

## **Hoard of the copper-plate grants from Bagh.**

Complex grants of kings Valkha<sup>1</sup>, after discovery the Bagh hoard consists from 32 copper plates, kept up to our time in a satisfactory condition (only one broken). Each grant contains a mention of king and date (year, month, fortnight and day), which, most likely, corresponds with “Gupta era”<sup>2</sup>. Now, are known for us 15 copper-plate grants of king 𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺<sup>3</sup>, 𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺<sup>4</sup>, 𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺<sup>5</sup>, 𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺<sup>6</sup> and one of 𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺<sup>7</sup>. All of them consist of 8-11 lines, have similar structure, using the similar formulations, terminology<sup>8</sup>. Uncommonness of a Bagh grants complex, partly, is, that the large part of the copper-plates(27) was found in one place, in one container. All of them have not the hole for ring<sup>9</sup>, seals. And each grant has a vertical stroke with a name of king and his title in Genitive. The last, in our opinion, is not connected with the contents of the grants (such mention simply superfluous, because all of them are made out on behalf of this king). Probably, we deal with the rest of small archive (𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺<sup>10</sup>, in which the copies of given grants were stored. Preservation of copies of the copper-plate grants allowed to reproduce them in a case of loss or fake. So, in the conclusion of the 𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺 grant from the earliest date we can see the unusual addition: “In 3 day of a dark fortnight of A<sup>TM</sup>𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺 year 47 at the request of the V<sup>TM</sup>𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺 𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺 was recounted and put down on the copper plate under the personal (king`s) order” (8.9-10). In other his grant we have addition: “Having heard of the counterfeit grant (𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺<sup>TM</sup>𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺) deed, under the personal order of king (it) was written down as the copper plate” (14.9). These additions, promote, also, explanation of rather late occurrence of wide practice of grants registration on the copper tables - it is obvious, that they were fixed at first on other, probably, more fragile material.

Already in the copper-plate grants of the first Bagh king, 𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺

known for us (with him the most of them, 15, is connected) we can assert, that they used the formed structure of the sanskrit text, fixing the grant. And, it is characteristic for Bagh copper-plates minimum amount of mistakes, in comparison with other copper-plate grants of that time (fact showing about a level of sanskritization). The degree of unification of texts just testifies to existence already to IV A.D., during the reign of first Bagh king, long practice of registration of the grants. And it cannot be explained only by influence by northern, Gupta tradition. The differences of the the Bagh copper-plate grants texts from grants of Guptas, Vakatakas, Parivrajakas and other are obvious. Except king`s panegyric and genealogical part, we don`t find here the final verses, glorifying grant, donator and indicating the penalties, which will comprehend appropriating (giving) the grant.

The text of grants practically always begins with the reference of king, where it is spoken, that king [11](#), meditated at the feet of the Supreme Lord (“[DUfUa UAU-™FUU](#)”), notifies [12](#) for all “servants” ([gUH™b](#)  
[™hi\\_H™b](#)) - “Let it will be known to you - we show an arrangement”. Separate distinctions in the second part of this reference are the most remarkable, connected with addition (or interpretation) usual expression - notifies all “servants” [13](#). In the copper-plate grants 13.2 and 7.2 text is adressed to “the servants and their “subordinated” [14](#), and “the best servants” [15](#), that speaks about presence hierarhization among these persons. In the grants 29.3; 31.2 the reference to king is directed to “all his servants and rural inhabitants, gathered in village”.- [16](#) And, at last, the grant 2.1-2 is unexpectedly supplemented: “notifies all his servants - guards, associates, executors, owners, [VUUVWUf](#) [17](#)and others” [18](#). By a similar type supplemented the reference in 32.2-3 [19](#).

Comparison of the notification formulas with all its additions with the formulas, present in the texts after expositions the contents of donee, within the framework of which it is offered to the determined persons recognize the fact of grant and to not repair obstacles to their addressees (usually in grants on this place in final verses we see glorification the grant, donator and indication the penalties, which will

comprehend appropriator the grant) are brought, allows to make a conclusion, that both parts of the texts are inverted to the same persons.

The term “ $\text{TMU}^3\text{LU}$ ” is present at a prohibitive part in 14 grants (in 11.9 it mentioned with a title “dutaka”), “ $\text{VUUWUUF}$ ” (that is similar to  $\text{W}^{\text{TM}}\text{U}$  and  $\text{VUU}$ ) - in 15 grants, “ $\text{dY}^3\text{U}^3\text{LU}$ ” - in 15 grants, and prohibitive part of the  $\text{6}\text{i i}^{\text{C}}\text{YU}$  grant from 54 formulated: “thus it should be recognized by all (our) servants ( $\text{TMi}_i\text{HU}$ )” (7.7-8). With these and other persons, at a prohibitive part there are the designations of “(king`s) relatives” ( $\text{HU}_i\text{`bU}$  in 14 grants and  $\text{HU}_i\text{`nb}$  in six other). And all these persons in the majority of cases (in 25 grants) are called “the members of group (or party) supporters [of king]” ( $\text{dU}^3\text{U cf}^{\text{dU}^3}\text{nb}$ ).

