CHAPTER III
DEVELOPMENT OF KULINISM

The development of Kulinism may be understood better if it is discussed under the two following broad-heads:

(I) Development among the Brāhmaṇas and
(II) Development among other castes.

DEVELOPMENT AMONG THE BRAHMAṆAS

The development of Kulinism among the Brāhmaṇas will be dealt with in the following two sections:

(A) Development among the Rādhīya Brāhmaṇas and
(B) Development among the Varendra Brāhmaṇas.

A. DEVELOPMENT AMONG THE RĀDHĪYA BRAHMAṆAS

In discussing the development of Kulinism among the Rādhīya Brāhmaṇas, the thing that should be known first is who the Rādhīya Brāhmaṇas were. It is, however, generally believed that the descendants of the five immigrant Brāhmaṇas settling in Rādha* were called the Rādhīya Brāhmaṇas. As to how the said descendants came to be known as such, different arguments have been offered by scholars.

1. See above, chapter I, pp. 34-35.
Of these scholars, mention may first be made of L.M. Bhattacharyya¹ who refers to a tradition, current in his time, according to which the descendants of the five immigrant Brāhmaṇas, in course of time, swelled into fifty-six in number. The descending families could not pull on peacefully. Since then, some of them transferred themselves to Rāḍha. Thus, the name Rāḍhīya Brāhmaṇa originated from the name of their habitation.

On the basis of the Rāḍhīyakulapañjikā, M.C. Majumdar² points out that having performed Ādiśūra's sacrifice the five immigrant Brāhmaṇas returned to their homes in Kānyakubja, but they were excommunicated from the society there on the ground that they had traversed over Magadha and gone to Āṅga which were countries forbidden by the Śāstras to visit, and were told that until they performed proper expiation for their sins, they would not be re-admitted into the pale of their society. This they refused to do and the king of Kānyakubja not being able to make any amicable settlement of their dispute, they in rage came back to Bengal. Ādiśūra endowed upon them for support the villages in Rāḍha (South-West Bengal). Thus, their descendants came to be described as Rāḍhīya Brāhmaṇas.

Further, Majumdar\textsuperscript{1} refers to some Ghatakas (match-makers) who state that Bhusura, the son of Adiśūra, was compelled to take shelter in Rāḍha owing to the rise of the Pāla power in Varendra (North Bengal). The descendants of the five immigrants who followed him came to be known as Rāḍhiyas.

According to R.K.Chakravarti\textsuperscript{2}, some of the descendants of the five Brāhmaṇaṇas owed allegiance to the Śūra kings in Rāḍha and hence they were called Rāḍhiyas.

N.N.Vasu\textsuperscript{3} suggests that the Ganges as boundary between Rāḍha and Varendra, the rule of various kings professing numerous religions and the custom of the Brāhmaṇaṇas being introduced by the name of gāṇī were probably the factors leading to the origin of the name of Rāḍhiya.

The Varendra kulapaṇjika\textsuperscript{4}, as L.M. Bhattacharyya points out, states that a section of the Brāhmaṇaṇas was described as Rāḍhiya during the rule of Ballālasena. R.C.Majumdar\textsuperscript{5} adds that Brāhmaṇaṇas came to be known as Rāḍhiya in the time of the Sena king according to their locality in which they lived.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1.] Op.cit., p. 52.
  \item[2.] Gauder Itihasa, Pt.I, pp. 79-80.
  \item[4.] Sambandhanirnay, 3rd ed., p. 316.
\end{itemize}
The general belief is, however, not always supported and attention is drawn to the existence of the Rāḍhīya Brāhmaṇas in much earlier time than the time (Śaka 654–732 A.D.) of the alleged advent of the immigration of the Brāhmaṇas from Kolāṅga, as mentioned above\(^1\). Thus, Pargiter\(^2\) draws attention to the Faridpur inscription of Dharmāditya (middle of the 6th century A.D.), in which is mentioned a Brāhmaṇa named Brha-Caṭṭa and opines that Caṭṭa is the same as the modern Caṭṭopādhyāya, a cognomen of the kulīna Brāhmaṇas belonging to the Rāḍhīya section. Besides, N.R. Ray\(^3\) draws attention to the Ashrafpur inscription\(^4\) mentioning Vandyaśaṅghamitra and opines that the existence of the Rāḍhīya Brāhmaṇas may be traced in the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. in Vaṅga (East Bengal). But one may believe that such Brāhmaṇas might have migrated from Rādha to Vaṅga. D.C. Sircar\(^5\) is, however, of the opinion that "there is no truth in the fantastic idea that learned Brāhmaṇas could not be found in East Bengal and that respectful Brāhmaṇa families now living in Eastern and central Bengal and calling themselves Rāḍhīya all migrated from their original home in Rādha," and according to him, 'the social division of the Brāhmaṇas into Rāḍhīyas and Vārendras'\(^6\) is also

