa, pārvana śrāddha, ābhuyadayika śrāddha, ābhyudayika śrāddha, vrddhiśrāddha, and nitya or daily śrāddha. *Ekoddiṣṭa* is the ceremony for one individual recently dead. It does not include the *pitaras* and, simplifying out variants, is performed every month for a year. *Sapinḍikaraṇa* is then performed and the deceased becomes a sapīṇa, i.e., joins the *pitaras* and receives piṇḍas. *Pārvana* is the model of

---

95 SAS 61.  
96 SAS 209-12.  
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101 SAS 170-76.
all śrāddhas and was derived from the *pinḍapitṛyajña* of śrauta ritual.\(^{102}\) It is performed monthly at certain times (parvan) such as the new moon day (amāvāsyā). Ābhyudayika is an occasional (naimittika) śrāddha of rejoicing, good luck, and prosperity.\(^{103}\)

*Nitya śrāddha* is daily śrāddha for the pitaras, but without *pinḍas*.\(^{104}\) It is not separate in practice from *pitṛyajña*, vaisvadeva and *bali*.

Daily śrāddha and *pitṛyajña* are contained in the rite of *bali* for *pitr*s. Without daily śrāddha, *pitṛyajña* is accomplished also by the verses for giving *bali* to the *pitr*s.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa says that it is observed for a year. After that, it is optional and, if performed, brings prosperity like śrāddhas of auspiciousness and rejoicing (*vyṛddhi* and ābhyudayika).\(^{105}\)

Śūdras had enjoyed the right to śrāddha since at least Yājñavalkya’s day.\(^{106}\) In the SAS, they are to invite Brahmins to perform them, just as do the upper *varṇas*, but with the substitutions appropriate for Śūdras. A good example is the formula of invitation to perform *sapinḍikaraṇa*:

*Sapinḍana* has the character of both ekoddīśṭa and pārvāna śrāddha. In this case, after inviting one Brahmin in the place of the deceased for *ekoddīṣṭa* with a gift of betel and other things, at the same time invite Brahmins for *pārvāna śrāddha* for the grandfather etc., one Brahmin for each, first performing vaisvadeva. The formula of invitation to be used goes: “Please take a moment, honorable sirs, and favor us by standing in for our grandfather who is a Śūdra of such-and-such *gotra*,” and so forth. When the father of a Śūdra is of a twice-born caste, or even when the father is Śūdra and his father and grandfather are of twice-born caste, then the names, Sharma, Varma, and Gupta should be used respectively for Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas. When the father, etc., in a family is of illicit birth, the son should be associated with grandfathers, etc., who are born of legitimate marriages, even though the father is impure, because of the relation of progenitor and progeny.

*Varṇa* distinctions again are observed in the naming of the deceased; but Śūdras have a *gotra* and mixed *varṇa* and illegitimate offspring are included.

**Aśauca**

Śūdras are also to observe the rules of ritual impurity after a birth or death in the family *aśauca*.\(^{107}\) Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa discusses at length the many variations in the period of impurity for Śūdras in the sources. The distinction between *sat* and *asat* is salient. A *sat*-Śūdra, generally speaking, has a shorter period of impurity. Baudhāyana, the

---

\(^{102}\) Gonda, *Vedic Ritual*, 444.

\(^{103}\) *Vedic Ritual*, 449.

\(^{104}\) *Vedic Ritual*, 443.

\(^{105}\) SAS 172.

\(^{106}\) Y 1. 121.

\(^{107}\) SAS 189-205.
Viṣṇusmṛti, Devala, and the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa set the period of pollution for Śūdras on a death at one month: Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, citing Yājñavalkya and Manu sets it at 15 days for sat-Śūdras. For Yājñavalkya:

A Kṣatriya has twelve days, for Vaiśyas fifteen, for Śūdras thirty days, and half that for Śūdras living dutifully (nyāyavartin). Y 3.22

For Manu:

Śūdras living dutifully should shave their head once a month, follow the rules of purification laid down for Vaiśyas, and eat the leftover food of the twice-born. M 5.140

Note that sat-Śūdras are equated to Vaiśyas and given their period of impurity of 15 days, undoubtedly reflecting the fact that already by Manu’s day Śūdras had supplanted or were indistinguishable from Vaiśyas in some regions and aspired to a varṇa respectability commensurate with their achieved social statuses. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa follows Śātātapī and Aṅgiras in setting the period of impurity for a sat-Śūdra who has been slightly degraded by some lapse in dutiful service to dvijas, but still observes the mahāyajñas and possesses all the virtues of an “absolutely good Śūdra,” at twenty days. In the view of others, the alternative of twenty days applies to an ordinary Śūdra in a state of misfortune and ten days to a sat-Śūdra in a state of misfortune. Some authorities see it as a matter of local custom. However, in the Kaliyuga, varṇa differentials hold: there is only a period of impurity of ten, twelve, fifteen, and one month respectively for the four varṇas. The period of impurity also varies depending on gender, relationship to the dead, anuloma and pratiloma, and so on.

We see in Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa a move toward equality for all varṇas in matters relating to women and childbirth. Following Pracetas, he sets the period of impurity due to menstruation at three days and the period of impurity from childbirth for women at ten days for all varṇas, including the Śūdra. The sat/asat distinction applies: it is thirteen days for asat-Śūdra. When the Brahma Purāṇa says:

A Brahmin, Kṣatriya, and Vaiśya woman who has delivered is touchable after ten days have gone by, a Śūdra woman only after thirteen,

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa comments that thirteen days is for asat-Śūdra women only. In short, in his treatment of aśauca, he distinguishes once again between sat- and asat-Śūdra effectively putting sat-Śūdras in the place of the Vaiśya. This is indicative of his overall approach of treating sat-Śūdras as the de facto third varṇa with whom they had socially assimilated.

108 SAS 190-91.
109 SAS 191.
110 SAS 192.
111 SAS 194.
Gotra

Krṣṇa Śeṣa discusses the question whether or not a Śūdra has a gotra.112 He first reviews the conflicting sources. Some—the Matsya Purāṇa and Kalpa Sūtra—grant only the twice-born a gotra. Āśvalāyaṇa is cited as saying that a Śūdra has no gotra since he has no illustrious forebears (pravara) and no sacred fire. But others say:

that a gotra name is commonly used for anyone born in a good family with a well-known founding ancestor. Commonly Śūdras born to a legitimately married Śūdra woman and dvijāti father use the gotra name for seven generations, until the end of pṛṇḍa offerings, and even in succeeding generations continue to use that gotra name. SAS 216

Baudhāyana speaks of the gotra of all four varṇas.113 Some sources say a Śūdra’s gotra is that of the Brahmin who instructs him;114 others that all Śūdras are in the gotra of Kaśyapa, and those who have no gotra are Kaśyapa.115

This is also Krṣṇa Śeṣa’s own expressed view on the matter:

A Śūdra should perform his domestic ritual according to the branch of the Veda in which the Brahmin who instructs him is versed; according to his gotra alone should he practice. But if he is not instructed in any particular one, he should follow the Vājasaneyi rite, and the gotra shall be Kaśyapa. SAS 107

That Śūdras belong to the Kaśyapa gotra is common in the law books, not least because of its bearing on inheritance.116 But why would the Kaśyapa gotra be regarded as the default for Śūdras? The question seems not to have been investigated, but several facts point in the direction of an answer. The Kaśyapa gotra is one of the most prevalent, being found in Northern, Central and Southern parts of the subcontinent. It is found in all four varṇas and in more castes than any other gotra. Kaśyapa was one of the seven Ṛṣis and played a role in the creation of living beings. He was the father of Manu, the progenitor of mankind, and, therefore, Kaśyapa was the first gotra of all humanity.117 In modern times, Ghurye remarks:

Kasyap [sic] ‘gotra’ has been used as the last resort by all, hopelessly handicapped in respect of their birth or Brahmanic standards.118

---

112 SAS 215.
113 Another citation not found in our texts of Baudhāyana.
114 SAS 216. Āpastamba already said this so, for the twice-born of course (Āp. Śrau. Sūtra 24.10.17).
115 SAS 217.
Untouchability

Two jātis are explicitly declared untouchable (aśprṣya, na sparṣa tasya): the Manguṣṭha (lime maker), and the Karmacaṇḍāla (construction laborer). A number of other jātis, however, are said to be outside (bāhya) of varṇa or śūdradharma, excluded (hīna) from varṇa, among the lowest (adhamā), among the antyajas, or even excluded from the antyajas. Such terms are applied by Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa or his sources to the Rajaka (washerman), the Śauṇḍika or Śauṣkala (maker and seller of alcohol), the Carmakāra (shoemaker, leather-worker), the Citrakara (painter), the Kaivarta (fisherman), the Śilīndra (masseur), and the Chāgalaka (goatherd). Some are have occupations that require them to live outside of town: the Mauḥkali (oil miller) and the Sūtradhāra (performing artist, puppeteer, acrobat).

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa devotes more discussion to the untouchability occasioned by birth and death pollution and the length of the period of impurity, matters of more general concern to all castes, and, perhaps, of greater interest to observant sat-Śūdras.

Kaliyuga

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa quotes long passages from the Matsya, Kūrma, and Liṅga Purāṇas painting a lurid picture of the breakdown of caste dharma in the Kaliyuga. They are full of Brahmin apprehension about the loss of social as-

---

120 SAS 52-54.
cendancy and the rise of low castes. In fact, we can see in them a negative image of the contemporary social realities with which Brahmins had to find a *modus vivendi*, a world where some of them are making a living in non-Brahmanical ways as shopkeepers, farmers, and soldiers, while low caste people have become rich and powerful and have taken up religion and education. Brahmins will be of Śūdra birth and Śūdras will presume, horror of horrors, to know and teach the Vedas. In a world turned upside down, Śūdras will everywhere be Brahmins. Brahmins will be harassed and dishonored by them. Brahmins will be dependant on the favor of Śūdras, who now rule the world.

In his comments, it is clear that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is concerned by Śūdras not honoring Brahmins, treating them discourteously, pulling social class on them, arrogating the āśrama of renunciation and other dvija prerogatives. In the Kaliyuga, Śūdras will:

- expound Vedic subjects, put themselves before Brahmins, harass and order them about, follow their way of life while wearing the ochre garb of a renunciate, shaving the head, and going “white-toothed,” not rising on seeing a Brahmin, striking them, using high beds, seats, and carriages in front of Brahmins, dishonoring a Brahmin when he is comes to visit, making him wait at the door, having Brahmins serve you, following the dharma of higher castes, performing sacrifices, and following the rules meant for a person sacrificing.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, in accord with common practice, regards some contradictions in the *smṛtis* as a matter of what is forbidden (*kalivarjya*) in the Kaliyuga and appropriate to another, more enlightened age.¹²¹ Shortening of the period of impurity is out of place in the sinful and degraded Kali, when many Śūdras fail in their duty of service and are śrāddha-less. As for references in some Purāṇas, *Matsya* 18.26 for instance, to sat-Śūdras performing śrāddha with cooked offerings, some commentators regard this as also concerned with another yuga because of its absolute detestability—Śūdras are enjoined to do śrāddha only with uncooked grain in the Kaliyuga and that seems to be Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s own view.¹²²

---

¹²¹ On *kalivarjya*, see Kane, HDS III, 885ff.

¹²² SAS 218.
Śūdras and the Pañcāyatana Deities

Gaṇapati was the most fitting deity to introduce a handbook on the dharma of Śūdras. He was preeminently the god of success achieved through obedience to Dharma, above all, for Śūdras whose well-being in this world and the next depended on dutiful service to their betters, their predominant dharmic duty in the Brahmanical order, a point Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa reiterates again and again. The welfare and salvation of Śūdras depended on their submission to the socio-cosmic order of hierarchies and exclusions of Dharma. Gaṇapati was the guardian of this order, the keeper of the gate of heaven and the auspicious operation of Dharma, placing and removing obstacles as merited by fidelity to svadharma. That is why he adorns the lintels of temples and the benedictory verses of treatises on Dharma.

Gaṇeṣa the auspicious, god of bhukti, prosperity and happiness, god of obstacles and their remover, Ga-ṇapati, Lord of Śiva’s bands, begins to appear in his familiar iconographic form in the 4th and 5th centuries when he becomes a major deity in the pantheon. His origins are obscure and theories about them inconclusive. Was he a primitive tribal god, a Vināyaka demon, a Dravidian totem? As A. Getty remarks, Gaṇeṣa may not have figured among the Vedic deities because he was a village god worshipped by the lower classes.

Others have noted Gaṇeṣa’s low caste character. To Alfred Foucher, he was a “jungle genius.”¹ Robert Brown speaks of the notion of him as the god of Everyman.² A verse ascribed to Manu makes Gaṇeṣa the god of the fourth varna.

Śambhu is the god of the Brahmins, Mādhava of the Kṣatriyas, Brahmā of the Vaiṣyas, and Gaṇaṇāyaka of the Śūdras.³

This verse is not in the standard editions. Said to be from an older version of Manu, it may be pseudepigraphic.⁴ If authentic, it suggests that in the time of Manu, Gaṇapati was considered the god of the low castes.

³ viprāṇām daivātām śambhuḥ kṣatriyāṇām tu mādhavaḥ vaiśyāṇām tu bhaved brahmā śūdrāṇām gaṇaṇāyakāḥ
What is clear is that Ganesha always had popular associations, singularly fitting him to be the god of Sudras and lower castes. This popularity have continued until today and the modern Ganesh, whose festival is celebrated with raucous festivities and special enthusiasm by poorer Indians: loud booming music, incessant fire-crackers, and clouds of vermilion sindoor, often to the disdain of higher class persons.

The popularity of Ganesha was boosted by political calculation in Maharashtra, where he is especially beloved. The nationalist reformer Bal Gangadhar Tilak, promoted the annual Ganesh festival as a populist bridge of solidarity between Brahmins and non-Brahmins to rally patriotic resistance to colonial rule. He took the private family celebrations out into the streets as a public event with images large and small installed in street corner pavilions, giving it a “sarvajanik” flavor.

Durgā pūjā is especially celebrated in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, a favorite it seems of late digest writers Hemādri, Raghunandana, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, and Kamalākara. Vaiṣyas, “devout” (bhaktiyukta) Sudras, and even Mlecchas were admitted to her worship.5 Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, as an apparently devout Vaiṣṇava, is primarily concerned with Viṣṇu pūjā, but the other four pañcāyatana deities are given their due. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa quotes the Devī Purāṇa, another primary source for Durgotsava, on the permitted flowers and offerings for Devī.

Do not offer to Devī unblown buds.
Exclude the heat-ripened and the out-of-season.
One makes offerings to her:

with bakula, coral tree, jasmine flowers, śīrṣa blooms, oleander flowers, rosewood, and aparajita. SAS 154

He quotes the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa on the worship of Durgā:

The man who always worships Durgā and bows with love;
he is a yogi; he is wise and holy; he holds liberation in his hand. SAS 131

The little section on flowers (151-154) is one of the more delightful in the SAS. In rounding up from the sources the prescribed and prohibited offerings for each deity, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa creates a botanical garden of Indian flora. The Sanskrit names of some are more easily identifiable with present-day plants than others.

Deity pūjā is a subject that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa goes into in opulent detail (128-140). He describes the forms and restrictions Sudras should observe when worshipping pithas (129), the five pañcāyatana deities (Viṣṇu, Śiva, Ganeśa, Sūrya, and Devī, 130-132)—śālagrama stones (133-134), and Śiva lingas (132-134, 149-151). Vaiṣṇava cult receives special attention, but particular aspects of the worship of the other four deities are noted. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa com-

5 An unnumbered verse from the BhP is quoted in Banerji, A Brief History of Dharmaśstra, pp. 176, 246-47.
mends initiation for Śūdras with Vaiṣṇava mantras and initiation in Pañcarātra (72-73) as authorized by the Pu-
rāṇas. Šūdras are entitled to initiation with Śakti and Vināyaka mantras (73) and pūjā to ancient, traditional liṅgas (75-77). They can bath the images of Viṣṇu and Śiva, but must keep their distance and not touch them (138-140).

It would be difficult to underestimate the role of theistic cult in absorbing lower castes into Brahmanism. Whatever may be its personal psychological and spiritual benefits, popular devotion to Viṣṇu, Śiva, Ganeśa, and Devī propagated a socially regulating religious practice among Śūdras while preserving the Vedic privilege of the upper varṇas. The core Vedic disqualification of Śūdras could be relaxed to a degree, while Vaiṣṇava initiation and devapūjā were generously and inclusively expanded for everyone. This goes far to explain the meticulous attention given to promoting devapūjā and its blending with the pañcamahāvajñās and other daily domestic rites in navya smṛti, as deity cult assumes ever greater weight in response to the Bhakti movements. Krṣṇa Śeṣa was, after all, a contemporary of Chaitanya.

Later smṛṭikāras all benevolently declared the eligibility of Śūdras for devapūjā. They are encouraged to practice the mainstream cults of Śiva, Durgā, Viṣṇu, Sūrya, and Ganeśa, the cults discussed as appropriate for them in the SAS as well. The SK has two chapters on devapūjā and the SAS has many pages (128-154) on the procedure and offerings for pūjā: flowers, clothing, scents, incense, lamps, food offerings (nai-vedya), circumambulation (pradakṣinā), bowing (pranāma), disposal of garlands (nirmālya). To sum up, what I think we can see in nibandhas like the SAS and the SK is the emergence of modern popular Hinduism through the fusion of Vedism with Āgama, yoga, pañcāyatana deity cult, and Tantra.