The specified distinctions in the formulation of the reference and prohibitive part hardly are possible to consider as errors. They are, as represented, built integrally in the text of grant, result of the author desire to interpret the certain common terms, to designate a circle of persons, to which grant is inverted.

The special composition of the content in the majority from Bagh grants is incorporated by expression from the formula of the notification: “we are rendered arrangement”, in the most of cases replacing the usual indication of the act of donation. Construction of the first phrase based on a mention of the addressee (always in Gen.) and subject of grant. Only in nine cases (<sup>1</sup> 1, 2, 3, 29-32) construction habitual for other grants. The transition to phraseology known for us from other grants has by a consequence the appearance of other expressions, usual for grants. So only in the copper-plate grants <sup>1</sup> 2, 30 and 32 purposes of grants is announced (similarly with set of other grants, for example, Parivrajakas) the achievement of a moral merit (“ $\text{di}^{\text{C}}\text{nb}$ ”) <sup>20</sup> by king, in 14.5-6 - we see the expression well known under the Vakatakas grants “... with libation of water we give” <sup>21</sup>.

The information on an object of grant, following practically always for an exposition of information about his addressee, also has a number of important additions - here mentioned the former owner, guarantor and



person, under the request of which is accomplished the grant. In the charter <sup>16</sup> is spoken about the grant of village to a temple 6UdUj<sup>TM</sup>WUXjU at the request of 6\c1<sup>TM</sup>WU-U 6Uxi<sup>TM</sup> constructing this temple, who was owner of this village<sup>22</sup>. In the charter <sup>12</sup> - we see the grant of other village by owner, 6\c1<sup>TM</sup>WU-U 6Uxi<sup>TM</sup>“under the request of his messenger Jaya“. In three other cases mentioned the grants to one brahman (<sup>15</sup>), and group of brahmans, living in Valkh (<sup>11</sup>, 32) which are given under the request of F<sup>TM</sup>a U 5<sup>TM</sup> 3<sup>TM</sup>Y\U@UxZ Ux Àfmh<sup>TM</sup>WU-U<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>

In two cases (<sup>15.3</sup>, <sup>6.3</sup>) the inscriptions indicated, as the former owner - noble ruler 6Uxi<sup>TM</sup>, who had the titles 6\c1<sup>TM</sup>Ux 6\U-U fM\UfA, in <sup>19.3-4</sup> probably, mentioned the owners of agrahara (or village M\oeif<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>U), and village @c\U<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup> from which, according to the text, fields transmitted as brahmadeya were withdrawn. In other grant mentioned the field, before used, as brahmadeya, transferred to 6UdUj<sup>TM</sup>WUXjU temple (<sup>13.4-5</sup>). Remarkable, also, certificate by king on transfer of a field as brahmadeya, owned by private persons (6\@hU<sup>TM</sup>U!Àfmh<sup>TM</sup>gU<sup>TM</sup>m<sup>TM</sup>, <sup>126.4</sup>). And, at last, it is necessary to specially note, often included in the information on an object of grants the names of “guarantors”<sup>23</sup>.

Are mentioned as a condition of grant the expressions usually interpreted, as “immunity`s formulas” - “where should not enter W<sup>TM</sup>U Ux WU<sup>TM</sup>”<sup>24</sup>, “without (duty to hand over) a part of production”<sup>25</sup>, “with the right of the tax i XU [U“<sup>26</sup>. The first formula is usually interpreted, as the interdiction to the officers (it is possible, executing policemen`s functions) to enter on territory of granted village, second and third - as the forms of fiscal immunity (bhaga - share of production, frequently - tax). And in Bagh copper-plate grants this formulas have not that meaning, which the latter is given by the researchers at the analysis of structure and contents of the more later copper-plate grants. First of all, they are present only at 9 copper-plate grants, and there is no occasion to consider, that the presence of immunities is supposed in other 23. They have not a precise place in a structure of grant. Only twice the first two formulas meet together -

once at the end of the basic contents, after the verses, spoken about the “eternity” of grant, in other case - before this verses, in the first part of the contents. In four cases, when only one formula  $UW^{TM}UV\UU$   $d^{TM}Ynba$  presented, it places - three times at the end of a phrase, after an information about donor, grant, and its purposes, and once - after the geographical orientation of grant. Similarly places the formula  $U\^{TM}Ua$ , but in one case, changed<sup>27</sup>. It is presented between two parts of the formula “for ever, while exist the sun the moon and stars “.