---

1. See Chapter 1, p.30.
3. *Banglar Hindu Varner Vivarana*, p. 18; also his *Bengalir Itihasa*, pp. 131-32.
6. For discussion on Vārendras, see below.
unsound, since the Maithil Brāhmaṇic mūla-grāma Gaṅgaulī is the same as the Bengal Brāhmaṇic gāṇi Gaṅgulī, as mentioned above.

As regards the person responsible for the introduction of Kulinism among the Rādhīya Brāhmaṇas, the Rādhīya kulapāṇjikā, as N.N. Vasu points out, states that king Dharāśūra introduced Kulinism and divided the said Brāhmaṇas into three grades, viz., Mukhya Kūlīna, Gaṇa Kūlīna and Srotṛiya. But Ballālasena (1159-1179 A.D.) is generally held responsible in the kulapāṇjikās for the introduction of Kulinism among the Rāḍhīya Brāhmaṇas. On the basis of nine virtues such as (i) good conduct, (ii) humility, (iii) learning, (iv) celebrity, (v) pilgrimage, (vi) faith, (vii) profession, (viii) religious austerity and (ix) charity, the Sena king is stated to have conferred the rank of Kulinism on the following nineteen Brāhmaṇas:

(i) Jāhlana, (ii) Maheśvara, (iii) Devala, (iv) Vāmana, (v) Īśāna and (vi) Makaranda of the village Vandya; (vii) Vahurūpa, (viii) Suca, (ix) Arabinda, (x) Halayūdha and (xi) Vāṅgāla of the village Caṭṭa; (xii) Utsāha, (xiii) Garuḍa of the village Mukhaṭi; (xiv) Śira of the Ghosāla village; (xv) Govardhana of the village Pūtituṇḍa; (xvi) Śīsa (Śīśu) of the Gaṅgulī

1. See Chapter II. p.77.
The said nineteen Brāhmaṇas were, according to R.C. Majumdar\(^1\), placed in the same grade. M.C. Majumdar\(^2\) is, however, of the opinion that Ballālasena probably made no rule regarding the marriage of Kulīna and he is supported by R.C. Majumdar\(^3\) who holds that Kulīnas could marry daughters of non-Kulīnas and also by D.C. Sircar\(^4\) who is of the view that there seems to have been no restriction of marriage between Kulīna and non-Kulīna Brāhmaṇas and between Rādhīya and Varendra. But N.N. Vasu\(^5\), on the authority of Vacaspatimisva's Kularāma, states that the Sena king made a rule that a Kulīna must restrict the marriage of his sons and daughters to Kulīnas of different gotras. A Kulīna could marry the daughter of a Śrotriya Brāhmaṇa, but he could not give his daughter in marriage to a Śrotriya Brāhmaṇa.

Dhruvānandamisva's Mahāvaṃsa\(^6\) states that Laksmaṇasena (1179-1207 A.D.) raised the number of Kulīnas to twenty-one by adding two to nineteen previously honoured by Ballālasena,

\(^4\) Prof.K.A.Nilakanta Sastrī: Felicitation Volume, p.354.
as mentioned above. R.C. Majumder\(^1\) observes that Lakṣmaṇasena made the system a complex by introducing among the Rādhīya Brāhmaṇas restrictions of marriages, for Vācaspatimiśra's Kularāma, as N.N. Vasu\(^2\) points out, states that Lakṣmaṇasena prescribed that there must be a mutual transfer in the marriages of Kulīna's daughters i.e., a Kulīna must necessarily marry the daughter of one to which family he has given his daughter in marriage. He, thus, laid down that whoever among the Kulīnas would make such relation he would be honoured as the primary (Mukhya) Kulīna. Besides, he introduced classification of Kulīnas into different grades according to their faithful observance of the marriage rules. Such classification is known as Samīkaraṇa (equality of status).

