

The *Mālik* in Rāmānandī Documents of the 18th and 19th Centuries¹

Monika Horstmann

1. Introduction

After the death of a head (*mahant*) of a Hindu monastic lineage, the succession to his position may become an issue of debate. Hindu ascetic lineages “do not owe allegiance to a monastery, but to a guru and through him to a lineage of spiritual succession” (Clémentin-Ojha 2006: 539). Succession is therefore based on a line of gurus and disciples and the sublines issuing from it. While Hindu ascetics typically do not observe *stabilitas loci* but keep moving from place to place, in this often following an established circuit, their stability rests in their spiritual genealogy. At the death of a *mahant*, then, two issues arise. One is that of rightful succession, the other is that of property. In whom does the authority over and ownership of property attached to a religious institution vest, and on whom will they devolve? Who is the legitimate owner (*mālik*)? Both issues usually do, but need not, fuse.

A similar problem arises at the death of the custodian of a deity (*adhikārī*)² represented by a temple icon. Custodians are not necessarily

- 1 This paper is based on field research conducted with support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft in winter 1999–2000. Special thanks go to Mahant Lakṣmaṇānandjī of Bālānand Maṭh, Jaipur, who allowed me to document his archive.
- 2 The shift of authority from a *mālik* to a *pujārī* was often set in motion by deflecting the flow of grants and other donations from the *mahant* and *mālik* to a subordinate local *pujārī*. This need not have invariably been the result of a stratagem on the part of the former. For example, if a branch establishment of a *gaddī* was remote from the main seat, a trusted *pujārī* could be put in charge of the management of the estate and thus fulfil all the administrative functions vested in the *mālik* despite remaining accountable to him. Such was the case when in 1797 (BM Śrāvaṇa b. 4, VS 1854/13 July 1797) the Śekhāvāt Rājā Lakṣmaṅsingh made a *bhog* grant (for sustaining the cult) to serve the temple deity Raghunāth of Lohārgal, for which see p. 405. The beneficiary of the grant

members of monastic lineages. Whatever rights they have vest in the image of a deity worshipped in a shrine. Land and other assets of various kinds may be dedicated to the material requirements for worship of the deity, but underlying all of them is the idea that they are given for the benefit of the deity.³ The case of a custodian's rights is in principle different from the issue of the succession to a *gaddī*⁴, the “throne” of the head of a monastic lineage. As such, it should be marginal to the scope of this essay, but it comes nonetheless occasionally into focus where *mahant* and custodian are identical, or where a *mahant* has transferred his power to act as caretaker of the temple deity and manage the temple to a temple priest, who for his part cannot claim any right to the property of the estate or the status of heir-apparent to the *mahant*. Such cases occur, for example, if the various temples of a monastic lineage lie widely spread out over a region.

A host of documents addressing the issue has been preserved over the centuries in the archives of religious institutions. In the course of succession contests, genealogies have been produced to establish claims, lawsuits have been brought before courts, attestations of arbitration councils have been solicited by contesting parties, and expert opinions solicited by the judiciary.

The problem has also been relevant to the collection of, or exemption from, revenue, the collection or remission of arrears, and other fiscal aspects of religious property. The issue gained heightened visibility from the colonial period on. Revenue was a central concern in the dealings of princely states with the British colonial power, because in their treaties with the British these states had committed themselves to the payment of high tribute in exchange for protection.

This paper focuses on the kingdom of Jaipur, in the colonial period Jaipur State, and, within Jaipur, on the Rāmānandī Nāgās (see 1.1.). Jaipur became a British protectorate in 1818 (Vashishtha n.d.: 6). A number of the administrative changes that ensued are relevant for the present context:

was the *adhikārī* Dayārāmdās, the first cult-officiant of the Raghunāth temple, to whom Bālānand entrusted the *adhikār*, “custodianship”. He thereby came to enjoy relative autonomy in the affairs of the Lohārgal temple. On *pujārīs* who exercise *adhikār*, see pp. 418–419. For synonymous terms, see *ibid.*

3 Charitable deeds for the worship of deities may also cover the honorarium of the custodian, but in such cases they tend to specify expenses for worship and the sustenance of the deity's officiant as separate items.

4 Variant spellings: *gādī*, *gadī*.

1. In their treaty with Jaipur and other kingdoms of Rajputana, the British had promised non-interference in the internal affairs of the states. Under the first resident in Rajputana and commissioner, David Ochterlony, appointed in 1818, interference was, however, a prevalent strategy, and one that led to tension with the states. This intensified the debate on how the mutual understanding of non-interference could be adjusted to the need felt by the British to exercise some control.
2. In 1821, internal feuds in Jaipur during minority rule greatly disturbed the traditional system of administration. The British reacted by appointing a political agent of Jaipur, which marked the beginning of the Jaipur Agency (*ibid.*: 19). The position of political agent was delicate, for he had to balance the declared principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of the state and the necessity to inquire into local customs. The political agent assisted also in the administration of revenue (Bhansali 1993: 51). The office of political agent came to an end in 1830 when the supervision of affairs relating to Jaipur was transferred to the Superintendent and Political Agent, Ajmer, who was also the governor-general's agent for the States of Rajpootana and commissioner of Ajmer, abbreviated A.G.G. (*ibid.*: 21, 40).
3. In 1829, and actually effective from 1832, the Rajputana Agency came into being, and all its constituent states were brought under the single control of the British. The A.G.G. reported directly to the British Government. From 1836 on, the Rajputana Agency came under the control of the North West Provinces, at the beginning under an expert in matters pertaining to Rajputana, Charles Metcalfe, in his capacity as lieutenant-governor.
4. In 1842, the position of Superintendent of Ajmer and Merwara was established with C.G. Dixon as its first officeholder.⁵ From 1848 on, Dixon communicated directly with the Lieutenant-Governor in matters of civil administration, and in 1853 he was finally made answerable to the Lieutenant-Governor alone. In section 2.2., a document drafted by Dixon in 1849 will be discussed.
5. In 1842, the first regular civil and criminal courts of Jaipur State, Adalat Diwani and Adalat Faujdari, respectively, were established.⁶

5 For details of these offices and their officeholders, see Sarada 1941: 238.

6 Bhansali 1993: 52 with n. 49, where "1889" is a typographical error.

The slim corpus of documents discussed in this essay forms part of an archive along with a great number of similar ones preserved in the Bālānandī Maṭh of Jaipur, a seat of Rāmānandī Nāgās. The documents selected range from 1829 to 1893, with the exception of one document of the precolonial period. It is undated, but belongs to the period between 1778 and 1803, the regnal period of Mahārājā Pratāpsingh of Jaipur. It has been selected because it provides insight into continuities and discontinuities between the precolonial and colonial periods.

1.1. Rāmānandī Nāgās of Jaipur

All documents discussed here are pertinent, first of all, to the *mālik* of the Rāmānandī Nāgās of Jaipur, that is, the *mahant* sitting on the “throne” (*gaddī*) of their temple and monastery, called the Bālānand Maṭh and situated in the Purani Basti of Jaipur. Second, they pertain also to the position of *māliks* dependent on the Bālānand Maṭh as chief *gaddī* by reason of having been offshoots of it. The documents concern either court cases to which the incumbent of the chief *gaddī* was party or for which his expert opinion was solicited from the judiciary.

Around 1720, Vrijānand and his lineage of Rāmānandī Nāgās came from Vrindaban to Jainagar, officially named Savāi Jaipur in 1727, the new capital of the Kachvāhā kingdom of eastern Rajasthan. Rāmānandī Nāgās had existed in Vrindaban before Vrijānand. In Jaipur, his lineage of militant Vaiṣṇava monks (*nāgās*) rocketed to political and military power under his disciple Mahant Bālānand (r. 1752–1795) and plummeted with the arrival of the Pax Britannica. Bālānand commanded thousands of *nāgā* soldiers and also acted as diplomat on behalf of the Kachvāhā court (Horstmann forthcoming). His role on the political stage of his time is the reason why the Rāmānandī Nāgās of Jaipur are also called Bālānandīs. Around 1743, his guru Vrijānand built the huge temple with its adjoining *akhārā* (“wrestling ground”, military station) of *nāgās* in Jaipur’s Purani Basti, the deities of which attracted sumptuous revenue grants.⁷ The temple represents the main seat (*gaddī*) of that Rāmānandī Nāgā lineage with its numerous offshoots, and its *mahant*, the incumbent of the *gaddī*, claims supreme discretionary authority in matters relating to that ramified lineage. Among the temples belonging to the Jaipur *gaddī* and figuring a number of times in the documents to

7 NP 3.10.1996.

be discussed below are two temples at the pilgrimage site of Lohārgal in the Jhunjhunun district of Shekhawati in Rajasthan.⁸ One is the Raghunāth temple, which is first mentioned in 1763, but was given its present expansive shape in 1776. The other is the Mālketu temple on the crest of a hill above Lohārgal, built by Mahant Sevānand (r. 1825–1842; d. 1877) in the period between 1850 and 1856 after he had abdicated.⁹ According to their respective locations, the Raghunāth temple is also referred to as the “lower temple”, and the Mālketu temple, as the “upper temple”.

The temples under the authority of the Bālānandīs are all of the type known as “private temples” (*nijī mandīr*).¹⁰ They were built by an ancestor in the lineage of the *mahant*, which is why the authority over these is based on genealogy.

Under the treaty with the British, the monopoly on the use of force outside Jaipur State rested solely with the colonisers. This sounded the death knell for the Bālānandīs’ power, and as a military order their fate was sealed in 1826, when they were disbanded in Bharatpur, a focal point of their activities during the Jāṭ wars of the late 18th century.

The Rāmānandī Nāgās formed part of the so-called “Four *sampradāyas*” (*catuḥsampradāya*) of the Vaiṣṇavas. These orthodox Vaiṣṇava orders defined themselves as a confederacy of four orders, including sub-orders, namely, the Rāmānujīya-Rāmānandī [Rāmāvat], Nimbārka, Viṣṇusvāmī-Vallabha, and Mādhva-Gauḍīya *sampradāyas*.¹¹ As a corporate body that came to consensual decisions, the four orders had been evoked as an authority at the latest since the early 1720s (Horstmann 2009: 58). While their organisation may have been more or less loose otherwise, during the colonial period these orders fought for their rights as a confederacy, and they used the judiciary to enforce rules that were actually in a state of erosion. In colonial Rajputana, these four orders were recognised by the British as a corporate body, and they also bonded with other religious orders to reinforce claims.¹²

8 Situated at 27°40′19″N 75°23′16″E.

9 NP 29.10.1996.

10 See, for the distinction between the *mahants* of “private” and other temples, Mukherjea 1983: 347; and in greater detail and with an ethnographic focus on modern Rajasthan, Bouillier 2009: 47–50.

11 The term “Four *sampradāyas*” with reference to a corporate body of Vaiṣṇavas can be traced back to the turn of the 17th century. The boundaries between the orders were a much debated issue, for which see Horstmann 2009: 54–58.

12 See pp. 408–410, 413.

2. The *Mālik* in Documentary Evidence

Crucial to the issue of authority and ownership in religious lineages is the notion of *mālikāī*, the status of being the master of a *gaddī*. Derived from “*mālik*”, it is in its original Persian form “*milkiyat*”, a common term of revenue administration. Its range of use has been studied by Irfan Habib (1963) who found it meaning proprietary rights over land, the right of the proprietor (*milkiyat*) being “nearly what in English would be called ‘private property’” (1963: 112, 140). How the authority of the *mālik* was understood and explained at the request of the colonial judiciary forms the topic of this paper.

2.1. The Royal *Mālik*

The earliest document under consideration (see doc. 1 in the Appendix) represents the only one selected from the precolonial period. As has been mentioned, it serves as a bridge to the understanding of similar documents from the colonial period. It is a *viññaptipatra*, a term paraphrased in the document by *maḥṣarnāma* (spelt *mahjarnāmma*).¹³ Both terms mean an attestation made by a group of people and bearing their signatures along with those of witnesses. The present *maḥṣarnāma* forms an attestation made by the council (*pāñc*) of Vaiṣṇava temples in the case of Tulsīdās, the hereditary custodian (*adhikārī*, *ṭahaluvā*) of the Bālmukund and Nṛtyagopāl temple at Laṣkāri Kuñj in Vrindaban. During the period when the document was written, the temple housed two idols, namely, Nṛtyagopālji and Bālmukundji.¹⁴ Disputing Tulsīdās’s “authority” (*satā*), the custodian and temple priests (*pujārī*) of the Govinddev temple had accosted him violently. According to the sources in the possession of the Bālānand Maṭh,¹⁵ Tulsīdās was a disciple of Bālānand. From Najaf Khān, *dīvān* of Shāh Ālam and leader of the imperial troops in the Jāṭ disturbances (between 1773 and 1778), Tulsīdās had received an imperial order, *farmān*, covering the revenue of two villages in the Mahāvan revenue district of Mathura for the service (*bhog-rāg*) of the deity Nṛtyagopāl. This was a way of expressing recognition to Bālānand, who at the time was fighting on the side of

13 For this type of document and research on it, see Desai 1998.

14 These names appear in the *superscriptio* of the document.

15 Information gathered from Mahant Lakṣmaṇānand and digested by N.K. Pārīk (NP 26 Oct. 1996).

the imperial army. From the *relatio*¹⁶ of the document it becomes clear that the temple can be traced back to the regnal period of Mahārājā Bīśansingh (r. 1689–1699). The Rāmānandī Nāgās had strongholds in Vrindaban and Govardhan. Mahant Vrijānand, who had shifted the order's centre of gravity to Jaipur, hailed from Mathura and retired to Vrindaban in 1752, the year of his death.

