Kings and Commerce on an Agrarian Frontier:

Kalketu’s Story in Mukunda’s *Candimangal*

Introduction

This essay examines a sixteenth century Bengali text in which novel ideas about a more pacific style of kingship are related to expansion of peasant agriculture north and west of the Bengal delta, and to a degree of commercialization of agrarian relations on that internal agrarian frontier. It contributes to studies of commercialization, and to debates about changes in state formation and in ideologies of kingship in early modern Bengal.

*An early version of this paper was presented to SACPAN (South Asia Colloquium of the Pacific Northwest), University of Washington, March 2, 1996; I wish to thank Prof. Frank Conlon for this opportunity. I also wish to thank the American Institute of Indian Studies for a fellowship in 1982-83 which allowed me leisure to begin the translation upon which this essay is based.*
Since the publication of C.A. Bayly’s study showing how a buoyant commercial economy in eighteenth century north India facilitated British imperial expansion, a number of historians have re-examined processes of commercialization of the agrarian economy, changing relations between rulers and merchants, and the political culture of non-European merchants in eighteenth-century Bengal. The choice to analyze the eighteenth century, however, continues to be based primarily on the availability of European records, and especially records of the English East India Company, and implicitly to assume that European trading companies were the primary agents for change. This essay confirms the need to study precolonial commercialization in Bengal over a period lasting at least three centuries, rather than in the eighteenth century alone, and to study endogenous processes of commercialization throughout that period. Second, this essay suggests that some processes of commercialization may have been experienced more intensively on the agrarian frontier than in the long-settled regions of the western delta, where European trade often was concentrated.
This essay suggests that care should be taken in describing markets and market transactions. In Sudipta Sen’s important work, the common assumption that buying and selling was or should have been an autonomous activity occurring in a politically protected and economically neutral space is replaced by an image of fluctuating, overlapping and contingent ‘passages of authority’ in eighteenth century Bengal, through which rulers taxed and redirected both marketed commodities and the transient people of marketplaces. This essay also provides evidence that the authority exerted by rulers over marketplaces, commodities, and vendors changed the meaning of buying and selling, by sometimes making them subject to force and fraud, as well as to normative uses of authority. But it also notes ways that forcible expropriation in markets was resisted, and it suggests change in the contrary direction, for commercialization of agrarian relations also seems to have changed state formation and ideologies of kingship, especially on the agrarian frontier.

Therefore this essay also contributes to debates about state formation and ideologies of kingship in early modern India. It argues that labor markets with a degree at least of commercialization and competition characterized state formation on the agrarian
frontier. It further argues that royal virtues could be seen as multiple and multivalent, and that it was precisely the multivalence of royal virtues which made possible their re-evaluation and repositioning in a new hierarchy where more pacific royal virtues became more important than the codes of honor of warrior-rulers. Finally, it argues that more pacific virtues came to be seen as more important because of a role for markets, commercialization, competition and choice in state formation.

The Text and its Tropes

This essay is based upon Mukunda Cakrabarti’s Candimangal, a text written in the second half of the sixteenth century, before the Mughal conquest of Bengal was completed, but apparently towards the beginning of a period of long-term economic buoyancy. To be sure, middle Bengali devotional literature has long been read by Bengali social historians for ‘facts’ about Bengali society. Instead of attempting first to isolate social ‘facts’ in literary garb, I read Mukunda’s Candimangal as a dramatic representation of a complex argument. Therefore, initially, I approach this text with two reading strategies. The first is to examine its explicit rhetoric. Mukunda’s text analyzed
economic and political problems of his own society, and presented solutions which would have required both human and divine agency, and institutional as well as individual change. In particular, he argued for a more pacific alternative in place of kingship based primarily upon the virtues of *ksatriya* status, of an individual’s martial capacity, and of his adherence to a code of masculine honor. We can examine the rhetoric by which he supports this position. The second reading strategy is to analyze assumptions implicit in this rhetoric. In particular, Mukunda’s depiction of more pacific royal virtues both describes and makes assumptions about buying and selling, about markets, and about agrarian relations between local kings and their subjects, relations which displayed at least a degree of commercialization. Although it is not possible to distinguish them with finality, I will try to note what seem to be assumptions and descriptions in Mukunda’s narrative.

The author was a Brahman who had left his home village near the southeastern boundary of Burdwan (Barddhaman) District, West Bengal, in the heartland of Brahman settlements along the Bhagirathi, Hugli, and Sarasvati rivers. According to a widely accepted text found in some manuscripts, he had departed because the Muslim governor
in his locality began to exact taxes more rigorously from local landholders. He moved south, and found a patron in the prince of ‘Brahman’bhum’, a little Hindu kingdom probably located in undivided Midnapur (Medinipur) District, West Bengal, and in what then was in a frontier zone between Bengal and Orissa. His narrative of agrarian expansion which this essay discusses apparently drew its inspiration from the contemporary clearing of forests to the northwest of this kingdom of Brahman’bhum, in the rolling peneplain which rises out of the Bengal delta and which lies between it and the Chota Nagpur plateau. Although this narrative is placed in the distant past, at the beginning of the Kali age, its hero belongs to a base-born (antaja) group from this peneplain, and the subjects of this hero’s kingdom belong to the familiar Hindu and Muslim castes and elite Muslim lineages of deltaic Bengal. Therefore we may locate his text in relation to two frontiers, for it was composed in a little kingdom which lay between the Muslim Sultanate of Bengal and the usually Hindu kingdom of Orissa, and it is situated between in the Rarh, between the western Bengal delta, long-settled and a center of Brahmanic culture, and the wild forests and ‘tribal’ peoples of the Chota Nagpur plateau.
Richard Eaton has shown that in the seventeenth century, in the active delta east of the Rarh, populations began a long-term process of conversion to Islam as the land simultaneously was put to the plough and brought under Mughal control. But neither Islamization nor a ‘Hindu’ reaction to it was a problem for Mukunda’s text, and it is not clear whether the more pacific style of kingship which his text advocates should be read as implicitly supporting peaceful accommodation to Muslim rulers of Bengal.

Mukunda’s explicit problem was how to create a more peaceful political order in the context of a local, untouchable raja, a ‘little king’ on the agrarian frontier; his solution, ultimately, was to integrate this raja into a more encompassing (but still local) polity subject to a high-jati Hindu king. Nevertheless, his text betrays no interest in or familiarity with the special beliefs and practices of indigenous, untouchable groups in the peneplain as they came under the influence of peasants, traders, and Brahmans from deltaic Bengal. For example, the wedding of this man, accomplished well before he became a raja, is described with rites typical for the higher jati of deltaic Bengal. Mukunda was concerned, instead, with the abstract terms of his problem. In the course of exploring
them, Mukunda represented ‘hunting’ as the fundamental cause of conflict and war. At its simplest, the trope of hunting depicts two classes in human society: predatory warriors, and the people who are their prey. Hunting is the result of a martial capacity of warrior elites which others do not have. Warriors, however, can be made kings, and can thus enter into pacific relations with their subjects.