Bagh copper-plate grants is important source for the investigation of socio-political structure of a society in the part of West India in the first half of I mill. A.D.<sup>28</sup> Inscriptions have not information about inclusion of this territory in Gupta empire, using only characteristic expression ( $DUfa\ U\U-U^{TM}U\Ud^{TM}X^{TM}i\ X^{TM}mhc$ ), that regard as the proof of dependence from Guptas, called frequently in inscriptions by this title. These certificates, taking into account a geographical arrangement of area where kings Valkha ruled (regions of north.Handesh-Dhar-Alirajpur, in basin of Narmada), through which pass the most convenient ways from Gang valley to Kathiavar and Gujarat, won by Chandragupta II, convince, that Guptas were obliged to include these territories in a zone of their influence and to subordinate these rulers. Valkha, most likely, as well as the areas, where ruled Parivrajakas, Uccakalpas, kings Olikara from Mandasor, kings, mentioned in Udayagiri inscription of Chandragupta II - represented as continuous front of the dependent states, included in Gupta empire, disposed on southern border of the latter.

Often for analysis of territorial structure of states (interpreted, as administrative-territorial) used those parts of the copper-plate grants, where the information on geographical orientation is given. The analysis of a terminology in Bagh grants allows to make a conclusion about absence in this area special administrative divisions. In a number of cases we have purely geographical orientation<sup>29</sup>, in one case - the direct indication of possession ( $6UdU6\U-U\!Wi\_h$  11.4)<sup>30</sup>, in 4 - indication of agrahara<sup>31</sup> and in one - rather transparent use popular term “ $B\Ufa\ a\ U\^{TM}U\Ud^{TM}Uj\ j^{TM}Uy$ ” (13.3)<sup>32</sup>. The terms most frequently

mentioned in the texts –  $f^{TM} \text{fU fUyUž}$  [ $UfH^{TM} 33$ ] and  $dUuU 34$  also difficultly to interpret, as administrative. In a number of cases they are mixed up in one phrase or word  $35$ . As well as some names of villages-  $36$ , such territorial designations are possible, sometimes, simultaneously to translate literally.  $37$

Bagh grants, also, allow to give the judgements about socio-political structure of a society in this time in Narmada valley. The persons called by a title  $\text{VU-U}$  or  $\text{VU}$  were, faster, representatives of the powerful nobility stratum. In the several grants we meet a mention of  $6 \setminus c \uparrow^{TM} \text{VU-U} 6 \text{UXi}^{TM}$ . In charters fixed three from this grants, 1 village, 2 village and half of village, the former owner of which he was himself  $38$  to the temple of a god  $6 \text{UduU}^{TM} \text{WUXj U}$  constructed by him in Valkha, in the capital. In one case (6.3-4) is spoken, that grant was carried out under his request, in other - at the request of his messenger Jaya (12.3-4). Part of nobility, probably, was on a service at king's court. As "dutakas" four times a name  $6 \setminus U \text{!È} \text{ j UfUXHU}$  (25.6; 26.8; 27.8; 28.8) is fixed, one time -  $6 \setminus U \text{!} \text{ F i XUX}^{TM} \text{gU}$  (22.9) and  $B \text{Ubu} \text{VU}$  (21.8).

As shows comparison of the formulas of the notification with transfers of the persons, which king calls to admit the fact of granting and to not interfere with its addressees, both these parts are inverted to the same persons (see above). Here, the whole number of the terms, earlier usually interpreted, as "administrative", as designations of the officers are listed. King, however, hardly addressed with such request to his officers, as they are obliged to follow his copper-plate grants on a duty of a service. All these persons, obviously, called by term  $^{TM} \text{in}_H \text{U}$  (servant, see, for example, 2.1-2; 32.2-3 and 1.7-8; 2.6-7; 7.7), provided that among them is "main" ( $d \text{fUX}^{TM} \text{!}^{TM} \text{in}_H \text{U}^{TM} 7.2$ ) and occupying a lower status (the text 13.2 is addressed to " $^{TM} \text{in}_H \text{U} \text{ j } \text{!} \text{in}_H \text{U}^{TM} \text{!}$ ", servants and their subordinated). As "servants" in the copper-plate grants are understood " $\text{XUj}^{TM} \text{fLU}$ " ("door-keeper"),  $^{TM} \text{U}^3 \text{LU}$  ("security guard"),  $d \text{fYU} \text{LU}$  ("the sender of messengers"  $39$ ),  $\text{VU} \text{WU} \text{WU} \text{f}$  (literally - "soldier" and "the carrier of a umbrella"  $40$ ),