... 'Rām-Rām' from Vrindaban, from all well-wishing *gosvāmīs*,¹⁷ *mahants*, and Vaiṣṇava officers¹⁸ with blessings and in recollection of the personal deity to Śrī (7x) Mahārājādhirāj Śrī Savāi Pratāpsimhājī.... Reference: May it please [Your Majesty] to take notice of an attestation (*viññaptipatra*). *Mahzarnāma*: Previously, the predecessors of the custodian (*adhikārī*) Tulsīdās have always conducted the service (*sevā*) and worship (*pūjā*) of the deities [Bālmukundjī]¹⁹ and [Nṛtya-gopālājī]. These reside here in Vrindaban in the Mahārājādhirāj's temple, and they were venerated by Your ancestors, Their late Majesties [Bisansingh]jī and [Jaisingh]jī, the Mājī Sāhibājī²⁰ and Pṛthvīsinghājī. He performs the first *bhog-rāg* (food and music for the deity), as is befitting.²¹ He proclaims the praise of Your ancestors. When Brahman Vaiṣṇavas visit the temple, he receives them hospitably. He enhances Your fame. And he keeps saying, "I am the Lord's servant (*ṭahaluvā*), and His Majesty is the master (*mālik*)". We, too, have always seen and heard him acting in this way. Nonetheless, the custodian (*ṭahal(u)vā*) and the temple priests (*pūjārīs*) of Śrī Govind[dev]jī have picked a quarrel with him. For one month they had the Muslims keep one of his Vaiṣṇavas²² locked in. They said to him, "Give us written evidence that you are in power". He rejoined, "Who am I? I am only the servant of the Lord. The *mālik* authorised to

16 Diplomatic terms used *passim* are those used by Bresslau (1889). The indigenous terms were adopted from Persian, but they do not figure in the documents published here.

17 Custodians of Vaiṣṇava deities.

18 Managers of religious estates.

19 Here and *passim*: All names put in square brackets in the translations are carried over from the *superscriptio* of the documents.

20 Probably Kunanbāi Cuṇḍāvat, the queen dowager of Mahārājā Mādhosingh (r. 1750–1768), mother of Pṛthvīsingh and regent during his minority rule. Pṛthvīsingh died at the age of fifteen in 1778.

21 "[F]irst" refers to the first round of worship of the day.

22 A common designation of temple servants.

make written statements is His Majesty (Mahārādhirāj)”. Then all of us formed an arbitration council (*pañc*), presented the case to the *āmil* (revenue collector),²³ and got the Vaiṣṇava temple priest released. For a whole month he had been locked in. This is something that ought not to have happened. Now this affair is up to the Mahārāj as master (*mālik*) to deal with. And the enclosure (*gher*) of Ratandās is mentioned as lying separate. There is only one enclosure here, and this belongs to Your Majesty, though it has different courtyards (*cauk*) that are separate. There is no enclosure besides this one. A plan of the enclosure has been sent to you. You may please check this. (Signatures of twenty-five Vaiṣṇava *mahants*, custodians, and managers of temples)²⁴

The document shows clearly the distinction between ownership of a temple and other buildings and property in land belonging to it, on the one hand, and the rights of a custodian that vest in the idol or idols in the temple, on the other. The *pujārīs* are appointed by the custodian, though their office may also be hereditary and vest in a lineage. The document also shows that the dedication of land and buildings to the worship of deities does not imply that the dedicator gives up his proprietary rights. These may lie dormant, but can be reactivated. Especially a royal dedicator would have considered it his duty to protect buildings etc. given for purposes of worship.

In the present case, the *mālik* is a king. What is fundamentally relevant is not his royal status but the fact that he is an outsider and thus quite different from a *mahant* (the head of a monastic lineage and at the same time owner of a temple) or from a custodian of a deity.²⁵

2.2. The *Mālik* of the *Gaddī*

It was mentioned above that the Four *sampradāyas* acted as a corporate body to enforce their rights, collective or particular to one of the orders. This has been discussed by Clémentin-Ojha (forthcoming) on the basis of a report issued by these and other orders in the year 1822. A similar document, dated 4 January 1829, was issued by the corporate body of

23 Persian terms are rendered according to their Hindi spellings in the documents.

24 BM n.d. This translation, like several others discussed below, represent only excerpts. For the full original text of the present one, see Appendix, doc. no. 1.

25 Further details of the document are discussed below, pp. 419–421.

orders in the interest of the Rāmānandī Nāgā Sevānand, *mahant* of the Bālānand Math of Jaipur from 1825 on.²⁶ Sevānand's title is *ācārya*, which means that he was the chief *mahant* of a monastic lineage with sublineages headed by local *mahants*. A comparison of the documents of 1822 and 1829 reveals that by the 1820s religious orders had not only bonded for concerted action but also drafted a form for their official written dealings with the judiciary. The declaration of 1829 reads:

Mahant Māhārājī Śrī Sevānandjī is *ācārya* in the Śrīmat-Rāmānuja *sampradāya*. His jurisdiction is authoritative for all members of his order (*bheṣḍhārī*, “habit-bearers”). The jurisdiction has always been vested in this *gadī*. Therefore, according to the true tradition handed down from generation to generation, all the four Vaiṣṇava *sampradāyas*, the Daśnāmīs, the Yogī *panth*, the Jain *mārg*, and celibate members of orders (*bīramcārī bheṣḍhārī*), the six systems of religion—in fact all [systems represented in the state]—have observed one and the same custom that the arbitration council (*pañcāyat*) speaks for its specific *gadī*, *ācārya*, *sampradāya*, or *mārg* and monitors the expenses and income of worship (*pūjā bheṭ karai*). An arbitration council (*pañcāyat*) of outsiders has no claim [to authority]. The claim vests in the consecrated master of the *gadī*. The members of orders everywhere—in the north, south, east, west up to the shore of the sea—exist dependent on *gadīs*. According to their rules of proper conduct they always deliver the [balance of] expenses and income of worship to the *gadīs*. The claim to all buildings and settlements accrues to the *gadīs*. They consider the master of the *gadī* the guru, who is equivalent to God. If someone violates the mode of proper conduct, the dharma is ruined.

(One line illegible)

A *gadī* cannot be shared. This has always been the rule of proper conduct. If someone violates this, he is dishonest. Accordingly, the Mahant Māhārāj made Kṛṣṇadās the master of the

26 In the period under review, the *mahants* of the Bālānandī Math of Jaipur were Gambhīrānand (r. 1805–1825), Sevānand (r. 1825–1842; d. 1877), Rāmānand (1842–1859), Jñānānand/Gyānānand (1859–1885), Mādhavānand (1885–1906), and Rāmkrṣṇānand (1906–1942).

building(s) at Pāhāsu Ḍībāī.²⁷ The *ācārya* of the *gaddī* made him also the master of all buildings and settlements there. And if someone claims these, he is making false pretences. Accordingly, if after a year's time Sukhrāmdās claims the *ghāṭī* (valley/a landing place along a body of water), he will be doing [so under] false pretences. He will certainly not get it. Transgressing the norms set by *ācāryas*, *mahants*, *mārg*, proper conduct and sect, he will have lied. He will not get it. A true account has arrived in writing. Date: Māgha k. 2, VS 1885/22 January 1829.²⁸

Thanks to the document of 1822, phrased in a similar form (Clémentin-Ojha forthcoming), both the standard form of declarations drafted by the corporate body of orders and the variations thereof can be easily defined. As compared with the document of 1822, this one emphasises that the corporate body in question consists exclusively of celibate ascetics (*bīramcārī bheṣḍhārī*), a point relevant to the nature of the dispute that gave rise to the declaration. The exact circumstances of the dispute are unknown, but the emphasis on celibate ascetics suggests that the claimant of the Rāmānandī Nāgā *gaddī* of the unidentified place of Pāhāsu Ḍībāī was not celibate. The *nāgā* origin of the place is pointed out by Mahant Sevānand, whose authority as *ācārya* was by that time already hollowed out, for soon after his installation as chief *mahant* in 1825 he formally dissolved his rapidly dispersing *nāgā* troops. It seems that Sevānand made his statement as party to a pending case and on the request of the court. In order to enforce his claim to a part of the property of the disputed religious estate, Sukhrāmdās apparently solicited an arbitration council unauthorised to arbitrate internal affairs of the monastic lineage. The duties of a genuine council of a *gaddī* are precisely defined, namely, speaking for the *gaddī*, *ācārya* and order, along with monitoring the accounts of worship expenses and income. Presently it will be seen that claims of authority and ownership over the property of religious lineages are quite typically underpinned by attestations of local arbitration councils whose legitimacy is controversial. The above declaration was signed by witnesses, most of whom were the representatives of religious orders. Some of these orders had also non-celibate branches, so that it was not immaterial that the document made the “celibate habit-bearers” (*bīramcārī bheṣḍhārī*) its group

27 Pāhāmsu in the Saharanpur District of Uttar Pradesh?

28 BM Māgha k. 2, VS 1885/4 January 1829; see Appendix, doc. no. 2.

of reference. Sevānand's case was in any event supported by all the orders enumerated.

Both statements, one in the interest of the Nimbārkas (1822) and the other in that of the Rāmānandī Nāgā *mahant* Sevānand (1829), required a synchronisation of the opinions of the orders, which appear in the document as speaking with one voice. The judicial process and the negotiations among the orders prior to the drafting of a formal—and calligraphically scribed—declaration that was to be endorsed by the Jaipur judiciary and the religious leaders concerned is revealed by a file of documents from the year 1849:

(Section 1: Formal report and request)²⁹

Report from Col. Dixon Sahib Bahadur, Superintendent of Ajmer, to the Mahantjī of the Rāmāvāt Sampradāy; 16 August 1849.

Reference: There is a dispute between Balrāmdās Svāmī, Nāgā Santdāsot, and Gobindrām, Saṃjogī Santdāsot, over the position of *mahant* in the Sītārām temple in *qasbā* Kekṛī,³⁰ the *pūjā*, and the ownership. Concerning this, a law suit is pending with our Adālat Court, and it is necessary to inquire about this from the aforementioned *mahant*. Accordingly, a translated copy of the case protocol must be sent to the aforementioned *mahant*. After reading that case protocol, he shall write a rejoinder to it. He shall write what is befitting and send it.

CG Dixon

(Section 2: Identification of subject matter of section 3 and issuing authority)

Case protocol of the Court of the Superintendent of Ajmer, term of office of Col. Charles George Dixon Sahib Bahadur Superintendent; 13 August A.D. 1849.

(seal)

CG Dixon

29 Italic captions in brackets are added by the author.

30 At that time a kasba, now a city, in Ajmer district (25.97°N 75.15°E).

(Section 3: Case protocol and ensuing queries of the Adālat Court)
Balrāmdās, Bairāgī Nāgā Santdāsot [...], resident of *qasbā*
Kekṛī, as plaintiff

vs.

Gobinddās, Bairāgī Saṃjogī Santdāsot [, as accused]

for registration of the claim to *mahant*-ship of the *gādī* of the temple Sītārāmjī and ownership of the temple, shops etc.

Current state of the lawsuit: The temple of Sītārām in Kekṛī was built by Dvārkādās Svāmī Nāgā Santdāsot, and during his lifetime he was its owner. Upon his death his disciple Rāmdās succeeded to the *gādī*, and upon the death of him, Gobindrām Saṃjogī became owner of the temple. And now Balrāmdās, Svāmī Nāgā Santdāsot, on the grounds that a *saṃjogī* is not suitable for this, claims the *gādī* and the ownership of the temple [arguing] as follows: “This *nāgā* temple was built by Dvārkādās Santdāsot. After his death and according to the wish of Daulatrām, Mahant Santdāsot, Dvārkādās’s disciple Rāmdās sat on the *gādī*. And there was no disciple of his (i.e. Rāmdās) following his death. In this situation it was the right of the *mahant*, in view of the close relationship of Saṃjogī Rāmdās with the Santdāsot Nāgās, to entrust the temple *pūjā* and ownership of the temple to the latter (i.e. the Santdāsot Nāgās) Accordingly Raghunāthdāsjī, *mahant* of the Santdāsots, in recognition of my close relationship with Rāmdās made me the owner and *pūjārī* of the temple. He has had my ownership of the temple registered. And if Gobinddās, who has become owner of the temple by using force, calls himself a disciple of Rāmdās, he is telling a lie. And even if he is a disciple of Rāmdās, the *gādī* cannot go to him, for he is a *saṃjogī*. He has a family. The temple was, however, built by *nāgās*. A *saṃjogī* cannot sit on a *nāgā gādī*. Therefore, according to the decision of the *pañc* of *nāgās* and of Raghunāthdāsjī, who is the *mahant* of all *nāgā-jamāyats*, I am entitled to the throne and the ownership of the temple”. End of statement.