The reason why he introduced such Samīkaraṇa was that the said nineteen Brahmans were falling out among themselves over their rank. None of them thought himself inferior to another, but everyone considered himself superior to another. As such, he held first and second Samīkaraṇa\(^3\).

In the first Samīkaraṇa seven Brahmans were considered to be equal in status and they were as follows:

---

(i) Āhita (his father Utsāha being dead),
(ii) Vahurūpa,
(iii) Śira,
(iv) Govardhana,
(v) Śisu (a),
(vi) Makaranda and
(vii) Jāhlaṇa.

In the second Samīkarana fourteen Kulīnas were made equal in status. They were:

(i) Arabinda,
(ii) Halāyūdha,
(iii) Śuca,
(iv) Vāṅgāla
(v) Devala,
(vi) Maheśvara,
(vii) Īśāna,
(viii) Rośākara,
(ix) Vāḍli,
(x) Vāmana,
(xi) Paṇḍita,
(xii) Abhyāgata (his father being dead),
(xiii) Kṛṣṇa and
(xiv) Kūṭūhala¹

1. Loc.cit.
Harimiśra's Kārikā, as N.N.Vasu¹ points out, states that Laksmanasena made fourteen secondary (Gauna) Kulīnas. Moreover, in his time, Kulinism was explained away by abstruse philosophy, and the qualities of Kulinism were to be explained by the argument of abstract logic².

King Danaujāmādhava (13th century A.D.), according to the Kulatattvārvanva, organised the third, the fourth, the fifth and the sixth Samikarana. He divided 508 Rādhīya Brāhmaṇas of fifty-six gānis into Kulīna, Sāḍhya-Śrotriya, Siddha-Śrotriya, Susiddha-Śrotriya and Ari (enemy) or Kaśṭaśrotriya. The Brāhmaṇas whose daughters were considered to destroy the kula were called Ari. He styled twenty-four Brāhmaṇas as Kulīnas. He is also credited with the creation of a class known as Vamśaṭa among the Kulīnas. The Mahāvamsa, as N.N.Vasu⁴ points out, states that a Kulīna becomes Vamśaṭa (non-Kulīna) on offering his daughter to a Śrotriya Brāhmaṇa. The origin of the Vamśaṭa has, however, been traced by some scholars. Thus, J. Wise⁵ opines that the difficulty of obtaining bridegroom increased as the families became extinct with the passage of time. Kulīna fathers often gave away their daughters to Śrotriya Brāhmaṇas and even to Saptasatī families, thus forming the

Vamsāja (literally belonging to the family), while according to G.N. Dutt, the Vamsāja class were those Kulīnas who, although virtuous, had not given or taken girls in marriage according to the prescribed rules for three generations. In the opinion of H.H. Risley, Kulīnas who lost their distinction on account of misconduct (i.e., their want of charity, discipline and due observance of marriage law) were called Vamsāja.

According to Danaujāmādhava's marriage rules, there must be Parivarta (mutual transfer) in marriage in the same generation in the case of the daughter of the Kulīna, and a Kulīna could marry the daughter of first three classes of Śrotriya. A Kulīna lost his social status by not giving in marriage to a Kulīna of different gotra and also by marrying a girl of the Ari or Kaśṭa-śrotriya group, and even for indifference to charity, aversion to ascetic self-devotion, addiction to sensual pleasure, greediness, illiteracy, extinction of the family, offering of pinda of a living man, adultery and for living as a bachelor.