Varṇasaṅkara, Dharmaśāstra’s Curious Anthropology

In the first section of the SAS (3-32), Krṣṇa Śeṣa begins with the origins of the Śūdra varṇa. He then sorts through a mixed bag of confusions thrown up for varṇasaṅkara theory by questions of illegitimacy; adoption; the extraordinary varṇa status (na varṇatva) of Mūrḍhāvasiktas, Rathakāras, Vṛāyas (unbrāh-maṇḍiz or fallen Āryas),

6 The Pañcarātras provided the injunction “missing” in Jaimini and Śabara authorizing initiation of the Śūdra. Vedāntadeśīka (1269-1370), the pupil of Yamunācarya, cites a viśīda to that effect in his commentary on Bhagavadgītā 18.44: hemantē śūdram eva ca [dikṣayet], “…and one should initiate a Śūdra in the winter.” Pollock, “Deep Orientalism?,” p. 126n79.

7 In his discussion of entitlement for devapūjā, Kamalākara considers the worship of Viṣṇu and other deities by Śūdras. On the authority of the Purāṇas, Kamalākara also qualifies Śūdras to learn and recite the mantras of Viṣṇu in Pañcarātra texts, as well as those of Śiva, Sūrya, Śakti, and Vināyaka.

8 Krṣṇa Śeṣa describes in great detail many of the sixteen or eighteen (enumerations and combinations vary) upacāras, the forms of worship and offerings made to a divinity: āvāhana, āsanapāda, arghya, ācamana, snāna, vastra, yajñopavīta, gandha, puṣpa, dhūpa, dipa, bhūṣana, tāmbūla, naivedya, nāmasāka, pradakṣinā, and visarjana.

9 Possibly in the nyāśa of deities on different parts of the body when applying sectarian marks (ārthikvapūṇḍra) as a kind of substi-
and Kāyasthas; the weight of parental varṇa, maternal jāti, and inherited character in determining the varṇa of legendary sages; and, conflicts in the sources on the mixed origins of some jātis, e.g., Sūtas and Vaidhehas.

Next, in excerpts largely from Manu and the Jātīviveka, Krṣṇa Śeṣa runs down the many and varied mixed Śūdra jātis and their dharmaśas, i.e., their characteristic ways of life (vṛtti). In the process, he gives us evocative bits of social history, snapshots of the world of labor and working class life in the prospering economy of 16th century India. The following is a list of the many occupations and livelihoods Krṣṇa Śeṣa mentions.

Indigo & madder maker, dyer, silk merchant, fabric printer, clothes maker, tailor, shoemaker, hatter, launderer, washerman, farmer, sheep & goat-herd, cowherd, butcher, tanner, dog-breeder, veterinarian, oil-miller, sugarcane miller, sesamum miller, lime-maker, salt maker, tool maker, coppersmith, metal worker, saddler, camel driver, weapons dealer, archer, martial artist, arrow maker, prison guard, jailor, wrestler, boxer, athlete, professional soldier, wild animal hunter, snake catcher, insect catcher, dog keeper, waste collector, mahout, horseman, groom, fisherman, ferryman, boatman, cotton and muslin weaver, hemp weaver, basketmaker, bamboo worker, furniture maker, potter, laborer, plasterer, white-washer, painter, bricklayer, mason, carpenter, blacksmith, armor maker, cook, baker, wine maker, alcohol vendor, betel and pan seller, perfumer, sandal seller, courier, gardener, flârist, garland maker, jeweler, bead maker, barber, beautician, masseur, physician, harem and brothel keeper, expert in kāmasūtra, porter, servant, butler, scribe, accountant, clerk, goods carrier, graphic artist, actor, dancer, musician, singer, bard, juggler, acrobat, theatre director, performing artist, mime, herald, bell ringer, storyteller, puppeteer, mime, newsmonger, and professional worshippers of Śiva and Viṣṇu.

As a glance at this list shows, the types of work prescribed/described in the SAS make up virtually the entire productive labor of any thriving Indian economy, including many of what we would now regard as lucrative skilled trades and professions in medicine, business, the performing arts, entertainment, athletics, commerce, trade, education, manufacturing, security, and the military.

In actuality, Śūdras were not limited to menial service, as might seem to be implied by the injunction that the svadharma of Śūdras is dvijaśuśrāṣā. Many arts, crafts, manufactures, and professions were taken up by low caste people and came to be recognized and permitted, if grudgingly, in Dharmaśāstra. The lives of Śūdras, far from the dull oppressive drudgery of the usual picture of caste, on the contrary, sound much more interesting and varied, certainly more productive, and probably more satisfying and pleasant, than those of the upper varṇas may often have been. They were in fact less subject to restrictive and onerous dharma rules and ritual observances than the upper varṇas, and in some respects were freer in their private lives. Already impure, they were allowed many indulgences such as drinking alcohol and eating meat denied to more respectable people. Many Śūdras attained wealth, social standing, and political power. Indeed, in some regions of the country—Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Punjab, and Bengal—Śūdra castes became the dominant and most successful upper classes.

In principle, Śūdras were not to exercise any of the modes of making a living reserved to Brahmans and Kṣatriyas, i.e., in religion, education, government, and warfare. In actual social practice, however, such a restriction was mostly a dead letter, or rather immaterial as far as the lives of most South Asians were concerned, and so constituted a prob-
lem for Dharmaśāstra, which enshrined a very exigent view of the place and duty of the fourth varṇa. The social and political rise of Śūdras, and the always alarming spectacle of Śūdra kings and priests, was taken in the Purāṇas, and underscored in the Dharmaśāstras, as the one of the signs of degradation in the Kaliyuga.

Dharmaśāstra has its own remarkable theory of caste: varṇasāṅkara, as first laid out in the law books of Gautama, Baudhāyana, Vasiṣṭha, Viṣṇu, Manu, Yājñavalkya, and Kauṭilya. Varṇasāṅkara theory is simplicity itself: it explains all castes as products of the interbreeding of the varṇas. It generates and includes them all within the cātur-varṇya system with a minimal conceptual toolbox: varṇa, jāti, anuloma, pratiloma, and karma. Anuloma is an hypergamous union with a woman of a lower varṇa and pratiloma an hypogamous union with a woman of a higher varṇa. Both are bad, but the latter is far more degrading and especially forbidden, perhaps due to their possible matrilineal origin. ¹⁰ All jātis are produced by the various anuloma and pratiloma conjugations of the varṇas, and then by the reconjugation of these mixed varṇas. These combinatorial rules generate six primary anulomas and six primary pratilomas. Further mixing of these mixed castes generates mixed castes to the second degree (sāṅkarasāṅkara):

Further sub-castes are said to arise from the unions of the anulomas and pratilomas with the four varṇas and of the male of one anuloma and the female of another, from the union of pratilomas among themselves and from the union of a male or female of an anuloma caste and male or female of a pratiloma caste.¹¹

The number, names, and derivations of the secondary mixed castes vary as authors grapple with untidy biocultural complexities. Indeed, even the primary anuloma and pratiloma combinations in the Dharmaśāstras differ. No two schemes are identical. More precisely, the variation in the early Dharmasūtras suggests that they may have reflected local population differences. Yājñavalkya and Kauṭilya, however, more uniformly followed Manu’s distribution of caste names for the primary castes.¹²

Theoretically, the castes were sub-divisions of the four varṇas or orders, the result of miscegenation, but in fact they had an entirely different origin and were much more organic and spontaneous in their growth.¹³

The result was a śrutisanctioned idealization varying from author to author and region to region whose connection to actual jātis from the point of view of an accurate descriptive anthropology was highly abstract. It provided the language and concepts with which people of Brahmanized culture spoke about their social relations, but its role in the regulation of social life is debatable.

¹³ Jha, 287.
As B. R. Ambedkar pointed out long ago, the treatment of *varṇaśaṅkara* mixed castes by Manu and other *smrtikāras* was already highly unsatisfactory in its own day. By Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s time, it is conspicuously inadequate to the actual complexity and diversity of castes on the ground. The categories and terminology he has inherited are obsolete, if ever valid. Many of the castes Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa names are nothing but names to us—Āyogavas, Dhigvanas, Ugras, Pukkasas, and Svapākas—and appear to be theoretical ciphers whose original reference is lost. Most likely, no one but Brahmins ever used the names of his occupational *jātis*—Sūpakāras, Rajakas, Pacakas, Vatsapālakas, Śayyāpālas, Carmakāras, Kīnāsas, Kumbhakāras, etc.—for social groups, but his general types of occupation (potters, smiths, gardeners etc.) were found under an immense diversity of names throughout the subcontinent. By his day, through shifts in occupation, Kumbhars, Kamars, and Malis were no longer necessarily making pots, smithing, or gardening, although Potter, Smith, and Gardener had not become surnames.

*Cāturvaraṇya* is an abstract and rationalizing concept into which many of the Śūdra *jātis* were only very arbitrarily fitted. All non-Aryan and even many Aryan peoples are seen as products of degeneration. The inadequacy is underlined when we observe the divergences among *smrtikāras* in the number, names, classification, and character of the mixed castes. The variability in Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s predecessors—Manu, Yājñavalkya, Gautama, Baudhāyana, Śūtasaṁhitā, and the Mahābhārata—is considerable. Different parentages are offered for many mixed caste such as, for example, the Sūta, Vaideha, Māhiṣya, Ambaṣṭha, Pukkasa, Ugra, and Āyogava, indicating the synthetic nature of the whole scheme or and the historical lability of caste.

These mixed caste names are also striking in their heterogeneity, derived from tribes and ethnicities, occupations, trades, professions, and forms of labor and manufacture, which presumably were often hereditary in families and endogamous social groups and so could have the appearance of a fixed and divinely instituted taxonomy. Ethnici-
ties and means of making a living are not clearly distinguished. Is Ambara, for instance, the name of a people or a trade, viz., weaver? Is Vaideha derived from the Videha people who found their caste niche as cloth sellers? Caste grew by absorbing such tribes and ethnic peoples into a subordinate position within its hierarchy. Other caste names such as Nīlīkātā, Śayyāpāla, Chāgalaka, Mālā-kāra, Vatsapālaka, Sūtradhāra, Rajaka, Sūpakāra, and Nāpita are obviously occupations. Others names, such as “Durlabha,” seem entirely made-up, or perhaps a colloquialism of some

---

14 B.R. Ambedkar, *Who were the Shudras?* Bombay, 1946.
15 Nirmala Kulkarni, a Maharashtrian Deshastha Brahmin, detects some Maharashtrian surnames and tribal designations among them. Other words and customs in the SAS have a Deccani flavor. The Jātiviveka, from which Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa copiously cites, may have a particular connection with this region. John Wilson described the Jātiviveka as a work of authority in the West of India and among Maratha Brahmins. *Indian Caste*, (New Delhi: Deep Publications, 1976), vol. I, 18,64. According to Kane, Dalapati in his Nṛsīnkaprasāda, another text from the Deccan with southern customs composed between 1490-1512 CE, also quoted from it. HD, I. sec. 99 and p. 548. Kamalākara does so as well, CC VII, 234.
kind. “Kuruvinda” is the name of kind of barley, which conceivably came to be the idiom for those growing or selling it. A dindima is a drum played, one supposes, by people making a living by performing with it, as we still see in Indian streets today, and so called Dindimas. We don’t really know. This ambiguity of caste names really began with the word “Śūdra” itself, which may have been the name of a subjugated people in Vedic times and later became the name of the varṇa of service and labor.

What seems to have happened was that certain ethnic groups and communities took up or were forced into particular ways of making a living at the margins and bottom of caste regulated societies, which became hereditary and identified with them. Other peoples who later practiced these livelihoods would be regarded as the same caste. This would be something like seeing your immigrant Roman Catholic Salvadoran gardener in Los Angeles as a caste. All these variables of ethnicity and livelihood were systematically packed together and formalized in varṇasaṅkara theory as stable, coherent dharmas, which they certainly were not, at least from the perspective of the longue durée. Dharmaśāstrīs looked out over the social landscape and drew up this tidy sociological map that imposes a stable identity on the chaotically diverse demographics of the subcontinent, but which more or less reflected from the point of view of Brahmanical orthodoxy the short-term realities of caste, namely, class, hereditary livelihood, and endogamy. Ethnic groups and ways of making a living had been turning into castes since the post-Vedic age, yielding the multiplying jātis of medieval times. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa has to fit the confusing proliferation of castes in his own day into the antiquated terminology of the Dharmaśūtras.

Varṇasaṅkara is a “degenerative” theory of how lower castes are engendered by the debasing miscegenation of the four pure varṇas. It is one of the forms of legitimation for social orders based on the purity and nobility of blood, in the Indian case explicated and justified with the ultra-sophisticated and totalizing concept of karma. As an account of how real jātis originated, it promptly breaks down under any searching scrutiny.

The Andhras, Ābhīras, Ambaṣṭhas, Māgadhas, Niśādas, and Vaidehakas, far from being like other unlocatable designations were real, historically documented peoples inhabiting identifiable regions of South Asia. But Manu et al. have reduced them to the impure products of varṇa mixture. Similarly, Manu describes all foreign peoples—Yavanas (i.e., at this time, Muslims), Kirātatas, Šakas, and even the Dravidas of the south—as Kṣatriyas who have degenerated into Śūdras by abandoning Vedic sacrifice and the services of Brāhmaṇas. It is difficult to resist the

---

16 Jha, 285-287.
conclusion that varnasāṇkara fails through its brahmanocentricity as an explanation of how such castes came into existence. The fairest assessment may be V. N. Jha’s:

The Dharma Sūtras represent the orthodox and ideal point of view and the varnasāṇkara theory provides an example of the brāhmaṇas’ capacity to create categories and carry things to their logical conclusion. The theory flourished on congenial soil. It helped to further the accommodation of the exterior groups into the Aryan order of society, promoted the formation of new castes and was adopted and expanded by future law-givers, Manu himself enumerating 61 mixed castes, and the number rising to more than a hundred later on.

The Śūta Samhitā adds sixty-three more mixed castes to the 40 or so of Manu, Yajñavalkya, Uśanas, Bau-dhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa mentions about ninety.

Varṇas in the Kaliyuga

Medieval writers were much concerned, as Kane points out, with the question whether the Kṣatriya and Vaiśya varṇas existed in the Kaliyuga. Their destruction and disappearance is a recurring theme in many Purāṇas. The Viṣṇu (IV, 23.4-5), Matsya (272.18-19), and Bhāgavata (XII.24.44) Purāṇas tell how power-hungry Mahāpadma Nanda, born of a Śūdra woman, would destroy Kṣatriyas like Paraśurāma and Śūdras would thereafter be kings. In a prophetic frame, the Kaliyuga was depicted as a degenerate cosmic cycle when varṇāśramadharma breaks down, the hallmark of which was the total extinction of Kṣatriyas. In some accounts, Vaiśyas likewise disappear and only two varṇas are left: Brahmins and Śūdras. In this dark age, there are no true Kṣatriyas and Śūdras would rule. In the Matsya and Brahma Purāṇas, there will be only one varṇa in the Kaliyuga, the Śūdra, everyone leveled down to equality.

On the basis of these Purānic scriptures, similar ideas gained currency among some neo-smṛtikāras as well. Bengali authors particularly espoused the notion of only two existing castes, Brāhmaṇa and Śūdra, reflecting as it did changes in Bengali society with the social absence of Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas and the rise of new professional castes

17 B. R. Ambedkar repudiated the Dharmashastric concept of caste as a racialist and “bastardizing” ideological construct demeaning whole groups of peoples, cultures, and communities as debased and inferior at birth. In Who were the Shudras?, he advanced the notion that Śūdras were originally Aryan Kṣatriyas who were defeated in their struggle with the Brahmins. Deprived of the sacred thread, they were degraded below Vaiśyas. This is not far from Manu’s “fallen Kṣatriya” theory of the origins of foreigners (mlecchas) or from Kosambi and Sharma’s of the formation of the Śūdra varṇa through conquest and internal subjugation. Ambedkar’s rejection of an Aryan invasion or race places his views, not to put too fine a point on it, somewhere in between Asko Parpola and the Hindutvas.

18 Jha, 287.

19 See Kane 1974 II.1. 380-82 for primary sources.

20 MP 144.5. BrP 229.52. As there was only one blessed varṇa of the good in the golden age of the Krṭayuga, so there will only be one degraded varṇa, namely the Śūdra, in the black age of the Kaliyuga.
such as the Kāyasthas.\textsuperscript{21} Raghunandana, quoting Manu X. 43, states in his Śuddhitattva that the Kṣatriyas no longer existed and Mahānandi and the Kṣatriyas of his day were really Śūdras.\textsuperscript{22}

Among the pāṇḍits of Benares, Kamalākara quotes a dictum from an unnamed Purāṇa that declares only the Brahmin and Śūdra varṇas remain in the Kaliyuga.

\begin{quote}

खु खु यथि तः सर्वेन क्षत्रियायान्तये स्वितः।

All [four varṇas] exist in very age, but in the Kali, only the first and last exist.