Ua<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>b</sup> (“associate”), <sup>Á</sup>mb<sup>U</sup>f<sup>U</sup> (“executor”), <sup>V</sup>c<sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup> (“owner”), <sup>TM</sup>be!<sup>TM</sup> j<sup>b</sup>f<sup>U</sup> [ <sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup> (“letting out the orders”), <sup>d</sup>f<sup>g</sup><sup>X</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>f</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>o</sup><sup>h</sup><sup>TM</sup><sup>X</sup> (“valet, scribe<sup>41</sup> and other). At the same time, by the term “<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup>”, as we can see by a context 2.6-7 are called “temple servants”, in wide meaning - not connected with king<sup>42</sup> (and they did not mix up with usual temple servants<sup>43</sup>). Copper-plate grants often called, as the labourers - “pashupatas“<sup>44</sup> and “ bringing gifts to a god“ (<sup>X</sup><sup>j</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>d</sup><sup>f</sup><sup>g</sup><sup>X</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>TM</sup>), sometimes “ genuine aryas“<sup>45</sup>, teachers<sup>46</sup>, worshippers of god<sup>47</sup>. In 12.7-8 “pashupatas, teachers and the worshippers of god“ are called “connected with this temple”<sup>48</sup>. Persons, called <sup>V</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup> <sup>W</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup> (literally, “worshippers of god”), as the additions in 5.8; 6.8<sup>49</sup> testify, occupied in the temple economy the special place. And, at last, once are mentioned “temple person in charge“<sup>50</sup>.

In general representations of the authors of the copper-plate grants about the structure of a society, terminology of Bagh’s grants, are extremely important a line of parallels (including at a conceptual level) with <sup>Ê</sup><sup>À</sup><sup>51</sup>. In both sources we meet the wide interpretation of “servant” concept (where included nobility, dependent kings, temple managers etc.), general designation of such persons, as “paksha” (party of the king’s supporters), that meets in inscriptions for the first time. Will not be exaggeration, if we shall make a assumption, that in <sup>Ê</sup><sup>À</sup> and Bagh copper-plate grants we deal with concepts similar on meanings, important for understanding of the structure of a society of that time. These concepts, most likely, in representations of the authors of Bagh grants, as well as in <sup>Ê</sup><sup>À</sup> based on the understanding of mutual relations of kings and nobility, rulers of different areas, territorial and other organizations. In <sup>Ê</sup><sup>À</sup> unity of an empire - consequence of policy of king. It directly depends on presence and size of such “party”, from ability of king to ensure loyalty of its members. The reliability of such approach proves to be true by the Bagh’s copper-plate grants. King specifies in each grant the connection with “supreme ruler“ (“<sup>D</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>f</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>TM</sup><sup>U</sup><sup>U</sup>”) – idea of each grant as though arises during reflections, when the king inclined before “supreme ruler”. The copper-

plate grants contain, therefore, first of all, reference to “party” of king-[52](#). In turn, copper-plate grants, in essence, fixing donations of villages from Bandhula to a temple of Bappapishacha (5,6,12) “before used” [53](#) (most likely, by Bandhula), “belonging to him” [54](#). So, there are characteristic, that Bandhula, the village owner, addresses to king with the request (once through messenger), to present his (i.e. Bandhula) possession to the temple constructed by him, Bandhula in capital, in Valkh. Essence of such relations is not reduced to the legal party (Bandhula the owner and grantor), to ritual (the participation of king in grant does not bear him “of a spiritual merit“). The king acts, formally, only as supreme ruler (emphasizing in first to a line, that the idea of grant proceeds from an even more high level, from “Duḥa WU-TU-U”). Sanctioning of Bandhula action, calling “servants” (which in a society, probably, occupied similar status [55](#)) to admit these grants, king acts, in the manner of policies, recommendations and concepts, reflected in “Arthashastra”, receiving in exchange of the loyalty from powerful “bhojika”, other persons, belonging to his “paksha” and total of a hierarchically organized society. Probably, the similar situation is meant and in some other copper-plate grants (No13 [56](#), 14 [57](#), 19 [58](#), 26 [59](#)), where the former owner is underlined only.

Rather characteristic it seems a list of the persons, included in “a party of the king supporters“ – most of the terms mentioned here it is possible to consider only as the titles. “Security guarder“, “associate (of the king?), “executor“, “owner” could be considered as the local ruler or the head of organization of any level, included the klan or village. “Door-keeper“, “Letting out the orders“, valet and scribe“, hardly were the simple servants, as well as “pratihara“, as is sometimes called “dutakas“, king’s messengers, from words of which, probably, was fixed the grants [60](#). Simultaneously (that not seems strange) as “owner” are called mentioned above the ruler Bandhula and “gurantor” Bhuta (2.4).

Extremely important the addition in 14.9-10 looks, where is marked, that the letter was carried out on copper “under the request of



brahmana's parishad". It is impossible to specify this concept for the reason of absence of other certificates. It is doubtful, that this parishad should be the king's council (so it is strange the lack of information about this body in inscriptions). It was, possibly, the "assembly" or other sort a body from brahman's community (later, in two cases we have the term close on character  $\text{g}\bar{\text{a}}\text{Ṛ}\text{Ṛ}$ ). It is impossible to exclude, that this "assembly", as well as request to king - it is necessary to connect with eight brahmanas, receiving the grant, because this is the sole from Bagh copper-plate grants, where is fixed the grant to eight brahmanas. But, in any case, this reference testifies to existence of general principles, which king was guided by in mutual relations with rulers of different levels, nobility, heads of different organizations of any level (including communal type [61](#)), and probably, even with the private persons.