And the rejoinder of Gobinddās is this: “During his *mahant*-ship Rāmdās supported my right to sit on the *gādī* and have ownership of the temple; and a certificate of adoption was made out

[for me]. And this has been confirmed by Īmratrāmjī, Santdāsot *mahant* of the Gurdvārā of Dānṭrā,³¹ who is *mahant* of *nāgās* and *saṃjogīs*. On the strength of all this, I sit on the *gādī* and have obtained ownership of the temple. Consequently, Balrāmdās is not entitled to any claim. And Rāmdās had made me his disciple and given me his promise”. End of statement.

Consequently, the government has to examine two things: First, if it was lawful that Gobindrām sat on the *gādī* after Rāmdās or not, and if in a temple of *nāgās* a *saṃjogī* with a family can be the owner or not. Second, if Gobindrām was not really the owner of the *gādī* of Rāmdās, or, in case he was, if he had no right to this; conversely, if the claim and right now vest in Balrāmdās or not. It is befitting that the *mahants* of the four *sampradāyas* inform on these issues. An order has been given accordingly.

(Section 4: Request to the addressee, the “Rāmāvat mahant”, to solicit statements from the Four Vaiṣṇava Orders)

A copy of the case protocol translated into Hindvi together with the report sheet in Hindvi may be sent to the Nimbārka, Mādhavācārya,³² Viṣṇusvāmī and Rāmāvat *mahants* in their capacity of *mahants* and *māliks* of the Four *sampradāyas*. The four *mahants* may write their answers in this lawsuit as they find befitting. End of statement.

CG Dixon³³

The first section of the document represents the Hindi report by Col. Dixon on a pending case relating to a *gaddī* in Kekṛī, Ajmer district.³⁴ The report, formally scribed in standard Nāgarī script, was to be sent along with the case report in Hindi translation and office script³⁵ to one *mahant* of the Rāmāvat order, the Rāmānandī Nāgā chief *mahant*, at that time Mahant Rāmānand of the Bālānand Maṭh of Jaipur.

31 In Ajmer district.

32 For “Mādhvācārya”.

33 BM 16 August 1849; see Appendix, doc. no. 3a.

34 The office of A.G.G. conducted its work in three branches, English, Persian, and Hindi, each under its own Head Clerk, titled Mir Munshi and Pandit for the Persian and Hindi branches, respectively (Vashishtha n.d.: 64).

35 A regional form of Kaithī script. The term “office script” is more ad hoc than comprehensively descriptive. I mean to distinguish drafts that circulated in the office from formal papers addressing a third party. Kaithī script was also used for many other purposes, and notably for draft letters.

The issue was that the *mahant*-ship of a *gaddī* established by celibate Rāmānandī Nāgās of the line of Santdāsots (tracing their origin to one Santdās) had gone to one Gobindrām Saṃjogī, the designation *saṃjogī* indicating that he was a sadhu living with a woman, and in this particular case with a woman and family.³⁶ Gobindrām is not a common name among Rāmānandī Nāgās, whose names typically end in *-dās*, and in a way the document reflects this anomaly by alternately naming the person Gobinddās and Gobindrām. The previous *mahant* was not survived by a celibate *nāgā*, let alone an heir-apparent to the *gaddī*. As Gobindrām asserts, he was selected because the deceased *mahant* had a close relationship with *saṃjogīs*, that he had been adopted by the *mahant*, and that a *mahant* of *nāgās* and *saṃjogīs* had confirmed his right to the *gaddī*. The name of that *mahant*, Īmratrām (Amṛatrām), and his dwelling place, a Gurdvārā, point to a temple of aniconic worship rather than one where iconic worship is performed. The Rāmānandī Nāgās, however—at least according to the norms emphasised by their leaders—conduct iconic worship of the Pāñcarātra type.³⁷ The origin of both Gobindrām and Īmratrām, then, must have been in either a milieu of *bairāgīs* of the aniconic Sant type or one accommodating sadhus of both iconic and aniconic persuasions. The iconic worship, practised by followers of the orthodox norms (*varṇāśramadharmā*), would have retained caste distinctions, whereas the aniconic worship was open to all regardless of orthodox norms.

As for Balrāmdās, the celibate *nāgā* contestant, it is not reported how he suddenly turned up to oust Gobindrām and assume the position of a *svāmī*, the head of a monastic institution and lineage. He had been supported, he says, by one Raghunāthdās, a *saṃjogī-mahant*, who had him registered as successor to the *gaddī*.³⁸ In making this statement, Balrāmdās insinuates that Raghunāthdās was well aware of the distinct norms of *saṃjogīs* and celibate *nāgās*. Balrāmdās argues that a *nāgā-gaddī* cannot be occupied by a *saṃjogī*. If anything, the statements of the contestants demonstrate the mixed sadhu milieu where *nāgās* who perceived themselves as following orthodox ascetic norms coexisted with *saṃjogīs*.³⁹

36 See section 2.5.

37 See p. 420.

38 Upon the death of a *mahant*, the succession needed to be officially sanctioned and registered, and succession (*mātmī*) dues paid (“Definition of Important Vernacular Terms” of 3 March 1938, section II, pp. 7–9. Daftar Dīvānī Hujurī, Rāj Savāī Jaypur, VS 199*, radīf dī, Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner).

39 For these *saṃjogīs*, see section 2.5.

Mahant Rāmānand duly acted as requested by Col. Dixon, circulating the court report and Dixon’s request to his colleagues among the rest of the Four *sampradāyas*. To produce unanimity, he himself rephrased their replies to the court’s questions. In this way the chorus of statements of the various orders was seamlessly harmonised.

Śrī Rāmjī

My “Jai Śrī Sītārāmjī” to you. Reference: From Ajmer a report of Agent Bahadur from the Government. In this it is written that Balrāmdās, Bairāgī Santdāsot, resident of Kekṛī, and Govinddās, Bairāgī Santdāsot, are fighting over who is to sit on the *gadī*. Regarding this lawsuit there arrived a case report from Col. Dixon Sahib Bahadur Superintendent Ajmer [that is being] directed to the Four *sampradāyas* in order to inquire into the state of affairs. This is sent [to you herewith]. Accordingly, the state of affairs is to be solicited from the *mahants* of the Four *sampradāyas* and sent. For this purpose the original case report of Dixon Sahib is being sent to you. Please duly ascertain the circumstances relating to this and describe the perennial tradition and norms of conduct of your *sampradāya*, phrasing this as an answer. Here is the answer: In our *sampradāya* has perennially prevailed the custom that if there is an establishment of celibate ascetics where there is a celibate disciple, this disciple will succeed to the *gadī*. And if there happens to be no disciple, a celibate ascetic closely related as brother and brother by shared relationship with the guru (i.e. as spiritual father) will be the incumbent. And if for one or two generations there is no brother or brother by shared relationship with the guru, a Vaiṣṇava from the same *sampradāya* as that of the *ācārya* will receive the responsibility and remain in charge. And even if there is a disciple, but this disciple becomes a *saṃjogī*, he shall be married within his own caste. He is not entitled to [take on] the responsibility for an establishment of celibate ascetics. In accordance with this custom, Balrāmdās Santdāsot is entitled to be given the responsibility.⁴⁰

The essence of this is that if there is no suitable candidate for a *nāgā gaddī*, the *gaddī* will eventually devolve upon a Vaiṣṇava belonging to

40 BM n.d.; see Appendix, doc. no. 3b.

the chief *mahant*'s—the *ācārya*'s—*sampradāya*. Most suitable is either someone of the same biological extended family or *gotra* or a fellow *celā*. Typically, the present *mahant* of the Bālānandīs, Lakṣmaṇānandjī, is a paternal nephew of his predecessor, and he himself, too, favours a paternal nephew of his as successor.⁴¹ Accordingly, given the absence of a suitable celibate *celā* (initiated disciple), it would have been obligatory to look for a *nāgā* candidate from outside the sub-lineage of the *gaddī* of Kekṛī. Mahant Rāmānand did not deem it necessary to respond to the argument of Gobindrām that he had been adopted by the late *mahant*. Making disciples by adoption or buying children to make them disciples was a common practice.⁴² However, Gobindrām's appeal on the basis of his status as son by adoption was of little relevance, for a valid candidate had to be or be made the *mahant*'s *celā*, regardless of his civil relationship with the *mahant*.

The following case proved to be traumatic for the Bālānandīs. It concerns the temples at Lohārgal, having started to cast a shadow over temple affairs in the 1860s and festering on into the 1890s.⁴³ Sevānand, the former *mahant* of the Bālānand Maṭh who had abdicated in 1842, builder of the Mālketu temple and manager of it and the Raghunāth temple of the Bālānandīs at Lohārgal, was dead by mid-April 1877. From 1867 on at the latest, ten years before his death, the aged Sevānand is found reprimanding Ajodhyādās as managing *pūjārī* (*mukhtyār*)⁴⁴ and his fellow *pūjārīs* for neglecting their duties, and complaining about this to his successor Mahant Jñānānand.⁴⁵ In 1877, Jñānānand forced

41 The preference for recruiting *mahants* from the same family or *gotra* has been discussed by Clémentin-Ojha (2006: 555).

42 On making a younger brother of the deceased or a paternal nephew successor to the position of custodian of the deity in the tradition of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas, see Horstmann (1999: 353–355; also *ibid.*: 206–207) for the case of Gopīra-man, a paternal nephew of the deceased custodian of Govinddevjī adopted into the line by the custodian's widow in order to be made successor of her husband. On the buying of disciples, an undated document (probably of 1857) in the BM archive concerns the case of a disciple bought for 60 Rs. by a *bheṣḍhārī* woman in order to be made a *celā* and heir-apparent to the previous owner of a temple in Jaipur.

43 Ajodhyādās and Bhagavāndās are documented as usurpers of the temples as late as 1893 (doc. BM Mārgaśiras b. 13, VS 1950/21 December 1893, letter of Mahant Mādhavānand to Ṭhākur Syosingh of Sīkar, whose family had sustained the Bālānandī temples of Lohārgal from the beginning by revenue grants).

44 It is not clear from the documents if the custodianship that had been entrusted by Bālānand to the first *pūjārī* of the Raghunāth temple of Lohārgal (see n. 2) had been extended to the Mālketu temple and had devolved upon Ajodhyādās.

45 BM Jyeṣṭha b. 13, VS 1924/31 May 1867, and Srāvaṇa b. 12, VS 1935/26 July 1878.

Ajodhyādās and the other temple priests to make the following affidavit, which was attested by six witnesses:

May the Śrī (5x) 108 Śrī Guru Mahant Mahārāj Śrī [Jñānānand] acknowledge the prostration before him of Ajodhyādās, disciple of Vaiṣṇudās (Vaiṣṇavdās), Bhagavāndās and others.

Reference: It is testified to Śrī Mahārājji that the house built at the estate of Lohārgar (Lohārgal) belongs to Śrī Guru Mahant Mahārāj Śrī [Jñānānand]ji. The produce of its garden and [those] of the villages Sonāsar, Kharolī etc. serve as its sustenance. The goods and materials of offerings etc. that are given or taken away have always been the property of the *khālsā*. The incumbent of the *gadī* of the estate of Jaipur is its owner (*mālik*). The authority to check expenses and income and to grant deferral of payment has always vested only in the Mahārāj. Now it is our⁴⁶ duty to do service for the good of the building exactly in the same way on behalf of Śrī Guru Mahant Mahārāj Śrī [Jñānānand]ji as of the late Mahārāj. You, however, are the owner of the *gadī*. Your order will be fulfilled. We serve that place now exactly as we did as long as the late Mahārāj was alive. Accrued income we spend on the *bhog* of the deity and the *sadāvrat* (the kitchen providing food to visitors). And what you order beyond this, we will heed this respectfully. We will abide by your wish. If you wish to have something done through our service, we shall proceed according to your wish, for the building is yours. You may act as you wish. This building has always been the property of the *khālsā* of Lohārgarji. You as the master of this building may order any service to be done. In no way can this be refused or objected to. The authority will vest only in you. We shall act as you wish. We are devoted to our master, and shall act according to the perennial tradition. We have written this out of our own free will. If we go back on this, we shall be acting against god Hari and the Guru, and shall have spoken untruth before the State Council (Rāj Pañc)⁴⁷ and British Government. Date: Mārgaśiras b. 10, VS 1934/30 November 1877.

46 Ajodhyādās is speaking for himself and his colleagues, but is the only signatory.

47 At that time, the Royal Council or State Council was the highest tribunal of Jaipur State and “presided over by the Ruler, who used to decide cases with the assistance of single Minister, styled as ‘Musahib’” (Bhansali 1993: 56).