\end{quote}

But he does so only to refute it.\textsuperscript{23}

In another Purāṇa, it is said that Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras are the four varṇas, the first three of which are dvijas. All these exist in very age but in the Kali age only the first and last remain.” How then can you speak of subcastes born of mixture with dvijas? The answer is: this doubt is not correct, for Viṣṇu says that in the Kali age some remain as seed and the Matsya Purāṇa says that those Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras who remain as seed will be mingle with them at the beginning of then Kṛta yuga. From these two authorities our respected father hold the opinion that there are Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas in the Kali age though their appearance is concealed and their karma or mode of life is defiled.\textsuperscript{24}

Similarly, Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa, great grandson of Bhaṭṭoḷī (1670-1750) believed that Hindu kings who claimed Kṣatriya lineage were vrātyas, fallen through non-observance of Vedic rites, upanayana in particular, and were in need of Brahmanical rehabilitation to recover their lost ksatriyatva, as had been the case with Śivāji.\textsuperscript{25} Lost ksatriyahood was a politically useful idea for Brahmins and claimants to power.

In point of fact, the view that only two castes exist in the Kaliyuga seems to have been an extreme; most smṛtikāras—Parāśara, Vijñānesvara, Hemādri, Vācaspati Miśra—assume there are still four varṇas and work out their privileges and duties. “Bogus” smṛti texts asserting that there are only two castes in the Kali age float untraceably about in Bengali śāstras of the late medieval, early modern period.\textsuperscript{26} What Manu 10. 43 and Kamalākara were asserting was not the total extirpation of Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas, but that they had lost their ksatriyatva and vaiśyatva through failure to keep svadharma and non-observance of sacred rites. Although they are degraded in karma, their seed lies latent in the Kaliyuga and will sprout up again. Traditional claims by many Śūdra castes to a lost Kṣatriya or Brahmin origin dovetailed with this notion and were abetted by Brahmins for their own strategic interests.

As Manu (9.301-2) and his commentator Medhātithi explain, the degradation of the Kaliyuga is not merely cyclic, but recurs whenever kings misrule and allow the confusion of castes. This is evidently the fear at work in these texts,

\textsuperscript{22} Śuddhitattva, ed. Pandit Jivananda, 268, quoted in Kane 1941, II. I. 381.
\textsuperscript{23} Dutt, 82 n.; Kane, 381.
\textsuperscript{24} Quoted in C. V. Vaidya, History of Medieval Hindu India (New Delhi: Cosmo Publications, 1979), II. 315.
\textsuperscript{25} In his Vrātyaprāyāsvacittanirṇaya. See K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, Rājadharma, Adyar Library Series 27 (Adyar, 1941): 196.
anxieties about caste and class disorder, the socio-economic rise of lower jātis, the spectacle of Śūdras rulers gaining political power, and the threat to the position of Brahmins. In the era of Muslim conquest there were, no doubt, real reasons for Brahmin intellectuals to worry about the disappearance of Kṣatriyas as the defenders of dharma and Brahmanism. As N. K. Dutt remarks,

It was not till the Muslim conquest of the country when the function of ruling passed away from the hands of Hindu royal families that any question could arise about the extinction of the Kṣatriya race.

Concern about the mixing and confusion of caste dharmas is Pīlājī’s reason, as stated in the introductory verses, for commissioning Kṛṣṇa to compose the SAS.

In his New History of the Marathas G. S. Sardesai claims that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa expounded this view that the Kṣatriya varṇa had died out in the Kaliyuga. As this is the only reference to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in a modern history and is part of the colorful legend of Śivāji, it is worth citing in full.

During the reign of Akbar a learned Brahman of Benares named Krishna Narasimha Shesha wrote a work entitled Shudrāchār Shiromani (the head-jewel of the functions of the Shudra caste) wherein a theory was promulgated that there existed no Kṣatriya caste in the present Kali age. The soul of Shivaji could not tolerate this humiliating position. The pronouncement of Krishna Shesha must be publicly refuted. So he sent a deputation of some learned Brahmans, Keshav Bhat Purohit, Bhulachandra Bhat, Somnath Katre, to go to Udepur and other centers of Kṣatriya tradition in North India and rally their opinion in favor of renovating the Kṣatriya caste and declaring that caste being never extinct. The deputation was headed by Bālāji Āvji, the keeper of Shivaji’s plans and a consummate diplomat. The avowed object of this regenerating movement was to purge society of stupid irrational notions, to put an end to the degradation that ignorance had inflicted in the spheres of the national language, the national religion and national patriotism. The deputation sought out an equally versatile opponent to Krishna Shesha, in the person of Vishveshvar Gāgā Bhatta, whose ancestor Govind Bhatta had left Paithan and taken his residence at Benares early in the 16th century, and who was now ready to display his deeper erudition and sharp dialectical powers and beat Krishan Shesha on his own ground. Govind Bhatta’s descendants formed a large school of learning and opinion at Benares and produced numerous works of outstanding merit on religion, law, polity, which are even to-day taken as authoritative in Indian courts.

The Rajput princes respected the Bhatt family so highly that no ceremony could be completed in that art of India without some member of their learned family being present to officiate at the function. Vishveshvar alias Gāgā was himself an author of repute and has to his credit an important standard work, Kāyastha-Dharma-Pradip, in which the fanciful theories of the Shudrāchār Shiromani have been fully demolished and Kṣatriya rites have been granted to the Kāyastha caste.

One is at a loss what to do with this scramble of a tale. Not a trace of the view attributed to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is to be found in the Khiste-Kaviraj edition of the SAS. He never even brings up the topic of the existence of the Kṣatriya varṇa in the Kaliyuga. He may do so in some other version of the text among the unpublished manuscripts scattered around Indian libraries not included in this edition. Since Sardesai also appeared to believe that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was at

27 Kane 1973, III. 892.
28 Origin and Growth, 90.
Paithan and was contemporary to Gāgabhaṭṭa and Śivāji.\(^{30}\) I have to conclude the odds are that this story is equally apocryphal. The appeal is obvious since, if documentable, it would provide the strongest piece of evidence that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa wrote the SAS. As it is, we have only inconclusive fragments. Sardesai gives no source for his attractive but unverifiable story and it may be taken as another instance of the intriguing tales adrift in Indian histories. Given that the idea of the disappearance of the Kṣatriyas was in circulation at this time and was reputed to be a factor in debates over caste status, that of Śivāji for instance, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa may very well have shared it. We just do not have any evidence. And given the uncertainty of the interpretations placed on texts in Manu or ascribed to Yama and Kamalākara on this topic, caution is in order.\(^{31}\)

The further claim Sardesai makes that Gāgabhaṭṭa attacked the opinion of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in his Kāyasthadharmadīpa (KDD) I have so far not been able to verify.\(^{32}\) This assertion is repeated in his Historical Genealogies.\(^{33}\) In the KDD, Gāgabhaṭṭa argued that the Prabhu-Kāyasthas of Maratha country were twice-born and had the right to wear the sacred thread.

This entire complex of issues, the existence of the Kṣatriyas in the Kaliyuga, claims to lost kṣatriyahood, Śivāji’s caste status as a Kṣatriya or Śūdra, Gāgabhaṭṭa’s role in the initiation and coronation of Śivāji were subjects of controversy in their own time and still are today. Witness the sensitivity around the figure of Śivāji and the furor stirred up by James Laine’s book on Śivāji leading to the ransacking of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Pune in January 2004 by demonstrators.\(^{34}\) Given the wide dissemination of the idea of the disappearance of the Kṣatriyas in Kaliyuga, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa may very well have advocated it, but does not discuss it in the SAS.

In the end, the best way to approach these issues may be that recommended by Rosalind O’Hanlon. The absence of any mention of these in the SAS is not conclusive. It is rather to the role of the Brahmin paṇḍit family as Dharmastric consulting firm and shastric proprietor and the rivalry between leading families of southern origin in Vārāṇasī for prestige and patronage that we should look.

I think it is more useful to pursue this question at the level of families and pandit houses, rather than at the level of individual intellectuals. Kamalākara-bhaṭṭa of the Bhaṭṭa family, uncle of Gāgabhaṭṭa, says right at the end

\(^{30}\) Historical Genealogies, 150. Gāgabhaṭṭa is clearly not KS’s contemporary. We know that KS was an active and authoritative adult in 1583, if we accept the authenticity of the Devarukha document, as O’Hanlon does in “Letters Home” (2009):20-24. That Gāgabhaṭṭa was politically engaged in the 1660’s and 1670’s is well attested. So they cannot have overlapped as active intellectuals.

\(^{31}\) N.K. Dutt, Origins and Growth of Caste in India, vol. II, 82-88 for a discussion of these texts and issues.

\(^{32}\) The Kāyasthadharmadīpa has not as yet been translated nor have I been able to sift the printed edition obtained from BORI in Rājavādyānī Gāgabhaṭṭī, ptd. K.T. Gupte, Poona, 1919, App. pp. 1-23. Includes the Kāyasthadharma-pradīpa (1677 CE), a supplement to the KDD (1677 CE).

\(^{33}\) Historical Genealogies, 150.

\(^{34}\) James Laine, Shivaji: Hindu King in Islamic India, 2nd ed. OUP: 2003.
of his Śūdrakamalākara that, following his father, Rāmakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa, and despite what it says in the Purāṇas that in the Kaliyuga there are only two varṇas, that kṣatriyas and vaiśyas who have given up their proper rituals do still exist here and there in a fallen state, with the implication that they might be able to be restored through penance (and of course, Śivāji performed penance before his abhiṣekha conducted under Gāgābhāṭṭa’s supervision).

So the story of a feud might be read more in terms of some intellectual disagreement which ran between these families. There may have been an element of family rivalry between the Bhaṭṭas and the Śeṣas that we do not yet know anything about. This is possible. Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa is mentioned as the pramukha or head of the Maharashtrian Brahmans in the 1583 Devarukha document. But the Bhaṭṭa house at that time was just emerging as very influential in the city, with Nārāyaṇa’s successful re-establishment of the Viṣvevāra temple though his good contacts with the Mughal court. I believe that these pandit houses were really set up to be competitive in this way, perhaps commercially as well as socially and intellectually, and of course, the setting for debates at that period laid great emphasis on individual dexterity and showmanship in public argument.

But all this is very speculative, because we simply don’t have any worked out intellectual history for these pandits, certainly not as far as these social questions are concerned, because Indologists don’t really focus on these things. We lack of course even the first outline of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s own position on the matter.35

The SAS, unfortunately, does not help with the last desideratum.

**The Vājasaneyi Samhitā and Śūdras**

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa recommends that Śūdras follow the form of rite in the tradition of the Veda in which they have been instructed.36 However, the default tradition for Śūdras uninstructed in any other should be that of the Vājasaneyi, i.e., the Śukla Yajurveda.

A Śūdra should perform the ritual according to the domestic rite of the branch of the Veda in which the Brahmin who instructs him is versed; in that succession alone should he practice. But if he is not instructed in any particular one, he should follow the Vājasaneyin rite. SAS 107

This is a view which he shared with others smṛtikāras writing about Śūdras, notably Raghunandana37 and Kamalākara (or reports it in his sources) of the idea that Śūdras are or should be Vājasaneyins.

The idea that Śūdras should follow Vājasaneyin ritual forms seems to have been common among dharmaśāstrīs of the Benares school and the Bengali school. Ideas were transmitted between the South Indian, Bengali, and Benares schools through controversies and debates among themselves and with other schools. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, for instance, refers on a number of occasions to what the “Easterners,” or people in Gauḍa, i.e., Bengalis, say on some disputed point of śāstra. The impact of Maharashtrian Brahmans and others migrating from the Deccan to Benares on its intellectual life is well known and has already been discussed.

Why Śūdras should be particularly associated with the Vājasaneyi Samhitā is not immediately clear. The topic has not been investigated or discussed by anyone to my knowledge. Kane supplies a few pieces of evidence: Ka-

---

36 Note here that Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa accepts that Śūdras be instructed in the Vedas, but only through the intermediary of a Brahmin.
37 SKVT in Smṛtitattva II, ed. Jivananda, p. 634; Malamāsatattva. Ibid., I, 792.
malākara cites Dakṣa in support of his view that Śūdras should perform the pañcamahāyajñas following the Vājasaneyi rite with a Brahman repeating the mantras for them.

Śūdras have the five great yajñas. They should be performed according to the Vājasaneyi śakhā. Śūdras are Vājasaneyins according to Dakṣa in a Bengali digest, as is said in Harihara’s bhāṣya in the Vivāhap rakarana. 38

Raghunandana explains this as meaning that Śūdras should follow the domestic rite as laid down in the Grhya Sūtra of the Śukla Yajurveda. 39 A Brāhmaṇa should repeat the mantra for him. The Śukla Yajurveda Grhya Sūtra is that of the Śrāuta Sūtra of Kātyāyana as an appendix that it is often also called the Kātyāyana Grhya Sūtra. 40 Therefore, when the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā was recommended for Śūdras, what was meant was not the collection of yajus, the sacrificial mantras, but the Vājasaneyi Grhya Sūtra. Kane adds that this is probably based on the Harivamśa (Bhaviṣya parva, III.13). 41 In the Kaliyuga:

All will expound brahman; all will be Vājasaneyins; when the yuga comes to a close Śūdras will make use of the word “bhoh” in address.

So, in the Kaliyuga, Śūdras appropriate the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā for themselves. There is a curious paradox here, or perhaps not. On the one hand, there is a warning of the degradation of the Kaliyuga in which we are now living, when Śūdras will usurp the Vedas, yet śrāvī recommends the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā to Śūdras as proper for them. On the other hand, this is simply a description of the fated state of affairs. That is just the way things are in this cycle.

Apropos other reasons for a Vājasaneyin-Śūdra connection, Nirmala Kulkarni speculates that the Athar-va Veda was not prohibited to Śūdras as stringently as the sacred triad of the Rg, Yajur, and Sāma Vedas. 42 As the “fourth Veda,” a repository of blessings and prayers for auspicious occasions, folk-belief, charms, imprecations, and sorcery for disease, possession, and the ills of life, the Atharva Veda was closely connected with the practical arts of life, medicine and astrology. Its spells carried potent power for harm. The legal literature of Dharmaśāstra, therefore, treated its magic charms and incantations overall as dangerous, inferior, and impure material requiring regulation and sanction. The fourth Veda thus resembles the position of the fourth varṇa as dangerous, polluting, and inferior.

Āpastamba accords the Atharva a lesser status and says that the knowledge of Śūdras and women is supplemental to

38 SK, 51. Kane says that the Vivāhap rakarana is from the Laghukārikā of Karka, pre-1100 CE author of a commentary on the Pāraskāraghyasūtra, aka the Vājasaneyaghyasūtra of the White Yajurveda.
41 Kane 156.
42 Personal communication. Nonetheless, typical Brahman attitudes are found in the Atharva about, for instance, the lecherous Śūdra female (1.5.22.6). In another verse the curse of a Śūdra and a Brahman can equally be repelled (10.1.3). The Atharva uses the formulaic phrase ‘the śūdra and the ārya’ (4.20.4). Maurice Bloomfield translates this as “every kind of person, as we should say in America, ‘black and white.’” Hymns of the Atharva Veda, 1897, 402.
the *Atharva Veda*. In Kulkarni’s view, Vājasaneyi Brahmins may have used the *Atharva Veda* as *purohitas* in the service of rulers and others of Śūdra origin, thereby authorizing the *Vājasaneyi Samhitā* for Śūdras in general. Whatever its merit, her speculation is suggestive of how this *samhitā* came to be regarded as the most appropriate for the fourth varṇa.

Colebrooke makes another suggestive observation in his essays on Hindu philosophy in the section on Pāñcarātras.

Many of this sect practice the initiatory ceremonies and admission to holy orders according to the forms directed by the Vājasaneyi-sakha of the Yajurveda.

Again, it is probably the domestic rites of the *Grhya Śūtra* of the *Śukla Yajurveda* that the Pāñcarātras and Bhāgavatas, with whom Colebrooke associates them, or, for that matter, any Vaiṣṇavas were following.

At first glance, there seems little reason for the mantras and *yajus* of the *Vājasaneyi Samhitā* itself to have any special relevant to the devotional theism of the Vaiṣṇavas. In fact, the *Vājasaneyi Samhitā* represents a shift from the adoration of the power of the gods in the *Rg Veda* back to the performance of sacrifices and rites as the main object of interest. It does contain two famous prayers which were important scriptures for Śaivas: the “Śatarudrīya” (*adhyāya* 16), a first-of-its-kind litany addressed to the one hundred forms of Rudra, including Śiva, Śaṅkara, Ma-hādeva, and Paśupati, and the “Śivasaṅkalpasūkta” (*adhyāya* 34).

The deeds and incarnations of Viṣṇu are accorded a more prominent place than in the *Rg Veda* as well, which may have led Vaiṣṇavas to see it as *śruti* sanctioning their worship of Viṣṇu. *Adhyāya* 40, the last chapter of the *Śukla Yajurveda*, is the short and darkly enigmatic *Īśā Upaniṣad*, which teaches not ritual, but the non-dual knowledge of Īśā, the Lord who is the inmost self of the whole world. This is often given a unitarian theistic reading.