Referring to Devīvara Vandyopādhyāya, a ghataka (match-maker), N.N. Vasu\(^1\) states that Datta Khān (14th century A.D.) made Gauṇa Kulīnas to be Śrotiyas. He also formulated that under the following circumstances one's kula would be lost to one:

(i) Absence of male or female issue;
(ii) Marriage with a girl who has no father and brother living;
(iii) The giving of pinda when one is alive;
(iv) Marrying within fifth descent on mother's side and seventh descent on father's side;
(v) Repetition of some recognized crimes;
(vi) Being burnt by fire;
(vii) Forcible marriage;
(viii) Adoption;
(ix) Being born blind;
(x) Abortion;
(xi) Leprosy;
(xii) Lameness;
(xiii) Marriage in a low rank;
(xiv) Performing the Nāndi Śrāddha in marriage with a low rank;
(xv) Being a disinherited son;
(xvi) Marriage in unequal succession of descent;
(xvii) Marrying before the elder brother was married;

---

(xviii) Killing or causing death to a Brāhmaṇa;
(xix) Marrying with a girl older in age;
(xx) Marrying with a girl of one's mother's name;
(xxⅴ) Marrying with a girl of one's own gotra;
(xxⅱ) With one polluted;
(xxⅲ) With one deformed;
(xxⅳ) Blind;
(xxⅴ) Hunchback or dumb.

Nulopeṇcānana's Kārikā, as pointed out by N.N.Vasu, states that at the end of the 15th century A.D., Devīvara Vandyopādhyāya, after an investigation into the short-comings of the Kulīnas, removed some from the status of Kulīna and divided the others with short-comings into thirty-six classes or Melas. L.M. Bhattacharyya refers to a tradition, current in his time, which relates the circumstances under which Devīvara introduced the Melas. He had a quarrel with his mother's sister's son Yogesa who belonged to a higher rank of Kulīna, and who as his guest had refused to dine at his house on the ground that he belonged to a lower rank of Kulīna. Enraged at this, he set himself upon re-organizing Kulinism. In order to punish Yogesa, he worshipped the mother goddess and became empowered. He, then, noticed that most of the Kulīnas

1. Ibid., pp. 172-73; cf. also Kulatattvārvavā, Slokas, 385 ff.
were devoid of nine virtues. So, he invited all the match-makers and made proposal to them to re-organize the order of Kulinism. The match-makers agreed to it, and a day for meeting was fixed. In that meeting the order of Kulinism was re-organized and Yogesa was made non-Kulina first and then was made Kulina when he dined at his house.

In favour of the introduction of the Melas, the Kulatattvārāgava\(^1\) states that Devivara was appointed Kulācāryya of the Brāhmaṇas by the then Muslim ruler of Bengal. He could not procure kulajīs and genealogical works, because the Muslims had burnt them. He, then, worshipped the goddess Kamakhya. The goddess became pleased with him and granted his prayer by saying, 'Devivara, you proceed to do in the matter of the Kula-bandhana of the Brāhmaṇas', He, accordingly, in consultation with the Kulācāryya, introduced the Mela or Mela-bandhana (binding together).

---

The *Dosanirgava* of Devūvara gives the names of thirty-six Mēlas as follows:

2. Better read 'Phuliā'.
The Melas were endogamous groups, each bearing the name of the original ancestor of the clan or of his village. How the Melas were formed has been explained by N.K. Dutt from the case of the principal Mela, known as Phuliya-Mela. The principal person of this Mela was Gangēnanda Mukhopādhyāya of the village Phuliya on the eastern bank of the river Bhāgirathī. He had the following four dogas or degrading faults.

(i) His father had married in a family of Vamsaja Vandyopadhyaya, and thereby committed an anti-Kulinia offence.

(ii) One Arjuna Misra had dined with a Brähmana family who acted as priest to lower class. Gaṅgānanda became matrimonially connected with Arjuna Misra.

(iii) Gaṅgānanda's nephew married in a family of Saptasatī Brähmana called Muluk jurīgāni.

(iv) Two daughters of one Śrīnātha Caṭṭopādhyāya were abducted by Hāsān, a Muslim police officer. Subsequently, one of them was given in marriage to Gaṅgāvara Vandyopādhyāya whose family became matrimonially connected with that of Gaṅgānanda Mukhopādhyāya. Thus, the Melas were formed on the basis of permutations and combinations of faults.