Signed by Ajodhyādās, true as written

Attestations of Hardev Prohat (Purohit), Harīdās, Adhikārī Nāgrīdās; Khemdas, Adhikārī-Mukhiyā of Raivāsā; Adhikārī-Mukhiyā of the deity Śrī—jī⁴⁸; Adhikārī Kamalādās (?) by order of Śrī Gusājī of the deity Śrī—jī.⁴⁹

The document confirms the absolute right of ownership of the *mahant* of the chief *gaddī* at Jaipur over these temples. As the State Council, the highest tribunal, is mentioned in the *sanctio* clause at the end of the document, it has to be concluded that the case had already been decided by the lower courts. It is not clear how the “British Government” fits in the context, for a decision of the State Council as highest tribunal was final. Was it conjured up to inspire confidence?

That *pujārīs*, temple priests, should try to usurp the ownership of a temple was not uncommon. Basically, a *pujārī*'s position is well defined and was confirmed many times by case decisions.⁵⁰ In a conversation with me, Mahant Lakṣmaṇānandjī of the Bālānand Maṭh put it laconically: “The *pujārī* is a servant/employee (*pujārī naukār hai*)”. A *pujārī* may very well be entrusted with the managing functions of a *mukhtyār*. In a letter to Ajodhyādās, the outraged Mahant Jñānānand cracks down on him: “Why did you not conduct the management (*muktyārī*) [properly for the late Mahārāj Sevānand]. You are absolutely ignorant and act according to your whims!”⁵¹ Ajodhyādās and his fellow *pujārīs* had been appointed by Sevānand at an unknown point in time. By the time Ajodhyādās's mismanagement is first mentioned in the documents (1867), he and the other temple priests had been appointed to the service of both Sevānand's Mālketu and Bālānand's Raghunāth temples. Dayārāmdās, the first *pujārī* of the Raghunāth temple, had been a *celā* of Bālānand himself and appointed by him. From Dayārāmdās descended a line of *celās*, meaning that the office of *pujārī* of the Raghunāth temple became hereditary. This lineage must have petered out, though, after which the *pujārīs* of the Mālketu temple were made additionally responsible for the Raghunāth temple. Ajodhyādās identifies himself as a *celā* of Vaiṣṇudās (Viṣṇavdās), and so was not in the

48 This and the following blank for the names of deities cannot be completed because the superscript (*sarnāma*) of the document is missing.

49 BM Mārgaśiras b. 10, VS 1934/30 November 1877; see Appendix, doc. no. 4.

50 Mukherjea 1983: 202, 5.1B.

51 BM Śrāvaṇa b. 12, VS 1935/26 July 1878.

spiritual line of Sevānand. A *pujārī* may be entrusted with the *adhikār*, the power of decision in matters of temple management. Cases in point are the cosignatories of Ajodhyādās's above-cited affidavit. Among them, two held the position of *adhikārī* ("authorised"), and two that of *adhikārī-mukhiā* ("chief authorised") priest. One is the chief authorised priest of Raivāsā, the important Rāmrasik Rāmānandī seat. This kind of authority (*adhikār*) does not imply any proprietary right, even if it is hereditary by custom. In cases of misdemeanor, the holder of the position can be dismissed (Mukherjea 1983: 203).

2.3. The Duties of an Officeholder

While the functions of *mālik*, *mahant*, and *adhikārī* are to be distinguished, they may also fuse in one person. As owner of a temple built by himself or an ancestor, a *mālik* can also be both the chief (*mahant*) of a monastic lineage and the custodian (*adhikārī*) of the deity represented by the image in the temple. In section 2.1., the Vaiṣṇavas of Vrindaban are cited attesting the zeal with which the custodian Tulsīdās fulfilled his duties (*sevā*), which are enumerated. These duties have to be carried out to ensure continuity of worship. In fulfilling them, custodians are or may be assisted by temple priests. Service of the deity is the reason for the temple's existence. This duty is also incumbent on a *mahant*, who may of course delegate it to a greater or lesser extent to temple priests.

In the year 1878, the attorneys⁵² of Mahant Jñānānand replied to the Office of Charities (*Kārkhānā punya*) of Jaipur State in the course of an investigation into the financial activities and assets of the Bālānand Maṭh. This investigation took place in the context of a recovery of arrears from the *gaddī*. The document gives evidence of the rapid decline of the fortunes of the Bālānandī Rāmānandī Nāgās. Jñānānand speaks of arrears of 14 or 15 thousand rupees. From his report it can be concluded that from the beginning of his term of office he had had to grapple with a load of debt that had accrued over three generations of predecessors, that is, since the term of office of Gambhīrānand (r. 1805–1825) and thus in part overlapping with the beginning of the colonial control of revenue collection and the end of the lineage's military and political power. In 1878, out of a total of 10,500 rupees of

52 The term *adikārī* (for *adhikārī*) is here used for a legal advisor, "attorney".

current expenses for worship, *sadāvrat*, paraphernalia, maintenance, etc., 1,500 rupees alone were spent on the stable. This indicates an attempt to maintain a noble status despite actual loss of power. Clause 2 of the investigation and the *mahant's* reply were,

2) And you wrote: “What kind of work do you do for the well-being of Śrī—jī (that is, the deity Sītārām)?” Here is the answer: Day and night, the only thing that I have in mind is the well-being of the deity. I have no other duty than this. Every day, two [...] 4 *gharīs* after sunrise, I make a muttered reading of the *Gītā*. Then I go to the temple of the deity Śrī — jī. I offer unguents, sandal paste, saffron, and flowers, remove the clothing and decoration and apply a new set [...], and then make a prostration before it and circumambulate it and make intense supplication for the abundant power of the deity’s beneficence; and after serving the deity food, I arrange for the communal meal line for the Brahman Vaiṣṇavas. Each day I sing the praise of the deity’s name, after which I and the servants of the deity (*sevag*)⁵³ take *prasād*, [standing] in the line of the deity’s servants. At four *gharīs* before the end of the day⁵⁴ a homily is given, and at sunset the [lay?] people of the estate, too, gather and sing, accompanied by cymbals and drums. After the evening ritual of lamp-waving (*sandhyā-āratī*) and the circumambulation, devotional singing (*bhajan*) takes place until four *gharīs* of the night. Then the ritual of lamp-waving (*āratī*) at the last round of worship (*śyaṅyan-bhog*) takes place. This is the procedure followed every day.⁵⁵

In essence, the *mahant-cum-mālik* Jñānānand’s representation does not differ from that made by the custodian Tulsīdās in the precolonial period (see section 2.1.). That Jñānānand replied in greater detail is perhaps due to the purpose of the investigation, namely, to ascertain if the charitable grants the *gaddī* enjoyed were being used properly. He must have also felt that the colonial authorities expected to be informed in detail of his actually quite ordinary ritual duties. That he points to his reading of the *Bhagavadgītā* may be similarly motivated. It may be

53 The term *sevag* usually means “servant, temple servant”. In the above context, however, it probably denotes the devotees attached to a temple. See also p. 429.

54 A *gharī* lasts 24 minutes. The day lasts from ca. 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., hence around 4:30 p.m.

55 BM Āśvina b. 2, VS 1935/23 September 1878.

added that Jñānānand on his tours also checked on the habits of *gaddīs* that were offshoots of the Bālānandī *gaddī*.⁵⁶

2.4. The Heir

The intent of the document of 1822, discussed by Clémentin-Ojha (forthcoming), was to set forth the rules of succession in the case of a disciple who had lapsed from the position but apparently now claimed the *gaddī*. As the documents show, the confederacy of orders took a position that they would uphold consistently.⁵⁷ Nonetheless, the issue was not put to rest by mere firm rhetoric, for celibate lineages, presented by the orders as neatly set off from non-celibate ones, actually lived in close contact or might coalesce with lineages of non-celibate *bairāgīs* (see 2.5.). A case in point is the one from the year 1849 discussed in section 2.2. In any event, the issue was investigated again and again by the judiciary, not out of ignorance of precedents but because each case displayed peculiarities of its own that called for examination of the particular customs of the religious institution involved. To cite a typical case,

If the heir-apparent has not been designated by the *mahant*,

1. who decides that the candidate is a legitimate disciple?
2. what is the traditional procedure for making someone a disciple?
3. what steps in the procedure are followed at which time?
4. has it been certified in writing that a person has been accepted as a disciple?
5. would a four- or five-year-old disciple be given a mantra?⁵⁸

Conflicts were clustered around two main issues:

1. No heir-apparent had been nominated and consecrated by the deceased incumbent or acclaimed by the monastic community and the authorised arbitration council.

⁵⁶ See p. 430.

⁵⁷ Almost identical with the position taken in the document of 1822 is that of Mahant Rāmkr̥ṣṇānand (r. 1906–1942) in his statement of opinion solicited by the deputy collector of Alwar in a case where no heir-apparent had been nominated by the *mahant*, now dead (BM, date only partly legible: VS 19***).

⁵⁸ BM 15 February 1880.

2. After his succession to the *gaddī*, the incumbent was found unsuitable—a charge made by a rival claimant and his party.

Both types of conflict were driven by the anxiety of celibate lineages lest non-celibate claimants intrude themselves. Only a *celā*, “disciple”, was eligible to become heir-apparent and *mahant*. As the above-cited list of five questions reveals, certain steps had to be followed, such as his nomination by the incumbent *mahant*. A *celā* was, however, distinguished from other types of persons in the following of a *mahant* in that he was initiated. This is the reason why in the questionnaire above the last question concerns the age at which the *mantra* of initiation is given. The Bālānandī Nāgās’ mantra consists of the six syllables [*om*] *rām rāmāya namaḥ*. Into the 20th century the initiation with the six-syllable mantra remained the decisive criterion for *mahant*-ship. In the Bālānand Math’s genealogy of *mahants*, the date of initiation is given for each of them. In the Pāñcarātra ritual, the initiation comprises five rites (Skt. *pañca-samṣkāra*; a common Hindi equivalent is *pāñc kī kaṭorī*). One of the traditional ritual manuals for this recognised by the Bālānandīs is the *Rāmapaddhati*.⁵⁹ According to it,⁶⁰ the sequence in which the ritual is performed is

1. application of the Vaiṣṇava brow mark, in the case of Rāmānandī *nāgās* the white *ūrdhvaṇḍra*, followed by a spell of meditation,
2. branding with the Vaiṣṇava conch-shell and lotus marks,
3. giving of a new Vaiṣṇava name (ending in *-ānand* in the case of the heir-apparent of the Bālānandī chief *gaddī*, and in *-dās* for all other lineages),
4. imparting the six-syllable *mantra*, and
5. adorning with a necklace of *tulsī*-beads.⁶¹

If a *mahant* dies without having named and initiated an heir-apparent, but the *sampradāya* (I take this as meaning the local representatives

59 I have in mind, in particular, the manuscript of the *Rāmapaddhati* of VS 1898/1841 CE, written for the use of the *pūjārī* Rāmcarandās. Ascribed to Rāmānuja, the text is one of the ritual manuals recognised by modern Rāmānandīs.

60 BM *Rāmapaddhati*, foll. 22b–23a.

61 The ritual prescriptions current in the Bālānandī Math comprise the whole course of five rites (for a 20th-century printed manual, see Rāmcarandās 1951), though the documents relating to them tend to focus rather on debates about the appropriate initiation mantra and thus the continuity of the line from guru to disciple.

of the *sampradāya*) agrees on a suitable candidate, the latter needs to be initiated before he can be invested with the shawl and necklace of a new incumbent.⁶² The decision of the *sampradāya* needs to be confirmed by its chief *mahant*.

Additional evidence to prove the legitimacy of a candidate was often produced by pointing out his role at the funeral of the late *mahant*. Analogous to the duty of a Hindu son, it was the duty of an heir-apparent to conduct the funeral of the deceased officeholder (Clémentin-Ojha forthcoming: 14). The significance of this is illustrated by a criminal case concerning a *gaddī* subservient to the *gaddī* of the Rāmānandīs of Galtā and communicated to the Bālānandī *mahant*: Gaṅgādās and Nārāyaṇdās, two disciples of Mahant Jānakīdās, now dead, fought over ownership of the temple.⁶³ The court inquired whose claim was valid. The Galtā Rāmānandīs replied:

... The reply to this is that Svāmī Jānakīdās was the previous owner of the temple. Then he died, and at the time of his death Gaṅgādās was absent, but then he came and informed the government (*rāj*). When the government entrusted the building to him, the whole *sampradāya* and the arbitration council of Vaiṣṇavas honoured him with a necklace and shawl. After this the *mālik* of the deity was Gaṅgādās and no one else. Then Nārāyaṇdās, a temple servant appointed to service,⁶⁴ removed him and forcibly made himself managing temple servant. Gaṅgādās brought the matter before the court. According [to what has been set forth] it is confirmed that in this lawsuit Jānakīdās's disciple has the rightful claim, and his legitimation is fully in accordance with the custom of the *sampradāya*, and the whole arbitration council of Vaiṣṇavas has honoured him with necklace and shawl, for *tahalvo*⁶⁵ and *mālik* are fully identical....⁶⁶

Though this is not stated explicitly, Gaṅgādās seems to have fulfilled his duty to perform Jānakīdās's cremation.

62 On the investiture of a Nimbārka *mahant*, see Clémentin-Ojha 2006: 546.

63 The document has no *superscriptio*, so that the name of the temple cannot be identified. On the Rāmānandīs of Galtā, see Burghart 1978 and Horstmann 2002.