The Vaiṣṇava-Vājasaneyi connection more probably arose from the low caste associations of Vaiṣṇa-vism. Although the Brahmins of the *Śukla Yajurveda* still excluded Śūdras from participation in *śrauta* sacrificial rituals, in later times they allowed them to take part in the domestic rites and ceremonies as outlined the *Grhya Śūtra*. It is believed that many early worshippers of Vāsudeva, Viṣṇu, and Krṣṇa, the Pāñcarātras, Bhāgavatas, and Sātvatas, were of low-caste, extra-varṇa, tribal, or foreign and otherwise non-Aryan origins.

---

43 Ā. II, 11, 29, 10.11.
44 Although a king’s priest was in all probability an Atharvan. Yājñavalkya (1.312) says that a minister should be skilled in *Atharva*.
The emergence of Vaiṣṇavism as an important sect during this period [circa. 200 BC – circa. 300 CE] offered Śūdras an option, and they could get rid of some religious disabilities imposed on them by the brahmanical system. The cult of Viṣṇu promised salvation to vaishyas, Śūdras, and women.47 Vaiṣṇavism offered religious equality to Śūdras. Unlike the old orthodox forms of Brahmanism, Vaiṣṇava texts display an unlimited solicitude for the spiritual welfare of lower castes promising them liberation from bondage through faith and devotion to the Lord. Reaching a high tide in the Gupta period, the ameliorating influence of Vaiṣṇavism on the lives of Śūdras goes on long after to moderate the treatment they receive in Dharmaśāstra.48

Given the presumably non-Vedic origin and development of early theistic Vaiṣṇavism as popular and dissident movements, before being co-opted and Brahmanized, the Vaiṣṇavite rites may have been seen as open to them in a way the other Vedas were not. This customary association was preserved in Dharmaśāstra as the recommendation of Vaiṣṇavite observances as best suited to Śūdras uninstructed in other śākhās.

On a closer look, the yajus of the Vaiṣṇavite Samhitā has other striking Śūdra-friendly features. Most interestingly, the Śukla Yajurveda was partly compiled later than the Krṣṇa Yajurveda and the other three Vedas and exhibits “the almost complete development of castes and mixt castes and considerable advance in arts and sciences, trades, handicrafts and occupations.”49

This is most evident in adhyāyas 30-31, which give the rite of puruṣamedha. These two adhyāyas may have contributed most to making the Śukla Yajurveda speak with particular relevance to Śūdras or rather recommended itself as such to Brahmin writers on Dharmaśāstra, giving a Vedic affirmation for their views on jātis and jīvikās. The thirtieth adhyāya is late, probably from the Brāhmaṇa period (800—600 CE) and gives a vivid picture of north Indian society at the time, and especially the lives of working class Indians. 159 different classes of people are typified by occupation, moral nature, physical characteristic, tribe, or varṇa.50 These are similar to the jātis found in other later works, Manu X, the Jātiviveka, and the varṇasaṅkara section (17-32) of the SAS itself, but appear still to be in the process of becoming castes.

Puruṣamedha here means not actual, but symbolic human sacrifice, the ritual initiation (saṁskāra) of persons into various occupations suitable to their aptitudes and natures. These include many of the job descriptions—dancers, potters, sports-players, carpenters, jewelers, perfumer, washer, goldsmith, herder, physician, brewers, arrow-

---

48 Sharma, 307-308.
50 For a complete list and discussion see R. Chandra and K.L. Chanchreek, Shudras in Ancient India (New Delhi: Shree Publishers, 2004) 64-72.
manufacturers, rope-makers, hunters, fisherman, musicians, and astrologers, etc., and the tribally derived jātis—Āyogava, Niṣāda, Vṛṣya, Bhilla, Kirāta, Kaivarta, Paulkasa, Cāṇḍāla, and Māgadha, etc.—met with in the SAS. The character types have a certain allegorical poetry as essences of nature, ethnics, and way of life. The Śūdra, appropriately, is the symbol and embodiment of toil (tapas).

For Maruts, a Vaiśya; for tapas, a Śūdra; for darkness, a robber, for hell, a manslayer; for misfortune, a eunuch, for trade, an Ayogu; for love, a harlot; for noise, a minstrel from Magadha.

For dancing, a Sūta; for song, a performer; for dharma, a councilor; for jokes and pastimes, a timid man; for sport, a chatterer, for laughter, a jester; for delight, one fond of women; for skill, a Rathakāra; for firmness, a carpenter.

For lakes, a fisherman; for standing waters, a fisher, for tank-waters, a Niṣāda, for reed-beds, a fish-vendor; for fords, an Ānda; for shallows, a Maināla; for sounds, a Bhilla; for caverns, a Kirāta, for mountains, a wild man.

The ceremony is concluded with a recitation of the famous Puruṣa hymn, a fuller version of the Puruṣa Sūkta in the Rg Veda (RV x.90; AV x. 6), which celebrates the creation of the world and the four varṇas from the self-sacrifice of Puruṣa, the Cosmic Person. There is a second creation hymn (xiv. 28-31) with a very different cosmology in which Śūdra and Ārya were created together among the other happy creatures, beings, animals, and seasons of the earth. Indeed this placing of Śūdra and Ārya on an equal footing in some regard is a remarkable feature of the Vājasaneyi Samhitā, so much so that it led B. R. Ambedkar to see a message of equality in it. Śūdras of earlier times may have done so as well.

We find this equation of Śūdra and Ārya repeated in a number of places. Śūdras are as much the recipients of the truth of the Vedas as Āryas:

As I speak this auspicious word to the peoples, to Brahmin and Rajanya, to Śūdra and Ārya, to kin and stranger, may I be dear to the gods and a giver of gifts in this world.

The light of truth shines on all varṇas, the high and the low:

O Agni, give to us light among Brahmins, light among kings; light among Vaiśyas and Śūdras; give to me light with light.

Sinning against a Śūdra is as serious a matter as against an Ārya:

Whatever offense we have committed in village, in forest, in assembly, and by our bodily power, against Śūdra or Ārya, whatever offense we have committed in the case of another, you are the expiation

51 See Uma Kant Pande (1979): 103-109 for a complete list.
52 This is the Ralph T. H. Griffith translation, Yajurveda Samhitā Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1990) 450, 454.
54 My translations of Šukla Yajurveda Samhitā xxvi.2, xviii.48, and xx.17.
Conclusions: The Ritual Life of Śūdras and the Bhakti Reformation

I have established, as much as the meager evidence allows, that the Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi is a work by Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in the latter decades of the 16th century. As the 1583 nirṇayapatra shows (whose authenticity is vouched for by O’Hanlon and Pollock), he was an active and authoritative figure then in the intellectual life of Vārāṇasī engaged in the adjudication of Brahmin caste disputes. Around the same time, or earlier, he wrote the Kaṁsavadha, a Kṛṣṇa nāṭaka, for Govārdhan, the son of Toḍar Mal, Akbar’s famous minister of finance. Toḍar sponsored the Toḍarāṇanda, an encyclopedia of civil and religious law, astronomy, and medicine, compiled between 1565-1589. This period appears to be Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s peak of eminence. His life may have spanned most of the 16th century and can be roughly dated to 1510-1590. His influence on figures in the next century, such as Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita and Gāgābhaṭṭa, however, suggests that he may have lived on into the early 1600’s.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was a scholar of versatile accomplishment, an exemplar of the multi-talented pandit characteristic of the period. He was most famous for his Prakriyāprakāśa, a work of neo-Paninian grammar, written for Kalyāṇa of Antarvedi in the Doab. Many other grammatical works credibly, and kṛṣṇa-kāvyas, more doubtfully, have been attributed to him, but only two dharmaśāstras: the SAS and the Dharmānubandhiṣlokačaturdaśī.

As I have argued in the section on dating, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s father, Nṛsiṁha, the author of the Govindārṇava, cannot be the son of the author of the Prakriyākaumudī, if the date of c. 1400 accepted by Pingree and others for that work is correct. Nṛsiṁha and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa must be in a later family line. In any case, there is clearly something amiss with the dating and lineage of the early Śeṣas which, given the patchy state of the evidence, remains unresolvable for the time being.

It makes more sense to put Nṛsiṁha in the era of the ‘Ādil Shāhis of Bījāpūr when they became liberal patrons of the arts and scholarship. Although the period of greatest flourishing was after Talikot (1565) under ‘Ādī ‘Ādil (1558-80) and Ibrahim II (1580-1627), Ibrahim I (1530-58) brought many Deccanis, including Marathas, into his service. According to another kṛṣṇa-kāvyā attributed to Krṣṇabhaṭṭa (presumably Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa), the Murārivijayanāṭaka, his father lived on the Godāvarī River and spent time at the court of Vidyānagara, i.e., Bījāpūr, where he was honored as
bhattachārīraṇaka, a title of respect for a venerable scholar. It was another honorific like “Śeṣa” that Kṛṣṇa and his father garnered, according them precedence and marks of esteem in sabhās.

Nṛsiṁha then settled in Vāraṇasī, where his son made his name. Both Kṛṣṇa and Nṛsiṁha were patronized by the Śrīvāstakas, the rājās of Tāṇḍava near Vāraṇasī, Nṛsiṁha by Govindacandra and Kṛṣṇa by Narottama, his younger brother. Kṛṣṇa repeatedly refers the reader to the Govindārṇava and, in one instance, claims the work as his own.

The patron who commissioned the SAS from Kṛṣṇa, Pilājī, was a dākṣinātya king who prided himself on his military prowess and patronage of pilgrimage to Prayāga. The only Pilājī we know of in this period is a scion of the Ghorpade family in Mudhol, in present day Karnataka. The Ghorpades were a side branch to the Bhonsles. Although the editors of the edition of the SAS edition on which my translation is based, Khiste and Kaviraj, did not make much of him, Pilājī Ghorpade, like the Śrīvāstakas is very much in the mold of the typical patron of the period. The Ghorpades were allies or feudatories of the Sultans of Bījāpūr, for whom they fought against Vijayanagara. Therefore, both Śeṣas and Ghorpades had close connections with the court of Bījāpūr. It seems well within the realm of possibility that Pilājī might have an interest in commissioning a work of Dharmaśāstra from a family in high standing there. The Bījāpūr connection is intriguingly strengthened by discovery of the fact that another Śeṣa, Vāmana, son of Ananta, may have been royal librarian to ‘Ālī ‘Ādil Shāh.

Deccan Brahmin families like the Śeṣas and Bhaṭṭas were the stars in the intellectual life of Vāraṇasī for the next two centuries during its last great burst of brilliance during the period of Maratha supremacy. Dākṣinātyas had long figured prominently in Dharmaśāstra producing many of the great nibandhas and commentaries that revised varṇa: from Aparārka, Vīṭhala, Hemādri and Mādhava, to Nīlakaṇṭha, Kamalākara, and Anantadeva). Meanwhile, Maharashtra, which belongs geographically to the south, but linguistically and culturally to the north was one of the main fonts of the second wave of Bhakti—its diffusion to the North—from the 13th century on, with the rise of the Vārkarī panth, the cult of Viṭṭhala, and the poet-saints Jāneśvara, Goroba, Chokhamela,Janabāī, Nāmdev, and Eknāth.¹ This seems not a coincidence. Maharashtrians would continue to play a leading role in resistance to and reform of caste from Sivājī right up Phule and Ambedkar. Bhakti by critique and resistance and nibandha-style Dharmaśāstras by a remapping of varṇa, of which śūdradharma texts were a distinctive aspect, both reflected and rearticulated caste as it was woven over the subcontinent in the two phases of the medieval: post-Harṣa regional agrarian state formation and Turko-Afghan Muslim conquest and domination from the twelfth century on.

The *Satśūdrācāraśiromaṇi* is a manual of dharma for Śūdras written by a Brahmin for Brahmins to guide them in officiating as priests providing ritual services to Śūdras. It was not written for Śūdras, although some were literate. It is difficult to understand a text like the SAS merely from its content as a *nibandha* or compendium of shastric quotations. It is its purpose and use for Brahmins that informs it.

As recent work on this period shows, what it meant to be a Brahmin, Kṣatriya, or Śūdra was a hot topic in shastra at this time. The socio-economic changes of Sultanate-Mughal India had torqued the sense and reality of caste, stimulating a deep questioning of *varṇa* identity. Did Kṣatriyas exist in the Kaliyuga, and who was entitled to exercise power? (As we have seen, tradition accorded Kṛṣṇa a role in this debate, but there is no trace of it in the SAS.) Who were Brahmins and what were their proper livelihoods and ranking vis-à-vis other Brahmins? Who were Śūdras and what were their ritual/social rights? This question took the form for Kṛṣṇa of who was a *sat*-Śūdra and what were the ritual rights of these “good” Śūdras. He answered it by working out a compromise position within the traditional limits of Dharmaśāstra.

These questions were implicated in each other. In the age of Bhakti, Brahmins had to revamp Dharmaśāstra to cater to new sources of patronage amongst Śūdras while preserving the Vedic aura of Brahmin privilege. How Brahmins could accommodate those who were not entitled to Vedic rituals and mantras was thus a matter of pressing self-interest as Brahmins. As later ethnographic surveys make clear, soon almost all *jātis*, even the lowest *antya-jas* such as Caṇḍālas, were paying Brahmins for their ritual ministrations. The beginning of this process can be seen in the SAS in the allowances made for *sat*-Śūdras.

A fundamental difficulty is that “Śūdra” was principally a term of classification in Brahmanical discourse: its relation and applicability to actual social conditions was and is immensely problematic. There is a vast literature on the subject. As will be observed, I have relied extensively on the work of R. S. Sharma, who, loosely speaking, like many of my secondary sources—D. D. Kosambi, Romila Thapar, Irfan Habib, and Sheldon Pollock—views religious discourse as expressing historically developing social relations, which can be read back out of these. Dharmaśāstra thus becomes a body of evidence reflecting and recording changes in the social status of Śūdras. There is a danger, consequently, of circularity when it is the only or main source.

Another pitfall is the tendency to overrate the significance of Brahmanical *varṇa* discourse, taking it as factual and descriptive. It is best to consider shastric texts not as descriptions, but as strategies primarily concerned with the
place of Brahmmins themselves and their interests in the scheme of things. What a text like the SAS was being used for was more important than its juggled traditional contents. Indeed, it can be argued that varṇa theory, for the most part, had little relevance to real caste/class relations or how people thought of or identified themselves.

Śūdra is a slippery term. Which groups had the term imposed on them or were willing to accept the label was the result of “caste struggle.” “Śūdra” was a contested status which anyone who could do so escaped by claiming higher caste. In social usage, it was a linguistic marker of subjection imposed on those downtrodden and exploited groups such as tribal peoples drawn into and kept at the bottom of the caste system with no economic and political power to resist it.² The social composition of the Śūdra varies over periods and regions. The evidence is most nebulous for ancient times, entirely extracted as it is from Brahmanical texts.

Related to the problem with the term “Śūdra” is the issue of translation. It will be noted that I have used the term “right,” speaking of the ritual “rights” of Śūdras, the enlargement of Śūdra “rights” in Dharmaśāstra, the “right” to perform a ritual or sacrament, and so forth. I have followed R. S. Sharma in this regard, who uses this language of rights.³ The term translated as “right” is adhikāra and lack of adhikāra as disability or discrimination. Adhikāra is more precisely rendered as authorization, entitlement, or qualification, all synonyms I use, depending on context. The adhikāras that matter in Dharmaśāstra are the entitlements to perform Vedic rites, use Vedic mantras, and receive sacraments reserved to the dvijas. The problem was to define the domain of adhikāra of the Śūdra, given his formal exclusion. This was accomplished by expanding his qualification for most rites and practices to some degree apart from those strictly dvīja, and supplying Vaiṣṇava initiation and other substitutes.

There are, of course, many theoretical questions about the socio-historical applicability of such terms as “right,” “disability,” and “discrimination” to Hindu caste, loaded as they are with the freight of liberal political theory and the discourse of human rights. These have been thrashed out in post-colonialist debates about cultural imperialism and Orientalism. Beyond those, we might say that there have been Enlightenments East and West, but culturally inflected in characteristic ways: in the West, the Greeks, the Renaissance, and the birth of modernity in the 17th and 18th centuries, in India, Buddhism and Bhakti. In premodern Hindu communities, the struggle for rights took a religious rather than a political form. In the nineteenth century, with the arrival of capitalism, modern political forms,

² For Berreman, power and status largely coincide. Caste ranking differs according to the relative social position of the judge and judged and varies between and within caste groups from Brahmin to untouchables, from ritual feast to bazaar. Claims are made with regard to status, sometimes by appeal to Brahmanically derived concepts and language, but conceded on the basis of power. The Gonds, for instance, are untouchables, except where they are landowners. Then, as Raj Gonds, they adopt the ritual symbols and conduct that justify their status. When status and power get too out of sync, viz., prosperous Śūdras, Brahmanical thinking effects a realignment, as we see in Śūdradharma texts. G. Berreman, “The Brahmanical View of Caste,” 16-23.
³ He does not discuss his own terminology in his Śūdras in Ancient India.
and democratic ideology, the language of rights was adopted with only a short time lag. India, however, was ahead of Europe, torn apart by religious wars in the 16th century, in its move toward religious toleration. Bhakti suffered the fate of most enlightenments—to be co-opted and refunctioned to serve the new system of power.

