

Lielukhin D.N.

Socio-political structure of early society and state as it reflected in Sanskrit inscriptions from Nepal (period of Licchavis).

The historian, analysing the details of rise and evolution of the concrete states runs into a paradoxical situation. In modern historiography there is a set of the concepts, interpreting the principal cause of the origin of the state<sup>1</sup>. Ones consider this cause, as result of development socio-economic, others, as the result of development socio-political and even of the socio-cultural relations (which, basically, on my sight, also look quite valid). And each of the indicated aspects of the human relations, quite often, is put forward as the basic, principal cause of the origin of the state<sup>2</sup> and, accordingly, basic criterion of such early states are defined in different ways. At the same time, most of the theories in discussions about the state (directly or indirectly) are based on its other uniform criteria, which more likely become simpler, than develop, despite of huge quantity of the information, put into use by historians, abundance of new researches indicative to more composite structure of the public relations, including, at an early stage of development of a statehood.

The present paper is continuation of our research of a history of forming and evolution of a socio-political structure of society in ancient and early medieval India. One of the most important aspects of this research, in our opinion, is the raising a problem of a place and role of traditional social collectives and their organisations within the various states, analysis the evolution of supra- and inter-communal administration, composite and contradictory process of its isolation from original collectives<sup>3</sup>. The essence of raising of such problem was defined by similar estimates of the authors about the complexity and step-by-step forming of "the state, as historically stabled system of self-organising of society», and «state, as superstructure, institutionalised part of social and political system"<sup>4</sup>, process which is carried out under direct and mediate effect of previous (or "lowest") forms of society's organisation, which, being included in structure of the state, in turn, underwent by definite changes<sup>5</sup>. Or else, we considered the process of forming of the concrete states, as the process of evolution of a socio-political structure of society, its integration or self-organising. Thus the special attention we attached to the forms of socialisation, precedent to the state (family, clan, tribe, community), which not only influenced on forming of a new system of a society's organisation (state), but also kept to function within such new system, undergoing definite changes. The analysis and discussion of results of this research (for what I especially given thanks to the colleagues) has allowed us to formulate more legibly some other conclusions, offered below our clarification, of two basic "criteria" of a statehood.

It is possible to evaluate separation of the population on the territorial instead of by a patrimonial principle, on territorial divisions – as the process extremely composite and ambiguous, which finality can be evaluate differently. Anyway, being based on our materials it is impossible to contrast patrimonial and territorial relations, to speak only about replacement of kinship relations by territorial. To the contrary, the territorial relations being formed within the patrimonial society and were not contrasted, but associated to a representation of clan and tribe, gradually settled on definite territory<sup>6</sup>. Family, clan and, even tribe (in separate societies), the kinship relations, by undergoing definite changes to some extent integrated in structure of state and other relations, persisted in modern society, quite often rendering definite effect on the relations of any level, including, on politics of the different states<sup>7</sup>. Speaking about new (territorial relations is really new to a definite level of public development), on my sight, it is important to take into account, that this new is developed within the evolution and under defining effect of previous, which, being recasted, here is included and integrated. Thus, apparently, raised the territorial or neighbour's commune, major form for organisation of population for the most ancient and medieval societies, becoming a basis of their social and political structure. How such integration

is proceeded, as the relations varied within the organisations based on kinship relations, as well as how long the process of forming of territorial relations and adaptations in their frameworks of family relations<sup>8</sup> proceeded and so on - detailed answers to these questions can give the future special researches.

At such approach, our analysis of the sources has formed the basis for a conclusion that a most ancient and early medieval states in India represented as associations of territories controlled by different dependent kings, various rulers, aristocrats, territories of communities and communal type organisations, within these states executing the function of its territorial subdivisions (not being originally and in fact only state subdivisions). The logic of forming of such socio-political structure in ancient and early medieval Indian society was defined, on my mind, simultaneously, by two major tendencies - to forming polycentric (with preservation of a set various centres of power having a definite autonomy and a natural peculiar authority, including in frameworks of more larger state's organisations) and mono-centric (uniform centre of power - government, uniform sovereignty and so on) its organisations, which parity was displayed in various periods of a history of country and within the various territories differently. Indian sources, on my mind, despite of existence of bull unilateral historiography tradition (coming from that the state - mono-centric organisation with one ruler, government, state borders, sovereignty and so on), allow to speak about original prevailing of the tendency to polycentric society's organisation. The analysis of sources, on my mind, allows to judge about the existence of the integrative tendencies as within the communal organisations shown in creation of inter-communal territorial associations of a various level, and within the various territories, as a result of struggle for predominance, formation of the relations of domination - subordination. The long-lived, ambiguous and contradictory process of integration, probably, occurred in India collaterally to process of struggle for power within such organisations and, as a consequence, with gradual slackening of the collective forms of government at the lowest levels of public hierarchy expressed in attaching the most important public positions for the concrete families and clans, transition to personalised authority. On a middle level of public hierarchy, probably, the evolution in such direction went much faster, that was defined by objects of such common bodies (in India were reduced, mainly, to mediative function and protection against aggression) and, on the other hand by their specialisation. The sources allow us to repute, that the indicated tendencies lead to replacement (but not everywhere) of the collective authority by personalised, to transformation of the chiefs of such organisations in the rulers of a various types. But, our statement of such common direction of evolution of social and political structure in ancient and early medieval India has not at all by purpose making of idea about uniformity of Indian society, its synthetic unitarisation, that rather often it is possible to meet in researches of the Ancient Indian state history<sup>9</sup>. Already in the famous Maurya empire were included the territories apparently on a various level of development - as rather more highly developed western regions governed by their rulers (Taksila, Surashtra), as the regions of different tribes from the central India. In a line of inscriptions of later kings are fixed the facts of including in their states of "forest tribes" territories (form of such integration, certainly, is the special question). All of India consists from "collectives of a miscellaneous sort, large and small, closely bound among them, entering one in other or is mutual crossed"<sup>10</sup>. And, as such collectives it is possible to understand Buddhist "samgha", monastic temple communities and organisations, states - "rajya" (single kingdom) and "mandala" ("empire"), territories ruled by various "dignitaries", rulers not having of king's titles and so on. The most of such collectives associated itself with definite territories, each - had the special government, possessed a definite autonomy, administration, jurisdiction. The forming of such extremely diverse polycentric socio-political structure was defined by the special significance of the patrimonial and communal relations creating the greatest obstructions for the mono-centric tendency already on this stage of the public development. The relations within the various territories were mainly formed on a basis *by type* of kinship relations<sup>11</sup>, as the result of its adaptation, shown differently in various

situations. Therefore, any territory (including state, empire<sup>12</sup>) can be considered in Indian sources as the family, clan or tribe, inhabitants living on such territory, king's subjects - as his children, part of such territory - as the ground of separate family, rulers of different parts of state - as "brothers and sisters" of dominated king. Rather legibly fixed on the high and middle level of public hierarchy, such features of the territorial relations, probably, even brightly expressed on low level (rural community - association of communities and so on). And it is wrong to reduce them only to ideology, to underestimate their significance. About an exclusive role of kinship relations, patrimonial norms and institutes in forming of new territorial, and, also, caste and professional organisations, it is possible to judge, being based on facts, that with these organisations interconnected the important functions of family and clan - care of the aged, children, ill, and needy, care of children education, care of preservation and support of family norms and family as such, organisation of production, identification of mediative function with the aged and so on. *Interrelation and interconnection of the territorial and patrimonial relations, relevant organisations and their institutes, long-lived time remained the important factor in a history India.*