64 That is an ordinary *pujārī* and not an *adhikārī*.

65 For *tahalvo* as synonymous with *adhikārī*, see p. 406.

66 BM Pauṣa s. 13, VS 1913/8 January 1857.

It was also incumbent on the heir-apparent to bear the expenses of the ritual of the twelfth day after the death of the deceased *mahant*, which act substantiated his claim. In one expert opinion given by the Bālānandī *mahant*, this is pointed out, and the—according to him false—claimant of the *gaddī* is described as someone who had come from the east, was of low caste (*kāchī jāti*) and had never before performed temple service or served in the temple kitchen. Such a person, it is emphasised, does not qualify as a disciple, he is a Śūdra and his claim rests on greed.⁶⁷

As for the criteria imposed on an aspiring heir-apparent or successor, it may be added that prior to and into the British period the revenue collector (*āmil*) or his representative would exercise the administrative power of transferring proprietary rights to a candidate and would testify before him and the wider community that he was authorised to wield *adhikār*.⁶⁸ The new incumbent had to pay a succession fee that depended on his status as either ascetic or layman and on the assessed wealth of the *gaddī*.⁶⁹ The local Vaiṣṇava *pañc* and the representatives of the Vaiṣṇava *sampradāyas* would invest the new incumbent with the insignia of succession, namely, a ceremonial shawl and the Vaiṣṇava *tulsī*-necklace. The succession was confirmed by the supreme chief (*ācārya*) of the *sampradāya*. When such *ācāryas* were from the chief seats of religious orders or other similarly high-ranking *mahants* were present, the king himself would attend the investiture, or in the case of lower seats would be represented by his sword carried by a noble on his behalf. The necklace that the king gave on this occasion was a costly string of pearls. In the same way, the nobility that were related to the religious seat as donors of grants would recognise the new officeholder and thereby confirm him as successor to the benefits accruing from the deeds performed by their family in favour of the seat.⁷⁰

A document of 1885 shows that the judiciary had established a routine form of investigation into similar cases:

67 BM, undated document from the period between ca. 1859 and 1885, and in all likelihood from 1881.

68 VRI/T2, VS 1796.

69 “Definition of Important Vernacular Terms” of 3 March 1938, section II. Daftar Divānī Hujurī, Rāj Savāī Jaypur, VS 199*, radīf dī, Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.

70 Examples of this in Horstmann 2001, *passim*; like other religious institutions, the Bālānandīs were anxious to maintain regular contact with the grantors of charitable deeds, as is reflected by the numerous letters from nobility to the Bālānandī *mahant* in which they acknowledge letters and the receipt of *prasād*.

Who performed the cremation and paid for it?
 Who received the shawl and necklace?
 Who performed the procedure of making someone a disciple
 (*celā*), and what is the procedure followed in your *sampradāya*?⁷¹

2.5. Celibate vs. non-Celibate Candidates

In this essay, the conflict between celibate and non-celibate candidates appeared first in the case of Balrāmdās, Bairāgī Nāgā Santdāsot, vs. Gobindrām alias Gobinddās, Bairāgī Saṃjogī Santdāsot (section 2.2. above). These designations of the litigants are those given in the court protocol, so that it can be concluded that they identified themselves by them. Both were *bairāgīs* and belonged to the same lineage of Santdāsot, but they differed in that one was a *nāgā* (celibate ascetic) and the other a *saṃjogī* (non-celibate ascetic). Further down in the cited document, the *saṃjogī* Gobindrām/Gobinddās mentions that he was supported in his claim by a *mahant* over both *nāgās* and *saṃjogīs*, and also that he had been adopted by the deceased *mahant* whose vacant office he had had hoped to fill. It is, however, unclear if he was already a *saṃjogī* at the time of his adoption. A *saṃjogī* is defined as an ascetic living with a woman and potentially a family. The case of *nāgā* vs. *saṃjogī* reveals at the very least that the *saṃjogī*'s was a monastic lifestyle approved by some Rāmānandī lineages. The *saṃjogī*'s claim was vehemently contested by the *nāgā* plaintiff and the Bālānandī Nāgā *mahant*. The Bālānandī Nāgā *mahants* have always/generally been Brahmans. They uphold the ideal of the twice-born *nāgā*, regardless of the factual situation prevailing in various places. Mahant Rāmānand speaks of the possibility of someone slipping from the state of *nāgā* into that of *saṃjogī*,⁷² that is, slipping from celibacy into an irregular sexual relationship. This, he explains, has to be redressed by having him marry within his caste, provided, of course, that he has retained his caste or that his caste status can be reactivated. A *saṃjogī* can therefore not be identified with the *gharbhārī* sadhus, who leave the second, *gr̥hasṭha* stage of life to become sadhus but continue to live in their previous houses.⁷³ These figured as a perfectly legitimate category of sadhus in Hindu

71 BM Vaiśākha s. 8, VS 1942/22 April 1885.

72 See p. 415.

73 For a discussion of this, see Clémentin-Ojha forthcoming: 10.

law.⁷⁴ Mahant Rāmānand clearly sees a *saṃjogī* as deviating from the *nāgā* ideal. In the case of Ajodhyādās, the usurping managing priest at Lohārgal, Mahant Jñānānand gave vent to his contempt of him. In a letter addressed to the arbitration council of Vaiṣṇavas, he served up an official report of Ajodhyādās's misdeeds.⁷⁵ Not only had the latter made the place a shambles and dispersed temple property, but he was also keeping “bad company with *saṃjogīs*”. In a letter he wrote less than two weeks later to Ajodhyādās himself, Mahant Jñānānand castigates Ajodhyādās's notorious mismanagement and neglect of caste rules (*jāti pā[ṃ]ti*) at a site venerated throughout the region and whose temple was equivalent to the body of a Brahman⁷⁶—a sanctuary where proper worship ought to have been conducted according to the Pāñcarātra ritual.⁷⁷ This was as much as to say that Ajodhyādās's guilt amounted to the murder of a Brahman.

There is one tradition, articulated in the *Bhaviṣyapurāna* in a passage presupposing the presence of Muslims and Rāmānandīs in Ayodhyā, and therefore probably not older than the 18th century, that sees in *saṃjogīs* (*saṃjogīs*) Rāmāvat sadhus who at one time had been forcibly converted from Hinduism to Islam and were reconverted Muslims.⁷⁸ This explanation is not resorted to in the material at hand, and it seems also too narrow to capture the widely spread phenomenon of sadhus living in a sexual relationship with a woman. The passage provides, however, a piece of interesting information: Rāmānandī *saṃjogīs* were not just lax *nāgās* but distinguished by a different sectarian brow mark in white and red, though the exact shape of this Vaiṣṇava mark (*tripuṇḍra*) is not described. The brow mark of Rāmānandī *nāgās* is completely white, *u*-shaped with a perpendicular line in the middle.

The occurrence of *saṃjogīs* was not limited to the Rāmānandī *saṃpradāya* or other Vaiṣṇava orders. In the first decade of the 19th century, Francis Buchanan observed Daśnāmī *saṃjogīs* in the Purnea district of north Bihar:

74 For Nepal, see Bouillier 1978.

75 BM Śrāvāna b. 1, VS 1935/15 July 1878.

76 This identification is not far-fetched, for conversely the body of a man with a Vaiṣṇava brow mark is a temple, while the brow mark itself is called the temple of Hari (BM *Rāmpaddhati*, n.d., fol. 26a).

77 BM Śrāvāna b. 12, VS 1935/26 July 1878.

78 Siṃh 1957: 65, quoting from *Bhaviṣyapurāna* 3.4.21: “These mleccas were Vaiṣṇavas who had originated from Rāmānanda; known as *saṃjogīs*, they lived in Ayodhyā. They wear a Tulsi-necklace on their neck, their tongue was made to indulge in Rām, and the *tripuṇḍra* (the Rāmāvat sectarian mark) on their front was white and red”.

Many of the Dasnami Sannyasis of this district have not been able to resist marriage, and their ten divisions have become exactly analogous to the Gotras of the Brahmans, no person marrying a girl of the same denomination as that of his father. These persons, on account of their yielding to the temptations of the flesh, are called *Sang-Yogis* [joined-yogis]⁷⁹, but they call themselves Sannyasis, Gosaings, Atithi, and even Fakirs, which is a *Moslem* title.

The Sang-Yogis are said to owe their origin to a pupil of Sangkaracharya, who could not resist the flesh, and married; but those whom I have consulted know nothing of their history... They admit of concubines (*samodhs*). The Pandits say that they have no learning, but it is evident that the sacred order [celibate Dasnamis]⁸⁰ views the Sang-yogis with considerable jealousy; and these fellows have indeed the impudence to bestow their blessing on the Brahmans, to which those here quietly submit, ...⁸¹

Pinch (2006: 200) links the phenomenon of “Sang-yogis” with the tantric, sexual yoga. This is facilitated by interpreting Buchanan’s idiosyncratic rendering of the prefix “*saṃ-/sam-*” as “Sang-” as *saṅg*, “joined”, actually “union”. As for the Rāmānandī *saṃjogīs*, the documentary evidence is silent on any such substratum to their practices. In the 1849 case, the celibate plaintiff merely described a *saṃjogī* as a sadhu who had a family.

2.6. The Arbitration Council (*Pañc, Pañcāyat*)

The process of local *gaddīs* separating from their chief *gaddīs* is typified by a case that occupied the judiciary for at least sixteen years. Malavika Kasturi (2009: 1058) reviewed the case at some length, where the focus lay on “women [fighting] bitter legal battles over property to establish their rights and those of their offspring within the sampradaya concerned”. The case sheds also light on the issue of non-celibate monks, as discussed, with an emphasis on *saṃjogīs*, in section 2.5. It concerns the fate of a *mahant’s* woman and offspring after his

79 Addition by Pinch 2006: 160.

80 Addition by Pinch 2006: 160.

81 Buchanan 1986: 269–270, quoted with some omissions from Pinch 2006: 160.

death. The contestants, while not referring to the sexual relationship of a monk as sanctioned by the institution of *saṃjog*, do refer to other *bairāgī* customs: The late Mahant Jānakīdās of the Badrīnārāyaṇ temple in Mohalla Kisrol⁸² of Muradabad had been succeeded by Sālagrām (“Saligram” in the court papers). Sālagrām was removed from the *gaddī* on grounds of “impropriety”, and replaced by Gopāldās, a younger son of Jānakīdās, and placed under the guardianship of his mother (Raman Bai) and aunt. Witnesses were in doubt as to whether Gopāldās was the son of Jānakīdās or rather the offspring from a previous sexual relationship of his mother with some other *bairāgī*. To add to the confusion, Gopāldās is also reported as calling himself a “maternal grandson” of Jānakīdās.⁸³ A member of the local arbitration council

that had removed Salig Ram as Mahant, deposed that Raman Bai was a Kayasth, and had been ‘kept’ by Janki Das. The latter, he averred, had contracted a *gandharva* marriage with her, as per the custom of *bairāgis*. (Kasturi 2009: 1058 n. 80)

At the stage of the first appeal in the case to the Allahabad High Court, he had already stated that “it was optional for the mahants to be bachelors or ‘enter the matrimonial state’” (Kasturi 2009: 1055 n. 64). Kasturi (2009: 1059) makes the point that Gopāldās’s mother, who defined her position as that of the “lawful wife” of the deceased *mahant*, claimed her son’s right on the basis of *bairāgī* custom. In August 1875, her claim was granted in a regular appeal to the Allahabad High Court.⁸⁴

Whereas this and other cases reflect some of the various *bairāgī* customs of forming sexual bonds, as reviewed especially by Kasturi (2009) and Pinch (2006), in the particular case of the deposed Sālagrām the Bālānandī *gaddī* had a role to play, and the case by no means ended with the Allahabad High Court judgement of August 1875. The temple was an offshoot of the Bālānandī *gaddī*. In 1864, apparently after having been evicted from the *gaddī*, Sālagrām appealed to Mahant Jñānānand, who confirmed his *mahant*-ship:

82 Not “Karoli” (Kasturi 2009: 1058, n. 79).

83 See p. 430.

84 Allahabad High Court Judgement, 27 August 1875, in Saligram Das vs. Mussamat Sujanio, Regular Appeal 8/1875, AHCDCCR (Kasturi 2009: 1059 n. 84).

Hail, to Śrī Mahant Sālagrāmdāsī “Jay Śrī [Sītārāma]jī” from Śrī Guru Mahant Mahārāj Śrī [Jñānānand]jī. Reference: The Murādābād site was built by Caraṇdāsī. Now you are (there) after nine generations of disciples. Therefore the ownership of the estate is yours, and no householder etc. has a claim [to it]. If someone makes a claim, he is doing [so under] false pretences. The estate is one of celibate ascetics. So it has always been. You will keep it [so]. Upon the death of Mahant Jānakīdāsī, all *pañcs*, servants of the deity (*sevag*) and *mahants* acknowledged this ceremoniously, and I too acknowledged it ceremoniously. Date: Jyeṣṭha s. 5, VS 1921/9 June 1864.