Devīvara formed two sections within a Mela. He from whose fault the Mela is organized is called Prakṛti, and he who became equal in respect of status by observing marital relation with him is Pālī. He made it a rule that a Brähmaṇa must marry the daughter of a corresponding Pālī in a Mela. An exception to this rule would involve the loss of Kulinism. The Mahāvaṃśa of Dhruvananda Misra,

as pointed out by N.N. Vasu\(^1\), states that Devīvara restricted the marriage of a Brāhmaṇa to his own generation, to his father's generation and to his son's generation. Thus, three kinds of kula originated among the Rādhīya section of the Brāhmaṇas, such as Ārtti, Kṣema and Ucita or Tulya. Besides, the Kuladīpikā, as N.N. Vasu\(^2\) points out, states that Devīvara introduced four kinds of rules in marriage, such as (i) Ādāna (Viz., to marry a daughter of a good family); (ii) Pradāna (Viz., to give daughter in marriage to a noble family); (iii) Kuśatyaṅga (Viz., marriage to a figure of Kuśa-made daughter in real absence of daughter), and (iv) Promise before the Ghaṭaka (match-maker) that one must give one's daughter in marriage to the son of another person.

He also made it a rule that a Kulīṇa would become Vamśaja if he gave his daughter in marriage to a Śrotriya Brāhmaṇa. A Vamśaja retained his rank of nobility for the seventh generation after which he became Śrotriya\(^3\).

2. Ibid., p. 330, note 2.
Kulinism is, however, associated with gāni (grāmin from grāma). The Rādhīya Brāhmaṇas had originally fifty-six gānis. The Kārika¹ of Harimśra gives the list of fifty-six gānis. Later on, three more were added to them. The list, given below, which follows Vācespatimśra's Kularāma² contains the names of fifty-nine gānis under the five gotras of Śāṇḍilya, Bharadvāja, Kāśyapa, Vātsyya and Sāvarṇa.

Of the fifty-nine gānis sixteen are of Śāṇḍilya-gotra, four of Bharadvāja-gotra, sixteen of Kāśyapa-gotra, eleven of Vātsyya-gotra and twelve of Sāvarṇa-gotra. They are enumerated below:


Bharadvāja-gotra - (1) Mukhaiṭī, (2) Diṅdisāyī, (3) Sāharika, and (4) Rāyī.


Vokaṭgāla and Jhikrāḍī of the Śaṇḍilya gotra and Hijjala of the Vātsyya gotra, as mentioned in the Kārikā, do not find place in the list of Vācaspatimīśra, while Kulakulī, Kayaḍī or Koyārī, Bhaṭṭa, Puṃsika, Dīghala and Ṭākṣa gānis, referred to by Vācaspatimīśra, are not mentioned in the Kārikā. According to N.N. Vasu¹, Dīghala, Puṃsika and Bhaṭṭa are the three new gānis, which were added to the list of fifty-six.

Kṣitiśūra, according to the Raḍhīya Kulapaṇjikā², gave a village for residence to each of the fifty-nine descendants of the five Brāhmaṇas and this led to the

origin of the fifty-nine Rādhīya gāṇis. But R.C. Majumdar\(^1\) observes that 'the fact that Saptasati Brāhmaṇas have also their gāṇi goes against the assumption in the kulaṇiś that the system originated with the grant of villages to the five Brāhmaṇas and their descendants'. N.R. Ray\(^2\) adds that the gāṇi system among the Rādhīya section of the Brāhmaṇas, in particular, may be traced in the sixth and seventh centuries, A.D. when the titles 'Cāṭṭa' and 'Vandyā' were prevalent.

J.N. Bhattacharyya\(^3\) suggests that the gāṇis later developed into surname. To make it clear, the residents of Mukhaṭi village had Mukhaṭi gāṇi and had the surname of Mukhaṭi or Mukha-Opādhyāya, by the addition of Upādhyāya (teacher) to the village name. The other well-known titles Vandyopādhyāya, Caṭṭopādhyāya originated in the same way.