Forming of the territorial relations unconditionally extremely important factor of social and political development of society permitted to leave for limits of patrimonial society, due to making of territorial organisations and their institutes, which promoted the development of new integrative tendencies. But the analysis of the territorial relations can not be complete, on my sight, disregarding that they were as a matter of fact, first of all, as result of adaptation, assimilation of kinship relations in new frameworks. Being recasted, they kept to play (and play down to the present time) a important role in the public relations, being developed differently and defining conduct and interests, both concrete people, and whole collectives of any type. And, at last, just the exceptional value of kinship relations in an antiquity defines that the social and political structure of society in Ancient and Early Medieval India originally had polycentric character. And though the tendency to monocentrism also was present in these times within any organisation, gradually, with development of the relations of domination - subordination and inequality acquiring the increasing significance - polycentric structure, expressed not only in existence of a set of various collectives and organisations, first of all of communities and communal type organisations, governed by their own administration within the framework of their jurisdiction, but also in a non-interference in affairs of such collectives, if they did not contradict to interests of authority from more high level, remained a major feature of socio-political structure of Ancient and Early Medieval India. Thus, commune (taking into account all contradictory tendencies in its development), communal institutes remain for a long time as a major part of ancient and early medieval Indian State.

The analysis of process of forming (or establishing, that looks less precise) of public authority now acquires extremely important for the understanding of a problem of state<sup>13</sup>. As the reason of it, first of all, it is necessary to mention consolidated in a historiography (domestic, western, Indian and so on) simplified understanding of "public authority", as "administration", "state machinery", and also identification the last with the state, which is, unconditionally, important methodological mistake<sup>14</sup>. The critical analysis of the interpretation by the historians of the evidences of sources about "state machinery", "administration" of "empires" in Ancient and Early Medieval India, has given us to a conclusion, that the functions of such apparatus executed, in most cases, by non-specialists and, alongside with the members of a king's clan, his servants, most likely, by representatives of central and local political elite - local governors, aristocrats, communal leaders, rulers of organisations of a communal type. It is represented quite logical, taking into account noted above features of territorial structure of the most of the states in Ancient and Early Medieval India (the process of forming of administrative-territorial structure starts in India much later<sup>15</sup>). It is represented also optimal, taking into account an exceptional value and variety of communal, communal type and intercommunal organisations, exclusive role of communal ideology<sup>16</sup>. The joining tendencies within the Ancient and Early Medieval Indian

states were developed "from below", when for fulfilment of restricted quantity of problems necessary for society (maintenance of the legal order, co-ordination of interests of various collectives, protection against external aggression etc.) - the various territorial unions or associations were formed, each of which had its own administration. Simultaneously, as a result of interaction of various collectives and their organisations in the various forms, including the struggle for leadership and dominance there was a process of forming of composite hierarchy of government bodies in various territorial or other organisations proceeded, one of the major base for which there were formed relations of domination - subordination.

Association of social organisations called, for example, necessity of co-operation for development of natural resources and opposition to external threats, already at a rather early stage of development quite natural adjoined with inequality and coercion within such associations. The latter stipulated by a biosphere, level of access to resources and by other factors, not dependent on the person, developed simultaneously with the evolution of social relations, when there was appeared the robbery, patriarchal servitude, war and tributes. Thus, paradigm for association of the most ancient and early medieval Indian states, was, apparently, find long before their appearance. So, for example, still tribe, by conquering the adjacent tribe, interfered ran into a problem of appropriation of the subordinate collective. And though different solutions of this problem was present<sup>17</sup>, apparently, the path of assignment of such collective bodily, with preservation for defeated of traditional organisation, traditional government and collection with the help of the last cumulative contribution was optimal (it was marked still by K. Marx)<sup>18</sup>. Among dignities of such path not creating, as against a line of other, insoluble contravention's between the winners and defeated, it is possible to call considerably smaller costs of material and human resources, the preservation of a traditional life style and traditional government bodies for defeated (that in turn defined weakness and fragility of such associations), possibility of regular appropriation the tributes from defeated by the winners and so on. Such "weak" method of integration promoted further evolution of mutual relation and actively was used in an initial stage of forming of the states, promoted for becoming of political society, transformation of traditional government in political, rendering essential effect on all course of social evolution. And the significance of such method of integration, on my sight, is not become exhausted by that it creates a possibility for collective exploitation.

In the special degree, the creation of unequal associations on the basis of the relations of domination - subordination between various collectives (both territorial and patrimonial) promoted increase of a role of public authority. At such associations, originally very unsafe, there were relations of a new type formed between collectives and their government (collective of the winners - their government - government of defeated collective - collective defeated), in which the key position was occupied by the persons realising public authority. Just from the moment of making such associations it is possible to speak about the tendencies of isolation of public authority from patrimonial society and transformation it in administration, about formation of the state relations. The creation of such associations has delivered before collectives a line of new problems, permanent care of which solution (contacts with subordinate, solution of disputed problems, preservation of inequality, receiving the "tributes" from subordinates and so on) could undertake only the members of collectives, specially delegated for this purpose, most probable - representatives of a government of the incorporated organisations, "important people". These people, though executed generally valid function (for their own collective), in this case already in the much greater degree ranging from the basic population, receiving simultaneously other status and significant more rights, especially under the tax and redistribution of a received additional product. The fulfilment of functions of the tax and redistribution, as it is represented to me, for a long time has become one of the basic functions of the state representing at this stage, first of all as hierarchical complex of organisations with a common government intended for regulation of the social relations in the society.

The increase of a role of public authority in connection with appearance of unequal associations,

alongside with contradictory process of social stratification with preservation of a defining role of communal structures and communal ideology, as it is represented for me, has rendered decisive effect on development of the state in India. The pattern of integration, considered by us (preservation of traditional organisation and its administration, appropriation of collective bodily), showed quite often in Indian sources in the ideologised form of " free-will" subordination, has become the major algorithm for forming any empire in Ancient and Early Medieval India, one of the major norm in tradition. Such form of integration, apparently, was favourable to rulers not only from dominant, but also from subordinate organisation. The latter's saved in many respects their status, amplified, including at the expense of the dominant party, in its opposition to collective government bodies.