As it represented more pacific kings and polities, Mukunda’s text was concerned with the requirements for being a king and with the nature of royal virtues. It described how royal virtues appear in three ranked, logically distinct, and collectively comprehensive transactions in human societies. The least ordered and most disruptive of these transactions he called ‘hunting’; and the royal virtues associated with hunting were the ones of yasa, a warrior’s strength, martial skill, valor and renown. For Mukunda the crux of the problem with kingship was the unavoidable, double-edged sword of military power, which always could be used by military elites against their own subjects. A king, however, could not be a king without the martial virtues of a hunter.
The second kind of transaction found in human society, more well-ordered than hunting, was ‘buying and selling’. This essay argues that the royal virtues Mukunda associated with ‘buying and selling’, considered expansively, were related to a king’s maintaining possession of sri (a word with a very wide range of meanings, including auspiciousness, wealth, beauty, fertility and purity), possession of which always was temporally unstable. While some virtues related to sri enable interpreting omens and judging the compatibility of proposed actions with their temporal settings, others supported rational, calculative self-discipline in expending wealth.21

The third and most well-ordered transaction is a particular kind of gift exchange: ‘giving benefaction’ by a superior, after receiving a less valuable gift from an inferior, and after hearing and judging his or her supplication. I argue that generosity on the part of the superior is one of the most important royal virtues in Mukunda’s text. But I also argue that for him gift exchange has a potential for entropy, because relations based upon it remain vulnerable to the ‘calculative dimension’22 usually found in buying and selling. Ultimately
for Mukunda, pacific kingdoms are possible only by means of the ordinary, unheroic, and sympathetic virtue of ‘mercy’.

By elevating buying and selling and pacific royal virtues, Mukunda opposed many of the ideals of contemporary martial sub-cultures in Bengal.\textsuperscript{23} In an important passage Georg Simmel suggests why pejorative views of buying and selling often are found in aristocratic, martial cultures, which instead value violent expropriation:

\begin{quote}
This [preference for robbery over honest payment] also is understandable;

for in exchanging and paying one is subordinated to an objective norm, and the strong and autonomous personality has to efface himself, which is disagreeable. This also accounts for the disdain of trade by self-willed aristocratic individuals. On the other hand, exchange favors peaceful relations between men because they then accept a supra-personal and normative regulation.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}
In Mukunda’s text, force and fraud were not assumed to be absent from Bengali markets. I suggest, therefore, that any ‘objective norm’ governing market exchanges may have been experienced as intermittent or weak. Nevertheless, according to Mukunda’s poem, conditions of labor scarcity on the agrarian frontier made it necessary, or at least at times advantageous, for rulers to protect ‘tax-free’ markets and to compete for subjects in market-like transactions. I argue that there is an important correspondence between Mukunda’s elevation of the pacific virtues of ‘buying and selling’ and of gift exchanges, and his criticisms of ‘hunting’, and of martial cultures and their excessive concern with masculine honor.

Hunters, Kings and War

The metaphor of ‘hunting’ within human society is introduced and secured by a reciprocal metaphor, the peaceable ‘kingdom of the animals’ which Candi established immediately after she had built her first temple and introduced her worship in the city and kingdom of Kalinga on the banks of the Kamsa river at the end of the Third Age.

Hundreds of animals of Biju [desolate] Forest begged for her intervention because they
were afraid of the tiger and other predatory animals. Candi granted them the boon of freedom from fear, instituted her worship among them, and along with her worship, established their ‘kingdom’, and promised them freedom from predation.25

Candi made the lion king of this kingdom. Similarly, she appointed all the predatory and powerful animals officers of the realm: the hyena (*taraksu*) was told to hold the royal umbrella; the tiger, bear, wolf, wild boar and rhinoceros were to be the king’s five chief ministers (*mahapatra*); and both the elephant and pairs of horses his royal mounts. There were roles for other animals as well: the *sarabha* (a mythical creature with eight feet and a single horn) was appointed royal *purohit*; the mongoose became the royal doctor whose medicines would preserve the animals from snakebite. Troops of monkeys would fan the king with chowries; the jackal (*bheur*: ‘one who follows’ and eats the carrion of the tiger) would be the royal panegyrist and genealogist. The kingdom’s wild buffalos were made chiefs of thousands in the royal army and the palace doorkeepers; and jackals again (*srgal*, also a pejorative term for someone clever like a fox) the city’s guards and their prefect of the police (*kotal*, P. *kotwal*).26
Candi could establish the kingdom of the animals only because she also abolished hunting by the predatory animals; in fact, these two statements are almost synonymous, for the predatory animals became members of the kingdom’s ruling elite. The kingdom of the animals can be read as associating kings with divine power when it makes the goddess’s lion-mount the king. But it also can be read as a satire of the rapacity of thoroughly human royal officers when it calls the lion’s royal ministers wolves, tigers, and bears, and both his panegyrist and his commander of the guard jackals. Thereby it provides an all too convenient excuse for kings when their administrations fail to rule justly.

Candi then arranged for a prince in Indra’s court to be cursed to suffer human existence. By his own self-description Kalketu, the human male thus born, was a Cohar by jati whom no one would touch. At the beginning of the Fourth Age he hunted the animals of Biju Forest, and his wife Phullara sold their flesh, horns and fur in periodic markets, where she also purchased rice and other foods which the family consumed. To protect their subjects the lion king and his ministers in turn went to war against Kalketu.
When Kalketu defeated them, they appealed to the goddess, and she determined to put an end to Kalketu’s hunting by making him a king.

Again, therefore, the problem posed by the narrative is ‘hunting’, and again the solution is establishment of a kingdom to be ruled by a former predator. Candi gave Kalketu great wealth and commanded him to use it to establish a kingdom. He bought regalia, arms, and provisions, cleared the forest where previously he had hunted, secured divine assistance to build a temple and city, and attracted subjects to Gujarat, his new kingdom, by offering them favorable terms. But martial prowess remained necessary for Kalketu’s kingship. Despite Candi’s command to abandon (teja, imperative) his bow and arrows, in order to fell the forest of Gujarat, Kalketu had to hunt and slay its man-eating tiger.30 Later, when he had to defend his kingdom against the army of Kalinga, Kalketu displayed an indomitable will and a heroic martial prowess, both of which virtues the poem celebrates while it also makes them subordinate to the goddess’s own power and purposes.31 At the end of the narrative we are told that the inferior ‘lords of the soil’
(bhua raja) worshipped him; that no raja was able to make war with him; and that after
they had been defeated, other rajas ‘gave him taxes’ (kar).\textsuperscript{32}

The dilemma of human polities is that rulers and their agents are usually powerful
men, ‘hunters’ by nature; paradoxically their duty is to protect subjects from the ‘hunting’
that in other circumstances they themselves do. Weaker humans, like the weaker animals
who are preyed upon, cannot aspire to rule because they cannot perform the warrior’s duty
of protection. Vulnerability to ‘hunting’ therefore is built into kingdoms, even though
kingdoms are constituted in order to negate ‘hunting’. Initially, this dilemma seems to have
been avoided through Candi’s divine gift of wealth to Kalketu, which both defined a
transaction opposite to the violent expropriations of hunting, and was itself so generous
that Kalketu could have had no need to hunt thereafter. But of course Candi’s gift of
wealth to Kalketu did not suffice to end ‘hunting’. Rather, his use of this wealth had to be
guided by royal virtues which would support a new, royal dharma, different from that of a
hunter. We now may turn to this complex of themes, as we examine Candi’s gift of
wealth.
**Sri, Sovereignty, and Wealth**

In this section I argue that in Mukunda’s text *sri* is associated with the second of his three transactions, ‘buying and selling’, and that the virtues which concern a ruler’s relation to markets have been elevated above those of ‘hunting’. A theme of ambiguous omens, auspicious and inauspicious, and of Kalketu’s inability to read them correctly, is broached when the goddess first appeared to Kalketu in the form of an iguana (*godhika*), whose common name, cow-snake (*go-sap*) indicates a conjunction of opposites. But this theme immediately is replaced by an ambiguous promise of wealth, another dimension of *sri*, in the following episode. After a fruitless search for animals more common in a Bengali hunter’s diet, finally a beautiful deer appeared, golden like the iguana. Not ignorant of the *Ramayana*, Kalketu understood that this magic doe (*mayamrgi*) was like Marica, that evil ‘treasury of magic’, who once had taken the form of a bejewelled deer to deceive Rama; and therefore Kalketu feared that its purpose was to ‘deceive’ him also.