Although parts of it (vyavahāra) deal with legal procedure and the matters we think of as criminal and civil law, Dharmaśāstra had only the force of custom (ācāra), not the force of law. It was religio—a code of community norms exemplified in the conduct of the sadācāra, i.e., those who act in accord with dharma. Public opinion was the chief enforcer of these norms. In this context, “right” can only be a term for caste-bound claims on certain ritual entitlements, social prerogatives, and material resources. It is political only in the sense of the power of the community. Throughout the history of caste, claims were made to certain adhikāras. These were customary, not constitutional claims on rights or liberties, although caste councils, as we have seen, did render common law decisions for their own communities, and, in that sense, were juridical.

Does it make sense then to speak of a liberalization and expansion of rights, as many modern scholars do, in the Śūdrācāraśiromani? Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa was engaged in the same project that had preoccupied digest writers since Lakṣmīdhara in the twelfth century: the more complete inclusion of Śūdras in the Brahmanical ritual system, while preserving the privileges and status of Brahmins. The social position of Brahmins rested on their exclusive control of Vedic education and ritual. This jealously guarded privilege as a source of prestige and income is still very much insisted on in the SAS. Nevertheless, Brahmanism periodically found it the best policy to stress ritual inclusion. What we see in the medieval digest is the deeper penetration of Brahmanically managed ritual into of the lives of the low castes, what can be called deep shastrification, or deep ritualization.

If the Śūdra labored under certain disqualifications, he had compensating advantages. The lives of Śūdras were far from being dull oppressive drudgery, as in the usual picture of caste oppression. On the contrary, they sound often much more interesting and varied and certainly more productive and often more satisfying and pleasant than those of the upper varṇas. They were less subject to restrictive and onerous dharma rules and ritual observance than Brahmins and Kṣatriyas and freer in their private lives. 4 They were at liberty to do many things such as, for instance,

---

4 As argue Kane HDS II, pt. 1, 164 and Brij Narain Sharma, Social Life in Northern India (Delhi, 1966), 55: Śūdras were better off than Brahmins because less imposed upon by purificatory rites. Suvira Jaiswal, however, sees no compensation in this: “In a society which placed a premium on the observance of purificatory rites, social recognition of the comparative laxity of a community in these matters meant low status, and as M.N. Srinivas has shown, lower communities tried to improve their social status through a process of Sanskritization, i.e., by adopting the behavior pattern of higher communities and emulating them in matters of food, drink and marriage.” Caste, 125n284.
drink alcohol and eat meat denied to more respectable people. They were free of penances and gotra restrictions in marrying. Many Śūdras attained wealth, social standing, and political power. Śūdras became kings, ministers, and soldiers, often to the consternation of Brahmins. It was precisely this freedom from ritual observance that śūtradharma texts were designed to regulate. They extend ritual down into these lower castes including them in a limited degree in the sacrifices and sacraments previously required only of the twice-born.

The question of who were entitled to call themselves Brahmins and what were their ranking and prerogatives was the focus of intense and sustained debate among the Brahmin communities of western India in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, involving history, lineage, entitlements, reputation, acceptable livelihoods and practices. Adjudications of disputed Brahmin status are the content of the nirnayapatras handed down by Brahmin councils such as those in which Kṛṣṇa and, possibly, his sons, Vireśvara and Cakrapaṇi, participated. These controversies took place in the social networks linking Maratha shrine towns and centers of worship such as Paiṭhan with Vārānasī in which Śeṣas and Bhaṭṭas prestigiously figured. Brahmins were forced to rethink their role under the new circumstances of Mughal and Maratha states, redefining themselves as a new scribal and administrative elite just as the social configuration of Śūdras was shifting at the same time under the impetus of the Bhakti movements.

One reason for the great number of śūtradharma manuals appearing at this time may have been a need for them among Brahmins as their “ministry” to Śūdra families expanded, ultimately to include all but the most marginal Śūdra castes, to lay down which rituals and mantras were appropriate and how to perform them. One of the them, the Śūdrakamalākara of Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa, no doubt due to the prestige and authority of the Bhaṭṭas, received the royal seal of approval for the Brahmin community of Maharashtra. In 1735, Balaji Rao issued an official dharmasthāpana, a decree for “establishing dharma” that Brahmins should follow this text when officiating as priests for Śūdras.

---

5 This was so at least true of asat-Śūdras whom Kamalākara (60) says do not incur sin even if they partake of meat and alcohol, provided they do not eat forbidden meat and that there is no pollution if a dvija comes into contact with a Śūdra who drinks. sat-Śūdras were more hemmed in by the expectations of good conduct. In theory, they had to follow good occupations and trades, dutifully serve the twice-born, abstain from alcohol, and eat a vegetarian diet, but this was less so in practice.

6 As O’Hanlon and Minkowski show, the agricultural and petty trade occupations many Brahmins found it necessary to make a living by were one of the issues in the debates and rulings among Konkani Brahmins. In the sixteenth and seventeenth century, these Maratha Brahmin communities linked the shrine towns and centers such as Paiṭhan with Vārānasī. As they competed for new source of patronage of the rising Maratha-Peshwa state as the emerging scribal and administrative the appropriateness of such livelihoods along with lineage and customs were vetted for “Brahmanness.” The Dharmashastric reassessment of śūtradharma was co-extensive with these debates about Brahmanness. See Rosalind O’Hanlon and Christopher Minkowski, “What makes people whom they are? Pandit networks and the problem of livelihoods in early modern Western India.”

7 Rosalind O’Hanlon, “Letters Home: Banaras pandits and the Maratha regions in early modern India,” See pp. 4, 21, 25, & 31. Brahmins back home in the Deccan appealed to their confreres in Banaras for resolution of disputes over ritual entitlement and precedence. Similar pressures of social change were stimulating a reconsideration at the same time of Śūdra ritual entitlement.
Brahmins performing rites such as marriage for Śūdras at home should perform the rite according to the text of the Śūdrakamalākara. They should not perform it according to the Veda.8

This may account for the fact that the Śūdrakamalākara went on to become the most influential and well known śūradharma text, much more so than the Śūdracāraśiromaṇi.

In an age when Brahmins’ position was insecure, claims to Brahminhood and its entitlements were contested, and Bhakti religious leaders challenged Brahmin superiority, it was necessary to adapt the dharma to new customer bases. Brahmins of low status offered their services to Śūdras and other low castes and would increasingly do so. By the nineteenth century, almost all castes made use of Brahmin priests for weddings, funerals, sacraments, and śrāddhas. Many Brahmin priests were themselves down on the lowest socio-economic rungs along with astrologers (jyotishs), marriage brokers (ghaṭaks), minstrels (bhāts), and entertainers.9 Some had fallen into “Śūdra” livelihoods or Śūdra ritual work that exposed them to challenges to their Brahmin status, as we see from Brahmin council rulings.10 In short, Brahmins were just as divided by caste and class as the other varṇas. Few attained the court patron-age and fame of high prestige śāstrīs like Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa.

Dharmaśāstra, which for two millennia had formally excluded Śūdras, was now made more welcoming to socially respectable, namely, sat-Śūdras, while still in fact observing caste distinctions and excluding them from Vedic mantra. In practice, this may not have made much of a difference since the lines between Vedic, Puranic, and customary rites were often faint or fading except for clearly Vedic mantras such as the Gāyatrī and jealously guarded dvija privileges such as upanayana. Moreover, the rituals of all varṇas were officiated by Brahmin priests.

Śūradharma texts were a conservative, normative response to the changing socio-economic conditions of caste in late Sultanate and Mughal India. They are an effort in the domain of traditional discourse to integrate Śūdras more fully into the Brahmanical ritual fold, part of the process of consolidating the Brahmanical order and preserving the integrity of the varṇa system in theory. By their very nature as a traditional discourse they appear to be hermetically sealed off from any such politico-economic influences.

One of the things, therefore, I have tried to do in this study is support the view that Dharmaśāstra, despite its ultra-traditionalism and self-constructed image as sanātana dharma, does in fact change with the times, but under the

8 No. 51 in V. S. Bendrey, Mahārāṣṭrītahas cī Sādhane (Bombay, 1966): vol. 2, 441.
canopy of continuity. As Mikael Aktor puts it, smṛti ritualized time itself.\textsuperscript{11} Present day custom was recorded and sanctioned but as remembrance, as the great ṛṣis’ perfect knowledge of timeless dharma.\textsuperscript{12} Textual production was mythologized, but retained flexibility in interpretation. If the social function of Dharmaśāstra was simultaneously to uphold caste with the sacred sanction of the Vedas and to preserve the social position of Brahmins within it as its custodians and gatekeepers, as caste changed over time, these functions had to be redefined and realigned. To show this, I have traced out two lines of intersecting development: the history of Śūdras and the history of Dharmaśāstra.

The treatment of Śūdras in Dharmaśāstra can be shown to track, if only in a very broad way, socio-economic changes in the lives of Śūdras. Brahmins did not have the grandly sweeping retrospective view we have of their activity. They were simply engaged in making a living and preserving their traditional ways of life, faith, and learning in changing circumstances.

3

In the early medieval period, the demographics of Śūdras becomes clearer, as does the Dharmaśastraic response. Regional agrarian kingdoms grew up through territorial expansion, peasantization, and cultural integration. Śūdras moved into agriculture as the agrarian kingdoms expanded into the tribal hinterlands bringing more land under cultivation and settlement.\textsuperscript{13} As both Śūdra and antyaja jātis proliferated and stratified, some Śūdra jātis were pushed up and the antyaja subcastes pushed down the social hierarchy. In the Tamil country and Karnataka, sat-Śūdras became the landowning castes.

Kulke’s processural-integrative model (from rājavanśa chieftoms, to sāmantacaktra kingdoms, to maṇḍala empires) may be the best description of these processes currently on offer. In this model, Brahmins played a pioneering role in the establishment of the caste system (jatification), the social and economic absorption of tribals (kṣatriyaization), and the inclusion of their religions and cultures (Hinduization). But in later centuries, they were replaced by non-Brahmin itinerant preachers, sect leaders, and holy men relying on vernacular languages and re-

\textsuperscript{13} Kulke, “The Early and the Imperial Kingdom: A Processural Model of Integrative State Formation in Early Medieval India,” in the State in India, 258-262.
regional norms (*deśa dharma*). As Kulke sees it, these regional traditions, in conjunction with Bhakti, played a vital role in binding together the local and imperial levels. 14

This points up another of the inadequacies in a Brahmanocentric view of caste: the overrating of Brahmins’ dominance as the bearers of high Sanskritization. As we have seen, the position of many Brahmins was insecure and low. Most had to make a living at other occupations such as teaching, medicine, astrology, farming, and so on. It was the structure of caste that dominated people lives, not Brahmins per se. There was movement within its structures up, down, or sideways for them as well.

In the Sultanate period, we see a process of re-urbanization. Towns grew in number, size and population, craft production and commerce expanded, and revenue more efficiently extracted. The introduction of new technologies made possible socio-economic niches outside of the caste structures of the medieval village.

Besides the changes in construction techniques and the arrival of paper manufacture that were already known, we now know that devices like the spinning wheel, pedals in the loom, pindrum gearing for the ‘Persian wheel’, tinning, more efficient liquor distillation, etc. were also adopted and diffused in the wake of the Sultan’s armies. 15 These factors coalesced to generate new artisanal manufactures and services and expand old ones. Śūdras then began moving into urban arts, manufactures, and services, and *antyajas* replaced them as the degraded pool of manual labor and servants. Urbanization lifted artisans out of the *jajmānī* system of the village. 16 Urban life also opened up many opportunities in the counterparts of modern entertainment, showbiz, and “adult entertainment” (prostitution) on a large scale. 17 Kṛṣṇa describes many of these professions in his section on mixed *jātīs*.

Such developments opened a narrow escape valve from traditional rural society into new social spaces. The spinning wheel spurred the growth of the textile industry making artisan-entrepreneurs like Kabīr possible, a weaver of silk cloth for the luxury market. Sericulture was introduced and took off in the sixteenth century as did carpet weaving, introduced from Persia, and paper making. The Sultans and Mughals had little interest in altering caste structures or in mass conversion. Conversion occurred minimally, mostly for reasons of economic opportunity opened up by horizontal relaxation of hereditary caste constraints and customs on labor. Islam had an unintended destabilizing effect on traditional Hindu caste, not so much from the pull of a supposedly more equalizing faith or the lure of con-

16 *Cambridge Economic History of India*, 279-281.
17 *Cambridge Economic History of India*, 303.
version, but from the pull of new economic opportunity and, as Irfan Habib has argued, through levees of captive and forced labor in the initial stages of conquest.  

The Mughal Empire was the culmination of trends at work through the Sultanate period: the growth of middle strata in trade and finance, shopkeepers, moneylenders, agents, brokers, merchants, master craftsmen and artisans, lower ranking bureaucrats, physicians, teachers, pandits, mullas, lawyers, and multifarious religious figures. These classes aspired to a gentility as bhadralok distinguishing them from commoners, i.e., Śūdras and lower. Many of these classes of people were Brahmins, Kāyasthas, thrifty Baniyas, and Khatris. Śūdra artisans and professionals prospered by serving these middle and upper strata and sometimes rising into them and claiming higher caste status.

Moreover, the Mughals developed a centralized system of administration and revenue collection, recording with meticulous detail prices, taxes, property assessments and the names and castes of households. The jagir system itself was a factor then, unclear how significant, in shaping caste by contributing to the regularization of caste identity prior to the administrative rationalizations of the Raj, which are made so much of in some post-colonialist scholarship. The Census of India simply laid down a new field in which to fight it out.

Foreign travelers visiting India in the 16th century invariably painted a picture of ruling elites enjoying lives of “oriental” luxury and the mass of peasants, artisans, and servants mired in misery. Such a class divide with extremes of power and wealth was the social reality everywhere at the time, no less so than in Europe. Another trend in post-colonial studies has been to see great dynamism and social mobility in the Mughal period. Caste was clearly in transition, but, as other see it, was confined to a churning within the narrow horizons of the centralizing system of surplus extraction. The system restricted organizational diversity and social mobility in many ways. The only real mobility for many Śūdras was vertical from agriculture to trades such as weaving and horizontal among related occupations of carpenters, braziers, goldsmith, and masons.

The SAS was addressed to the religious needs of these urban craftsmen and professionals. They were Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s sat-Śūdra jātis. Not coincidently, they were also the groups to and for whom Bhakti spoke. Bhakti in the North and West was, in a sense, the ideological expression of these new artisan classes in the domain of the reli-

---

19 Cambridge Economic History of India, 466.
20 Cambridge Economic History of India, 465.
21 Leon Sinder, Caste Instability in Moghal India (Seoul: International Cultural Research Center, 1963) advances this view most vigorously.
22 Cambridge Economic History of India, 277-278.
23 Cambridge Economic History of India, 285.
igious. Their labor was devoted to the production of household comfort and luxury goods for the affluent. They were oppressed by taxation and longing for something more, or complete release, which they found in their devotional faiths. They were doing better, but their aspirations had run into the structural limits of caste.

Virtually every relevant feature of the economy, society, and the state was designed to hold the artisan firmly to his lowly place in the scheme of things allowing very little scope for upward mobility or differentiation. Nearly every foreign observer spoke of the relentless tyranny suffered by the artisan, a description confirmed by the indigenous accounts of the manner in which 

**sa’ir**
duties on manufactured goods were collected and literary references to extortions by even the village headsmen.24

Dharmaśāstra adapted to the changing social landscape. This is what we see in the nibandhas and manuals of ritual from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century: a newly complex view of the place and ritual rights of Śūdras recognizing the new status of these better-off Śūdras and bringing them within the ambit of Brahmanical ritual as patrons for priestly ritual services from which they had been formally excluded. The texts of the tradition that writers on śūradharma cited to authorize enlargement of Śūdra ritual rights were from the late Dharmaśāstras and Purāṇas, which were shaped by an earlier surge of Vaiṣṇava reform that expressed improvements in the social status of Śūdras.

The nibandha was the symptomatic form of the era authoritatively assessing and settling the regional and traditional differences in custom and practice in the śāstras. Being a “southerner” in the North may have sharpened Kṛṣṇa’s sense of the differences in ācāra between dākhṣinātya customs (Deccan), and those of madhyadeśa (by which he seems to mean the Ganges midlands), and gauḍa (Bengal), as he refers to them on a number of occasions. My Maharashtrian Sanskrit teacher found a certain Deccani flavor in the language and cultural references of the SAS.