Administrative functions represent, in definite sense, manifestation of universal characteristic of human collectives<sup>19</sup>. One of primary goals of administration within the framework of any organisation, collective, is the maintenance of the order and co-ordination of interests (i.e. performance of mediator function)<sup>20</sup>. The forming of administration, as special sort of activity (in its various forms) on my sight, has taken place rather early, for stage of patrimonial society. And already at the earliest stages of existence of such activity it is possible to speak about its institutionalisation, i.e. about forming of definite public institutes, about appearance of the public posts (leader, member of the elders council, member of the tribe's council and so on). A basis for the co-ordination of interests within any collective, more often, was the complex of the traditional rules, savers and explorers of which within the framework of collectives were the elders (heads of families, clans, aged, respected members of any collective) or realised of a control function appearing rather early council of the elders. So early it is possible to speak about appearance of special interests of the persons, in charge of administration, which were displayed that they took into account in the activity as personal interests (self-preservation, reproduction and so on), interests of their family, clan, tribe - collectives, by which members they is simultaneous itself counted. The parity of such interests, including with common (all organisation) interests, apparently, was changed with the course of time, reflecting changes of public structure, being displayed in the various forms and on miscellaneous in concrete situations. But just this parity (instead of extremely personal and corporate interests of the administrators) was substance of special interests of the persons in charge of administration. Naturally, though not being brightly expressed on early stages of society development, these special interests were gradually changed. The increasing role in them was played by personal and group interests of the persons realising control functions. However, such isolation, anyway, in Indian conditions, never had character of denial. The most of the persons possessing an authority and a realising control functions, not only kept to associate itself with definite family, clan, territorial organisation, but also were the leaders (and even, quite often, chiefs) of such organisations. And down to the present time it is necessary to consider conduct of any officer (as well as any person) in a concrete situation, not only through a prism of the corporate relations, but also, simultaneously, taking into account a parity of them with his personal interests, interests of his family and clan, territorial organisation, other collectives (for example, caste) with which he himself associates. A problem of forming and evolution of public authority, long-lived and contradictory process of its transformation in administration, state machinery (for the lack of other more legible terms, I use traditional) should be considered with allowance for a features noted above. The fulfilment of functions of a state machinery by the local leaders, chiefs or representatives of various institutions, including communal and communal type is represented, from my point of view, important feature of socio-political structure and states in Ancient and Early Medieval India<sup>21</sup>. Alongside with the members of a king's clan, his nearest encirclement (including, servants in wide significance of this word - "bearing a service to king"), local elite, local nobility, as well as the administration of the communes, organisations of a communal type - representatives of the lower level in administration, centres of power, performing, simultaneously a line of the general state functions (first of all, in collection of taxes) the long-

lived time is a most important element of the state in Ancient and Early Medieval India, basis of a state machinery.

In Indology the quantity of researches is dedicated to the analysis of the evidences from different sources about the taxes and taxation, including special monographs, in which, quite often, the only formal analysis of the sources coming based on conception about unitarisation of territorial and administrative structure of the state, about unitarisation of the forms and rates of the taxes predominates. The experts with complete gravity argue their ideas, using the relevant professional terminology characteristic for the newest time states and considerably modernising the contents of sources (so appear implying a rather definite context the "land tax" and "cadastre", "poll-tax", "direct and indirect taxes" and so on). Thus, process of forming of the taxation, as far as I know, understanding of transition from the non-systematic tax of a contribution (present on pre-state stage of development) to the organised taxation, their differences practically is not examining. This is one of the important lacunas in the theories of forming of the state.

Marked above by us two important features of Ancient and Early Medieval India states allow to correct the contents of considered criterion. The social and political structure of Indian society in that time unconditionally, does not allow speaking about even relative unitisation of the taxation. A line of express indications in epigraphy allows to approve that the mentioned function, probably, was realised by local bodies, even by a rural community bodies. In the interpretation of the taxes and privileges terms, listed in inscriptions, it is necessary to take into account, on my sight, what even the using of similar terms, formulas not always can testify to a likeness of the forms and tax rates. Sometimes such likeness in the use of a nomenclature looks and as result of an understanding of individual local cases in uniform textual epigraphical tradition<sup>22</sup> (basic source of information about the taxes and taxation - just epigraphy).

\* \* \*

Noted above features of forming and evolution of a state formulated by us on the basis of the analysis of Kautilya's "Arthashastra" and the Indian epigraphy II - VI AD find confirmation and development in offered below examination of early Nepal Sanskrit epigraphy from a Licchavi's period (IV- VIII AD)<sup>23</sup>. As it looks for me, the evidences from early Nepal inscriptions can be compared to the similar information from the Indian epigraphy. It is possible to judge, proceeding from such comparison the paths of development of social-political structure and state in India. As the basis for this comparison it is represented for us the common language (Sanskrit) and cultural community of early sources of Nepal and India, their structural similarity (in this case, we mean so-called "donative" inscriptions<sup>24</sup>), use of similar concepts, terms.

Unconditionally, we have the right to search the common in an early history of both countries, but, certainly, we not consider of Nepal only as one of Indian areas, taking into consideration only effect of Indian literary tradition and culture. In Nepal, and, first of all, in a Kathmandu valley, there were own state<sup>25</sup> and other territorial units, having, quite probably, special tendencies in development since the antiquity. This was promoted by the special ethnic structure of Nepal and, in the same degree, special conditions of life.

The basic attention here we shall devote to the analysis of the use in inscriptions of the several important "administrative" terms widely used in various Sanskrit texts, both in literary, and in epigraphy - in the texts of grants. It will allow to improve, on my sight the meaning of terms, and to describe a place and significance of organisations, which by them were designated in a structure of society of early Nepal. We mean, first of all, term "adhikaraṇa", usually interpreted, as "office, department"<sup>26</sup> and some others, with which are referred to, both rural, and higher organisation. The evidences of epigraphical texts we shall state in the chronological order. It will enable to judge about the changes in the status of separate organisations.

The term "adhikaraṇa" does not meet at all in inscriptions from the time of the Manadeva, which have reached for us. It is explained by a specific structure of inscriptions - except for a known poetic panegyric from a temple Chāṅgu Nārāyaṇa, they, mainly, very brief and contain, mainly,

information on lingaserection and creation of the godhoods. The mentions of land grants are rare and brief. Among inscriptions from the time of the Manadeva does not meet the texts of "king's grants" both characteristic by structure and phraseology, as for subsequent Nepal, as for all India epigraphy.

First of such "grants" is referred to time of subsequent sovereign, Vasantadeva and is dated by 428 year. The formula of "grant" here is traditional<sup>27</sup>, the essence of it consists, in an interdiction of access on the village territory for the persons named cāṭa and bhāṭa (about the meanings of these terms see below). Here, also, mentioned organisation, not having the concrete title, (20.19-20 = V.22)<sup>28</sup>, named "consisting from 18 members", probably, rural or inter-rural. Other grant from 435 year firstly mentions the terms, interesting for us. In the formula of the notification is spoken about the judges in four "adhikaraṇas"<sup>29</sup>, further, in the defective text the titles of two of them - Liṅgvala and Kūtherā (23.8,9 = V.25) are read. Though from the subsequent donation (25 = V.27) of Vasantadeva up to us has reached only its final part, here are, apparently, two "adhikaraṇas" also mentioned<sup>30</sup>. The considerable interest is represented with two subsequent donations of Vasantadeva from 454 year (29,168 = V.31, 32). In the first - Vasantadeva notifies the rural householders and Brahmans about the joint donation Sarvadaṇḍanāyaka Mahāpratihāra Ravigupta and the king Śrī-Kramalīla, performed at the request of the first. About the contents of this grant, in spite of the fact that the text is damaged, it is possible to judge, that it was reduced, most likely, to exemption the village from "visitation" of its territory by the representatives of "Śollā and Kūtherā adhikaraṇas".<sup>31</sup> And, probably, in exchange for such concession, and, also, that "there was no reduction in king's treasury"<sup>32</sup>, for indicated "adhikaraṇas" two plots of land were given<sup>33</sup>. The following grant of Vasantadeva (168 = V.32), which initial part is damaged, has the similar contents (separate discrepancies in the formulas are insignificant). The considered grants represent first, special, in our judgement, type of Licchavi king's grants, describing practice of mutual relation with organisations named "adhikaraṇa" - exemption of access on the territory of village for "adhikaraṇas" with donation of land to the latter as reimbursement of "average general costs".