The analysis of the Bagh copper-plate grants allows us, in summary, to state a number of reasons about the epigraphical texts and to designate the prospect of work with one of major parts of the indian epigraphical texts – with copper-plate grants. It seems obvious, that the grant's texts is made out in frameworks of evolution of epigraphical textual tradition, cooperating with other (epic, shastric etc. traditions), with use of traditional phraseology and terminology. Not casually, therefore, separate steady expressions, terms, it is possible to meet in epigraphy from the ancient time up to the late mediaeval times. So, for example, one of the formulas in Bagh copper-plate grants ("while shines the moon and sun") meets yet in inscriptions of Ashoka (VII Kol. edikt, stk.21). Therefore, the interpretation of the contents of the copper-plate grants should be based in an equal degree, on the analysis of a context of each specific text, as well as on traditional meaning of the term or phrase. Similarly, probably, it is necessary to approach to interpretation of grants as a whole, including their pithy part. Gift, grant - the extremely important tool of the public relations cannot be understanding outside of cultural context of a particular civilization and the socio-economic its aspect is not far from always basic, determining. So for example, the basic sense of Bagh copper-plate grants, from our point of view, is reduced to the procedure, to

addressing<sup>62</sup> to all of a hierarchically organized society do not interfere the grant. , within the framework of which King acts as a traditional figure (“defencer”, “mister”), and as of politic, following the quite sensible concept, known for us from ÊÀ, definitely, reflecting specificity of an indian society, as in Ancient times as in early Medieval times. For the economic aspect of grant, the authors of the copper-plate grants give much less attention - traditional design of transfer of privileges (“pariharas”) or immunities meets only in 9 copper-plate grants and, strongly truncated<sup>63</sup>, in many copper-plate grants there is no mention of the act of granting. Poorly borrowed by the authors of the copper-plate grants even result of grants for kings, “religious its aspect“, more often in the copper-plate grants determined as “increase of a moral merit“ of the king and his relatives. The similarity of the copper-plate grants is represented for us of the extremely important and requiring detailed research. The copper-plate grants occur approximately in one time (III-V îî.í.ý.) in different regions of the country, up to that time never knowing real political unities. Already earliest (Pallava, Vakataka, Valkha kings and other) are largely unified - are similar on structure, phraseology, terminology. Simultaneously, the obvious basic similarity of the copper-plate grants is supplemented separate regional (or dynastic) distinctions, including essential. Therefore we have result of determined development of the powerful textual tradition, of which it is necessary to research<sup>64</sup>. Thus a unilateral estimation of the last group of grants, as made purely “on religious motives“ is hardly fair, recognizing that the majority of the early texts – the grants to brahmanas and temples. So, for example, in Bagh copper-plate grants even the grant to a temple, incomes from which it is supposed to use on purchase of garlands etc. for the performance of ceremonies, rather pragmatical, about a spiritual merit for the grantor, in the majority of cases there is out of the question.

---

1 In 1982, in one copper container, in a field, 1 km from Bagh, near a temple Bagheùvarè were found out 27 grants, dated by 47-134 years.

Publ. - A copper-plate hoard of the Gupta period from Bagh, Madhya Pradesh. Ed. by K.V. Ramesh and S.P. Tewari. New Delhi, 1990 (further CPHGP). Further we shall call it Bagh grants. [back](#)

2 Only V.V. Mirashi (CII, v.IV, pt.1, p.XXXI-XXXV) correlated dating of five inscriptions, known in his time with “Kalachuri-Chedi era”. The most indologists correlated their dating with “Gupta era”, considered these kings as Gupta vassals, rested first of all, on characteristic phrase (Dufā U\U<sup>TM</sup>-fU<sup>TM</sup>Ud<sup>TM</sup> X<sup>TM</sup> bi XXm<sup>TM</sup>U” meditated at the feet of the Supreme Lord”, Dufā U\U<sup>TM</sup>-fU<sup>TM</sup>U- famous Gupta title. [back](#)

3 Dated by years: 47 (further <sup>11</sup>); 50, 7U<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>U(12); 50, D\<sup>TM</sup>[i bU(13); 51 (14); 54 J U<sup>TM</sup>\U 3 day (15); 54 J U<sup>TM</sup>\U 4 day (16); 54 A<sup>TM</sup>\U(17); 55 > m<sup>TM</sup>\U and 56 (18); 55 U<sup>TM</sup>f<sup>TM</sup>J<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>U(19); 56 À j<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>U(110); 57 7U<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>U(111); 57 D\<sup>TM</sup>[i bU(112); 59 (113); 38 (47 A<sup>TM</sup>\U(114); 57 D\<sup>TM</sup>[i bU 12 day (115). All references are given according to CPHGP and consist from <sup>11</sup> and line. [back](#)

4 Dated by years: 63, ?<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>U 1 day (116); 63, ?<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>U 8 day (117); 65, J U<sup>TM</sup>\U(118); 65, 6\<sup>TM</sup>X<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>U(119); 66 (120); 67 (121). [back](#)