S.C. Chakravarty\(^4\) suggests that after the Muslim conquest of Bengal, the Rulina Brāhmaṇas began to assume the names of the fifty-six villages as their surnames implying thereby that they were descendants of the five Brāhmaṇa immigrants from Kānyakubja. D.C. Bhattacharyya\(^5\) is of the opinion that such titles were probably introduced

---

2. Bangalir Itihasa, pp. 131-32.
in the 16th century A.D. D.C. Sircar also suggests that gānis are Mula-gramas, i.e., the villages in which the families of the Brāhmaṇas originally settled. Sircar further adds that gānis as a technical term denotes the social status of a Brāhmaṇa determined by his original connection with a particular village in Bengal. In this connection, Sircar draws our attention to the prevalence of the same custom in other parts of India, e.g., 'in Mārāṭhi family names like Bhāṅgār-kar, Pūsal-kar etc., and South Indian names like Sarvepalli Rādhākrṣṇan, Mallampalli Somākharan Śarmā etc., in which Bhāṅgār, Pūsal, Sarvepalli and Mallampalli are the Mula-gramas'.

Sircar, however, considers the tradition that the cognomens such as the Caṭṭopādhyāya and the Vandyopādhyāya are derived from the names of certain villages to be doubtful. Earlier than Sircar, as it may be pointed out, K.P. Bhattacharya seems to have expressed similar opinion when he took the said titles to be creations of the Ghaṭakas. Sircar argues that the names Brha-Caṭṭa and Vandyo-Devabhādra, mentioned above, are found respectively

2. Loc. cit.
3. Loc. cit.
7. See Chapter II, p. 70.
in a Bengal inscription of the sixth century A.D. and in an Orissa inscription of eighth century A.D. Sircar\(^1\), is, therefore, of the opinion that the Brāhmanical cognomens in question may not be so late as is usually believed.

N.N.Vasu\(^2\) has located the 56 Rādhīya gāṇis in Rādha. But D.C. Sircar\(^3\) observes that 'the attempt to locate the 56 Rādhīya gāṇis in Rādha' is unsound. Sircar\(^4\) then suggests that the gāṇi Gāṅgulī which has been identified by Vasu\(^5\) with the village Gāṅgur in the Burdwan District of West Bengal was outside Bengal as the Bengal Brāhmanic gāṇi Gāṅgulī is the same as the Maithil Brāhmanic mūla-grāma Gāṅgulī, as mentioned above\(^6\). Sircar\(^7\) also draws attention to the Belwa inscription\(^8\) of Mahipāla 1 (988-1038 A.D.) mentioning the village Poṣalī in North Bengal and opines that the said village is the same as the Poṣalī gāṇi of the Rādhīya Brāhmaṇas, which has been identified by Vasu\(^9\) with modern Poṣelā in the Burdwan District of West Bengal, 'although little can be said in favour of the identification'.

\(^{4}\) Loc.cit.
\(^{6}\) See Chapter II, p.77.
\(^{8}\) Loc.cit.
Sircar\(^1\), further, draws attention to the Mehar inscription\(^2\) of Dāmodaradeva (13th century A.D.) mentioning no fewer than four villages, viz., Purvagrāma, Siddhala, Dīṇḍisā and Kesāraṅa, which are included in the list of the 56 ṣāṇis and opines that 'to what extent the above inscription may be taken to bear information concerning the origin of the ṣāṇis of the Rāḍhiya Brāhmaṇas is very difficult to say'.

B. DEVELOPMENT AMONG THE VĀRENDRA BRĀMAŅAS

The descendants of the five Brāhmaṇas who are believed to have settled in Varendra are generally called the Vārendra Brāhmaṇas. There are, however, different accounts for the origin of the name of the Vārendra Brāhmaṇas. Thus, K.M. Banerjea\(^3\) refers to a tradition, current in his time, which describes that Vīramalla, the king of Varendra, felt envious of the glory which Ādiśūra, his son-in-law, had acquired by his solemn festivities. He, therefore, desired to impart a similar lustre to his own territory by performing an equally important sacrifice himself. He, accordingly, applied to the king of Gauḍa for five Brāhmaṇas of the Kolaṇca family who might realize

this object. Ādiśūra agreed to the wishes and sent five Vedic Brāhmaṇas from his Kolāncā stock. These five Brāhmaṇas, thus separated from their brethren, received the designation of Vārendras from Varendra where they settled. K.M. Banerjea¹, however, observes that if Ādiśūra procured only five Brāhmaṇas from Kānyakubja for his ceremony how could he immediately get five more of the same stock to spare for his father-in-law.