The first donation of king Ganadeva from 476 year is considerably damaged and only proceeding from comparisons of separate phrases we can presumably judge its looking alike by the subsequent donations of mentioned king. Six his other charters (38-43 = V.44-49), all dated 482 year, are read quite confidently. On the basis of their analysis, it is possible to judge about new type of Licchavi's grants, new practice of mutual relation with organisations named "adhikaraṇa". So, in the first (38 = V.44), king notifies all "big" people and Brahmans in the village Tegval (38.2-3) that, in addition to donations of "former" kings, which essence was reduced to the prohibition of access in the village for "adhikaraṇas" Kūther<sup>34</sup> and Śully (38.4-5), at the request of Sarvadaṇḍanāyaka Mahāpratihāra Śrī Bhaumagupta he will grant as the favour for inhabitants - prohibition of access in the village for two others "adhikaraṇas" - Liṅgval and Māpoka. Even in case of committing "5 great sins" (pañcāparādha), as is spoken in the grant, (now, the village territory) is unavailable to four "adhikaraṇas" (38.6-10). The contents of five other grants of Ganadeva (39 = V.45, 40 = V.46, 41 = V.47, 42 = V.48, 43 = V.49) is similar.

In six donations of following king, Shivadeva I from 516 and 517 years (53, 56-59, 64 = V.60, 62-64, 69) we meet a new, special type of grant. According to the text 53 (= V.60), "major" people and Brahmans from the village (the name of which was not saved) are notified about the king's grant at the request of Śrīmahāsāmanta Amśuvarmman. The latter is reduced to the sanction for the "adhikaraṇa" Kūther to enter on the territory of grant only for the definite tax collection (tri-kara-mātra-sādhana), and prohibition for "adhikaraṇas" Liṅgval and Śulli to enter on the territory of donation even in case of "5 great sins and other". Follow-up in this grant the inhabitants are released from the tax (part of?) collected by them (crop) of garlic and onion<sup>35</sup>. The subsequent charters have a little different formulas - so, for example, in the grant for the inhabitants of village Khṛpuṇ (56 = V.62), is spoken about a prohibition of access for "adhikaraṇas" (formula does not include their titles) on the village territory even in the cases "5

great sins, (for accomplishment?) written donations and other"<sup>36</sup>. Similar contents have the grants 57-59 (V.63, 64,69). Any unessential different formulas has the text of the grant 64 (V = 69) - here are mentioned "adhikaraṇas" Kūther and Liṅval, to which was prohibited of access to the territory of donation. Only Shivadeva's grant from 520 year, from Dharampur (62 = V.67) use other formula of donation - well known for us from other North-Indian grants, which prohibited for the persons, marked as Cāṭa and Bhaṭa to visit the territory of grants, given " by former kings " (62.6). Here, king grants also exemption from concrete taxes. The similar prohibition is used in the last grant of Shivadeva I (55 = V.59) to a Chāṅgu Nārāyaṇa temple. In donation from Khopāsī (63 = V.68) the prohibition for access in village for "all adhikaraṇas" (63.8) is mentioned, and, also, it is offered to the inhabitants at all jobs to deal certain Svatalasvāmin.

First grant of one of the most famous Licchavi's king, Amśuvarman (67 = V.81), contains the prohibition for access in a territory of grant for "adhikaraṇa" earlier in Nepal inscriptions not met, and having already Sanskrit, instead of local title - paścima (i.e. western). In the Amśuvarman's grant from 29 year (Gn.-34), contains the prohibition for access in a territory of grant for other, Bhaṭṭ-ādhikaraṇa (68.6 = V.71). In the grant from 32 year (75 = V.78), which contains the donation to the inhabitants of village Śaṅgā of a line of privileges in the tax collection ("the calling torments" - 75.12), are contained two important theses. Exempting the inhabitants from the tax of oil, king specifies - " this tax- vastu should be surrendered by oil of somebody other".<sup>37</sup> And in the conclusion of the text of grant, after designation of date and name of "messenger"(dutaka), there is an apparent addition: " Here - (accordingly) decision of adhikaraṇa."<sup>38</sup> In the grant from 39 year (80 = V.85) for the first time, instead of usual formula ("notifies the major people, Brahmans and householders-kutumbinas"), king addresses to " (anybody), in present and future held by the deals of Paścim-ādhikaraṇa". For the time of Amśuvarman this fact is unusual and also can be explained by the contents of the grant contains the prohibition just for this, mentioned above "adhikaraṇa"<sup>39</sup> for access in a territory of adhaḥśālā panchayat, governing in village, to which the grant was given. The incomes of this grant, as follows from the text, should be used for protection and repair erected lingams. This is here too spoken, that if the responsibility (on protection, service, repair defective and so on) of the mentioned panchayat to be realised will not be or they abandon it "properly", the question should be decided by kings with the person "living here"<sup>40</sup>. In the grant of Amśuvarman, which date was not saved (79 = V.84), again, after almost centenary absence the local title Liṅval in the formula of the prohibition for access in a territory of grant for this organisation and usage (by them) horses for carriage of heaviness and bulls carrying vehicles is mentioned<sup>41</sup>.

The grant of Dhruvadeva, which date was not saved, alongside with fixation of king's donation, was mentioned "confirmation" (anumatisāsanam) of his predecessors grants fixed in three charters. In the last part it mentions granting by former kings as donation - the prohibition for access in a territory of grant for "adhikaraṇas" Liṅval Śollā and other (101.17-18 = V.109), this mention we have the complete right to connect to a period, when such "privileges" were usual. The contents of the Bhīmārjunadeva's grant (109 = V.118), where the "property of Māpcok"(māpcokavastu), probably is mentioned, also contains the prohibition for "adhikaraṇas" for access in a territory of village Bhr̥ṅgāra (109.11), also concerns just "adhikaraṇa" with such title. Similar looks the mention in the next grant of "adhikaraṇa" Bhaṭṭa. The grant of Narendradeva from 67 year (116 = V.124) contains already the prohibition for access in a territory of grant for the persons named Cāṭa and Bhaṭa, and the following his donation from 67 year (117 = V.123) consists in an prohibition for access in a territory of Yūpagrāmadraṅga, "free from an authority of services Bhaṭṭa and Māpcok"<sup>42</sup> to the representatives indicated "adhikaraṇas" even at "improper" conduct of the inhabitants and "crucifying of the people".

In the Narendradeva grant from 80 year (122 = V.129) we meet the fresh formula of the notification - king informs about the donation not so "major" people, Brahmans and householders-kutumbinas, but "the rulers in borders of Nepal heading a various services"<sup>43</sup> about

various grants for Hainsagriha draṅga and village.... Paścimaka, free from the access on their territory by the persons named Cāṭa and Bhaṭa. The exemption from the access on the territory of grant by the persons named by these terms is mentioned, also, in the subsequent Licchavi's charters (126.12, 127.6, 128.6, 132.5, 136.7 = V.132-134, 139, 140). The Narendradeva grant from 82 year, probably, was dedicated "to exemption from access from all adhikaraṇas".<sup>44</sup> And, at last, in the Śivadeva II grant, which date was not saved, is twice mentioned pūrvādhikaraṇa, earlier in the grants not met.