(address:) Mohalla Kisrol, house of Jānakīdās⁸⁵

The fight over the *gaddī* here gains contour as a conflict between a chief *gaddī* of celibate Rāmānandī monks who has interceded on behalf of the celibate successor to a *de iure* but not *de facto* celibate sublineage of the chief *gaddī*, on the one hand, and the non-celibate constituency of that local *gaddī*, on the other. Factually, the line of Muradabad had ceased being celibate at some unknown point in time. The late Mahant Jānakīdās himself was non-celibate in ways hard to keep track of, but he had groomed two celibate disciples.⁸⁶ Sālagrām had survived both his fellow disciple and Mahant Jānakīdās, and he had been duly installed as successor. The claim of the minor Gopāldās’s mother and aunt was supported by a local arbitration council. According to Mahant Jñānānand, this local council had revoked the confirmation of investiture of Sālagrām by the proper arbitration council, the servants of the temple (*sevag*),⁸⁷ and Jñānānand himself. Three months after the judgement handed down by the Allahabad High Court, the Bālānandī *mahant* appealed to the government, the result of which I have been to date unable to trace:

Let it be known from Mahantjī Mahārāj Śrī [Gyānānand], incumbent of the chief seat, [namely,] the temple of Mahārāj Śrī [Bālānand], resident of Savāī Jaipur, officer of the Four *sampradāyas*, [writing] from the capital to the followers of the Four *sampradāyas* and the British Government, with reference to the following: The officer⁸⁸

85 BM Jyeṣṭha s. 5, VS 1921/9 June 1864; see Appendix, doc. no. 5a.

86 See p. 430.

87 See p. 428, n. 84.

88 English word in the original.

in the four *sampradāyas* is the monk who decides in case of a conflict in his particular order. The arbitration council (*pañcāyat*) of no party whatever has any authority to make a decision. The authority vests in me. In the four orders no one else besides me has the authority to decide who is capable of being *mahant*, or who is unqualified to be kept and should be removed. So if now in the lawsuit of Sālagrāmdās, disciple of Jānakīdāsji of Murādābād, an arbitration council of five monks got together and with bias and hostility, and without informing me, acted against my wishes and out of hostility, this arbitration council is dismissed and abolished. Who are these monks that they hold an arbitration council, and what for? I am the officer. As Mahant Jānakīdās was a celibate ascetic, he had neither wife nor daughter's son. Gopāldās calls himself a "maternal grandson". In the first place, Jānakīdās had no wife; he was a celibate ascetic. And as for "maternal grandson", no brother, a brother's or sister's son, or maternal grandson has a claim as long as there is a disciple. Jānakīdās had two disciples (*cele*). One was Nārāyaṇdās, the other Sālagrām. Jānakīdās himself in his own lifetime installed Nārāyaṇdās on the *gādī*, and after Nārāyaṇdās Sālagrām sat on the *gādī* and was *mahant*, and for some years remained on the *gādī* and managed the affairs of the estate (*thikāṇā*). And I went for *darśan* and pilgrimage to Śrī Badrīnārāyaṇ, and at that time stayed for a couple of days at the temple in Murādābād. At that time I saw Mahant Sālagrāmdās and personally made him *mahant*. He is conscientious; and I watched the behaviour of the people around him. I noticed no mismanagement. Therefore, that five monks got together, formed an arbitration council, and made Gopāldās *mahant* is totally illegal. It is illegal to give the temple to someone else as long as there is a disciple. Sālagrāmdās is *mahant* and suitable for the *gādī*. There is no fault in him. I have made Sālagrāmdās *mahant* [and] master of the temple and property and entitled him [to act as such]. It is necessary that he be installed on the *gādī* according to the rules that prevail among us. Sālagrāmdās is the *mahant*. The arbitration council consisting of outsiders who out of hostility made Gopāldās the *mahant* is dismissed. It has no right. No one has a right except Sālagrāmdās.

Date: Kārttika s. 9, VS 1932/7 November 1875.⁸⁹

89 BM Kārttika s. 9, VS 1932/7 November 1875; see Appendix, doc. no. 5b.

The Vaiṣṇavas and their confederate orders had consistently emphasised that councils had each to consist of members from their own order and could not be convoked against the will, or make decisions that would violate the will, of the *mahant* of the *gaddī* concerned or, in the case of his office being vacant, the chief *mahant* of the order or sub-order. The range of a *pañcāyat*'s rights was well circumscribed.⁹⁰ In the *maḥzar-nāma* drafted sometime in the period between 1778 and 1803 in Vrindaban, the attestations of the witnesses prove that all of these were representatives of Vaiṣṇava orders. This shows the coherence and exclusiveness of the assembly convoked. The administrative officers of Vrindaban acting as witnesses figure separately. These were the chief village officer (*mukadam*), local land revenue officers (*cau-dharī*), and the village accountant (*paṭvārī*).

An arbitration council formed by members of the order was present at and approved the investiture of a new incumbent of the *gaddī*.⁹¹ Implicit to the document of 1829 is the notion that a contested claimant of the *gaddī* had been supported by an arbitration council extraneous to the Rāmānandī Nāga order. Similarly, in the conflict between Mahant Sālagrām and *bairāgīs* over the *gaddī* of the Badrīnārāyaṇ temple of Kisrol, Muradabad, the arbitration council formed by *bairāgīs* was declared illegitimate by the chief *mahant* at the Bālānandī Maṭh on the grounds that they were not authorised to meddle with the affairs of a *nāgā gaddī*.⁹²

The interference of extraneous, and therefore unauthorised, local *pañcāyats* runs through most of the material discussed. This indicates that authority over *nāgā* institutions, claimed by local Rāmānandī Nāgā *mahants* or the chief *mahant* at Jaipur, had all but broken down. The case of Sālagrām of Kisrol offers especially blatant evidence for this: the *bairāgī* claimants did not even bother to acknowledge that the temple was a *nāgā* institution.

90 See BM Māgha k. 2, VS 1885/4 January 1829, pp. 408–410; Appendix, doc. no. 2.

91 See BM Pauṣa s. 13, VS 1913/8 January 1857, p. 413.

92 See pp. 429–430.

3. Conclusion

In her study of the Nimbārka document of 1822, Catherine Clémentin-Ojha relates the principles enunciated in that document as conforming to the rules of traditional Hindu law. Accordingly, she raises the unavoidable question:

[W]hat was the point in reiterating these principles if they were well-known? Either they were totally unheard of in Jaipur.... Or, as I am inclined to think, the presence of the British made their implementation problematic. (Clémentin-Ojha forthcoming: 13)

In her conclusion of a detailed analysis, she says:

It is all this that leads me to think that the necessity to leave a record of the state of things did respond to the presence of the British who as newcomers would not have been acquainted with them. (ibid.: 18)

Though the document she studied may not reveal this conspicuously, in looking back on it from the perspective of the 1829 document studied in this essay,⁹³ and given its caption “report, statement of facts”, it must be concluded that it was indeed drafted precisely as a report solicited by the British during the legal dispute over the succession to the Nimbārka chief *gaddī* of Salemābād (Clémentin-Ojha forthcoming: 17). This, then, would mean that the case had been taken to the political agent of Jaipur State. The initiative to draft it would have come from the celibate Nimbārka *mahant* whose claim was contested by a candidate from a non-celibate lineage but endorsed by the confederacy of Vaiṣṇava and other orders. Dīvān Bairīsāl (Rāval Bairīsāl of Sāmod) put his seal at the head of the document. He was acting on behalf of the minor Mahārājā Jaysingh III and, in all but name, as adjunct regent of the Regent Mother.⁹⁴ As Dīvān Musāhib, he dispensed justice in the

93 See pp. 409–410

94 The reading and interpretation of the seal given by Clémentin-Ojha (forthcoming: 23 and 25, respectively), needs modification: *śrī rāmājī/śrī mahārājādhirāja/śrī savāi jaysimhajī/vande rāvala bairīsāl nāthāvata*, “Śrī Rāmājī—Rāval Bairīsāl Nāthāvata, servant of Śrī Mahārājādhirāj Savāi Jaysimh (III; not a reference to Savāi Jaysimh/Jaysimh II, r. 1700–1743)”. While *vande* does mean “I do homage”, the word occurs in a position where one expects

name of the ruler, who at that point in time still “exercised supreme civil and criminal jurisdiction”.⁹⁵

A number of the documents discussed above form examples of how the tradition of consensual decision making continued operating and was recognised as valid by the colonial judiciary.⁹⁶ With the exception of the one precolonial document, all of the documents indeed answer the need to explain the customs of the Rāmānandī Nāgās to the colonial power. In the process, the Bālānandī *mahant* again and again emphasised that a *nāgā mālik*, *mahant*, or *celā* must be celibate and of high caste, namely, a Brahman.⁹⁷ As long as the Bālānandī Nāgās had been actively militant and thereby flourished, there was no dearth of celibate disciples and, of course, a motley crowd of *bairāgīs* and soldiers. Once the material base of their prosperity, active militancy, had broken down, the Bālānandīs ceased attracting disciples. The Bālānandī temples and the chief *gaddī* itself were depleted of their wealth. In a state of degradation both of wealth and power, the *mahants* fought to guard their honour by defending the one prized possession left to them: their status as celibate *nāgās* of Brahman descent. They also hoped that proving their historical rights to temples by underpinning them genealogically would stem the tide of history itself. For this they eagerly solicited the help of the judiciary of the colonial dispensation.

either the word *sevaka* or *bandā*, “servant”, and not a verb in the first person singular. For this reason, I suspect that *vande* is a mistake for *vandā*. For the Hindi seal of Pahārsīngh Khaṅgarvat, featuring *ba[ṅ]dā*, see Horstmann (1999: 77), and for *sevaka* in the corresponding position, *ibid.*, p. 79, (3) and (4).

95 Bansali 1993: 50; see also *ibid.*: 51.

96 See Appendix, doc. no. 1 for a precolonial document recording a consensual decision, and—for colonial documents—Appendix, doc. nos. 2 and 3 together with their formal antecedent of 1822 as discussed by Clémentin-Ojha (forthcoming).

97 This has been the preferred practice since the 18th century. In the *Rāmapaddhati*, fol. 25a (see n. 59), even a pure-hearted Caṇḍāla is mentioned as eligible to display the *tripuṇḍra*, “the temple of Hari”.

Appendix

Texts

Only a selection of the original texts quoted has been given in the Appendix.

In the main body of the texts, word separation and punctuation have been added.

Unless stated otherwise, the original line breaks have not been retained.

Underscoring indicates uncertain reading.

/.../ indicates additions added above the line.

Missing superscript vowel signs, metathesis, disaspiration of consonants, and missing or “misplaced” nasals are features of the original texts.

1. BM n.d., regnal period of Mahārājā Pratāpsingh of Jaipur (r. 1778–1803)

Language: Hindi

॥श्री सीतारामजी
वालमुकुंदजी
श्री नृतगोपालजी
विसनस्यंहजी
जैस्यंहजी

॥स्वस्ति श्रीमन् महाराजेषु राजाधिराज ऊग्रप्रतापमारतंडो दयवत् कुपथ धर्माधिकारन् द्रावयमानय श्री वृंदावननिकुंजगुंजपुंजेषु गौरस्यामधामभावनां निपुणवृजरजभक्तिभावक श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री महाराजाधिराज श्री प्रतापसिंहजीजोग्येषु श्रीधाम तें सुभवांछिक स्मस्त गुसाई महंत वैस्नव जिमीदारन कै प्रति पूर्वक आसीर्वाद ईस्ट स्मर्णपूर्वक राम राम यथाजोग्य वंचनी। अत्र आनंद है। आप को आनंद श्रीधाम मैं श्रीजी के आगे सुभ वांछिते है। अप्रिया येक विग्यसिपत्र जानूगे। महजरनांमा आगैं आप के वडेर महाराजाधिराज वैकुंठगामी [विसनस्यंहजी] तथा महाराजाधिराज श्री वैकुंठगामी श्री [जैस्यंहजी] तथा माजी साहिवजी श्री तथा प्रीथीस्यंह जी ईन सवन के मांथे कै श्री ठाकुर [वालमुकुंदजी] तथा श्री ठाकुर [श्री नृतगोपालजी] ईहां श्री वृंदावन मैं श्री महाराजाधिराज के मंदर विराजै है। तिन की सेवा पूजा अधिकारी तुलसीदासजी के वडेर सदा सूं करत आये हैं। जो पहैलो भोग राग है ताही मर्जाद मांफिक चलायै ज्यां है। आप के बवडेर[न] को नाम जस करै है। और ब्राम्हन वैस्नव मंदरन मैं आंवैं ता को स्तकार करै है। आप को सुजस वदावै है। और यह कहै है। हम तौ टहलुवा श्री ठाकुर जी के है और मालिक तौ श्री महाराजाधिराज है। सो यह सदा सूं हम भी षेपत सुंनत आये है। या मैं श्री गोव्यंदजी के टहैलुवा पूजारीन नैं ईन सूं टटो कीयो। ईन को वैस्नव महीना येक तलक तुरकन कै धिराय दीयो। कही सता तुम हम कूं लिषि द्यो। ता पै ईन नै यह कही। हम कौन है। हम तौ ठाकुरजी के टहलुवा है। सता लिषवे के मालिक तौ श्री महाराजाधिराज है। तव ईन के पुजारी वैस्नऊ कूं तो हम सब पंचाय करि आंमिल कूं स्मझाय करि छुडाय लाये। मंहीनां येक ताई पुजारी धिरा रह्यो। से यह वात तो चाहिये न्ही। अव वात के मालिक श्री महाराज्य है। और वह रतनदास को घेर न्यारो बतावै है। सो ईहां तो घेर है। सो श्री महाराजाधिराज को येक ही है। और चौक न्यारे न्यारे है। और दुसरो घेर कोई है न्ही। सो घेर को नंकसा है सो हजूरि मैं भेज्यो है। सो आप देषि लीजेगो।

ऊगाही अ[...]