In the Valmiki *Ramayana*, Rama had argued that the bejewelled deer was ‘all the wealth a man could ask for...riches enough to swell his coffers... ’. And he had enclosed
this thought with the following two general truths: ‘In the deep forests [kings do] gather riches with determination, precious metals of all sorts, veined with gems and gold’, and second, the science of *artha* teaches that ‘a man in want of something should go and get it without hesitation’. Kalketu also decided that the magic doe, with its hooves of silver, antlers of gold and bejewelled body, would put an end to his ‘net of sorrow’ if he were to get its gold and jewels, or to sell it for provisions for his household. Elsewhere the poem quotes (but does not quite approve of) the following proverb: ‘Fish in a dry pond, a wandering woman, gold and silver in the deep forest—seeing these even a sage’s heart is enticed, for no one leaves aside what can be got without effort’. Nevertheless, as Kalketu feared, the deer herself appeared and disappeared at will, and so could not be hunted. More interestingly, recognizing the divinity of her magic, Kalketu could not even aim his arrow when he saw her face. Kalketu saw that the doe was divine and that the apparent potential to seize a fortune in the forest was deceptive. In this way his prowess as a hunter is marginalized by the story, just before he returned to the border of the forest, tied up the iguana, and took her home.
We now return from the forest to Kalketu’s hut, where, as the iguana, Candi broke free from her bonds and changed her appearance again, to become a beautiful, sixteen-year-old Brahman woman wandering alone. This appearance introduces still a third opposition, that of a beautiful but apparently unchaste woman, and this opposition also is linked to wealth and to the temptations of greed, because this beautiful sixteen-year-old promised Kalketu’s wife Phullara that she would deliver the couple from poverty and suffering by giving them an unimaginable fortune, if she could live with them. Phullara was not tempted by the offer of her wealth, and went to complain to Kalketu. To his wife Kalketu denied that he had brought the woman home; to the woman he argued that she should return to her husband before she was dishonored by the people of her own family, or punished by the king of Kalinga for defiling her jati by staying with a family of untouchables.38

One may see an analogy between the magic doe bearing great wealth in the forest and a ‘wandering woman’ to be had ‘without effort’. Perhaps in her erotic beauty and teasing puns we also may see a divinity playing with the figure of the king’s devadasi,
never widowed and therefore always auspicious, the ‘moving Laksmi’ whose rituals of erotic dance assure a kingdom rains, fertility and prosperity. Nevertheless, the story comically emphasizes Kalketu’s conjugal fidelity, rather than any royal capacity to enjoy many wives. But perhaps simplicity and fidelity are virtues not irrelevant to kingship; for, if kingdoms are to be conceived as autarkies, kings have a primary obligation to the well-being of their ‘own’ people, as a husband does to his wife.

This story does not repeat the misogynist language frequently found in Indian martial cultures, for example in stories which tell how beautiful women seduced Gorakh Nath renunciates or celibate wrestlers and warriors, and so made them lose their semen and therewith mental and bodily powers. Nor did Kalketu either reject the woman’s proposal because she seemed already to be impure, or see through the disguise of the goddess, and reject her advances because he knew she was testing him. Despite the seductive beauty of the goddess, neither the dangers of beauty nor the value of sexual purity receives further emphasis as an aspect of sri. Instead, Mukunda has shaped this episode to suggest alternative royal virtues to those of a warrior’s valor (yasa), by relating
improper sexual desire to desire for wealth and luxury, rather than to loss of semen and resulting injuries to male health and bodily strength. Apparently, to deserve the great wealth the goddess was about to give them, Kalketu and Phullara should not desire wealth and luxury at the expense of their own marital bond. The ambiguous potential of wealth for good or for ill is the one dimension of sri which is consistently emphasized in this episode.

Gifts of Wealth and Dharma

To end Kalketu’s hunting, Candi then gave the couple great wealth, in the form of a jewelled ring as well as pots of siver rupees, and with this wealth she also gave them a new dharma. As part of his new dharma, Candi commanded that Kalketu should ‘break’ the ring (that is to say, take it to a money changer and exchange it for money), cut down the forest of Gujarat, give hundreds of people homes together with a capital of cowries, husked rice and paddy seed, and nurture all his subjects as he would his sons.43

Immediately, Kalketu responded with a cogent objection to Candi’s command:
My birth is in an extremely debased lineage; by jati I am a Cohar. No one can touch me. People call me a ‘savage’. What Brahman will ever be my priest? Does getting any kind of wealth ever make the base-born high?

But Candi replied, ‘Your priest will get sight of me. The highest Brahman will accept gifts from you’. At least on this frontier of Bengali agrarian settlement, Candi intended that her temple worship should dissolve the expected links between jati and kingship. She reconstituted a political order in which kingship would be based on wealth and devotion to her, rather than on any kind of qualification by birth, conquest or heroic self-sacrifice.

Of course, in Mukunda’s time leaders from low-born, ‘tribal’ peoples had become kings on the agrarian frontier below the Chota Nagpur plateau. We may take as an example the Malla kings of Vishnupur, who begin to be visible to historians during the reign of Akbar, but who claimed a much more ancient royal lineage. Stories which legitimate the Malla lineage, despite its apparent relation to the ‘base-born’ (antaja) jati of Bagdis, narrate that Adi Malla, founder of the lineage, was born to a Rajput king and
queen from north India; that he was abandoned at birth, and raised as a foundling by a poor Bagdi family; that a Brahman nevertheless recognized signs of royalty in the young boy, and took him to his house to educate; and finally, that after the death of a neighboring king that king’s royal elephant seized the boy in his trunk and set him upon the throne.  

Kalketu’s story in *Candimangal* in contrast is inevitably comic, because he is without a royal lineage, signs or qualifications. Indeed, exactly while relating how he came to be a king, Mukunda satirizes Kalketu’s simplicity and ignorance as a base-born hunter.  

It also is a comic story because Candi initiates Kalketu’s transformation by the gift of a ring worth an immense sum of money, and she directs him to ‘break’ the ring for money. Are we not meant to understand a reduction of the ring (a symbol of wholeness, of *sri*, and thus of Candi’s selection of Kalketu to be king, and of her divine gift of sovereignty) to the function of money as a store of value for the instrumental purpose of buying things? If so, we do not have a story about a divine fetish which must be carefully guarded as ‘sacred’ to attest to the allegedly ‘eternal’ sacredness of a temporal political order.  