Among early Nepal charters the special place occupy the texts which were made out with usage of the formulas and phraseology, traditional for grants, but not being the donations under their contents. It is the known two charters of Amśuvarman from 30 and 32 years (69, 74 = V.72, 77), fixing the "rules" (maryādā) about the taxes or payment at committing the grants - huge lists of the persons, temples, viharas etc., with the indication of the sums, to whom and how much should be transferred. It is difficult to present, that all indicated payments were made at each king's or, especially, private donation - without delay here we have attempt to rank, to codify traditional norms (fact in itself very unusual). Similar is the place and significance of the Bhīmārjunadeva's grant (107 = V.116) from 57 year, where, probably, is attempted to systematise<sup>45</sup> (naturally, it should be understood very much conditionally) the responsibilities and rights of Māpcok (māpcokādhikāra) "service", known from other grants, which functions were realised by the similar "adhikaraṇa". The contents of the saved part of grant enables to judge that under management of the mentioned "service" (and, probably, having the similar title "adhikaraṇa") there were affairs connected with the family law<sup>46</sup>. One of the late Licchavi's charter, which date was not saved (143 = V.149) - is even more interesting. Though here also is fixed donation (or some donations), the considerable portion of it is dedicated to codify "of the responsibilities and rights" of the doorkeeper (dauvārika). Here are mentioned any other "adhikaraṇas" (Śrīpūrvva -, Śrīpaścim -, Dakṣiṇagata -, Bhaṭṭa -), by the contents - in the definition of the prohibition for access in a territory under the control of "door-keeper"<sup>47</sup>, among which responsibilities is mentioned the overseeing, how "panchalikas", i.e. people and rural authority follow the rules (or laws, king's decrees).

Collected by us the information allows to make any conclusions relating to the contents of the term "adhikaraṇa", to characterise a place of organisations named by the indicated term in the structure of Early Nepal society, their mutual relations with Licchavi kings. As well as in inscriptions from the Gupta times<sup>48</sup> - the term "adhikaraṇa" in Nepal inscriptions can not be interpreted as "office", "state department". It is represented apparently, that so were referred to local inter-rural (or inter-communal) collective organisations. By analogy to later inscriptions from Tamilnadu and Karnataka, fixing the similar pattern, it is possible to designate them as "committees"<sup>49</sup>. At absolute majority of case "adhikaraṇas" are present at the formulas of the prohibition for them for access on the territory of donations. It is not difficult to guess about significance and sense of such "access" - organisation these had, along with particular, inherent for each separately (we have not enough information about this<sup>50</sup>), simultaneously, common for all - fiscal and the judicial functions (this was testified by line of quoted above formulas<sup>51</sup>). Just they were, most likely, basic tax collectors, part of these taxes transmitting in king's treasury (see contents of the mentioned above inscriptions 29 and 168). Their titles (often in the charters such organisations are present as pairs - Kūther and Śully, Liṅgval and Māpcoka), apparently, local, also confirm, that they had not any relation to Licchavi's state "administration". Most likely, in Kathmandu valley such four organisations existed originally (therefore, for example, in 23.5 is spoken about "four adhikaraṇas"). Only in the time of rule of Amśuvarman are mentioned for the first time new "adhikaraṇas", having already Sanskrit titles: paścima (i.e. western) and bhaṭṭādhikaraṇa ("master's", i.e. imperial?). Even later (the time of Śivadeva II and later) mentioned third, pūrvādhikaraṇa (i.e. eastern). Because "new adhikaraṇas" are mentioned with "old", other local organisations in one contexts (it is even new "pair" come in - Bhaṭṭa and Māpcok, see, 117), and they are meeting in the charters, mainly, in the formulas of the prohibition for them an

access in a territory of donation, it is possible to find their functions and the status similar with mentioned above "adhikaraṇas"<sup>52</sup>.

In the formula of the prohibition for them an access in a territory of donation, alongside with "adhikaraṇas" we find, also, (generally, in the charters of late Licchavis - Narendradeva and Śivadeva II) mentioning of the persons called Cāṭa and Bhaṭa, which are fine known from North Indian inscriptions. As the contents of the indicated terms is represented, it is possible to understand them similarly to North Indian inscriptions - so the local leaders were referred to, not having of the king's status, but possessing sufficient resources for fulfilment fiscal and judicial functions. The frequency of the use of these terms in the time of last Licchavi kings testifies to definite changes in the structure of the local authority, gradual replacement of collective organisations ("adhikaraṇas") by nobility, local aristocracy.

Being based on the contents of Licchavi's inscriptions, it is possible, on my sight, to judge with confidence about the structure of their state. In the Licchavi's kingdom usually were included the territories governed by various local rulers. About this detail are allow to repute numerous donations "at the request", where king from Managriha only authorised donations, which genuine initiators were not only other "kings" (for example, Mahārāja-Mahāsāmanta-Śrī-Kramalīla from the grant of Vasantadeva from 454 year, Mahārāja Vipravarmman from the grant dated by 31 year), crown princes (for example, Yuvarāja Udayadeva in the grant dated by 36 year), but also persons, who used known from others Sanskrit inscriptions nobility titles ("mahāpratihāra", "daṇḍanāyaka"). It is possible to note, that a lot of Śivadeva I grants (516-535 years) is issued "at the request" of Anśuvarman, becoming later supreme ruler of Nepal and releasing, subsequently, his own grants, prolonging to name himself only as "Mahāsāmanta", not accepting, probably, the "king's" title.

The structure of Licchavi's kingdom was plotted, simultaneously, by the integration of a lot of local inter-rural organisations, possessions of local nobility, local rulers. Thus, most likely, just "adhikaraṇas" were the main executors of the basic mediative functions, collecting the duties paid by the villages (or "the taxes" on common needs), only part of which, probably, transmitted to the local governors or Licchavi's kings. The inscriptions allow fixing even details of evolution of such structure, development of mutual relation of kings with local organisations. The indicated organisations not only executed the function of tax-collection on the greater part of territory subordinated to Licchavis, but also enjoyed by the acknowledged authority between inhabitants<sup>53</sup> and, accordingly, should be conceived by king, as the basic objects to subordination and integration in the frameworks of kingdom. And we can fix some types of activities of kings, their politics in relation to the indicated organisations in the texts of donations, which, is simultaneous with the directly declared problem, realised the function of easing the "adhikaraṇas" (mentioned extremely as organisations, to which was prohibited access into the territory of grants).

The first stage of mutual relations of "adhikaraṇas" and king's authority is possible to characterise, as a period of relative concessions. Essence of grants to the inhabitants of villages in the charters of Vasantadeva - prohibition of access into their territories for four "adhikaraṇas", naturally, leading to losses in their share of duties, fines from fulfilment of judicial functions. These losses are indemnified here by granting for them different plots of land, found outside the village's lands. And the latter was accomplished, as was spoken in the charters, that "there was no reduction in king's treasury" (i.e. "adhikaraṇas" remained basic "collectors" of duties).

As the inscriptions of Ganadeva testified, the practice of prohibition to access for "adhikaraṇas" in the village territory was widespread among his predecessors. In all his grants, king mentioned the charters "of former kings", according to which the access into the territory of granted villages for two "adhikaraṇas" - Kūther and Śully was prohibited. And in his inscriptions the new type of politics in relation to "adhikaraṇas" used - prohibition to access in the territory of granted villages now is fixed for two others "adhikaraṇas", Liṅgval and Māpcoka. Even in case of committing of "5 great sins", as is spoken in the charters, the territory of the village is unavailable for four "adhikaraṇas".