ऊगाही तेजा मोकदम के

ऊगाही रामजी मुकदम की वगाही कासी मुकदम की

ऊगाही गुपल मुकदम की

ऊगाही वीद मुकदम की

ऊगाही प्रीया चौधरी की

ऊगाही वीरजवासी चौधरी की

ऊगाही मोतीराम चौधरी की

ऊगाही कीसनदास पटवारी की

(The following attestations are arranged in the left and right margins of the document; the original line breaks are not maintained.)

(left margin, from top to bottom)

- अत्र साछी श्री महंत रामदासजी परमारथी के
- साछी श्री विहारीजी के गौस्वामी उत्मा[...].विनोदीलाल
- [अ]त्र साछी श्री [...].हुरी[...].जी के महंत हरी[दा]सजी विस्नुदासजी
- अत्र साछी श्री स्यामसुंदरजी के महंत गोपालचरणजी
- अत्र साछी श्री राधारवंगजी के गुसाई श्री जीवनलालजी श्री नंदलालजी
- अत्र साछी श्री रसिकबिहारीजी के महंत श्री स्वामी गोवर्धनदासजी
- अत्र साछी श्री गलता के मुषिया सीतारामजी
- अत्र साछी श्री राधादमोदरजी के टहलुवा कन्हरदास
- अत्र साछी मथुरादास दिलप्रवरीजी के
- अत्र साछी बडी कुंज को मुषिया चतुरदास
- अत्र साछी श्री मदनमोहनजी के टहलुवा दामोदरदास
- अत्र साछी श्री वीनोदीलालजी के नीमचरनदास
- अत्र साछी श्री गोपीनाथजी के टकहलुवा नंदन सिरकार

(right margin, from bottom to top)

- अत्र साछी दूल्हैराम श्रीजी को मुषिया
- अत्र साछी श्री नागाजी के मुषिया लालदासजी
- अत्र साछी सेवग श्री महाराज्यके गोव्यंदराम
- अत्र साछी श्री मलूकजी के महंत जैरामदासजी
- अत्र साछी श्री जुगलकिसोरजी के गुसाई हठूलालजी
- अत्र साछी श्री विहारीजी के गुसाई मयानाथजी
- अत्र प्रमाण अत्र साछी श्री सिंगारवट के गोस्वामी श्री निवानंदजी
- अत्र साछी दीनानाथ गरुत्म
- अत्र साछी श्री व्यासजी के टहलुवा [...].जराजजी
- अत्र साछी श्री राधावलभजी के गोस्वामी चतुरसिरोमण लालजी
- अत्र साछी श्री गौस्वामी राधावलभजी क्रपासिधुलालजी
- अत्र साछी सेवादास विस्नुस्वामी

2. BM Māgha k. 2, VS 1885/22 January 1829

Bilingual, Persian in the left and Hindi in the right column; an illegible English endorsement in the bottom left corner. The copy underlying the edited texts is difficult to read, for it represents a paper copy made from a print of a photo taken of the document, which was framed behind glass and stained.

श्रीमत रामानुज संप्रदाय के आचार्य महंत माहाराज जी श्री सेवानंद जी है। ईन को कीयो न्याव सरब भेष म प्रमाण है। सदीव सु ई गदी न्याव होता आया है। सो सति परिपाटी परंमपरा मे सदामद संप्रदाय च्यारि वैसन्वै समस्त वा दसनामी जोगी पंथ जैन मारिग वा बीरमचारी भेषधारी समस्त षट द्रसन सबन की ये ही रीत है अपणी गदी आचारज संप्रदाय मारिग मैं पंचायत पुकार पुजा भेट करै। ओरु की पंचायत का दावा नहीं। दावा गदी का टीकाई धणी का है। गदीन सु भेष सरबत्र उत्र दषिण पुरब पछिम समुद्र पर्यंत रहते है। गदीन कुं भेट पूजा माफिक मर्जाद हमेस पोहोचाते है। सब अस्थान मकान ऊपरि दावा गदीन का पोहोचै है। गदी के मालिक कुं गुरु परमेसुर समतुल मानै है। ज्यो कोई गदी की मरजाद मेट करै तै धरम बिगडै।

(one line illegible due to a crease in the document)

गदी का बांटा होता नहीं। ऐसैं सदीव मरजाद चली आवे है। ज्यो कोई मेटन करै सो झुठा। ऐसैं ही मकान पाहा सुडीबाई का महंत म्हााराज नै कृष्णदास कू मालिक कीया। वाहां कै सब मकान अस्थान का आचारज्य गदी का नै भी मालिक करि दीया। ओर कोई दावा करै सो झुठा। ऐसैं ही सो ब्रस्पीछ सुषरामदास ने दावा घाट का कीया। सो झुठा है। पवै न्ही ही। आचारज्यान महंतान मारिग मरजाद संप्रदाय सु बाहिर झुठा कीया। पावै न्ही। सत्य बारता लिषण म आई है। मिति माघ कृसन पषसि २ सवत १८८५

3a. BM 16 August 1849

Section 1 of the file of documents is written in a formal Nāgarī script; the rest in office script, a regional form of Kaithī. Gregorian date in the original. Language: Hindi.

॥श्री रामजी⁹⁸

(signature) CG Dixon

(Section 1: Formal report and request)

कैफीयत करनैल डिकसन साहब बाहाद्र सुपरंटीडट अज्मेर नाम म्हांतजी रामावत संप्रदा के ता. १६ अगसत १८४९ ई०। अप्रंचा बलरामदास स्वामी नागा संतदासोत अर गोबींदराम संजोगी संतदासोत के सीतारामजी का मंद्र कसबे केकडी के म्हांताई अर पुजा अर मालकी का झगडा हे अर मकदमा ईन का अदालत कचंहडी हमारी में दायर हे। अर पुछ ता सीरसते का म्हांत मजकुर सैं जरुर हे। ईस वासते त्रजमा नकल रुबकारी ईस मुकदमे का पास म्हांत मजकुर के भेजा जावे। अर म्हांत मजकुर ईस रुबाकारी कुं बाच कर जवाब रुबकारी का ज्यो वाजब हौ लीष कर भेज देवे

(signature) CG Dixon

98 The document has a few Persian and English office endorsements, here ignored.

(Section 2: Identification of the subject matter of section 3 and the issuing authority)

रुबकारी कचेरी सुपरंडंटी अजमैर जलुस मै करनैल चारलस जारज डीगसन साहब ब्हादर सुपरंडंट की ता० १६ महीनां अगसत १८४९ ईसवी

(seal; Persian and Hindi; Hindi:

māhā kacaharī sāhab supa/raṁṭaṁḍaṁt bahādur jilāi/ajmair san īsavī/1849)

(Persian endorsement)

(signature) CG Dixon

(Section 3: Case protocol and ensuing queries of the Adālat Court)

॥बलरामदास बैरागी नागा संतदासोत भा[.....]

[...]वकीफ (?)

रहने [?का] कसब के क ऊ० ---- मुदई

॥गोबींदराम बरागी संजोगी संतदासोत

(three short lines illegible)

दावा दषल पांने ऊपर गादी महंताई मंदर सीतारामजी के ओर मालक होने मंदर वा दुकानो वागर ता के मंदर के वा बापोती की रूसं

॥हाल ईस मुकदमै का येह मंदर १ सीतारामजी का केकडी मै दबारकादास स्वांमी नागा संतदासोत नै बनाय्यां था। अर जनम जीवते ताई मालक रहा। जब व रामसरण हुवा रामदास चेला ऊस का गादी बठा। अर ऊस के मरने पीछे गोबींदराम संजोगी मालक मंदर का हुआ। अर अब संजोगी के नालक होने स बलरामदास स्वांमी नागा संतदासोत दावा गादी बैठने अर मालक होने मंदर का ईस तर करता है। ये मंदर नागो का बनाय्यां हुवा दुवारकादास संतदासोत का है। ओर पीछे मरने ऊन के दोलतराम महंत संतदासोत की मरजी स रामदास चेला दुवारकादास का गादी बैठा। अर पीछे मरने ऊस क कोई चेला ऊस का नै रहा। अब महंत का अषतर्यार हे के नागो संतदासोत म संजोगी रामदास के नजीकी होवै पुजा मंदर की अर मालकी ऊस कुं सोपै। सो रुघनाथदासजी महंत संतदासोतो के न मुज कुं रामदास का नज़ीकी ज्यांन कै मालक ओर पुजारी मंदर का किय्या है। दषल मेरा मंदर मै कराय्या जावै। अर गोबींददास ज्यो जंबरदसती मालक हो गय्या है अर आप कुं चेला रामदास का बतावै है झुट है। ओर चेला रामदास का होवै तौ भी गादी ऊस कु न्ही पोछे कुक वो संजोगी है। कुटुम कबीला रषत रहै। अर मंदर बनाय्यां हुवा नागो का है। संजोगी नागो की गादी पर बैठ न्ही सकता। ईस लीये माफीक तजबीअ पंच नागो के ओर रुघनाथदासजी के जो महंत सब जमायत नांगो का है मुज कु गादी अर मालकी मंदर की पोचैती है। फकता ओर जवाब गोबंददास का ये हे के रामदास महंती दफे वासते गादी बठने ओर मालकी मंदर के मुज कुं होव क हमरा थे। अर दसतावेज गोद लेणे की लिष दी थी। अर ईस बात कुं संतदासोत महंत ईमरतरामजी गुरदवारे दांतड़े के जो महंत नागो अर संजोगियों के है ऊनो नै कायम रषा। ईस सब बस मे गादी बैठा अर मालकीयत मंदर की पाई। अब बलरामदास का कुछ दावा न्ही पोछैता। अरे रामदासजी नै मुज कुं

चेला अपना कर के बाव हमारा कर दीय्या था।फकता अब सरकार कुं दो बात तहकीक करनी हे। येक य्यां है क गादी बैठना गोबींदराम का रामदास के पीछे वाजबी हुवा य्यां न्ही अर मंदर नागो मै संजोगी कबीलदार मालक हो सकता है य्यां न्ही। दुसरी जो गोबींदराम असल मै मालक गादी रामदास का न्ही /हुवा/ अर हुवा तो बेवाजब हुवा तो फेर अब दावा ओर हक बलरामदास का है य्यां न्ही। सो दरय्यांफत करणां ईस बातो का महंतो च्यांर संपरदा सै वाजब है। ईस वासाते] हुकम हुवा।

(Section 4: Request to the addressee, the “Rāmāvat mahant”, to solicit statements from the Four Vaiṣṇava Orders)

तरजमां नकल ईस रुबकारी का हीदवी मै हो कै सुधा परचे कैफयत हीदवी मै पास महंत नीमारक वा माधवाचारज वा बीसनुस्वामी रामांवात चारो संपरदा के महंत मालको के पास भेजी जावै। च्यांर महंत जो वाजब जानं जवाब ईस मुकदेमे का लीषे।फकता

(signature) CG Dixon

3b. BM n.d.

Related to 3a. Language: Dhūṇḍhārī.

॥श्री रामजी

म्हां की जै श्री -----जी की बांचोगा। अपरंचा कफीयेत अजमरे सू अजंट वाहाद्र की राज्य कनां ये आई ती मे लीषी वलरामदास बरागी संतदासोत रहणवाला केकडी का अर गोब्यंददास वरागी संतदासोत क गदी बठिबा को तकरार आपस मै छै। ती मुकदमां मै रुभकारी करनेल डीगसन साहिब वहाद्रु सीपरटुंट अजमेर का की वास्त पूछणे हवाल च्यारु संप्रदाये के आई। सो भेजी छै। सो च्यारु संप्रदाये का म्हांतां सू हवाल पूछि अर भेजीज्यो। ई वास्त असल रुभकारी डीगसन साहिब की आप क पासि भेजी अर लीष्यो जाये छै जो अहाल /ई का/ नीका समजि सनांतन की राहा मरियाद मूजिब आप की संप्रदाये के अन सूवार द्र जबाब लीष भेजोला। सो ई को जवाब यो छै। म्हां की संप्रदाये में तो सनांतन सू या राहा छै नीहंग का सथान होये ज्या मे नीहंग चेलो होये सो ही गादी बठ अर कदाचित् चेलो न्ही होये तो भाई गूर भाई नजीकी नीहंग होये सो बठ। वा० भाई गूर भाई येक दोये पीढी में न्ही होये तो जी संप्रदाये को बैसनू होये जी का आचारजि होये जें को दायीयो पोंच व राष जो ही रहा। ओर चेलो भी होये अर संजोगी हो जाये वा अपणी जाति में व्याह करि ले तो नीहंग का सथान में दायीया न्ही पोंचा। या रीत सें तो दायीयो वलरामदास संतदासोत को पो[च।

4. BM Mārgaśiras b. 10, VS 1934/30 November 1877

Top lines with *superscriptio* missing and left margin cropped. Language: Dhūṇḍhārī.