Candi’s divine gift nevertheless would both authorize and make possible lesser royal gifts
to constitute and display Kalketu’s kingship through his personal relations with his subjects.

But Kalketu’s gifts also were not precious objects to be safeguarded as fetishes, but utilitarian tools, animals, paddy seeds, and cowries, a local money.\(^47\) We have a story which thoroughly and comically integrates a money economy into the constitution of kingship.

Kalketu’s first item of purchase was a covered palanquin, at once throne and conveyance, ornamented with golden crests set with diamonds, with jewels and strands of pearls, with a seat of sandalwood, and with a cover of splendid silk. Elephants, Arabian horses, and mountain ponies were other insignia of kingship bought in the marketplace; they also were necessities for a royal army. His personal weapons simultaneously served as regalia: a suit of armor, a helmet ornamented with jewels, and a curved, broad-blade sword (\textit{taripatra taroyal}) with a golden handle. Otherwise, Kalketu purchased only the minimum of ornaments for himself and his wife, together with a golden chest for their safekeeping.\(^48\) It is worth noting that Kalketu did not purchase saffron or sandalwood to anoint his body, nor a chariot and sandalwood throne, nor a white umbrella, the royal
‘honors’ that properly would come only later as royal gifts and by ritual investiture (abhisek) by an overlord.\textsuperscript{49} He concentrated instead on weapons of war. Among weapons we can note matchlocks (tabak; A. tupak), battleaxes, several kinds of swords, also spears, pikes, slings, elephant goads, maces, bows, arrows, daggers and shields. Kalketu finally completed his purchases in the market by buying large stocks of food, apparently for both his army and his subjects. Reduced to purchasing power, sri allowed Kalketu to purchase men and weapons for a military force, so that his individual virtues as a warrior and a hero could be extended to leadership of an army. A story that suggests that one could become a king by means of wealth also implies a degree of commercialization of the instruments of kingship: in Mukunda’s account, men willing to engage for a price in military service,\textsuperscript{50} accountants to manage expenditures, the basic regalia of a conveyance, of personal armor and weapons, and of royal ornaments; the stock of common weapons needed by an army, and a store of food all could be purchased in a market.
Moreover, as we watch Kalketu exchange the ring for money and then purchase some of the insignia and instruments of kingship, we are shown vices and virtues which attend market transactions: among vices, the greed and dishonesty of the pawnbroker and money-changer Murari Sil, and the simple-mindedness of Kalketu in bargaining with this man, and later, in bargaining with the Kayastha headman Bharu Datta; and among virtues, the numeracy of Kayastha accountants who recorded and paid for Kalketu’s purchases, and Kalketu’s self-restraint in not purchasing many luxurious accoutrements for himself and his wife. A story which at the same time says that Kalketu’s wealth was the gift of Candi draws a veil over more ordinary sources of the wealth by which ‘hunting’ men might have become kings. (But one of the accusations which the king of Kalinga later would bring against Kalketu is that he had obtained his wealth by killing and robbing some merchant.\textsuperscript{51}) In making new wealth the gift of Candi, Mukunda both mystified the acquisition of wealth and failed to provide any human escape from the zero-sum logic of ‘hunting’. A zero-sum logic similarly is visible in the way Kalketu’s kingdom was settled: indigenous people of the forest did not become new peasants; rather, Kalketu had to
attract existing peasants to his kingdom from the kingdom of Kalinga, and therefore the
king of Kalinga had to lose all those whom Kalketu gained as his subjects. Finally, this
zero-sum logic is visible in Kalketu’s royal gifts to his subjects, for they are given out of
the vast treasure that Candi had given him. Should it not also apply to transactions of
buying and selling? If so, to Mukunda whatever profit a merchant gained must be
equivalent to a loss sustained by someone else. Although Mukunda realistically portrayed
expansion of settled agriculture on the agrarian frontier, and a degree of commercialization
of the instruments of kingship there, he did not observe, let alone attempt to find a human
explanation for, a general and secular growth of the economy.

Gifts of *Pan* and a Redistributive Economy

Although one could buy many of the instruments of kingship, apparently one could
not simply buy a kingdom. Kalketu cleared the forest with hired laborers, but to build a
city and a temple for Candi and to find settlers he had to ask for divine assistance.

Having received these further divine gifts, Kalketu in turn made gifts to people who had
come to settle his new land, and thus by receiving and giving he moved beyond
transactions of ‘buying and selling’. Nevertheless, Mukunda’s narrative implies that his gifts and the relations which they constituted had a ‘calculative dimension’ as Kalketu bargained for settlers on the agrarian frontier.

Compared to other authors of Candimangal, Mukunda complicated the story of settling Kalketu’s kingdom. Candi, in his account, did not simply advise the headman Bulan Mandal in a dream to relocate with his subjects for the sake of tax-free lands, or threaten him with floods if he should choose to remain in Kalinga.\textsuperscript{52} Rather, in his account Bulan Mandal and his peasants actually lost their stores of wealth in the flood Candi sent, had no savings with which to pay the king’s revenue demand, and would have had no income until weeks after it was due.\textsuperscript{53} In this situation Bulan went to see Kalketu to negotiate more favorable terms.

Mukunda thereby outlined problems of village headmen and of kings on the agrarian frontier. In a situation of labor scarcity, village headmen used their authority over other peasants and their mobility to negotiate for better terms from alternative rulers. Crucial to their interests were: an initial period of tax free possession to allow clearing and
cultivating forests or bushy fallows, security of title to the land they would cultivate,

permanency of settlement of the land revenue demand, absence of labor taxes or

additional cesses or taxes in kind, and their own control of agency for tax collection from

their dependants and subleasees (rather than tax collection by the king’s officials).54

Village headmen also considered the procedure for assessing the land revenue demand

(more strictly, by measurement of the land, or more loosely, per plough), its remission for

harvest failures, the schedule of its installments relative to the times of harvest, and the

security held for and the rate of interest assessed on unpaid installments of the land

revenue.55 According to Mukunda’s narrative, a ruler should satisfy generously the

demands of village headmen coming to his city with their dependants, and at the same

time he should establish direct and permanent relationships with those same dependants.

Kalketu constituted his relation to his new subjects by a royal ceremony giving pan
to all of them. (Pan are ‘betel leaves’, Piper betel, but the text suggests gifts of prepared

‘rolls’ of pan, containing ground areca nuts, catechu, a lime paste made from sea-shells,

and perhaps spices as well.) Royal gifts of pan commonly were used to honor subjects.
In addition, at least in this poem, royal gifts of *pan* were ‘taken’ in a courtly ceremony in order to indicate that a subject voluntarily had accepted a royal command. Kalketu did not accompany these gifts of *pan* with any commands. Were Kalketu’s gifts of *pan* represented only as royal honors to all his subjects, or did their ‘taking’ the gifts of *pan* also mean that they voluntarily had entered into a new relationship with Kalketu as their ruler? If the latter is the case, then a ceremony of ‘taking’ *pan* simultaneously acknowledged his subjects’ capacity to choose their ruler.