The ŚivadevaI inscriptions fixed a new stage of mutual relation of the king authority and local collective organisations. For this period some weakening in positions of king is characteristic. After his rule starts period of Kailasakuta domination, just this king was changed by Śrī-Mahāsāmanta Amśuvarman. In his charters, alongside with prohibition for "adhikaraṇas" to access on the territory of grant, even in case of committing "5 great sins and other"<sup>54</sup>, is spoken about the sanction for separate "adhikaraṇas" to access on the same territory for the sake of the definite tax collecting<sup>55</sup>. In the charter from Khopāsī from 520 year "exemptions from adhikaraṇas" is supplemented by the curious recommendation for the village inhabitants - in all cases "in present and future" to deal certain Svatalasvāmin, who in a general context of the charter acts as the person taken on himself fulfilment of all functions related with "adhikaraṇas". It is possible to interpret the indicated fact, as the important detail of politics of king in mutual relation with the local authority, when the effect of collective inter-rural organisation not only was deadened, but also was superseded by a privately-owned authority of one of the leaders of a local, rural elite. Though such interpretation is presumable, of a similar sort of activity look found in a general course of politics of king in relation with "adhikaraṇas". The information, which can be interpreted similarly, meets also in other charters - see, for example, 80.17-18.

The charters from the time of Amśuvarman give a line of the new evidences about mutual relation of the king's authority and "adhikaraṇas". Here, first of all, it is necessary to mention the addition to the charter from 32 year (75 = V.78). Addition to the king's instruction that the tax should be paid "by somebody others" - "(according to) the solution of adhikaraṇa" testifies that king, granting exemption did not repute at all decrease of general receipts from this territory. This grant look likes, in essence, as redistribution of taxes from the inhabitants of one village on the inhabitants of other. And adoption of a decision - "who must pay" - was shifted by king on organisation named "adhikaraṇa". This certificate allows to fix already quite distinctly formed "executive vertical", which major constituent was collective, by the matter and origin "non-state" organisation.

To time of Amśuvarman are referred also the important changes in a structural part of the text of grants (unusual fact, even for the early grants, with already usual, unified structure). Instead of usual formula for the earlier grants ("notifies the major people, Brahmans and rural householders-kutumbinas"), in his charters notification is addressed to "(anybody), in present and future held by the deals of Paścim-adhikaraṇa". For his (its) successors it is possible more often to meet the notification addressed "the rulers in borders of Nepal heading a various services", "to the heads of all adhikaraṇas acting within the borders of Nepal", "to all king's people ruling in their adhikaraṇas in bhūkti Nepal" etc. And, though in inscriptions prolong occasionally to be mentioned, both old and new "adhikaraṇas", for these charters more characteristic the mention of the prohibition of access into the territory of grants for the persons named by the terms Caṭa and Bhaṭa, in earlier inscriptions met much less often<sup>56</sup>. So were referred to, as in Nepal, and Indian inscriptions of that time, most likely, local leaders, not having of the king's status, but possessing sufficient resources for fulfilment of fiscal and judicial functions. This fact, as it is represented, is entered in a general course of evolution of mutual relation of king and local authority and can be explained both by strengthening of autocracy, and by delivering of power in inter-rural bodies to local nobility, gradual decomposition and elimination of such collective organisations. This, quite probably, was promoted also by politics of king in relation to "adhikaraṇas". It is necessary to mark also, as entered in a general course of evolution of mutual relation of king and local authority, considered above fact of existence of an inscription, where, the attempt of ranking (or to codify) the rights and responsibilities of one of such organisation (Mapcok) undertaken.

The analysis of early Licchavi's Nepal inscriptions testifies that this period was the important stage in "state" construction of Nepal. Processes, similar on character, we marked, being based on materials of the analysis of Kautilya's "Arthashastra" and inscriptions from the I part of I

millennium AD<sup>57</sup>. By moving in a Kathmandu valley not earlier than IV AD, Licchavi, the famous Indian military clan, has found in this region a line of local inter-rural organisations becoming a basis of their state. Just they, as it is represented, executed initially basic administrative functions, were the intermediaries between a king's authority and villages population (in transfer of a part of products and traditional duties collected from the rural inhabitants - on "common" needs, to king - for "protection" and so on). This is corresponded as Indian and, as it is possible to repute, Nepal tradition. The further development of "state" structure of Nepal went on a path of easing of effect of the mentioned organisations in villages, their decomposition at the expense of limitation of their presence in villages, delivering of power within such organisations to nobility and their partial replacement, probably, by local elite or by the "king's servants".

Such politics has a number of analogies in Indian sources, argued in the political literature (it is easier to substitute disloyal "head" than to annex new territory) and corresponded to the common character of evolution of a socio-political structure of a society in Gupta times. And, what is extremely interesting, the definite important "political" role in this process was played by the "king's" grants, which, alongside with the basic declared purposes executed function of "exemption" the villages from "access" on their territory from the mentioned inter-rural organisations, that unconditionally conducted to easing the last, their authority among the people.

---

1 Thus, on my sight, in researches dedicated to the origin of state and early stages of its development we can see prevailing of T. Hobbs's ideas, first of all, his theory of the sovereignty. According to his theory, the state dominates over society (which members - only objects of government). The authority should be indivisible and is presented by the uniform sovereign, i.e., should be unitary and uniform, though the forms of this sovereign can be various – it can be expressed by one person (monarchy), social gathering (democracy) or part of society (aristocracy). (For more details, see, T. Hobbes, *Sobr. soch.* v.2, c. 132-133, 134-135, 142, 144). Is significant less often authors give attention to J. Locke's ideas about the separation of powers and Ch. Montesquieu about confederation. [back](#)

2 Thus, many authors agree that socio-economic, socio-political, socio-cultural and so on relations, especially in early society exist in the unshared form. [back](#)

3 The contents of the first part of the present paper represent our understanding of results of the research collective project published under the title " The State in a history of society. To a problem of criteria of a statehood ", Moscow, 1998, based not only on my paper, but on the ideas from papers, directly to India state not touched. In the second part it is prolonged in research of early Sanskrit inscriptions from Nepal. [back](#)

4 Lyubimov Y.V. Problems of political integration (Russian colonisation. XVII-XVIII ages), in: *The State in a history of society. To a problem of criteria of a statehood.* Moscow, 1998, p. 144. [back](#)

5 See, in detail, Lyubimov Y.V., *Problems of...* p.146-147. [back](#)

6 It is easy for demonstrating on semantics of one of the known Indian terms - janapada (territory, country, and state) - this term could designate both territory, and population living on this territory. [back](#)

7 For example, family and clan relations in administrations of any level, political crises in separate countries, based on patrimonial and even inter-tribes opposition. [back](#)

8 It seems for me here pertinent such usage of Y. Lyubimov ideas about the logic of evolution and interaction of cultures (Y.V. Lyubimov *Op.cit.* p. 148). It is a correct estimation, on my mind, about the evolution as such. [back](#)

9 The essence of such unitisation - is result of natural (but unhistorical) desire of researchers to systematise the evidences of sources on the basis of modern representation of state. It is expressed in unsuccessful attempts to find "districts" and "provinces", "departments" and

"ministers" in Ancient states and so on. [back](#)

10 Vigasin A.A., Samozvanzev A.M. Arthashastra. Problems of social structure and law. Moscow, 1984, p. 145. [back](#)

11 Therefore at political treatises there is a concept of "mula" original territory of a king's clan presented. Such territories are fixed, for example, for Cholas, Pallavas, Gangas, and some other dynasties - here they ruled even in those periods, when the representatives of other dynasties occupied the leading position in the same regions. [back](#)

12 Probably, therefore, different Indian states in epigraphy in the most of cases are referred to as the possession of definite families, clans - Satavahanas, Pallavas, and Guptas, sometimes simply not having other title. [back](#)