The influence of Bhakti is not overtly evident in the content of the SAS. It is more a matter of a percolating influence. Kṛṣṇa was clearly a devout Vaiṣṇava, as was, apparently, his patron Pilājī, whom he calls a paramavaśīṣṭa sprung from the lotus feet of Śrī Hari. Special attention is given to bathing and worship of Vasudeva with music and bells and the immense merit derived from it. But, on the whole, the SAS is pañcāyatana and smārta in its orientation. Indeed, the SAS illustrates the syncretic emergence of modern Śmārta Hinduism with its fusion of Vedic ritual and theistic devotion as popular ceremonies and scriptures were Vedicized and, conversely, the Vedas took on board popular theistic worship. Pūjā of Viṣṇu, Śiva, Ganeśa, Devī, and Sūrya, bathing, and purification were fused with

---

24 Cambridge Economic History of India, 284.
the traditional Vedic rites of the five mahāyajñas, most of the sanāskāras, homa, vratas, tarpana and the śrāddhas and made available in some degree to everyone.

The long-term consequence, ironically, certainly unintended by Brahmins, of opening Vedic ritual to all castes was a decline in their observance by everyone including Brahmins. By modern times, few Vedic sanāskāras were being kept up apart from upanayana (initiation into Vedic study), marriage, and funeral rites. Except by the very traditionalist, pure forms of Vedic worship such as somayāga and agniṣṭoma were rarely performed. Perhaps, Vedic rites had lost something of their social caché when they were diluted into general forms of worship. Most Brahmins, along with everyone else, were now practicing forms of worship in which Āgamic rites and mantras together with yogic, tantric, and Vedantic elements predominated. Brahmin priest are mainly brought in for marriages and funerals.

The SAS does emphasize devotion to the śālagrāma stone, a feature of popular worship much promoted at this time by the followers of Chaitanya.25 Viṣṇu was worshipped in the aniconic, “formless” form of these petrified ammonites from the Gaṇḍakī River, as Śiva was in the liṅga. Some Purāṇas and sants extolled them as filled with the especially intense presence of the Lord and as a substitute for the often untouchable mūrtis of the god for Śūdras and women.26

Krṣṇa quotes the Skanda Purāṇa in support of the universal blessings of śālagrāma worship.27 More precisely, it permits the śālagrāma stone to “good” Śūdras, fully in keeping with his thinking on these subjects.28 While some Purāṇas and Brahmin opinion opposed allowing the śālagrāma to Śūdras, Krṣṇa is with the Chaitanyites on this issue, indicating where his sympathies lay. The Hari-bhakti Vilāsa (pre-1541), a well-known guide to Vaiṣṇava worship and practice also quotes the Skanda as authorizing śālagrāma worship by all castes.

If women, Śūdras, Brāhmaṇas, and Kṣatriyas worship the śālagrāma cakra,
they attain the eternal abode of the Lord.

Hari-bhakti Vilāsa 5.45229

It similarly holds out the possibility of Vaiṣṇava initiation even to Caṇḍālas, but with Tantric mantras, showing how common was the strategy of inclusive substitution of rituals for low castes that still holds them at a proper social

27 SAS 133-134.
28 Skanda Purāṇa VI.243.46.
29 Chapter 5 of the Hari-bhakti Vilāsa has an extensive discussion of śālagrāma worship.
distance. The *Hari-bhakti Vilāsa* is attributed to Gopāla Bhaṭṭa (1503-1578) and Sanātana Gosvāmī (1488-1558), two of the six Gosvāmīs of Vṛḍāvana who articulated the theology of grace of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas.30

The spirit of transcendent egalitarianism preached by Bhakta poet-saints was beginning to work its way into the stronghold of orthodoxy, Dharmaśāstra, while the leading role non-Brahmins had taken in popular worship poised a challenge to Brahmin religious primacy. This spirit can be seen in other texts not specifically addressed to śūdradharma, but about ritual in general. A good example is the *Tristalīsetu* of Nārāyaṇa, Kṛṣṇa’s contemporary in the competing house of Bhaṭṭa and restorer of the Viśveśvara temple with its muktiṃḍapam hall where Kṛṣṇa once sat in council in 1583. What we might alternatively call the emotional egalitarianism of Vaiṣṇava Revivalism is more marked in works like this than in the SAS.

The *Tristalīsetu* (c. 1550) is a work on the ceremonies performed at sacred places and, especially, pilgrimage and worship at the tīrthas of Prayāga, Kāśi, and Gayā.31 It is much concerned with śrāddha, but has long sections on tarpaṇa, bathing, fasts, and tonsure, all topics discussed at length in the SAS. Nārāyaṇa considers pilgrimage and worship as equivalent substitutes for Vedic sacrifices and penances, as does Kṛṣṇa. Indeed, it is more excellent, because it is easy and can be performed by everyone, rich or poor, Brahmin or Śūdra, whether or not they are married or can afford a rtvij.

Within Dharma, the kind of Dharma which consists of sacrifices, donations, etc., cannot be practiced in full detail nowadays, because it requires much material expense, and because it consists of many and various parts; and not all varṇas, mixed varṇas, and life-stages are authorized to practice it, because it can be carried out only by a married man, and completed with the aid of a rtvij and other priests.32

Śūdras, pratilomas, mixed castes, those who have lost caste through misconduct, and women are all entitled to pilgrimage.33 Worship at tīrthas transcends the rules of caste and untouchability.34 There is no pollution by contact with an untouchable while on pilgrimage. Such attitudes lead Richard Salomon to say that the work shows a “democratic outlook quite untypical of orthodox brāhmaṇical law.”35

Nārāyaṇa cites the *Mahābhārata*, *Matsya Purāṇa*, and Medhātithi,36 who argues away the prohibitions found elsewhere in the *Mahābhārata* and in Manu, as his authorities for the dharma of pilgrimage for Śūdras with the same proviso in the SAS: it is encouraged as long as it does not interfere with their first duty of service to the twice-born.

30 For up-to-date information and sources on the text, its authorship, and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa’s cult of the śālagrāma, see Kenneth Russell Valpey, *Attending Kṛṣṇa’s Image: Caitanya Vaiṣṇava mūrti-sevā as devotional truth*, (Routledge, 2006), 44-48.
32 *Tristalīsetu*, 37.1.
33 *Tristalīsetu*, 90.4-98.
34 *Tristalīsetu*, 190-91.
35 *Bridge to the Three Holy Cities*, Intro. xvii.
36 *Tristalīsetu*, 95-96.
Ritual practices at tūrthas and pīṭhas are major topics too for the SAS, which, after all, was commissioned by a patron who prided himself on his support for pilgrimage to Prayāga.

This promotion of pilgrimage clearly reflects its growth in this period as a major feature of cultural and commercial life. Temple towns and tūrthas were important nodes in the networks of trade and production stimulating local economies, providing Brahmans, among many others, with incomes, and rulers with revenue, piety and profit perfectly coinciding. Hindu and Muslim pilgrimage thus was a significant integrator of late Sultanate and Mughal society. The large numbers of pilgrims traveling all around the subcontinent gave rise to what we might describe as a lucrative religious tourism industry.

Nārāyana’s many works on ritual became standards on these subjects and were used all over India up to the time of Kane.37 Their contents and caste outlook are quite similar to those of the SAS and could have been an influence on it. Such texts were in the air at the time and products of competitive mimesis between the leading pāṇḍit families in Vārāṇasī. They show that meeting the religious needs of non-Brahmins of high and low station by finding alternatives to expensive and prohibitive Vedic sacrifices was a common concern of Brahmans collectively as they were thrown back on their need to secure the patronage of rising sectors of society in the Bhakti-diversified religious marketplace.

They were now in competition with non-Brahmin leaders of popular Vaiṣṇavism. Followers of Chaitanya such as Narahari Sarkār, a Vaidya and Narottama Ṭhākura, a Kāyastha, taught Brahmans. Brahmans received initiation from Vaiṣṇavas of lower caste than themselves. Tukārām had Brahmin disciples. Although Rāmānand, Chaitanya, Surdās, Rāmdās, Eknāth, and Tulsīdās were Brahmans, they disregarded caste distinctions and accepted backward castes as disciples. To be sure, the more conservative Tulsīdās regarded the appearance of Śūdra religious preachers as a sure sign of the Kaliyuga.

As is well known, many of the most revered Vārkāri panthīs, bhaktas, and sants were of Śūdra or lower origins. Dādū was a cotton carder, Janābāī a maid-servant, Goroba a potter, Kabīr a weaver, Narahari Sonar a goldsmith, Phule a gardener, Haridās a Jat slave, Raidās an untouchable leather worker, Sena a barber, Dhana a butcher, and Nāmdev a calico printer. Tukārām was from a family of grocers and, socially speaking, from the wrong side of the tracks from the Śeṣas. He illustrates the kind of caste order and the middling, squeezed place sat-Śūdras occupied within it that must have been familiar to Krṣṇa as a fellow Deccani.

Tukaram was born into a merchant family of modest wealth and social importance. In the caste hierarchy, his family was sudra, a large category with many endogamous subdivisions, occupying a middle position between Brahmins and untouchables. From the standpoint of contemporary Brahmins, who monopolized both religious and social power, Hindu society in Maharashtra was composed of only two classes: Brahmins and sudras. Moreover, the barriers between these classes, enforced by the Brahmins control over Sanskrit education and access to sacred Hindu texts, were clearly defined and understood by all. It is certain that Tukaram, having been raised in a family of traders and grocers adept at keeping written accounts, would have acquired basic literacy in Marathi at an early age. But he would have also been cut off from the entire corpus of textually validated norms and traditions that Brahmins jealously guarded.38

Theoretical debates about the existence of only two varṇas and the disappearance of Kṣatriyas in the Kaliyuga reflected a real social experience: that there were only two classes of people that mattered, Brahmins and Śūdras, and that Śūdras were above the antyajas.

As David Lorenzen observes, the religious outlook of Tukārām, like other Vārkarī sants, was typical for sects that drew their support from a middle range of castes. They accept much of the Brahmanical idea of karma and reincarnation and the services of Brahmin priests, but believe that salvation is attainable without the Vedas. The grace of god (prasada) is sufficient, and the path to grace is devotion (bhakti) and self-surrender (prapatti). The stress on grace and the demotion of the importance of Brahmin priesthood and Vedic knowledge gives it, in this regard, a similarity to the Protestant Reformation.39

The humanism of Bhakti’s devotional equality and Akbar’s religious toleration both had their limits. The SAS has taken on their spirit of humanity, but, like them, became a strategy of containment and a means for conjuring consent. Bhakti is a catch-all term for multifarious religious and social developments about which it is difficult to generalize. But the idea of salvation that transcended caste runs through the reform movements emanating from Rāmānand, Kabīr, Chaitanya, and Guru Nānak in its saguṇa and nirguṇa forms, and in its Muslim-Hindu hybrids like Sikhism. A new spirituality, nominally freed from caste and creed, arose in the social space of aspiration opened up in the urban lives of artisans, seeking grace and liberation from the continuing constraints of caste most obvious in Brahmin social, religious, and educational privilege, with a new felt sense of worldly tribulation and its escapability mixed of longing, protest, and resignation.

Bhakti expressed new caste relations and aspirations, but did not radically change caste as a system, indeed, went along with its more pervasive spread. Perhaps of no other religious expression is it truer to say that it was the “sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions.”40 The “opium of the

people” may be a particularly apt metaphor here considering that opium was one of the main agricultural products for domestic consumption and trade together with oils, tobacco, saffron, and alcohols long before the British began trading it to China. It is arguable that the real effect of Bhakti devotionalism was to encourage Śūdras and lower castes to accept their place and identity by the benevolent promotion of submissive hope and mystical resignation.

Śūdradharma texts such as the SAS reform Dharmashāstra in the same direction and within the same limits. Caste distinctions are essentially preserved. Śūdras are still denied upanayana and the use of Vedic mantras. They are still subject to Vedic disqualification, but in a moderate form and provided with Puranic and customary substitutes. They have access to the blessing and auspiciousness of the numen of the Vedas, but only through the intermediary channel of the Brahmin. Similarly, caste distinctions were maintained even among the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas. The leaders of the movement were mostly Brahmins and the followers lower castes. Likewise, the motives for Akbar’s policy of religious toleration were not entirely philanthropic. A Tariq Ali has remarked:

[Amartya] Sen is right to stress the tolerance of the Mughals, particularly Akbar, toward the non-Muslim majority. The Muslim conquerors, like the British after them, knew that stable rule was dependent on securing the consent of crucial layers of the indigenous elites. This they did successfully, and even the last of the great Mughal emperors, the devout and narrow-minded Aurangzeb, presided over an imperial army led by an equal mix of Hindu and Muslim generals. Even Akbar’s much praised interfaith dialogues between Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsees, Jains, Jews and even Charvaka atheists who regarded Brahmin sacrifices, rituals, gifts, and penances as self-interested priest-craft, were a purely courtly affair.

41 Cambridge Economic History of India, 274.
## Appendices

### Table of the Mixed Castes in the SAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin and Name</th>
<th>Livelihood and Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andhasika</strong>: Vaideha father &amp; Rūpaka mother.</td>
<td>Cook; popularly known as “Pācaka.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambara</strong>: Āvartaka father &amp; Venyā mother.</td>
<td>Weaver; name of a people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambaṣṭha</strong>: Brahmin father &amp; Vaiśya mother.</td>
<td>Physician; veterinarian; also called “Agney-anartika;” One of the subcastes of Kāyastha professionals in Bengal and Bihar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ābhīra</strong>: Brahmin father &amp; Māhiśya or Ambaṣṭha mother.</td>
<td>Cowherd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Āvarta</strong>: Kṣemaka father &amp; Ingu mother.</td>
<td>Camel-driver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Āyogava</strong>: Vaiśya father &amp; Śūdra mother.</td>
<td>Carpenter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Āvartaka</strong>: Rjuvaṭha father &amp; Brahmin mother.</td>
<td>Worship of Viṣṇu, the arts of song; dance, &amp; playing the conch shell &amp; vīnā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aurabha</strong>: Rjuvaṭha father &amp; Chāgala mother.</td>
<td>Sheep-herder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ugra</strong>: Kṣatriya father &amp; Śūdra mother.</td>
<td>Snake-catcher; encomiast; bard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Udavāha</strong>: Brahmin father &amp; Vaideha mother</td>
<td>Parasol-bearer; seller of women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ulmuka</strong>: Kṣatriya father &amp; Māgadha mother.</td>
<td>Iron-workers; excluded from the four <em>varnas</em>, best of the sub-castes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rjuvaṭha</strong>: Vratya father &amp; a married Brahmin mother.</td>
<td>Worship of Viṣṇu; the arts of song &amp; dance; playing the conch shell &amp; vīnā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaṭadhanā</strong>: Āvartaka father &amp; married Brahmin mother.</td>
<td>Worship of Viṣṇu; the arts of song &amp; dance; playing the conch shell &amp; vīnā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karaṇa</strong>: Vaiśya father &amp; Śūdra mother.</td>
<td>Ornament-maker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karmacanḍāla</strong>: son of an ascetic &amp; a widow.</td>
<td>Laborer on earth-works such as wells &amp; tanks; untouchable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kāyastha</strong>: Vaideha father &amp; Māhiśya mother.</td>
<td>Scribe; writing of vernacular scripts; accounting, serving the four <em>varnas</em>. He has five <em>sam-skāras</em> &amp; is excluded from the <em>ṣikhā</em>, initiation, red garments, &amp; touching the images of deities. For KS, they are top Śūdras or be-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kimṣuka: Vaiṣika father & Kuruvinda mother. A subcaste; whitewasher; plasterer; brick layer; seller of bamboo-ware.

Kīnāṭa: Kṣatriya father & Pārasaiva mother. Coppersmith; commonly called “Tāmbera.”

Kīnāśa: Diṇḍina father & Śauṇḍika mother. Insect catcher.

Kukkuṭa: Niṣāda father & Śūdra mother. Metal-smith. puts on dance & theatre in play-houses; show business; on the level of the lowest castes.

Kuntala: Māgadha father & Ugra mother. Barber; manicurist.


Kuravinda: Sūta father & Kukkuṭa mother. Specializes in silks; lives following the dharma of the sub-castes.

Kuśivala: Ambaṣṭha father & Vaideha mother. Performing artist; actor; dancer; mime; bard; herald; newsmonger.

Kolhāti: Śiṅindra father & Kṣatriya mother. Juggler; acrobat; street performer; popularly know as a “Bahuṟūpi,” an impersonator of divine figures.

Kaivarta: Pārasaiva father & Āyogava mother. Fisherman; boatman.

Ksattr: Śūdra father & Kṣatriya mother.

Kṣemaka: Kṣatriya father & Ugra mother. Porter; doorkeeper; butler.

Gāruḍa: Niṣāda father & Vaideha mother. Same dharma as the seven subcastes.

Gūḍhajataka: child born to an unfaithful wife and in Hindu law claimed by the husband; A Kṣatriya, but denied consecration.


Citrakara: Dhīgyaṇa father & Kumbhakāra mother. Painter; extra-vanṣa.

Chāgalaka: Kaṭadhāna father & Maṇju mother. Goatherd; popularly known as “Ajāpāla.”

Jāṅghika: Pārasaiva father & Ugra mother. Swift of foot; courier; colloquially called “Vāri.”

Dasyu: Mlecchas.

Durlabha: Āyogava father & Dhigvaṇa mother. Saw makers; first of the antyajas,
Devalaka: Brahmin father & Bhojaka mother.