When Kayastha headmen came to settle Kalketu’s kingdom, they brought gifts (*bhet*) of food—curds, fish, and ghee in clay pots—to initiate a relationship. They promised to settle their dependants (*prajagan*), and requested that Kalketu give them and their dependants *pan*, along with good lands well delimited, houses, paddy seed, and money to buy bullocks; and that he delay requiring them to repay loans. Kalketu’s acceptance of the gifts of food are matched by their acceptance of gifts of *pan*, and both signify acceptance of a relationship.
The narrative suggests in several passages that Kalketu gave *pan* to all his subjects, both Muslim and Hindu, and both high-born and low-born.\(^5^8\) Gifts of *pan* thus became socially and religiously neutral symbols of inclusion in a kingdom which contained very different kinds of subjects. They initiated other, more valuable royal gifts of land which would be tax free for an initial period (or in the case of Brahmans, in perpetuity), of interest-free loans, of paddy seed, of houses, and of ‘beautiful clothes’.\(^5^9\) In turn these royal gifts were to be reciprocated by his subjects’ gifts of taxes after the revenue-free period had expired, and in the case of Brahmans, by their ‘judgment’ of *sastras*, and by the intangible gifts of their blessings.\(^6^0\) Finally, in Kalketu’s city *pan* growers (*barui*, ‘who continually gave the hero *pan*’) also could count on a special relationship with him. He promised them that no one would take goods from them by force without their being able to call upon the king to intervene, and that he would impose no unjust regulation upon them.\(^6^1\) In this narrative gifts of *pan* from the king mark out the autarkic boundaries of royal redistribution, and by synecdoche gifts of *pan* from *pan*-growers to the king also
suggest the other side of a redistributive economy, gifts of taxes from non-Brahman subjects to the king.

Mukunda’s text proposes a direct relationship between king and subjects, even though it also specifies a mediating role for labor-controlling Kayastha headmen over their dependants. Gifts of pan both sealed and veiled bargaining about the specific terms offered to settlers, a process which Mukunda’s text represents as intensely competitive, suggesting conditions of labor scarcity on the agrarian frontier. Therefore, behind the gifts of pan we may imagine a price, or a series of prices, more or less freely and mutually agreed upon, as a frontier king divided his lands among subjects who were valuable to him in different ways and in different degrees; and as they in turn came to terms with him about the taxes most of them eventually would have to give, and computed both the economic value of his terms of settlement, and the degree of honor he would show them.

In this text the ‘poison in the gift’ was not the capacity of some ritual gifts to transfer inauspiciousness. Rather, precisely because they were voluntary, gift exchanges and relationships constituted by them had a ‘calculative dimension’ through which they became
vulnerable to the entropy of competitive self-interest. Through calculations of self-interest
‘hunting’ would be reintroduced to the moral economy of Kalketu’s gift-centered and
autarkic realm, which, because of Kalketu’s great wealth and exemplary generosity,
otherwise might have been a peaceable kingdom, invulnerable to predation.

Markets and ‘Hunting’ within a Redistributive Economy

Before Bulan Mandal and Kalketu could seal their agreement, a rival headman
appeared who complicated the bargain. This man’s name was Bharu [cheater] Datta.

Also a Kayastha, he nominated himself as Kalketu’s ‘minister’ (patra) by giving the king an
exaggerated account of his own lineage and family honor. Mukunda satirizes Bharu
Datta’s transparent attempts to claim more honor than was his due, the greed which
motivated him, and Kalketu’s simplicity in failing to discern either his character or his
intention. Proposing himself as minister, Bharu advised Kalketu:

There is no fear in speaking what is right. To win the love of your
dependants (jinite prajar maya, a pun also meaning, ‘to defeat the deception
of your dependants’) take a ledger (chiya, A. siyaha) of their deeds [of land], so that they keep to their own plots. When the winter harvest ripens, you should set upon them a deep stratagem (bisam phanda). Distrain the grain of the poor. Thus no one will flee while indebted to you, and in the end you will not suffer from fraud.⁶⁴

In this way Kalketu would have insured that peasants could not sell the standing grain, pocket the profits, and flee without paying taxes due to the king. Bharu further advised Kalketu to make that ‘peasant’ (casa) Bulan Mandal his ‘headman of peasants’ (desmukh) while making Bharu ‘chief’ (mukhya) of all the Kayasthas. And to justify both of these steps he quoted the following proverb, which clearly applies to himself: ‘In the hands of a servant a sword, and in the possession of wives a treasure—they [both] cause great sorrow in the end’.⁶⁵

A process of negotiation brought settlers to Kalketu’s new kingdom, partly because Kalketu had to offer better terms than his rival, the King of Kalinga. Negotiations
proceeded, and became more complex, because the redistributive economy which he thereby instituted could have had either of two conflicting goals. The king and his agents could employ the redistributive economy to 'nurture his subjects like sons', or alternatively, they could keep subjects firmly in their place, like servants or wives, without weapons and without wealth, so that they would not 'cheat' the king of his taxes, or bring him 'great sorrow in the end'. Through the tigerish minister Bharu Datta and his 'deep stratagem' of distraint of the main winter rice crop before harvest, and through the alleged 'deception of dependants' which it would have counteracted, Mukunda's poem can be read to suggest how force and fraud, endemic to competition in Bengali marketplaces, also entered into strategies of tax collection and tax resistance, and therewith into the redistributive economy of local kingdoms.

Moreover, a market economy intersected the redistributive economy instituted by Kalketu. The poem's list of *jatis* of people who settled his kingdom no doubt was meant to indicate all the services and products which a kingdom must have, in order to be able to produce and reproduce itself, to be an autarkic whole. Although the poem clearly
states that Kayastha families brought with them their own dependants, families of artisan
and serving jatis, we are told nothing of non-market, customary ‘jajmani’ exchanges
between households of these patrons and their clients.67 Instead, to allow for the
exchange of goods and services among his subjects, as well as for trade with other lands,
we are told by Mukunda that Kalketu founded a ‘tax-free market’ (bebaj hat, bebaj
bajan).68 In founding a market for his kingdom which, by the absence of taxes, would
attract ‘merchants from various lands’,69 and which would allow subjects to buy and sell
without being taxed, Kalketu apparently fulfilled one of the duties of kings and safeguarded
his subjects’ wealth.70

Bharu, however, treated Kalketu’s market vendors as a hunter treats his prey, by
‘looting their wares and loading his baskets and giving not a cowrie for all the things he
took’.71 He involved the vendors in mutual quarrels, for the resolution of which his dhuti
swallowed bribes of silver rupees. His knavish son and his widowed sister took a ‘tax in
kind’ (tola) of greens, brinjals, radishes, clay pots, rice, and even of areca nuts and pan.
The vendors complained to Kalketu in a body, and threatened to leave his kingdom. When
Kalketu summoned Bharu for trial and judgment of their complaints, another kind of fraud also was alleged. Kalketu himself claimed that Bharu took ‘interest’ (kalantar) on loans to others, despite his paying none for the loans of paddy seed given him by Kalketu, and despite his living upon gift lands and in a house built for him at the king’s expense.