13 In modern conceptions was changed, in my mind, the logic of understanding of the state forming. If for F. Engels the forming of the territorial relations lead to establishing of public authority (other, not patrimonial, acknowledged by public, people and consequently authority), now, the significance of the forming of territorial relations is reduced quite often only to separation of the people on territorial subdivisions (i.e. to forming the base for realisation of functions of middle level of a state machinery). [back](#)

14 Y.V. Lyubimov Op.cit. p. 144. Here it is extremely important, on my mind, to overcome, also, absolutisation of the methodology of separation and opposition (which is only one from the means of scientific research) to the detriment of understanding that the subject of the analysis (society and form of its organisation - state) in each of the moments of the existence, simultaneously remains as the uniform system. [back](#)

15 This problem is represented to me extremely important and, unconditionally, requires the special research. The administrative-territorial division of the states is hardly reasonable to consider now extremely as the imposed from above separation of territory, disregarding of borders of organisations and collectives, living on such territories, their features, interests and so on. The history gives us the extremely restricted quantity of examples, when the forming of new territories and their borders negates precedent separation of the population (as, for example, departments in France) and each of such cases in a general context of historical development, by more detailed research does not look so one-valued. More often, as it is represented for me, the forming of new territorial subdivisions of the state means potentially less conflict path - association of existing territorial organisations within the new, larger, as sub-subdivisions. The borders of such new territory are formed with allowance for the borders of small-sized territorial organisations included, and the interests of new collective, very gradually, are formed with the co-ordination of interests of the collectives existing in such territory. [back](#)

16 See: Samozvanzev A.M. The Socio-legal organisation of Indian society in the last half of I millennium BC - first half of I mill. AD In the: The State in a history of society. To a problem of criteria of a statehood. Moscow, 1998, p. 250-281. [back](#)

17 Many historical examples of other solutions of this problem, for example assassination of the adult members of defeated tribe both including of children and women in structure of winner tribe etc. are known. [back](#)

18 It is necessary to mark, that such variant could be accepted for a rather high stage of public development, and also that this variant, unconditionally, was retrieved during social evolution. The detailed consideration of the given problem falls outside the limits of our research. [back](#)

19 Y.V. Lyubimov Op.cit. p. 146. [back](#)

20 And, speaking about appearance of the opposition, we is not lead them extremely to the forms economic (irregularity in access to means of production) or socio-political (irregularity in access to an authority) opposition. [back](#)

21 Without consideration it, the researcher, gets in "a trap of the theory of the sovereignty" (as it names by V.Ostrom) which proceeds extremely from mono-centric conception of the authority and administration. As an example it is possible to give the thesis of H. Claesen and P. Skalnik about an extreme scarcity of examples, when the local heads, the leaders or other administrators

of pre-state society accepted supra-local administrative functions generated by ruling hierarchy (it intended the collection of taxes). Next thesis look like as confuted the former - actually it is impossible to create effective central administration without 'new' groups of the people free from the responsibilities concerning to their own rural community and completely loyal to central authority. But this thesis in turn confuted by the next, when the authors spoken that mostly the members of ruling strata, i.e. representatives of a class of local rulers, in essence, just the local leaders involved in the apparatus of the early state (H. Claesen, P. Skalnik *The Early State*. Hague. 1978, p.599). [back](#)

22 Uniform textual (and epigraphical, as a part of common) tradition, as it is represented for me, played a huge role in public life in an antiquity and middle ages, being by a major consolidating basis for an Indian civilisation, source of moral, law and so on, not only as reflection of the tendency to integration, but also as its means. We marked its effect at the analysis of a epigraphy, when one term could designated the representatives of the whole stratum of public hierarchy. (See, for example, use of the term "samanta", neighbour, "mahamatra" in Ashokan edicts, "kumaramatya" in inscriptions of the Gupta time, compare Russian and Sanskrit terms, similar to on an abstractness, - dignitary, major, "important" people. As it is represented for me, in sphere of the taxation we have a lot of such generalised terms, as "kara", "shadbhaga", any others. Essentially it is important that epigraphical, as well as other forms of text tradition, can use a general meaning of term and even the whole blocks of the same terms - formula, meaning, sometimes, rather various contents, phenomenon and people. [back](#)

23 Rather full complex of Sanskrit inscriptions from Nepal is issued triply, twice on nepali, and once in English - D.R. Regmi, *Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal*, 3 vols. New-Delhi, 1983-85; D.V. Vajracharya, *Licchavi Kāl Ka Abhilekha* (in Nepali), Kathmandu, 2003 Vir Era; H. R. Joshi, *Nepāl Ko Prāchīn Abhilekha*, (in Nepali), Kathmandu, 2003 Vir Era. See, also, A. Bhattacharya, *Nepalese Inscriptions in pre-Nevari eras: An annotated bibliography*, Calcutta, 1994. Are present, also, earlier and less complete publications: R. Gnoli, *Nepalese Inscriptions in Gupta Characters*, Roma, 1956; Bhagavanlal Indraji, *Twenty-three Inscriptions from Nepal*. Bombay, 1885; S. Lévi — "Anciennes Inscriptions do Nepal", *J.A.*, 1907, Vol., IX, pp, 49-114. On the basis of the indicated publications, by us is performed and is published on a server of Oriental Institute ([www.orient.ru](http://www.orient.ru)) Databank of inscriptions of a Licchavi's period, taking into account all variant readings. [back](#)

24 All inscriptions, known for us, (except for two) are, how they themselves named "śilāpaṭṭakaśāsanam" (stone-charters). Here is used phraseology, terms, formulas and, even, verses - characteristic for many others Indian "grants", issued on copper-plates. And, though the practice of using of copper plates for "grants" publication was known in Nepal (see, for example, 119.27), the tradition of cutting the texts on a stone was for Licchavi's time, probably, basic. [back](#)

25 Already to the end of a Licchavi's period, the kings rather legibly associate of their possession just with territory of Nepal. [back](#)

26 In the interpretation of this term, naturally, authors of the publications and translations of Nepal inscriptions follow to Indian tradition. See about our understanding of this term, important for the analysis of a socio-political structure of Indian society, in "Arthashastra" and Gupta epigraphy - Lielukhine D. N. The concept of the theoretical state in Kautilya's "Arthashastra" and the problem of Ancient Indian State structure. - in: the "State in a history of society". M., 1998, p.115-121 etc. [back](#)

27 Village was given, "atisṛṣṭa". The use of this term instead of usual for grants derivants from a verb dā (to give), testifies that here estimate, most likely, the use of incomes from village. The similar formula can be met, for example, in inscriptions of Vakatakas. Even more often employee a term prasāda, the having particular shade (it is possible to translated it, as donation - gift, a victim) in Nepal inscriptions basic for designation of "grant". Most often met formula "those donations accomplished for you" (iti prasādo vaḥ kṛto), allows to judge that in the most of

the texts estimated the donation of the definite rights for village inhabitants or members of local organisations. [back](#)

28 The grant is addressed for Brahmans, "major" people together with their [council]? consisting from 18 members (brāhmaṇa-pradhānāḥ s-aṣṭādaśa prakṛtayas=teṣām). The similar formula we can see above, in a line 8, where is placed the king's notification about donation. At the reference to number of an inscription we use a serial number of an inscription in our database (up to 164 numbers he coincides with numbering in the A. Bhattacharya list), in brackets. And the reference to other publication, if needed (used reductions V = Dh. Vajracharya; Gn = Gnoli; Bh. - Bhattacharya) are given. [back](#)