Domba: Caṇḍāla father & Niṣāda mother. Remover of dead horses & donkeys; lives in cemeteries.

Dhigvaṇa: Brahmin father & Āyogava mother. Armor maker; leather worker saddler; (from dhikvarna, “despised caste”?) popularly called “Mocī.”

Naṭa: On of the seven antyajas or sub-castes below the four varṇas.

Nāpita: Brahmin father & Śūdra mother. A Brahmin who is without the samskāras and is the son of a Śūdra girl becomes a barber.

Niṣāda: Brahmin father & Śūdra mother. Colloquially know as “Kahāma.” In other sources described as a wild non-Aryan tribe; hunters; fishermen; robbers; Bhilla or Bhils.

Nilikartā: Ābhīra father & Kukkuṭa mother. Indigo-maker.


Pāṃsula: Pauṣṭika father & Kaivarta mother. Hemp-weaver.

Pāraśava: Brahmin father & Śūdra mother.

Pukkasa or Pulkasa: Niṣāda father & Śūdra mother. Wild animal hunters; similar to the subcastes.

Pulinda: Vaiśya father & Kṣatriya mother. A wild mountain tribe; cattle raisers; hunters.

Puṣpaśekhara: Kaṭadhaṇa father & Brahmaṇin mother. Worship of Viṣṇu; the arts of song & dance, plays the conch shell & vīnā.

Pauṣṭika: Brahmin father & Niṣāda mother. Called in modern times Kahāra or Bhoī (palanquin-bearer).

Bandhula: Maitreya father & Jāṅghikā mother. A Mālaka, a forest people; a gardener.

Barbara: Kuntala father & Mañju mother. Non-Aryan peoples; barbarians?

Bandhula: Maitreya father & Jāṅghika mother.


Bhasmaṅka: The son of a fallen Śaiva or Pāśupata with a wife of a Śūdra. Living by Śiva worship & offerings, & on the donations made to Śiva called the Lord of Caṇḍī’s share.


Manguṣṭha: Jāṅghikā father & Kaivarta mother. Washer- man; lime maker; untouchable.

Malla: outcaste Kṣatriya father & mother. Wrestler; boxer; athlete.

Māgadha: Vaiśya father & Kṣatriya mother. Cattle-herder.

Māhiśya: Kṣatriya father & Vaiśya mother. Garland maker; florist.

Mālākara: The son of a Māhiśya father & Pāraśava mother. Hunter-gatherers in jungles and mountains; commonly known as the “Gohu.”

Mūrdhāvasikta: Brahmin father & Kṣatriya mother. Bell-ringer at dawn; praise-singer.

Meda: Vaideha father & Kārbolika mother; also Kārāvara or Niṣāda mother (M, MB). Oil miller; seller of pure sesame oil; among the higher subcastes; because of the offensive sound of the milling machine, he must live outside of town.

Maitreyaka or Maitreyuka: Vaideha father. & Āyogava mother. Salt-maker.

Mauṭkali: Ugra father & Pāraśava mother. Oil miller; seller of pure sesame oil; among the higher subcastes; because of the offensive sound of the milling machine, he must live outside of town.

Mleccha: The Mleccha jātis were begot according to Krṣṇa Śeṣa by Śailandhra men on Meda women, but Manu says that:

“In consequence of omitting the sacred rites and not heeding Brāhmaṇas, the following tribes of Kṣatriyas have gradually sink in this world to the condition of Śūdras: Puṇḍraka, Coḍa, Kāmboja, Yavana, Śaka, Pārāda, Palmava, Cīna, Kirāta and Darada.” (M. X.43).

Rajaka: Ugra father & Vaideha mother. Washerman.

Rathakāra: Māhiśya father & Karaṇa mother. Lives by the arts; said to be eligible for Vedic initiation.

Rūpaka or Rūpakārī: Performing artist.


Vatsapālaka: Vaiśya father & Karaṇa mother. Cowherd.

Vena

According Manu (vii, 41; ix, 66-67) founded the degraded Niṣādas and Dīvvaras (mixed caste in Gaut. iv, 19).

Venyā. Dancer.

Vaitālika: Living by the arts of love (kāmaśāstra); encomiast, balladeer; performing artist (bhaṭṭakarma); Bhats?
**Vaideha or Vaidehaka:** Vaiśya father & Brahmin mother; or Brahmin father & Vaiśya mother (M); or Śūdra father & Vaiśya mother (G)  The Videha people; traders; attendant women’s apartments.

**Vaiśṭhika:** Brahmin father & Niṣāda mother.  Porter.

**Vṛātya:** the “broken-vowed;” sons born to dvijas by wives of their own varṇa that have become outcaste through non-observance of the sacraments, esp. the offspring of a Kṣatriya & a Śūdra, (AV).

**Śayyāpāla:** Kṣemaka father & Sairandhra mother.  Keeper of the bedchamber; domestic manager.

**Śālakya:** Mālākāra father & Karanā mother.  Jewelers; lapidaries; popularly called “Manihāras” (necklaces), or “Mañjas” (topazes).

**Śalmala:** Mañju father & Kulāla (potter) mother.  Betel-seller.

**Śīndra:** Mālākāra father & Kṣatriya mother:  Masseur.

**Śailandhra**

**Śauṇḍika or Śauṣkala:** Vena father & Ābhīra mother.  Wine-seller.

**Śvapāka:** Caṇḍāla father & Pukkasa mother.  Cookers of dog-meat.

**Sūta:** Kṣatriya father & Brahmin mother; or Brahmin father & Kṣatriya mother; or Śūdra father & Kṣatriya mother.  Charioteer; equerry; driver; groom; master of the horse; herald; bard.

**Śūpakāra:** The son of a Sūta father & a Vaideha mother.  Soup maker; cook.

**Śūtradhāra:** Āyogava father & Rathakāra mother.  Ears a living by his wife; a public performer; acrobat; knowledgeable in the arts of dance & theatre; writes lines for shadow-puppet theatre; lives outside of town.

**Sairandhra:** Karanā father & Āyogava mother.  Perfume maker; vendor of flowers & sandal.

**Saunika:** Caṇḍāla father & Kaivarta mother.  Butchers; mutton-sellers; colloquially know as “Khaṭṭika.”

**Sauvīra:** Kukkuṭa father & Ābhīra mother.  Clothes maker for all jātis; traditionally called “Koṣaṭa.”

**Syandolika:** Śūdra father & Vadinī mother.  Madder dyer; dying & printing cloth; tailor.

**Harimekhala:** Vaideha father & Ambaṣṭha mother.
Texts and Authors Cited in the SAS

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, in proper nibandha form, quotes from many Smṛtis and Purāṇas, from the Mahābhārata among the two epics, and from digests such as Aparāṅka, the Kalpataru, Smṛticandrika, and Mitākṣarā. My list of his sources draws mainly on Kane for background information.¹ A compilation of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s sources, unfortunately, does not help much in dating the SAS. Only two of the texts, the Kṛṣṇabhattachya and Prāśādadīpikā, can be dated later than to a fuzzily indeterminate “before-1500 CE.” If the author of the SAS is quoting texts from the 15th century, it does, however, seem a bit more likely that he is writing in the next century at least, since citing close contemporaries is an uncommon practice in the tradition-oriented field of Dharmaśāstra and more often seen in the navya smṛti of the seventeenth century.

Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cites much from sūtras and smṛtis now lost or preserved only in fragments or quotations in commentaries and digests.² These include Aṅgirasa, Atri, Gārgya, Uśana, Kaśyapa, Jātukarṇya, Devala,³ Paiṭhāṇasi, Brhaspati, Bharadvāja, Śaunaka, Yama, Vyāsa, Caturvināsātimata, Hārīta, Pitāmaha, Kārṣṇājini, Śātātpa, Sumantu, Pracetas, Samgraha, Laugākṣi and Rṣyaśṛṅga. As often as not, his quotations, even from standard and extant smṛtis such as Viṣṇu and Manu, are not in the printed versions we have. In the case of Manu, he could be relying on some transmission of the text now lost to us. Many of these texts such as the vrddha-prefixed ones, Vṛddha Pārāśara Smṛti, Vṛddha Manu Smṛti, Vṛddha Śātātpa Smṛti, Vṛddha Vasiṣṭha Smṛti, and Vṛddha Yājñavalkya Smṛti, seem to be, as Rocher has observed, in the category Derrett called “bogus,” “supposititious,” and “apocryphal” smṛtis.⁴

From the ninth century on, irrespective of the development of purānic material, a new wave of smṛti writing occurred. The names given to the works, often prefixed (as were some older works) with Vṛddha-, Laghu-, and so

---

¹ Kane, HD (1974,) vol. I.
³ This one at least has been reconstructed by M.L. Wadekar in Devalasmṛti-Reconstruction and Critical Study, 2 vols. Delhi: Koshal Book Depot, 1996. However, only four of the sixteen quotes in the SAS from Devala are found in the reconstructed text. This is the case for many of the minor smṛtis—most of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s quotes are not in the published texts.
⁴ Derrett (1973), 40. See Richard Lariviere, Dharmaśāstra, Custom, ‘Real Law’ and ‘Apocryphal’ Smṛtis,” Journal of Indian Philosophy, vol. 32, no. 1, Feb. 2004, 611-27, for a sharp critique of the inadequacy of the distinction Derrett makes between genuine and “bogus” smṛtis. Derrett gives no criteria for making a judgment of authenticity beyond implying that older texts are more authoritative than newer ones and one-off, unlocatable quotes from lost sources are apocryphal. If this is so, then the SAS is full of “bogus” material. In any case, a tradition must make such a judgment of authenticity and Dharmaśāstra does so in its own way. “The ultimate test of the verity of a text is whether or not it is acceptable to successive generations of śiṣṭas. These are the vectors for the transmission of any text. If the śiṣṭa determined that a verse or whole text was bogus, apocryphal, etc. then they would not have bothered to transmit it. The methods of transmission—by teaching a text to students and by having a manuscript copied—ensured that there was an informed, vigilant, and conservative audience which would be able to detect fraud quickly,” p. 620.

This is linked with Lariviere’s view that dharmaśāstra is a record of the actual customs, mores, and norms of certain communities in particular times and geographies as they sedimented in tradition, and are not merely “suasive” as Derrett would have it. The idea of the fraudulent is inappropriate in the context of smṛti since dharma literature was always adapting itself to new circumstances and needs, as I believe we see the SAS doing.
on, are chosen from the list of known authors of genuine smṛtis...The wave of ‘bogus’ smṛti writing, which, may have extended into the seventeenth century, was not juridical in inspiration. The fragmentary smṛtis, on the other hand, are often turned to for new information.

We do not know if Krṣṇa Śeṣa was familiar with variant oral versions or had actual copies of the texts he is quoting. Or is he drawing citations from other nibandhas? In other words, were they still in existence in his time or already lost. Krṣṇa Śeṣa is, apparently, one of those commentators for whom now lost and incomplete sūtras and smṛtis contained significant and valuable information. His many citations of them, if nothing else, indicate the vast number of smṛtis once available and how variegated in content they could be.

Ācārya


Aṅgiras Smṛti

Aparārka: 12th century digest in the form of a commentary on Yājñavalkya

Āpastamba Dharmasūtra

Āśvalayana Grhya Sūtra

Āśvamedhika

Atri Smṛti

Bahuvrīca Parīṣṭa: appendix to the Bahuvrīca Grhya Sūtra, mentioned by Hemādri, Raghunandana & in the Nirṇayasindhu.

Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra

Bharadvāja: a. of śrauta- & grhya-sūtras.

Bhaviṣyapuruṣasvarasa

Bṛhaspati: smṛtikāra on Artha- and Dharmasās-tra, post-Manu jurist, a. of a long & influential work on law (200-400 CE.)

Bṛhat Nārādiya

Caturviṃśatimata

Chandoga Parīṣṭa: quoted by Hemādri, may be the same as the Karmapradīpa of Gobhila; many commentaries.

Dakṣa Smṛti

Devala: influential jurist, contemporary of Bṛhaspati & Kātyāyana.

Dharmavīrī: mentioned in Madanapāla.

Dīkṣaparakāśa: Tantric text quoting the Gaṇeśavimāraśīṇī on the pañcāyatanam deities.


Gautama Dharmasūtra

Gauḍa: an “eastern” smṛtikāra in the Bengal or Gauḍiya School of Navya Dharmasāstra.

Gobhila Grhya Sūtra


Grhyapariśṭhamata: may be an epitome of the Bahuvrīca Grhya Parīṣṭa.

Hārīta: jurist c. 4th-7th century, a. of a Dharmasūtra.

Hemādri: c. Maratha dāksinātya a. of the Caturvargacintāmaṇi, a voluminous encyclopedia of ancient religious rites and observances, c. 1270.


Jamadagni Smṛti: mentioned in Mit, Ap, Haradatta, Kalpataru & SC.
Jātiviveka: Several works by this title are listed by Kane (HDS pp. 548-549) by Parāśara, Viśvanātha, Raghunātha. Nārāyaṇabhāṭṭa, and Viśveśvarabhāṭṭa. It is unclear which one Kurśa Śeṣa may be citing.

Jātukarṇya or Jātakarṇa: 3rd or 4th century

Kālpataru: c. 1125 CE, a. Lākṣmīdhara, influential digest.

Kārṇāḍīni: vide Kane 223.

Kāśya or Kāsyapa: a. of a Dharmaśūtra.

Kātyāyanasūtrabhāṣya

Krātu: a. of a sūtrī mentioned by Mit, Ap & SC; attributed a Kālakhaṇḍa in the SAS.

Kurśabhatṭīya: before 1500 CE.

Laghu Parāśara Sṛṃṭi

Laugākṣi: vide Kane 235.

Madaṇapāla: patron of Viśveśvarabhāṭṭa, the putative a. of the Smṛtiṇaṃgaṇḍi, c. 1360-1390 CE.

Mahābhārata: authoritative source of sūtrī in later authors, including Kurśa Śeṣa.

Mahābhāṣya

Maitri Upaniṣad

Manusmṛti & Mānavadharmaśūtra

Marīchī: vide Kane 230-231.

Medhātithi: 820-900 CE, a. of famous bhāṣya on Manu.

Mitākṣara: 1050-1120 CE, a. Vījñāneśvara, epitome of all preceding Dharmaśāstra, basis for Hindu law.

Nārada Sṛṃṭi: 1st BC to 4th CE century.

Nṛṣimhāṅgṛhrimahodadhi: obscure, curiously entitled work I could find nothing about.

Nyāyakusumāṅjali: a. Udayanācarya

Paiṭhīṇa: ancient sūtrakāra on Dharma.

Pāraskara: a. of the Pāraskara Grhyā Sūtra.

Parāśara Sṛṃṭi

Pitāmaha Sṛṃṭi: 4th-7th century

Purāṇas: Rich in Dharmaśāstra materials and much quoted in later authors as authoritative sources of sṛṃṭi, as does Kurśa Śeṣa, who most frequently cites the Bhaviṣya, Brahma, Mārkandeya, Kurma, Varaha, & Viṣṇu Purāṇas.

Āditya Purāṇa
Agni Purāṇa
Bhāgavata Purāṇa
Bhaviṣya Purāṇa
Brahma Purāṇa
Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa
Devī Purāṇa
Kālikā Purāṇa
Kurma Purāṇa
Liṅga Purāṇa
Mārkandeya Purāṇa
Matsya Purāṇa
Nārada Purāṇa
Narasiṁha Purāṇa
Padma Purāṇa
Śiva Purāṇa
Skānda Purāṇa
Vāmana Purāṇa
Vaiyāviṣamhitā Purāṇa
Varāha Purāṇa
Vaiyu Purāṇa
Viṣṇu Purāṇa

Pracetās: vide Kane 229.

Prāsādāpiṇī: before 1500 CE.

Rṣyaśṛṇga: vide Kane 223.

Saṁgraha: 8th-10th century much quoted in later authors on all parts of Hindu law including vyavahāra.

Samvarta: pre-Yājñavalkya writer on Dharma.

Śāṅkarabhāṣya

Śaṅkhadhara: before 1050 CE.

Śaṅkha-Likhita Dharmaśūtra

Śaṅkha Sṛṃṭi
Śāṅkhāyana: grhyasūtra with many later commentaries.

Śatātapa Smṛti

Satyavrata Smṛti

Śaunaka: numerous works attribute to him; probably the eponym of several authors according to Kane.

Smṛticandrikā: c. 1200 CE, a. Devanābhaṭṭa, well-known digest quoting profusely from numerous smṛtikāras, valuable source for lost works on many topics of Dharma.

Smṛti Bhāskara: Two texts by this name. 1. mentioned by SC and the Nṛsimhaprasāda with a section on śūdradharma. 2. a. Nilakaṇṭha.

Smṛti Kaumudi: 3 works by this name.
1. a. Madanapāla/Viśveśvarabhaṭṭa, c. 1360-1390 CE. aka Śūdradharmotpaladyottinī; 2. digest by Devanāthaṭhakkura; 3. a. Rāma-kṛṣṇabhaṭṭācarya. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is mostly likely quoting the first.