Bharu, in his defense, explained all his demands as his ‘headman’s tax in kind’ (mandaliya tola), and claimed that Kalketu was trying to cheat him, after having got the benefit of his work, for ‘all the dependants who were my servants came here at my word’.72 Without being told, auditors of Mukunda’s poem know that this last claim is false; Kalketu’s city already had been settled before Bharu arrived.

Mukunda’s poem suggests that royal agents, ‘ministers’ and ‘headmen’ like Bharu Datta, were well placed to exploit subjects by force and fraud, and we can understand the calculations of short-term self-interest behind such exploitation. Force and fraud in collection of taxes inserted the most entropic and predatory relations of ‘hunting’ and ‘buying and selling’ into relations that had appeared to be based upon exchanges of gifts.
Dismissed from Kalketu’s service, Bharu immediately presented himself with offerings (bhet) to the king of Kalinga, and gave him the news of Kalketu’s upstart kingdom within his territory, and the king of Kalinga determined upon a policy of war. The plot of the poem therefore inscribes a circle, from Kalketu’s hunting upwards to his sale of Candi’s ring and his purchases of men, regalia, and instruments of kingship, upwards again to the gifts of pan, homes, land and capital by which he attracted subjects, and the gifts which they promised in return, but then downwards to the appearance of force and fraud in Bharu’s tax collection in his marketplace, and downwards again to war. But it also inscribes a complication in the argument, for through the plot we see more clearly the potential for conflicts of interest within ruling elites as well as between them and their subjects.

Battle and a Warrior’s Honor

David Schulman has alerted us to the ‘symbolic activity’ of battle in literature of the Chola kingdom, ‘in which [symbolic activity] the unwieldy and disharmonious fragments of the kingdom combine in a moment of institutionalized breakdown and release’. In Tamil
poetry war was imagined as surreal, ludic, vividly sensual, and at the same time frenzied and grotesque; descriptions of death in battle made war into a carnival feast for Kali’s minions, a ghastly ‘demon sabbath’. Mukunda, no warrior himself, often relied on stereotypes to convey the battle between Kalketu and the army of the King of Kalinga, and in these passages his poem seems to have attracted the interpolations of lesser talents as well. It is clear, nevertheless, that he meant to convey some of the same links between war and a ‘wilderness of comic chaos’, a wilderness dominated, however, by Kalketu’s heroic will.

Kalketu’s will is emphasized by the contrast between his simple bow and arrows and the weapons of the army of the King of Kalinga, with its cannons carried on ‘hundred of thousands of wagons’, and with its war elephants that seemed like vermilion clouds, they were so huge. Indeed, the plot of Mukunda’s account of their battle progressively strips Kalketu of all weapons, until he had to fight only with his fists, but so strong was his will to conquer, and so great his prowess in battle, that even then he could not be defeated, until Candi caused him to lose his ‘intelligence and power’ (balabuddhi). But
battle is not seen as without any value; it too has a divine dimension. As is the case with
the other battle described in this poem, Candi’s ghouls joined the fray, and happily drank
the blood of the slain in a carnival feast.76

At a crucial moment in the battle, however, the heroic contest is called into
question, and temporarily is made comic and inconsequential. After the army of Kalinga,
led by the commander of the guard, had suffered a convincing defeat, Bharu goaded the
commander of the guard into resuming his attack. Kalketu’s wife Phullara then recalled an
episode from the *Ramayana*. Before their second and crucial battle, Valin was challenged
by his brother Sugriva, despite already having defeated Sugriva in combat. Sugriva,
however, challenged his brother this second time only after securing an alliance with Lord
Rama, and only because he counted on Rama’s secret and unchivalrous promise to come
to his assistance in what should have been single combat between heroes. Phullara also
recalled that Valin’s wife, Tara, suspecting some such plot, had advised her husband to
submit to Sugriva this second time, and that she had witnessed Rama kill her husband by
treachery when he failed to accept her advice. Phullara concluded that she also should advise her husband Kalketu not to resume the battle.

Valin, we must recall, had replied to Tara as follows: ‘For invincible heroes who never turn back in battle, to endure insolence is worse than death, timid woman’. Thus he made the masculine honor of a warrior his ultimate value. Indeed, in proposing the challenge, Rama had counted on the fact that heroes like Valin do not tolerate insults, ‘particularly when their women are present’. Kalketu, on the contrary, listened to his wife’s good advice and at once hid in the granary. Nor was his opponent, Kalinga’s commander of the guard, any more heroic in Kalketu’s sudden absence. Convinced that somewhere Kalketu was lying in ambush, he halted; his body became covered in goose-flesh, and his mouth could give voice to no sound, while he strained to hear some slight noise indicating Kalketu’s location. In the heart of the account of the battle, one finds this comic image of two warriors each hiding from the other.

We are never told that, like Valin’s, Kalketu’s honor depended on fighting whenever challenged, even to the death, and ‘particularly in the presence of women’. Later, when
freed from his shackles and released by Candi from the Kalinga prison, Kalketu would be quite indifferent to her promises that on the morrow the king would honor and reward him. Instead, he wanted only to escape while he could with his bow and three arrows. The whole episode suggests a pragmatic orientation to issues of war and peace. Indeed, we will see that a solution to war must involve, among other reforms, replacing the codes of honor which require victory or death from both men and women in warrior lineages.

**Tej, Stuti, and Mercy**

Kalketu announced a theory of his kingship when brought before the King of Kalinga to be tried and punished for his upstart kingdom. Prompted by the king, who evidently expected that Kalketu either would admit his usurpation or would identify a rival overlord as his protector, Kalketu in fact claimed that Mahes Thakur (Siva) was the king (*raja*) of his kingdom, that Candi was the ‘administrator’ (*adhikari*), and that he himself was her ‘chief minister (*mahapatra*) holding her ‘tej’ (energy), and the ‘executor of her commands’ (*ajnakan*). In Mukunda’s time and place an ideology declaring that the king was only the delegate of a divine ruler would have been associated with the region of Orissa or
‘Kalinga’. It first had been announced in Cuttack by the Ganga king Anangabhima III in the years 1230-38, who declared himself the ‘deputy’ (*ravuta*) and ‘son’ of Purusottama. 

More recently the theory had been revived and elaborated by Kapilendra (r. 1435-1467), who usurped the Gajapati throne and founded the powerful Suryavamsa dynasty in Orissa.

Despite the familiarity of Kalketu’s theory, however, Mukunda did not represent it as persuasive to the king of Kalinga. Denying any divine and spiritual authority to Kalketu, the king was interested only in how a vile hunter had acquired so much wealth, and in the various kinds of dishonor he, the king, had suffered in consequence of the upstart little kingdom within his realm. Kalketu asserted that Candi had given him her own wealth. This claim seems to have enraged the king, precisely because of its violation of the hierarchical principles of *jati*. Kalketu’s claim that he ruled as a delegate by ‘holding Candi’s tej’ therefore is an assertion that complements his claim to rule by her gift of wealth. Does it refute the claim that *jati* order had been violated by his possession of a kingdom, or by the prior acquisition of wealth which made that kingdom possible?
In Bengali *tej* has a range of meanings which tend to emphasize the expression of ‘radiance’, ‘heat’, or ‘energy’ in mental or spiritual ‘power’, ‘physical strengh’t’, ‘valor’, ‘courage’, or ‘heroism’.