...]री श्री श्री श्री श्री १०८ श्री गुरु म्हंत म्हाराज्य श्री ---- की हजुरी म वैष्णुदा-
 सा] का चेला अज्योध्यादास भगवानदास उगर की साष्टांग दंडोत मालिम होय
 अप्रंचि श्री म्हाराजी की हजुरी म लिष दीनी ज्यो श्री लोहागरजी को स्था-
 ना] वणायो हुवो घरु श्री गुरु म्हंत म्हाराज्य श्री ---- को छै। जीनी वगीच वा (crease in paper)
 बा]ग १ वा मोजे सोनासर षरोलि उगर की जीवका छै। /च/डयो उतर्यो भेट उग-
 र] को माल सवाव छै सो सदीव सु षालसाई छै। ज्यो जपुर क स्थान गदी वटै-
 ण]वालो मालिक छै आवंदी षरच भालिवे तरफी म्हाराजी क इकत्थार
 ...] सदैव सु हि। अबै वडा म्हारा (!) श्री गरु म्हंत म्हाराजी श्री ---- तरफ म
 ...] कीसु यो मकान तालिक म्हां कै वदगी करिवा न कैर छै। सो आप गदी का
 मा]लीक छो। कह्यो आप को होसी। अबै जै तह वडा म्हाराज्य बीराज्या छै जी
 ...]र तो उठा की सेवा वही करै छै। आवंदी आव सो श्री जी का भोग सदावरत
 मे लगावै छै। और पाछै आप को हुकम होसी सो माथ राषिस्था। मरजी मुजिबै रह-
 स्या। ज्यो आप म्हा सु वंदगी करास्यो तो मरजी /मुजीव चालि/वार चाला तो मकान आप को
 छै। जी चाव सो करो।यो मकान सदैव सु श्री लोहारगरजी को षालसा को छै।
 ई मकान मै जीसु धणी वंदगी करावो सोई कर उजर कोई भी न्ही। येक हुक-
 म आप को [...] रहसी। आप की मरजी होसी सो करस्या। म्हे तो स्यामषोर गदी
 का छा। और आमनाय सदैव की छै जी माफिक चालिस्या। या लिषावटी म्हा
 की राजी कुसी सु लिषी। ई म फीरा फिरावा तो श्री हरि गुरु सु वेमुष राज पंच
 अंगरेजी सौरकार म झुठा। मीती मगसर वदी १० संमत १९३४ का----
 दसकत अजोध्यादास का माफीक लीषे सरो----
 दसकत हरदेव प्रोहत का कह्यो अजोध्यादासजी क लीषी----
 साष १ हरीदास की कह्या अजोध्यादास क लीषी

साष १ अधिकारी
 नागरीदास की कहो
 अजोद्या/दा/सजी क करी

साषी रवासा सुथान का अद-
 कारी मषीया की कहे
 अजोद्या-
 दासजी क करी षेमदासजी

द० अधिकारयान /मुषिया/
 ठाकुरजी
 श्री ---- जी का कहा
 अजोध्या-
 दासजी की करी
 स्याष १ ठाकुरजी श्रि ----जी
 का अधीकारी कमलादास
 की हुकु श्री गौसाईजी का
 षहा अजुध्यदास का लीषी
 की करी

5a. BM Jyeṣṭha s. 5, VS 1921/9 June 1864

Draft letter, no *superscriptio*. Language: Hindi.

॥श्री

स्वस्ति श्री महंत सलगरामदासजी जोग्य श्री गुरु महंत महाराजि श्री ----जी के जय श्री ----जी की बंचज्यो। अप्रंचि। मुकाम मुरादाबादा म सथानं चरणदासजी बाध्यौ। अब उन के सीस्य नव पीढी पीछे तुम हो। सो वा सथान म मालकीयत तुमारी है। ओर कीसी ग्रहस्त वगहर का दावा नही। जो कोई दावा करसी सो झुठा है। ये सथानं नीहंग का है। सदीवा सो ये ही रहा। तुम रषौ। मरणे महंत जानकीदासजी के पीछे सब पंचुन वा सेवगुन महंतां ई का सिसटाचार तुमारां कीया। सो महे बी थां को सीसटाचार कीयो। मीती जेठ सु० ५ संबत १९२१
कीसरोल का महोला जानकीदासजी को मकान

5b. BM HL 313, Kārttika s. 9, VS 1932/7 November 1875

Language: Hindi.

श्री रामजी बंदरीनारायनजी
ग्यानानंदजी बालानंदजी

तरफ महंतजी म्हाराज श्री ---- सद्रनसीन मंद्र म्हाराज श्री ---- साकिन सवाई ज्योपुर्अफसर चारुं संपडदा की सुं म्हापुर सों चारुं सपडदाय आहाल्यां/न/ सरकार अंगरेजी को मालुम हो। अपरंचा ये फकीर चारुं संपडदा मैं अफसर ह जो ईस भेक मैं किसी तोर का झगडा हो ऊस का फसला यू फकीर करता ह। ओर कीस कुं पंचायत य फसले करन का अषतयार न्ही है हम कुं अषत्यार ह। जो महंत लायक हो उस कुं रषना नालायक हो उस कुं दुर करने का ये अषतयार चारुं भेक मैं स किसी कुं नही सिवा हमारे। ओर अब जो पंचायत मुकदमे सालगरामदास चेल महंत जानकीदासजी मुरादआबादवाले की पांच मुरतीन मिल कर रियायत व अदावत स बे ईतला हमारे करी षलाफ मरजी हमारे व अदावत स करी य पंचायत मनसुष व रद ह। कीस वासते ये फकीर कोन हैं जो पंचायत करैं। हम अफसर हैं। क्युंके महंत जानकीदास नहंग थे उन के ओरत न्ही थी ओर न कोई दोहयता था। गोपालदास षुद कुं नेवासा बतलाता ह। अवल तो जानकीदास के ओरत न थी। नहंग था। ओर जो नेवासा होगा तो चेले के होते भाई भतीजे भानजे व नवासे वगरे का कुछ दावा न्ही। जानकीदास के दो चेलो १ तो नारायनदास दूसरा सालगरामदास। सो जानकीदास ने जीते जी अपने नारायनदास कुं गादी पर बैठा दीया। और नारायनदास के पीछे सालगरामदास गादी बैठा ओर महंत हुवा ओर कई बरस गादी पर रहा ओर काम ठीकाणा का अनजाम दीया। ओर हम वासत दरसन व जातर श्री---- के गय जब मंदर मुरादआबाद मैं चार पांच दीन रह ओर महंत सालगरामदास को देषा ओर हम ने भी अपनी तरफ स महंत कीया। ओर तोर चलन ह सब दसतुर अपन गिरोह क देषा कोई बद चलन की न्ही देषी। ओर फकीर पांच मील कर व पंचायत कर के गोपालदास कुं महंत बना दीया ये बिलकुल बेजा ह। चेले होते दुसर कुं मदर दे देना ये बात बेजा ह। सालगरामदास महंत लायक गादी के है। ईस मैं कुछ कसुर न्ही ह। हम न सालगरामदास कुं महंत व मालक मंदर व जायदाद का कर के भज है। चाहीय के ईस कुं बदसतुर गादी पर बैठा देना चाहीया हमारे गीरोह के मवाफिक

सालगरामदास महंत हा जो ओरोन पचायत अदावत सु कर के गोपालदास कुं महंत कर दीया ये पंचायत मनसुष हा ईस का कुछ हक न्ही पोहंचता। सीवा सालगरामदास के कोई हकदार न्हि हा मीती कातीक सुदी ९ स्वं० १९३२ का तारीष ९ नोवंबर सन १८७५ ईसवी

Abbreviations

A.G.G.	Governor-General's Agent for the States of Rajputana and Commissioner of Ajmer
b.	<i>badi</i> (lunar day in dark half of the month; synonym: <i>kṛṣṇā</i>)
BM	Bālānand Maṭh, archives
k.	<i>kṛṣṇā</i> (lunar day in dark half of the month; synonym: <i>badi</i>)
NP	“Nagar parikramā” (column by Nandkiśor Pārīk in the daily newspaper <i>Rājasthān Patrikā</i> , Jaipur edition)
s.	<i>sudi</i> (lunar day in the bright half of the month)
VRI/T2	Vrindaban Research Institute, Vaishnava temples, reel 2

References

Archival Sources

Bālānand Maṭh, Jaipur
Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner

Primary Sources

Rāmāpaddhati, manuscript, scribed VS 1898 (1841), BM.

Newspapers

Rājasthān Patrikā, Jaipur.

Secondary Sources

- Bhansali, S.R. 1993 (1992). *Legal History of Jaipur State*. Jaipur: University Book House.
- Bouillier, Véronique. 1978. “L’ascétisme dans le code népalais.” *Journal asiatique* 266.1–2: 133–152.
- . 2009. *Itinérance et vie monastique: Les ascètes Nāth Yogīs en Inde contemporaine*. Paris: Éditions de la maison des sciences de l’homme.
- Bresslau, Harry. 1889. *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Veit.
- Buchanan, Francis. 1986 (1928). *An Account of the District of Purnea in 1809–1810*. New Delhi: Usha Jain.
- Burghart, Richard. 1978. “The Founding of the Ramanandi Sect.” *Ethnohistory* 25.2: 121–139.
- Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine. 2006. “Replacing the Abbot: Rituals of Monastic Ordination and Investiture in Modern Hinduism.” *Asiatische Studien* 60: 535–573.
- . forthcoming. “Ascetics’ Rights in Early 19th-Century Rajasthan.” In: Flügel, Peter, and Gustaaf Houtman (eds.): *Asceticism and Power in the South and South-Asian Context*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press. <https://www.academia.edu/9960323/_Ascetics_rights_in_early_19th_century_Jaipur_Rajasthan_in_forthcoming_since_2005_.P._Fl%C3%BCgel_Peter_and_G._Houtman_eds._Asceticism_and_Power_in_the_Asian_Context_London>
- Desai, Z.A. 1998. “*Mahzar* – an Important Source for Administrative History: An Early Eighteenth-Century Gujarati/Persian Specimen.” *The Indian Historical Review* 25.1: 16–28.
- Habib, Irfan. 1963. *The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1556–1707)*. London: Asia Publishing House.
- Horstmann, Monika. 1999. *In Favour of Govinddevjī: Historical Documents Relating to a Deity of Vrindaban and Eastern Rajasthan*. Delhi: IGNCa and Manohar.
- . 2001. “Religious Dignitaries in the Court Protocol of Jaipur: Mid-Eighteenth to Early Nineteenth Century.” In: Berkemer, G., et al. (eds.): *Explorations in the History of South Asia: Essays in Honour of Dietmar Rothermund*. Delhi: Manohar, 139–155.
- . 2002. “The Rāmānandīs of Galtā (Jaipur, Rajasthan).” In: Babb, Lawrence A., et al. (eds.): *Multiple Histories: Culture and Society in the Study of Rajasthan*. Jaipur and New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 141–197.

- . 2009. *Der Zusammenhalt der Welt: Religiöse Herrschaftslegitimation und Religionspolitik Mahārājā Savāi Jaisinghs (1700–1743)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- . forthcoming. “Power and Status: Rāmānandī Warrior Ascetics in 18th-Century Jaipur.” In: Flügel, Peter, and Gustaaf Houtmann (eds.): *Asceticism and Power in South Asia*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press. https://www.academia.edu/25680433/Power_and_Status_R%C4%81m%C4%81nand%C4%AB_Warrior_Ascetics_in_18th-Century_Jaipur
- Kasturi, Malavika. 2009. “‘Asceticising’ Monastic Families: Ascetic Genealogies, Property Feuds and Anglo-Hindu Law in Late Colonial India.” *Modern Asian Studies* 43.5: 1039–1083.
- Mukherjea, B.K 1983 (1952). *On the Hindu Law of Religious and Charitable Trusts*. Calcutta: Eastern Law House.
- Pinch, William R. 2006. *Warrior Ascetics and Indian Empires*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rāmcarāṇḍās. 1951. *Dīkṣā ke* (sic). Jaipur: Śrī Bhagvatī Ī. Pres.
- Sarda, Har Bilas. 1941. *Ajmer: Historical and Descriptive*. Ajmer: Fine Art Printing Press.
- Siṃh, Bhagvatīprasād. 1957 (VS 2014). *Rāmbhakti meṃ rasik sampradāy*. Balrāmpur: Avadh-Sāhitya-Mandir.
- Vashishtha, Vjijay Kumar. n.d. *Rajputana Agency 1832–1858*. Jaipur: Aalekh Publishers.