

I referred (JRAS., 1904, p. 397) to the striking resemblance between stanzas 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 in the inscription and the description of Śarat in the second canto of Bhaṭṭi. To my thinking they agree to a great extent in style and language. I cannot pronounce my opinion so authoritatively as to make the point decisive, for I cannot pretend to claim any authority. I leave it to the learned scholars to decide. It cannot be denied that if Vatsabhaṭṭi were the author the work could be entitled *Bhaṭṭikāvya*. I therefore fail to see how my suggestion can be considered as "most unfortunate".

B. C. MAZUMDAR.

SAMBALPUR.

May 20, 1909.

UDBALIKA AND PRANAYAKRIYA

We are much indebted to Mr. Thomas for adducing from the Kauṭīliya - Arthaśāstra (see p. 467 above) the term *uchchhulka*, 'free from tolls and duties, octroi.' In view of that, there can be no doubt that the word *ubalike* in l. 4 of the Rummindēi inscription (this Journal, 1908. 473) stands for *ubbalike*, and represents a Sanskrit *udbalikaḥ* with the meaning 'free from the *bali*'. And I may add that my own inclination was to take the word in that manner; and that I was led to seek another explanation of it only in consequence of receiving an authoritative expression of opinion, corroborating that of Professor Bühler, that such a formation as *udbalika* could not be grammatically explained in such a sense.

We cannot, however, follow Mr. Thomas in thinking that precision has been given to this term by Sir Charles Lyall's proposal to find a connexion between it and the term *ubari*, *ubārī*, which is now in use in certain parts. Information given in Baden-Powell's *Land-Systems of British India*, 2. 155, 477, and under the account of the Jhānsī District in the *Imperial Gazetteer*, 14. 141, shows

that the *ubarī* or *ubārī* tenure is of modern origin, dating only from the Marāṭhā period. It is one of the tenures of land granted in lieu of a definite annual sum of money ; namely, a tenure according to which, when the annual value of the land exceeds the intended sum of money, the excess is paid as revenue. And the derivation of the term is found in the Hindī *ubarnā*, 'to be in excess,' and *ubārṇā*, 'to cause to be in excess,' which are to be traced back to the Sanskrit *ud* + *vri*.

In ordinary literature, the word *bali* is found used in the sense of 'taxes' or 'tribute' in general. As a specific fiscal item, the *bali* is mentioned and defined in the Mānava-dharmaśāstra, 8. 307–8, and the commentaries thereon. Verse 308 says :—"They say that a king who levies the *bali* sixth part, but fails to afford protection, takes upon himself the entire foulness of all (*his*) people." And the commentaries on verse 307 explain the *bali* as being *dhāny-ādēḥ shashthō bhāgaḥ*, "the sixth part of the grain, etc." The Kauṭīliya-Arthaśāstra would seem to treat the *bali* from two somewhat different points of view : (1) as a regular tax levied for religious purposes (IA, 1905. 47, 116); and (2) as a special tax levied ostensibly "to propitiate gods", but in reality to accumulate what is nowadays termed a war-chest (ibid., 111). We shall understand that better when we have the text of the work in question : the abstract translation which Mr. R. Shamasastri has given us serves a very useful purpose ; but in this case, as in others, we need also the text itself for definite ends.

* * * * *

In looking through Mr. Shamasastri's translation of the Kauṭīliya-Arthaśāstra in connexion with the term *bali* when I was dealing with the Rummindēi inscription, I noted the explanation of another epigraphic expression about which there has been a difficulty.

In ll. 15–16 of the Junāgaḍh inscription of Rudradāman

(EI, 8. 44) we are told that that king carried out a certain public work, an improvement in strength and dimensions of the dam of the great lake Sudarśana:—*apīdayitvā karaviṣṭi-praṇayakriyābhiḥ paura-jānapadaṁ janam*. The difficult term here is *praṇayakriyā*. Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji suggested (IA, 7. 262, n. 19) that it might denote “a kind of tax like the modern *prītidān*”: but he did not explain what he understood by the latter term, which means literally ‘a gift made from love or affection’. Professor Kielhorn translated:—“without oppressing the inhabitants of the towns and country by taxes, forced labour and acts of affection,” and suggested that the “acts of affection” (*praṇayakriyā*) might mean “offerings or contributions which nominally are voluntary, but which people feel constrained to make to please somebody or for other reasons”.

The word *praṇaya* has the meaning of ‘request, solicitation’, as well as ‘affection’. And the term *praṇayakriyā*, as used in the Junāgaḍh inscription, is explained, in the direction indicated by Professor Kielhorn, by the Kauṭīliya-Arthaśāstra: see IA, 1905. 115 ff., where we are told that, for the collection of funds by special taxation in times of financial stress, the ancient kings of India had recourse to *praṇaya*, ‘begging,’ supplemented, if necessary, by coercion.

The Indian system of *praṇayakriyā* plainly answers, in fact, exactly to that of the “benevolences”, the forced loans or contributions, which our own kings used to levy.

J. F. FLEET.