Taken in any of these senses, Kalketu’s *tej* already had been demonstrated in battle. Are we to understand that a commitment to truth and dharma, or a moral teleology in general is inherent in this term? Of course, in other mangal-kabya there are stories of kings or warriors who became invincible through divine gifts. We may mention the character of Ichai Ghos in *Dharmamangal*, a rebel against proper authority and a protégé of the goddess, who received from her a deceptive assurance of invincibility.

Lau Sen, the hero of this story, succeeded in battle against Ichai Ghos by the intervention of Lord Dharma, and with the help of other male divinities. In Vipradas’s *Manasa-vijaya*, for another example, Cad for a time was invincible as a king because of Siva’s gift of gnosis (*mahajnan*), concretely embodied in gifts of an ascetic’s uncut hair, a ‘pouch of *siddhi*’ (hashish), and most important, a ‘victory scarf’ which allowed him to raise the dead to life. But again divine gifts of invincibility did not prevent Cad from committing grave mental errors (*kubuddhi*) in his dealings with Manasa. In Kalketu’s case, what particularly
refutes the king’s claim that jati order had been violated is Kalketu’s counter-claim that he was only the executor of Candi’s commands. The king’s ministers, whose minds were not clouded by rage, noted that Kalketu showed no fear of the king, because his mental and emotional attention (*bhab*) was fixed upon Candi. Because he was marked by participation in the divine, they refused to consent to his execution, and without their consent the king relented and had Kalketu imprisoned.\textsuperscript{87} Apparently Kalketu’s devotional absorption in and dependence on the goddess had given them some evidence that he ‘held Candi’s *tej*.

No purification rituals could have cleansed Kalketu of the impurity which was his by birth. Although Candi intervened to release Kalketu from prison, and made sure he received investiture from the king of Kalinga, she did not arrange for elaborate royal rituals to infuse in him more of her own *tej*, except as that virtue might have been present in gifts of regalia and unguents from the king of Kalinga.\textsuperscript{88} Kalketu’s theory of his kingship, which identifies the divine basis for his authority as holding Candi’s *tej*, is not emphasized in
subsequent events of the narrative; in fact the phrase appears nowhere else in Mukunda’s text.

Instead of extraordinary royal rituals, the text emphasizes a common devotional practice as the means by which Kalketu could reverse an entropic flow towards hunting and war. This practice was *stuti*, a prayer for divine intervention. It could be performed by all regardless of *jati*, and by men and women alike. The virtue by which Candi herself responded to *stuti* to save Kalinga and Gujarat, and which she awakened in both of her kings to save them from an endless cycle of hunting and war, was the anti-heroic and non-hierarchical virtue of mercy (*karuna, krpa*).

*Stuti*, at least as Kalketu modeled it at the crux of the narrative, was an emotionally multivalent, devotional hymn which praised the goddess, mentioning all her names, attributes, and salvational actions in the world, and which questioned her indifference to, and abandonment of him. At the same time, it gradually became an act of moral reflection, a reckoning and judgment with respect to his own life. Kalketu punctuated his verses of praise (given us in an improbably Sanskritized Bengali, and using verses also
used by all her other worshippers) with entirely personal interjections in colloquial Bengali.

In the latter he insisted on his innocence before some charges (he never was a ‘thug’ [t\_hag]; he never had misbehaved with another’s wife) and admitted to others (he had been a hunter; he had been guilty of greed in taking Candi’s wealth, and such greed in general leads to lascivious conduct). For ‘grievous faults’ (\textit{darun dos}) thus gradually identified, Kalketu’s \textit{stuti} finally asked for Candi’s forgiveness, while at the same time he begged Candi to ‘fly quickly to deliver her servant’.\textsuperscript{90}

Candi’s emotional involvement in Kalketu’s \textit{stuti} is most interesting. She came at once, ‘without tying up her hair’, felt herself ashamed to see Kalketu bound in prison, and sorrowed to see his weeping face. She freed him from bondage, and insisted that he should remain in Kalinga to be invested and to receive from the king a royal umbrella, along with other ‘honors’ and ‘rewards’.\textsuperscript{91} An unmotivated act of mercy immediately follows: she freed, not Kalketu alone, but also all the prisoners in the king’s prison, and had her ghouls seize the weapons of all the prison guards, who fell unconscious and in disarray.\textsuperscript{92}
But it is following Kalketu’s investiture that we see the most extraordinary acts of mercy. The first occurred as Kalketu was returning to his kingdom. On the road he saw the wives of the soldiers he had slain. They were preparing to immolate themselves upon their husbands’ funeral pyres. Kalketu’s ears were filled with their weeping, and he acknowledged his responsibility for their fate in a way contrary to the code of masculine honor for a warrior: ‘In shame and fear he kept his head downcast’. Candi understood his silent wish, and promised to restore the soldiers to life. Hearing this promise, Kalketu forbade the women the rite of anumarana, and Candi revived the slaughtered soldiers, who danced in a carnival of joy that reversed their experience of the carnival of battle. We must note at once that here Kalketu reciprocated an earlier act of mercy, by which his own wife had been spared suicide or immolation, when he had been captured by the commander of the guard of Kalinga. That man, inspired by the goddess, had promised Phullara that he would speak to the king and save Kalketu’s life. Finally, this episode corrects the model for heroic action enacted by Lord Rama, who had raised to life only his allies, the dead monkey soldiers of Sugriva.
Kalketu’s treatment of Bharu Datta was even more extraordinary. The latter, by one final set of falsehoods, attempted to regain his old position as minister, but Kalketu judged him and found him guilty, and the whole town joined in giving him disgraceful punishments. A barber wet him with a horse’s piss, scraped his hair and beard with a dull razor, made streams of blood soak his garments, and left only five long strands of hair on his head. People of the town marked one of Bharu’s cheeks with white lime and one with lampblack as a sign of his disgrace. The commander of the guard poured whey upon his head. They gave him a garland of ‘China roses’ (oramala), and drove him from the town, beating him on all sides, while boys taunted him along the way, and even the shyest brides pelted him with blackened cooking pots. Nevertheless, despite the undoubted justice of these punishments, ‘seeing Bharu’s dishonor (laghabe) the hero felt great sorrow, and taking mercy (krpa kar), gave him back his house and home’.

We are meant, I think to contrast unfavorably Rama’s rejection and banishment of Sita, not for any real misconduct, but merely because some of his subjects had been gossiping about her. In the midst of victory, the ordinary, unheroic, and sympathetic human emotions of shame
for his own deeds, fear for their consequences, and sorrow for others allowed Kalketu to
‘take mercy’ and to make peace out of victory.

Conclusion

This essay has analyzed the rhetoric and assumptions of a sixteenth century
Bengali text, which argued for a novel and more pacific style of kingship on the agrarian
frontier, where peasant agriculture was expanding north and west of the Bengal delta. It
has argued that Mukunda’s *Candimangal* is a rich historical source for our understanding of
two, related topics. The first topic is commercialization on the agrarian frontier: an
increasing role for markets and market-like transactions, especially in state formation. The
second topic is a change in the ideology of kingship, involving a re-evaluation of royal
virtues, to give more importance to those which would make possible a more pacific polity,
and less importance to martial prowess and masculine honor.