5 Dated by years: 68, > m<sup>TM</sup>\U(122); 68 À<sup>3TM</sup>Y<sup>TM</sup>\U(123); 69, 7U<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>U(124); 69, À j<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>U(125); 70 (126); 67, 7U<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>U 10 day (127); 67, 7U<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>U 12 day (128). [back](#)

6 From 102 (129); 127 (130) and 129 (131) years. [back](#)

7 Year 134 (132). [back](#)

8 So it is possible to characterize, also, any other complexes of the copper-plate grants of Gupta time - Vakatakas and other. [back](#)

9 It is possible, also, explained by that each letter is put only on one plate. [back](#)

10 See, for example, mentioned in Samudragupta inscriptions “U<sup>TM</sup>i [f<sup>TM</sup>a<sup>TM</sup> \_U<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>” (SII, v.1, p.272, l.11, p.274, l.15) [back](#)

11 A name with a title a U<sup>TM</sup>f<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup> is usually brought. [back](#)

12 Only in the copper-plate grants 6\U<sup>TM</sup>-fU<sup>TM</sup>U and B<sup>TM</sup>f<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>U (four last from a complex) together with other changes, instead of a verb “g<sup>TM</sup>a<sup>TM</sup> bed<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>h<sup>TM</sup>” there is the term “\_i<sup>TM</sup>U<sup>TM</sup>” (favourable, virtuous). [back](#)



13 **gUhu<sup>TM</sup> b! ni<sup>TM</sup> hu<sup>TM</sup> b** Compare, for example, meeting in the majority of the Vakatakas copper-plate grants expression **nbhoga UhgUhu<sup>TM</sup> · gUj<sup>TM</sup> XXnb<sup>U3</sup> Ubma[ Ub]ni<sup>TM</sup> h<sup>TM</sup>**. [back](#)

14 **ni<sup>TM</sup> hu<sup>TM</sup> U · j ]b]ni<sup>TM</sup> hu<sup>TM</sup> b** [back](#)

15 **dfU<sup>TM</sup> X<sup>TM</sup> b! ni<sup>TM</sup> hu<sup>TM</sup> b** [back](#)

16 For example, **Gi gUUbfb<sup>TM</sup> fbUY ga idU<sup>TM</sup> Ufb' g<sup>TM</sup> b! ni<sup>TM</sup> hu<sup>TM</sup> b [f<sup>TM</sup> a U dfUj<sup>TM</sup> gbU 1OMQ(29.2-3)**. [back](#)

17 Lit.- carriers of a umbrella and mercenary warriors. Epigraphists often gave significant attention to interpretation of these two terms used already in the Satavahana`s grants in the immunitet`s formulation (see, for example, Sircar D.Ch. Indian Epigraphical Glossary, p.51, 67-68, 73). Usually they considered as policemen, proceeding from separate contexts (for example, interdiction to enter on the grant territory “except cases of catching thieftes and etc.“, EI, VIII, p.287).

[back](#)

18 “**Uga UhgUhu<sup>TM</sup> b! hu<sup>U3</sup> ]! a ni<sup>TM</sup> hu<sup>TM</sup> AmU fUUV\cU UV\UUVWUf! Xb! ni<sup>TM</sup> hu<sup>TM</sup> b**”. [back](#)

19 “**ga U<sup>TM</sup> ni<sup>TM</sup> hu<sup>TM</sup> cWfi' `1W fUUV\U dYU<sup>U3</sup> ]! Xb! ga cedunh]**”.

[back](#)

20 “**\_fla U<sup>U3</sup> TM Ya Udi ni<sup>TM</sup> dnrhb! ni<sup>TM</sup> hu<sup>TM</sup> · j ]g<sup>TM</sup> a U” QpQf&) L** [back](#)

21 “**i XU! hgUf [ Y<sup>U3</sup> TM bi<sup>TM</sup> ba U QpQ** [back](#)

22 Ê.V. Ramesh translates this fragment “we have presented... under the request **6\c<sup>U</sup> ]! V\U-U 6UbXi<sup>TM</sup>**”, to a god **6UddU ] WUXj U** built by him, **6\c<sup>U</sup> ]! V\U-U 6UbXi<sup>TM</sup>**. Obviously, the temple is constructed by the latter, therefore to consider a temple “as the former owner” impossible. [back](#)

23 Whole such references 11 (<sup>11</sup> 2.3, 4; 4.3-4; 7.4; 13.5; 15.4; 17.4; 18.4; 21.4). [back](#)

24 **UW<sup>TM</sup> UV\U Ud<sup>TM</sup> jYnba** - 1.7; 5.4; 6.5-6; 8.4; 9.5; 17.6; [back](#)

25 **U<sup>TM</sup> ]Ua** -1.7; 8.4; 15.5. Ê.V.Ramesh translates “provided that will not be divided (shared)”. [back](#)

26 **gcXU [ UVUa UXnb<sup>U</sup>** - 29.6 [back](#)

27  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  - 26.5 [back](#)

28 Uses of a complex of inscriptions of determined period (Maurya's epigraphy, epigraphy of the Gupta time) for statement of historical problems in indology - usual phenomenon. We quite have the right to allocate complexes of inscriptions, using them, as complex sources, outgoing from uniform (though in general) representations of a society and his organizations, certain, similar image reflecting a reality, well known for their authors and the readers. Correctness of such assumption, use the Bagh grants, as a complex source from some reasons (significant generality of the contents, general purposes of drawing up, dating etc.), from our point of view, does not cause doubt.