Smṛtiratnāvali: 4 texts by this name in Kane. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa is probably citing the one mentioned in Nṛsimhaprasāda, Nirṇaya-sindhu, etc.

Smṛtisāgara: 1. another name for the Govindārava; 2. digest by Kullukabhaṭṭa, c. 1250 CE.

Śrīdattānhikā: 1275-1300 CE, a. Śrīdattā, an early Maithila nibandhakāra, fl. 1279-1310 CE.

Sumanuṭ: a. of a prose sūtra on dharma, quoted in Ap., and SC; personage in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa and Bhaviśya Purāṇa.

Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad

Taittiriya Samhitā

Taittiriya Āraṇyaka

Uśanas Dharmaśāstra

Vasiṣṭha Dharmaśūtra

Vāsisthāyana

Vivasvān: a. of a smṛti.

Viśvambharasāstra

Vṛddha Pārāśara Smṛti

Vṛddha Manu Smṛti

Vṛddha Śatātapa Smṛti

Vṛddha Vasiṣṭha Smṛti

Vṛddha Yājñavalkya Smṛti

Vyāghra: a. of a smṛti on daily duties mentioned by Ap, Mit, & SC.

Vyāsa: a. of a smṛti and legendary compiler of and personage in the Mahābhārata.

Yama Smṛti

Yājñavalkya Smṛti

Yogī Yājñavalkya: a. of the Yoga-Yājñavalkya.
I’d like to talk briefly about how Dharmaśāstra can be interesting and useful, with my text as example The Śūdrācāraśiromāṇi, “The Gemstone of Śūdra Conduct,” is a work from the late period of Sanskrit, long regarded by Western Indologists as one of dried-up scholasticism and exhausted creativity. Indian scholars however, regarded it a “golden age” of Sanskrit with undoubted achievements in new philosophy and linguistics, astronomy, and poetry. Western scholarship has come round to the Indian view of it. In recent years, there has been a burst of fresh study of the period, most notably Sheldon Pollock’s Sanskrit Knowledge Systems on the Eve of Colonialism project. A text like the Gemstone of Śūdra Conduct is at the intersection of many issues of current study: the development of caste and the role of brahmans and brahmanization in it, the formation of Hinduism as a religion and identity, the prehistory of dalit studies, and the pre-colonial, colonial, and postcolonial focus of recent endeavors. A text like the Gemstone is useful in getting a longer perspective on these matters.

My author, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, is one of the outstanding figures of this late, brilliant period. He made his name as a neo-Paninian grammarian, but wrote many kṛṣṇa-kāvyas (if we accept their attributions), most certain and well-know of which is the Kamsavadha, a nāṭaka composed for the son of Todar Mal, Akbar’s minister of finance. Kṛṣṇa’s peak of activity is roughly 1560-1590. In the 16th-17th centuries, Vārāṇasī became a pan-Indian center of scholarship and culture. Pandit families from the Deccan, such as the Śeṣas and Bhaṭṭas, one of whom, Gāgābhaṭṭa, was closely connected with Śivājī, played a leading role in the intellectual life of Vārāṇasī. This was the era of the political and cultural rise of the Marathas. Being a Maharashtrian residing in Vārāṇasī may have sharpened Kṛṣṇa’s sense of the regional variations in custom between Deccanis, Madhyadeshis, and Gauḍas.

I spent a lot of time, perhaps too much, on the problems of dating Kṛṣṇa and sorting out the works that are attributed to him. The evidence for his authorship of the Gemstone is as exiguous as the rest of it. The main difficulty was that the Govindaṁava of the author’s father, Nṛsimha, was dated by Pingree and Kane to the early part of the previous century. I had to show the weakness of the evidence for this, in the end, not very conclusively. I think I may have had more success in identifying the patron of the Gemstone, Pilājī, as the raja of Mudhol in the 1570’s, whom Kṛṣṇa praises as a valiant king in the South, a supporter of pilgrimage to Prayāga, and a pious defender of dharma concerned about the confusion of varṇas. Pilājī was of the Ghorpade dynasty, a side-branch to the Bhonsles, which ruled Mudhol until the 20th century. He fought for the Sultans of Bījahāpūr in the wars with Vijayanagara. As Nṛsimha
was also at the court of Bijāpūr, according to another play of Kṛṣṇa’s, a connection of patronage between them seems highly plausible.

When I was in Pune working on my translation with Nirmala Kulkarni, a Deshashta Brahman and a woman doing Vedic, she introduced me to Parshuram Paranjape at the Vaidik Samshodhan Mandal, who claimed, astonishingly, to be a descendent of my author, by which, it turns out, he meant that he was in the same gotra. He gave me material on the Šeṣa family, part textual, part gotra tradition, which I’m still not quite sure what to do with.

The Gemstone is a work on the ritual practices of śūdras, since that is the lens through which Dharmaśāstra looks at the social. It shows us what brahmans were thinking about caste and the place of the śūdra in the 16th century, and, when read critically, can give us a picture of the lives of working class Indians engaged in livelihoods that brahmanical discourse categorized as śūdra. How to read such texts is the problem. A Dharmaśāstra can’t be read straight off as a sociological document since it is all filtered through the constructions of brahmanical varṇa theory. The construction of caste was something that was occurring long before the colonial period. What brahman pandits were engaged in a text like the Gemstone is what I call “deep ritualization,” with a tip of the hat to Pollock’s Deep Orientalism, meaning the more inclusive ritualization and brahmanization of respectable low castes, i.e. sat-śūdras, bringing them more fully into the brahmanical fold by expanding their ritual rights.

The Gemstone has a section on varṇasankara, the brahmanical theory of caste origins, which describes the mixed jātis of śūdras and gives a vivid picture of the social landscape of the day. Real castes and their livelihoods and ways of life are all understood as the product of the intermarriage of pure varṇas—from a sociological point of view, the wrong way round.

The Gemstone is primarily a handbook for Brahmans. I don’t think it was written for śūdras to read, although some were clearly literate, Kāyasthas, for instance. Even a śūdra like Tukārām must have kept his grocer’s accounts in Marathi. The Gemstone was a manual for Brahman priests to consult in officiating for śūdras and in administering their ritual life. It includes śūdras in ritual more completely, but with the role of brahmans as priestly officiants assumed and the Vedic mantras reserved. Exclusion of śūdras from Vedic sacrifices and mantras was becoming increasingly irrelevant as even upper caste people and brahmans themselves were giving up performing purely Vedic sacrifices. In any case, everyone now, including brahmans, was doing many rituals like the saṁskāras of birth, marriage, and death and śrāddhas with Puranic and Agamic mantras and with customary, local forms and, by modern times, will cease doing most of them entirely. Eventually, all castes, even many untouchables, will have brahman
priests, often themselves of low caste, performing their weddings and funerals, as we can see from the ethnographic
surveys of the colonial period.

The *Gemstone* is written in *nibandha* style as a digest of law and consists mainly of quotations from the *sūtras*,
*smṛtis, Purāṇas*, and the *Śāntiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* with its more heterogeneous and liberal Vaiṣṇava ele-
ments, but not the more straight-laced *Rāmāyaṇa*. Nibandhas revise dharma in accord with regional variation in cus-
toms by harmonizing them with the timeless unchanging dharma by a method of selective quotation. From the 12-
17th c. we see a great production of such nibandhas sponsored by Hindu kings, of which a new attention to *śūdrad-
harma* is a notable feature. It is not a coincidence, I think, that this is also the era of Muslim Turkic conquest and
rule. Not just the identity and role of *śūdras* was of renewed interest, but questions of who were kṣatriyas, who were
brahmans and what was their place and acceptable ways of making a living. Nibandhas are syntheses of the whole
tradition of dharma as a totality as *varnāśramadharma*, as *sanātana dharma*, with a sense of a shared common tradi-
tion to be defended in the degraded time of the Kaliyuga. They are monuments of tradition in the face of the un-
precedented nature of the challenge of unassimilating Muslims. Thus, we see the beginning of the formation of a
Hinduism modeled after the “other” of Islam, showing how Hinduism as a religion and identity was being sedi-
mented in this pre-colonial period and the need to see it as a multi-phasic process.

The question of whether the kṣatriya *varṇa* had disappeared or become latent in the Kaliyuga was much debated
in Kṛṣṇa’s day, and it is easy to see why, with the loss of sovereign power under the Delhi Sultanate and the
Mughals. This is in line with the Hocart-Inden view of the impact that the loss of kingship as the linchpin of ritual-
ized social hierarchy had on caste. brahmanical purity and impurity regulation of caste filled the vacuum left when
kingship was removed. Hocart, as do many others including Indians, regarded the brahmanical four *varṇa* system as
a pure figment, an invention of brahmans for their own glorification. Well, it was that, but it also became the cultural
imaginary of Indian society in the absence of kingship. li can be compared to what happened to Judaism in the exile
and diaspora.

The concern in *śūdradharma* texts to extend and enlarge the ritual rights of *śūdras* was part of this process, to
enmesh them more fully in brahmanical ritual regulation. Some have regarded this as a liberalization. It can only be
called that with qualification. Vedic sacrifice lost its full public political function and was replaced by the cultivation
of personal piety in Bhakti and the private ritual of Tantra. Eventually, this had an impact even on Dharmaśāstra, the
bastion of orthodox tradition, which, while preserving the Vedic privilege of *dvījas*, meaning mainly Brahmans by
this time, shifted its focus to domestic rituals open to all castes in appropriate ways with Brahman priests as officiants, to maintain their monopoly of ritual access.

The improved status of śūdras as farmers, landowners, and artisans as we see in the Punjab, Tamil Nadu, and Maharashtra and, indeed, the disappearance of kṣatriyas and vaiśyas in Bengal required a readjustment in Dharmaśāstra adapting it to new client bases for ritual services. By the 16th century, Dharmaśāstra was fully on board with pūjā, pilgrimage, worship at tīrthas, domestic homas, purifications, and penances for all varṇas. Even such concessions to popular devotion would be too much for the nirguni sants, who wanted to toss it all out. Śūdra texts like the Gemstone worked out a way to include Śūdras more fully in rituals that started out long before as Vedic sacrifices and practices that formally excluded them and were gradually turned into devotional observances for everyone.

Caste too evolves and changes. Who was classed as a Śūdra and their socioeconomic and political status varied enormously over time and region. From the Gupta period into the early medieval with the rise of the agrarian regional kingdoms and peasantization, Śūdras moved into agriculture and then, during the re-urbanization of the Sultanate and Mughal periods, into crafts and manufactures. Śūdra jātis proliferate and stratify, as do those below them, the antyajas and untouchables. The status of many Śūdra jātis improves relative to that of the growing number of ādivāsīs drawn into the bottom of the caste system. Dharmaśāstra tracks the changing status of Śūdras by improving their ritual status to match. It registers and accommodates changing custom while preserving its self-constructed image as eternal dharma.

Finally, the changing make-up of socioeconomic groups labeled as śūdras in Dharmaśāstra bring us to the problem of the relation of the ideal, stereotypic brahmanical discourse of varṇa to actual castes. Even Nārada, Yājñavalkya, Brhaspati, and Kātyāyana, when discussing workaday things like wage rates and taxes speak of wage earners, laborers, workers, and artisans rather than Śūdras. Brahmanical ideas of varṇa purity and impurity appear often to have had little relevance to how people experienced caste relations. Their prominence, it can be argued, was a product of the Muslim years and was then reinforced during the colonial period. Colonial administrators, and scholars, relying on their brahman pandits and texts, took varṇa theory as a description of how India was and always had been rather than as a prescription. In that sense, it can be said that they invented the modern understanding of caste and furthered the next step in its brahmanization. Who was regarded as a śūdra was the result of what might be called “caste struggle.” “Śūdra” was a term in elite discourse, essentially a religious term, which those who had the power
and social leverage resisted and escaped by claiming higher caste, if they concerned themselves with it at all. Poor and powerless groups were stuck with it.

The Bhakti movements also had an oblique impact on Dharmaśāstra, over time shifting the weight of its tradition in the direction of inclusiveness, and promoted the formation of Smarta Hinduism with its fusion of Vedism with popular devotion. Some forms of Bhakti, especially the nigunipanths, can be seen as expressing the social and spiritual aspirations of these sat-śūdra artisans and farmers with its stress on non-Vedic and non-caste faith, clearly under the influence of equalitarian, monotheistic Islam.
Bibliography

Sanskrit Texts and Translations

_Agni Purāṇa_. Anandāśrama Sanskrit Series 41. Punyākhyapatattana (Pune): Ānandāśramamudrāṇayala, 1900.


_Aparārka_. Commentary of Aparāditya on the Yājñavalkyasmiṛti. Edited by Narayan Ram Acharya.


_Dinakaroḍdyota_ of Dinakarabhaṭṭa. with the Śūdradhardromodyota of his son, Viśveśvara Gāgābhaṭṭa. 210 folios, Devanāgarī, Samvat 1838, 1895-1902 C.E. Manuscript deposited at the BORI, Pune. Microfilm Roll no 2105, accession no. 122, Indira Gandhi National Center for the Arts, New Delhi.


_Dharmasāstrasangraha_. Edited by Jīvanāndā Vidyāsagara Bhaṭṭācarya. 2 vols. Kalikātā:
Sarasvatīyantrālaya, 1876.


_Bṛhaspati Smṛti (Reconstructed)._ Rangaswamy Aiyangar, Gaekwad’s Oriental Series 85. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1941.


Yajurveda. The Texts of the White Yajurveda. trans. Ralph T.H. Griffith. New Delhi: Munshiram Manohar-  
Yājñavalkyasmṛti. Translated into English with notes by M. N. Dutt. Edited by K. L. Joshi. Delhi: Parimal  
———. The Institutes of Yājñavalkya with the commentary Mitāksāra of Vijnāneshvara. Ed. Bapu  
Līṅga Purāṇa. Edited by J. L. Shastri with the Sanskrit commentary “Śivatoṣṇi” by Ganeśa Nātu. Delhi:  
Vajrasūcī of Āsvaghoṣa. Edited with Hindi translation by R. P. Prasad Dwivedi, Harijivandas Prachya-  
.Varāha Purāṇa. Critically edited by Anand Swarup Gupta in 2 parts. Varanasi: All-IndiaKashiraj Trust,  
1981.
———. Translated by A. B. Bhattacharya. Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust.
Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā of the Mādhyanāṇa and Kānya śākhas, with the commentary of Mahīdhara.  
Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā of the White Yajur Veda, with the commentaries of Uvvāṭa Mahīdhara. Ed. Pandit  
———. (Sanskrit text with English translation). Edited by A. S. Gupta. Vārāṇaṣi: All-India Kashi  
Rāj Trust, 1972.
———. A Prose English Translation by Mannatha Nath Dutt. Chowkamba Sanskrit Series 90. Varanasi,  
1972.
Viṣṇu Smṛti. Translated into English by M. N. Dutt. Edited by K. L. Joshi. Delhi: Parimal Publications,  
2006
Viśeṣvāra Gāgā Bhaṭṭa. Kāyasthadharmadīpa in the Samskārakānda of the Dinakaroddyota of his father  
no. 526, Accession no./Mss. No. 68409 at the Indira Gandhi National Center for the Arts, New Delhi.
Mss. no. 1652/2800 as listed in Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office:  
Vol. 1, part 3 (1891), 525.
Viśeṣvārabhaṭṭa. Smṛtikaumudī or the Śūradharmabodhinī. 147 folios, 1550 C.E. Mss. deposited in the  
British Museum, London. Mss. no. 1649/2515 as listed in Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the  
Library of the India Office: vol. 1, part 111 (1891), 524.
Vedānta Sutras of Bādarāyana, with the commentary by Śaṅkara, trans. by George Thibaut, part 1, Sacred  
Sanskrit Series Office, 1861
Śaṅkhālikhitau. Reconstruction of Śaṅkha-Likhitā Smṛti. Edited by A. D. Thakar. Delhi: Bharatiya Kala  
Śaṅkhyāyaṇa Gṛhya Sūtra. Edited by Hermann Oldenberg in Indische Studien XV, pp. 1-166. Leipzig: F. A.  
Brockhaus, 1878.
Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa (with Sanskrit text and English translation). Translated into English by C.  
———. Critically edited by H. G. Shastri. 4 vols. Ahmedabad: B. J. Institute of Learning and Research,  
1996.
Catalogues, Reference Works, and Scholarly Apparatus


Hazra, R. C. *Studies in the Purānic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. University of Dacca, Bulletin No. XX, 1940.


The *Mughal Period*. Edited by Lt. Col. Sir Wolsey Haig and Sir Richard Burn, ed. *The Cambridge His-
Secondary Sources


Ambedkar, B. R. Who were the Shudras? Bombay, 1946.


——. “Sanskrit Scholars of Akbar’s Time.” *Indian Historical Quarterly* 13, no. 1 (March 1937): 31-36.


Jha, V. N. “Vārṇaśāṅkara in the Dharma Sutras: Theory and Practice,” Journal of the Economic and


Pimpulkāra, R. S. Cítelhaṭṭa-Prakaranā (Bombay, 1926).


Rizvi, A. A. Muslim Revivalist Movements in Northern India in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Agra, 1965.


Upadhyay, Vasudev. *Socio-Religious Condition of North India. 700-1200 A.D.*