In his rhetoric portraying the proper characteristics of a frontier kingdom ruled by a
local, base-born, untouchable *raja*, Mukunda’s vivid details suggest direct observation of
the role of markets and trade on the agrarian frontier in sixteenth century Bengal.
Mukunda gave unusual importance to wealth, to buying and selling, and to marketplaces.

As a gift Kalketu received from Candi a vast treasure, not sovereignty itself, nor any
precious symbol of sovereignty or of his relation with her. He received that wealth only
after demonstrating that he was not ‘lascivious’ (but to some extent he was ‘greedy’), and
he used her gift of wealth to purchase soldiers, numerate and literate servants, laborers, a
minimum of regalia, weapons for himself and an army, and a stock of food. In bargaining
for settlers on the agrarian frontier he entered into market-like transactions by offering
them more attractive terms than the neighboring, high-jati king had done. He founded a
central, tax-free marketplace in his kingdom to serve his own subjects and to attract
foreign merchants. Finally, through his scheming minister Bharu Datta, competitive self-
interest and force and fraud entered tax collection in that market and threatened the
redistributive ‘moral economy’ of Kalketu’s little kingdom.

Mukunda’s sixteenth century text suggests that commercialization in early modern
Bengal should be studied in the *longue durée*, over the course of at least three centuries,
not just in the eighteenth century. It also suggests that processes of commercialization
may have been experienced most acutely on internal agrarian frontiers, rather than along
the axis of the Bhagirathi, Hugli, and Sarasvati rivers.96

In this narrative Candi promised to end both hunting of animals, and ‘hunting’ in the
sense of exploitative predation in human society. Mukunda’s text developed ideas about a
more pacific kingship and the royal virtues such a kingship would have required.

Nevertheless, this essay has argued that, according to Mukunda, in order to protect their
subjects kings must have the very martial virtues that make predation possible. By
representing martial virtues through the trope of ‘hunting’ Mukunda’s text de-emphasized
them, but did not altogether deny them a role.

At the same time it elevated to a middle position those virtues which relate broadly
to the possession of sri, always temporally unstable, and which relate narrowly to buying
and selling. For buying and selling it valued shrewdness in bargaining, instrumental
rationality in choosing what to purchase, and an absence of greed for luxury, sensual
enjoyment, and many wives. Mukunda’s text differs with those views of kingship which
emphasized the king’s divine capacity for sensual enjoyment (bhog), lavish generosity, and
elaborate and expensive royal rituals, views in which the fluid capitals of cash crops and market economies are reflected in royal rituals of feeding Brahmans and other displays of conspicuous consumption.\textsuperscript{97} Probably Brahmans like Mukunda would not have regarded any ostentatious expenditure as virtuous in a base-born raja on the agrarian frontier, but nothing in his text suggests a different standard for judging expenditures of higher ranking kings.

Ultimately, as this text imagined them, more pacific kings and polities had to be based upon royal gifts, gifts which originated from and were modeled upon a divine gift of wealth to the king. As did authors of most other versions of \textit{Candimangal}, Mukunda made Candi require a fatherly generosity in the royal dharma of giving to the king’s subjects. Mukunda’s emphasis, however, was less upon transforming ‘wealth into alms’ in order to give ‘moral value’ to what otherwise would be a ‘raw material, itself neutral’,\textsuperscript{98} and more upon constituting a redistributive economy in order to attract subjects to Kalketu’s new kingdom. By narrating a story in which Candi’s divine gift both authorized and made possible further gifts from Kalketu, Mukunda veiled human sources of new wealth on the
agrarian frontier, and mystified the economic growth that must have been experienced as settled agriculture expanded into the forested peneplain north and west of the Bengal delta.

Mukunda both preserved a logical distinction between ‘buying and selling’ and ‘hunting’, and developed an entropic pattern of causation by which ‘buying and selling’ easily can be reduced to ‘hunting’. Perhaps the ‘super-personal and normative regulation’ which makes markets free of force and fraud was known to him, but was experienced as intermittent or weak. Of course, with a zero-sum logic, any profit may have appeared as the result of ‘hunting’. Further research is needed to clarify whether and how a distinct domain of ‘buying and selling’ sometimes appeared in marketplaces, despite fraud, and despite multiple and overlapping ‘passages of authority’ which intervened to redirect both marketable commodities and vendors.

Mukunda’s account devalues the royal virtues proper to hunting and war. In its emphasis on individual character rather than jati, its de-emphasis, if not disapproval, of lavish royal gifts and expenditures, and its openness to seeing some royal virtue in calculative, rational transactions of ‘buying and selling’ and gift exchange, Mukunda’s
narrative of Kalketu can be compared to one medieval Jain text on kingship from Gujarat. Both suggest multiple and multivalent royal virtues. The Jain text does give unusually important roles to merchants, and narrates alliances between them and the king. At the same time it denigrates luxurious and sensual royal entertainments, and upholds a calculative rationality. The Jain text, however, does not devalue ‘hunting’ and war; its paradigmatical Jain king begins his career as a thief, and secures the treasure needed for kingship by robbing the tax collections of a neighboring king.

To model a more pacific kingship Mukunda had to re-evaluate both models of heroic masculinity and the expectations of martial culture for wives of warriors and kings. Mukunda’s text was opposed to the masculine codes of honor of young men training to be soldiers, of wrestling akharas, and of Gorakh Nath renunciates. In all three arenas one could find in sixteenth century Bengal attempts to perfect and make invulnerable the celibate male body; and in Bengal as elsewhere a widely shared misogynist discourse was associated with all such disciplines. Mukunda’s text, on the contrary, is relatively free of both misogynist and misogynist discourse. Here also this study suggests an avenue for
comparative research, to develop more detailed contrasts with contemporary martial subcultures in Bengal.

Twice Mukunda’s narrative represented ‘mercy’ as a preferable alternative to the code of honor which required ritual immolation of the wives of defeated warriors. The royal virtue of mercy provided alternatives to a warrior’s code of masculine honor, and made peace possible. Mercy is supported by stuti, the devotional practice which the poem most frequently upholds. At least as Kalketu modeled it at the crux of his story, stuti was punctuated by individual, moral self-reflection, and by the ordinary, unheroic human emotions of sorrow, shame and fear, and it concluded with a prayer for Candi’s forgiveness of ‘grievous faults’. Having experienced forgiveness of his goddess, Kalketu could act with mercy for others.

No doubt the self-effacement required for this virtue is related to Kalketu’s lowly status by jati and to that simplicity of character which Mukunda satirized in earlier episodes of the narrative. But I argue that it also is related to the king’s submission to norms of exchange, in both buying and selling and in gift exchanges, to his calculative rationality in
expenditures, and to the large role which Mukunda’s text gave to markets and to commercialized agrarian relations in his kingdom. In all these cases we can see normative limits placed upon the ‘strong and autonomous’ personality of a warrior king.

In discussing Kalketu as a raja the words ‘king’ and ‘kingship’ may be problematic, because he came to acknowledge the superior authority of a maharaja, an overlord. I use them nevertheless because in this text because it has no different account of what would constitute right rule by a maharaja. Cf. Rahul Peter Das, ‘Little Kingdoms and Big Theories of History,’ Journal of the American Oriental Society 117 (1997): 127-34.
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