[back](#)

29 B Ufa a  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}\text{XU}^{\text{TM}}$  1.6; 11.4; 16.3; 22.3; 24.4; B Ufa a  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}\text{dU}^{\text{TM}}$  3.3; 14.4; B Ufa a  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}\text{dU}^{\text{TM}}$  17.4; 20.3; [back](#)

30 Thus, may be, indicated the possession of a  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  temple, popular in inscriptions.  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$ , probably, the title, similar to  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  ( $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  see, for example,  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  25.6; 26.8; 27.8; 28.7;  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  22.9;  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  7.3-4; B  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  21.8; [back](#)

31 In three cases it is, probably, the villages ( $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  6.4;  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  31.2;  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  19.3), in one -  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  8 (in agrahara of Arya, from Vatsya gotra, moving from Dhar", 14.2), possession. To this group, probably, it is possible to carry expression I  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$ , (place of a field) on the borders of grant I  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  [back](#)

32  $\text{U}^{\text{TM}}\text{U}^{\text{TM}}$  - is higher and below; close and on removal (distance). Most likely this term should be understood "in area of Narmada basin". Possibly, this is designation of the whole territory ruled by kings of Valkha. [back](#)

33 Lit.- "hole, cave, channel". [back](#)

34 Difficultly to agree with usual interpretation of this term (as "distrikt", "administrative division"), taking into account the general information about the level of development Ancient Indian state.

Probably, this is designation of association of communities, if we accepting the interpretation of this term by D.Ch. Sirkar - "group of villages". In a number of cases there is the indication of area with urban centre (for example, "[in area] on a way in ; <sup>TM</sup>X]bU fU" - 22.4 ; 31.2, "[in area] on a way in ? i 'Udi fU" - 22.3-4; "[in area] on a way in BUf] <sup>TM</sup>, 21.3; 22.3), included in larger association ("[area] included in BUf] <sup>TM</sup>fUU" 24.4-5; 25.3. [back](#)

35 For example, 8 <sup>TM</sup>gUUU (lit. - little village 8 UgUU is mentioned as "f <sup>TM</sup>fU" (14.4), as "dUHU" (28.3) and as village, on south-western border of which placed the granted field (27.3-4, see, also, 22.4) Alongside with the term BUf] <sup>TM</sup>fUU(20.3), meets reference to BUf] <sup>TM</sup>fU dUHU in 24.4-5; 25.3. The term [Uf] <sup>TM</sup> mentioned, as a component of the village name (J M dUQUf] <sup>TM</sup>[ fUa Ugh <sup>TM</sup>EXU , 5.4), name of the channel (8 ca d\Uf] <sup>TM</sup> · UdfU) on western bank of the channel 8 ca d\U 20.3-4), together with the term dUHU(I X a VfU [Uf] <sup>TM</sup>dUHU [in area] on a way to the channel Udumbara 17.4;32.4-5) [back](#)

36 See, for example, @c\U <sup>TM</sup>fUU] <sup>TM</sup>(the handicraftsmen`s on metal village) 18.4. [back](#)

37 See, for example, 8 U<sup>3</sup>]@UJ Ua LUUj <sup>TM</sup>UY, lit. - on a way, in valley of southern Valmika, 21.3-4. [back](#)

38 D@fjj UVi <sup>TM</sup>ba <sup>TM</sup>bUU (5.3-4; 6.3) obviously connected with Bandhula and not with temple, constructed by him. In the third grant (12.3-4) the village, obviously belonged to Bandhula (HghU yU gUU ). [back](#)

39 Sirkar D.Ch.Indian Epigraphical glossary. Delhi, 1966, p.264. [back](#)

40 It is usual to interpret them, as "policemens", since further exceptions (for example, XU! <sup>TM</sup>dU <sup>TM</sup>XU "10 offences") were sometimes listed, when they had the right to enter on the grant territory. See above. [back](#)

41 As translates the term by K.V. Ramesh, probably, proceeding from usual interpretation of the term \_fU@U [back](#)

42 aU <sup>TM</sup> a <sup>TM</sup> @ i QgUU! <sup>TM</sup> in HUUYjUfa a ]@U!WU - "temple



servants and servants of great mother”. [back](#)