29 [catu]rsv=adhikaraṇeṣu dharmasthā - - - - - 23.5-6(=V.25). Though further inscription is damaged, it is represented essential for the characteristic of these organisations the mention of the judges (dharmasthā) in "adhikaraṇas". 4 "adhikaraṇas" is, apparently, often meeting in further inscriptions Kūtherā-Śollā(Śulli) and Liṅgvala-Mapchoka, two of which are mentioned in this donation. [back](#)

30 . . . . .dhikaraṇena pīḍālpā karaṇīyā kūther . . . .karaṇamātraṁ tadubhayam . . . (25.1-2=V.27) [back](#)

31 In the text - (kuthaṁ) rādhikaraṇābhilekhyakaiś-ca pañcāparādha - - - - -(29.4-5), what it is possible to translate, as the prohibition for visitation to the territory of donation for scribes - representatives of "adhikaraṇa" Kūtherā (and, probably, Śulli). Such conclusion is possible to make both of the subsequent contents and from comparison with other grants. In this text is further spoken that king will not forgive the one who, infringing this instruction, will visit fixed [this donation] (imām-ājñām-utkrāmy-ābhilekhyam praveśayed, 29.8-9) also there should not, also be "reduction" for king's treasury, for what to both "adhikaraṇas" (here is already directly spoken about śollādhikaraṇa and kūtherādhikaraṇa) two plots of ground are given (as though in an exchange, for reimbursement of losses - because the prohibition for "visitation", most likely, were reduced the tax and fines collection). The "prohibition for visitation" of grant territory by the representatives of various " adhikaraṇas " - common feature of many subsequent Licchavi's grants. [back](#)

32 The phrase can be interpreted, as the indication, that the taxes paid in treasury just by "adhikaraṇas", collecting them from the village inhabitants. As it looks, the income from the granted land should indemnify their losses from the prohibition of visitation the village (which purpose, most likely, was a tax collecting). [back](#)

33 Just in an exchange, because the information about donation of land is given only at the end of an inscription, supplementing the grant (sve sve grāme dhikaraṇayor=ubhayoḥ kṣettraṁ dattam, 29.12, the fields in village as the property for both " adhikaraṇas ") are given. This information, also, is extremely interesting, though its various expounding are possible [back](#)

34 Kūtheravṛttyadhikṛtānām, the heads of Kūther (adhikaraṇa), 53.7. [back](#)

35 laśuna-palāṇḍu-kar-ābhyām ca pratimuktaḥ (53.9) - in other grants it is not been found. [back](#)

36 lekhyadānapañcāparādhādyartthan tvapraveśa (56.10-11). [back](#)

37 etad-vastu tailaṁ-kasyacid deyaṁ, here "vastu" used as tax-designation. [back](#)

38 iha - adhikaraṇavivaṁjitāni, 75.18-19 [back](#)

39 The similar notification, probably, is contained in the hardly damaged text of the Dhruvadeva's charter, 98.6 (= V.106). [back](#)

40 rājābhīr-antarāsanena, 80.17-18. So, the management of granted property (definite taxes collection) is reduced to a vertical - king - representative of king in village - village, passing " adhikaraṇa ". [back](#)

41 liṅgvalaṣaṇḍh-aśvika-vāhik-āgantrī-balivardānām-apraveśena, 79.7. [back](#)

42 bhaṭṭa-māpcok-ādhikārayoḥ prā[ba]lyād-avaśyaṁ 117. 10. There is no final certitude, that new pair of " adhikaraṇas " is identical with mentioned earlier (though it seems to be most probable). First - it is obvious later, has Sanskrit title, second - is obvious local, more early. [back](#)

43 nepāla-sīmāntaḥ pātinaḥ sarvā-dhikār-ādhikṛtān. From this time, appearance of the similar

formulas of the notification are more often. In the charter from 121 year (134 = V.140) is spoken about the heads of all *adhikaraṇas* functioned within the borders of Nepal (*nepālāntarvarttinaḥ sarvādhikaraṇānām* 134.3), in the Śivadeva II grant - about "all king's people" ruled, accordingly, in their "*adhikaraṇas*" in "bhūkti" Nepal, *nepālabhūktau yathāsvam-adhikārānadhitiṣṭhataḥ sarvarājapuruṣāṃs tadvṛttibhujāḥ* (136.4). Similar is, probably, the contents of the damaged charter 144 (= V.150), which date was not saved (stk. 3.. *nepālamaṇḍal-āntar-nivāsino yathāsvam=adhakaraṇa . . .*). [back](#)

44 *sarvādhikaraṇānām apraveśenā* - 121.9 [back](#)

45 The charter even names itself *vyavasthā*, "establishment" (107.21). [back](#)

46 Compare 107.18-19. [back](#)

47 The text of this charter, as well as contents of the responsibilities and rights of "door-keeper" (*dauvārika*) require special examination. [back](#)

48 See, Lielukhine D.N. The concept of state in Kautiliya's "Arthashastra" and the problem of structure of Ancient Indian State. - in: The State in a history of society. M., 1998, c.115-121 etc. [back](#)

49 The inscriptions of Gupta times used the term "*adhikaraṇa*" in similar meaning - here are mentioned a lot of such organisations - *viṣay-ādhikaraṇa* ("regional committee"), *adhiṣṭhān-adhikaraṇa* ("central regional committee"), *aṣṭakul-adhikaraṇa* ("eight-families committee"). (See Lielukhine D.N., Op.cit. p. 121 etc.) [back](#)

50 The special examination with usage more broad audience of other Nepal sources here is required. Here we can only assume, being based on semantics of the terms, that, for example, "*adhikaraṇa*" *Māpoka* was linked somehow to the markets, trade (*Māp* - measurement, sizes, the system of measures in Nepali, Assamese, Gujrati, Bengali, *māpaka* - " the employee by a measure " in Sanskrit, *cok* - in Nepali - " courtyard, market-place "), "*adhikaraṇa*" *Śully* - could be linked to criminal offences (*śul*, *śuli* - in Nepali, *sūl*, *sūlī* - in Kumaoni, *sulā*, *suli* - in Assamese, *śūla* in Sanskrit - rod for punishment of the criminals, staff, pain, travail). [back](#)

51 In one cases separate "*adhikaraṇas*" were authorised to access in granted village only for collection of definite taxes, in other - was prohibited, even in cases of committing "of five great sins" etc. See higher. [back](#)

52 It is possible even to repute the change of the titles of traditional "*adhikaraṇas*". Though it is impossible to exclude and possibility of forming new "inter-rural committees" under effect of the king's authority, where entered (as well as, for example, in "*adhiṣṭhān-adhikaraṇa*" mentioned in Damodarpur copper-plates from the Gupta times, representatives of king, king's "servants". Their Sanskrit titles, besides is possible to estimate and as result of process sanscritisation of a Kathmandu valley. [back](#)

53 In mentioned above charter from 435 year is spoken about "judges" (*dharmasthā*) in such organisations, which were informed in the charter about the grant. [back](#)

54 To this formula the term *lekhyadāna*, " (for accomplishment) written donations " is added in any charters. [back](#)

55 *Tri-kara-mātra-sādhana*. [back](#)

56 Once - in the charter of Vasantadeva and twice - in the charter of Śivadeva I. [back](#)

57 See, in detail, Lielukhine D.N. The concept of state in Kautiliya's "Arthashastra" and the problem of structure of Ancient Indian State. - in: The State in a history of society. M. 1998. [back](#)