43 8 Yj U\_faa ]C° 2.5-6; Xj U\_mbl \_f`U™ 3.5.; Xj U\_dlf]WfU\_U° 4.8; Xj U\_faa ]C° · 9.7; [back](#)

44 Compare D™i dUUXj U\_faa ]C° in 9.7/ D™i dU™ W™ fmb] W\UjUW!W]³-!™ Xhm· Xj U\_faa ]C° 1WUin 12.7-8 and gUHU!™ in hUUXj U\_faa ]C° in 2.6-7. See, also, 3.5-6 (Xj U\_mbl \_f³U™ 1\_ÀUhc· jUdUHU° · D™i dU™ Àfmb]7\c\_³™ · Xj U\_dfg XU™ 1WU), 5.6-7; 6.6-7(D™i dUUXj U\_dfg XU™ Xmb™ ); 10.7-8; 13.6-7. [back](#)

45 Àfmb]7\c\_³™ 3.6. [back](#)

46 ÀW™ fmb] [back](#)

47 6\UjUW!W]³-Ug(K.V. Ramesh translates "worshippers of a god Narayana"), but they are working on the ground, granted to god Bappapishaca together with pashupatas.. [back](#)

48 hX Xj U\_i !™ f]h™ " [back](#)

49 W\UjUW!W]³-U!UX\ÁU° Q V\UjUW!W]³-Y!UX]³-À]U° · Q Q [back](#)

50 Xj U\_faa™ h\_U [back](#)

51 See, in detail, Lielukhine D.N. State, administration and policy in Kautilya’s "Arthashastra" – Vestnik Drevney Istorii, 1993, No. 2. P.4-24. (in Russian) [back](#)

52 The “village inhabitants" mentioned in last copper-plate grants, obviously, nor simple farmers, too. [back](#)

53 d®fj j UVi nba™ BUU° [back](#)

54 hgm] Yj U gUHUU° [back](#)

55 Because they could "not admit" the fact of grant from the private person and to interfere with it. Therefore in the list of the servants we meet the term "bhojaka" (2.2). [back](#)

56 Here is spoken about a field "(used) before as brahmadeya" (d®fj j U VUa UXmb]³YfU° ). [back](#)

57 Granted village was in Àfmb]8 \U!cXXÁU!™ f™ Y™ [back](#)

58 Granted field was in M Uef]oe] f™ \ fU\_Y Vi nba™ BUU\_³YfU°

दुःखं a, moreover was given to a field before used (by village inhabitants?) - @c\U<sup>TM</sup> H<sup>TM</sup> U<sup>TM</sup> L<sup>TM</sup> mO l Qd<sup>B</sup> fj j U V i n h a<sup>TM</sup> b U a 1 Y U<sup>3</sup> Y f U<sup>3</sup> . [back](#)

59 Here is spoken, that the field is used by two other owners (6\@<sup>R</sup> h d<sup>TM</sup> U<sup>TM</sup> ! · À f m b X<sup>TM</sup> g U \ m<sup>TM</sup> · W i \_ h U<sup>TM</sup> · \_<sup>3</sup> Y f U<sup>3</sup> .) [back](#)

60 It completely precisely viewed in Bagh copper-plate grants - or the text is spoken "from (own) words" (g<sup>TM</sup> h a i \_ \ U<sup>TM</sup>, in 11 cases), or mentioned "dutaka" - three times Adyakarna, twice called as "pratihara", twice – Gomika, once Jayanatha, once have a title "pratihara" Shramanaka, Skanda and Varaha, "arakshika" Hattaka and Rudrilaka, "bhandagarika" Shashtidasa, and also having a title \U<sup>TM</sup> - f l l · \U<sup>TM</sup> - U<sup>TM</sup> \U<sup>TM</sup> h Á - three times Ishvaradatta, twice Rudradasa (once without a title) and once Nanna [back](#)

61 So, the order about one of grant (see 1.8.) was given personally by king in presence pañcha-kàrukai, literally "before five handicraftsmen". Obviously, it is a urban body, "council", including the chiefs of craft organizations, look like as mentioned in Gupta's inscriptions "U<sup>TM</sup> X<sup>TM</sup> J<sup>B</sup> - \<sup>TM</sup> C<sup>TM</sup> X<sup>TM</sup> L<sup>TM</sup> U<sup>TM</sup> C<sup>TM</sup>" (see, for example, SI, p.291), also, consisting from five members. [back](#)

62 In a number of cases Bagh copper plates fixing private grants, about than sometimes is spoken directly. [back](#)

63 If to use accepted at that moment concept (see, for example, History of East, ò.2, part 2, P. 49-50), "tax" immunity is presented only in four (!) from 32, and judicial (so is treated an appeal to the king's servant do not enter grant territory) in 6 of 32 cases. [back](#)

64 So, for example, at that moment significant amount earlier by chronology buddists private grants (on sanskrit and prakrits, from II BC) are known, certainly rendering significant influence to formation of the texts of copper-plate grants. [back](#)