On the other hand, according to J.W. Wilkins², Viramalla made a request to the king of Kanauj (Kānyakubja), in response to which five Brāhmaṇas were sent to him also.

In support of Banerjea, M.C. Majumdar³, on the basis of the Vārendrakulapaṇjikā, points out that on the death of the five Brāhmaṇas, their eldest sons by their former wives in the old homes performed the śrāddha ceremony in Kānyakubja and were, therefore, outcast. They, therefore, emigrated to Bengal and Ādiśūra induced them to reside in the same territories with their step-brothers, whom they considered illegitimate. The king then granted them villages in Varendra country. Thus the name Varendra originated from their habitation in Varendra. Majumdar⁴ also refers to some Ghatakas (match-makers), mentioned

1. Loc.cit.
4. Ibid., p. 52.
above, who state that some of the descendants of the five Brāhmaṇas remained in Varendra when others followed Bhūṣūra who took shelter in Rāḍha owing to the rise of the Pāla power in Varendra. The Brāhmaṇas remaining in Varendra came to be known as Varendra Brāhmaṇas. Supporting Banerjea, L.M. Bhattacharyya refers to the tradition, current in his time, mentioned above, which relates that some of the fifty-six Brāhmaṇas remained in Varendra and they were, thus, termed as Varendra Brāhmaṇas according to the locality in which they lived. N.N. Vasu appears to support Banerjea when he refers to some people who believe that the name of Varendra has been derived from Varendra Śūra.

Vasu, further, suggests, as mentioned above, that the Ganges as boundary between Rāḍha and Varendra, the rule of various kings professing numerous religions and the custom of the Brāhmaṇas being introduced by the name of gani were the factors acting behind the origin of the name of the Varendra Brāhmaṇas. In favour of Banerjea, J.N. Bhattacharyya observes that Varendra derive their class name from Varendra, the ancient name of North Bengal.

1. See above, p. 81.
3. See above, p. 80.
5. Loc.cit.
6. See above, p. 81.
The Varendra kulapaññikās regard Ballālasena as the originator of kulinaism among the Varendra Brāhmaṇas. The Sena king laid down nine virtues, mentioned above, as the criterion and assigned the rank of kulina (higher social status) to those who possessed all of them. Among the one hundred gānis of the Varendras, the Sena king made eight kulina, eight Sat-Srotriya and eighty-four Kaṣṭaśrotriya.

The names of the eight kulina Brāhmaṇas were:
(i) Sādhu, (ii) Rudra, (iii) Lokonātha of the Śaṇḍilya-gotra; (iv) Krutu, (v) Matu of the Kāśyapa-gotra; (vi) Laksñādhara and (vii) Jayamānamiśra of the Vātσyagotra; (viii) Śaṇacāryya of the Bharadvāja-gotra.

N.N.Vasu holds that Ballālasena prescribed no rule restricting marriage between Kulinas and Srotriyas.

Among the Varendra Brāhmaṇas there is a section called the Kāpa (corresponding to the Vaṃsāja, mentioned above). The origin of the Kāpa has, however, been traced by some scholars. Thus, James Wise mentions a story, current in his time, which relates that one Narasiṁha Naral (Nādiyāl), a Vṛndāvana Brāhmaṇa, having a grown up but unmarried daughter, came to Bengal. When he was

2. See above, p. 83.
4. See above, p. 87.
crossing the Padma river, the ferryman upbraided him for keeping her so long a maid, and asked in mockery whether he intended marrying her to Madhu Maitra or Rāmadhanu Vāgīsi (Vāgci)*, the two chief Kulīnas of the Varendras. Narasimha, losing his temper, promised that he would either marry her to Madhu Maitra or commit suicide. He, accordingly, put his daughter, a cow and a Sāligrāma on board a boat and proceeded to Guramai near Nātora where Madhu Maitra lived. He met the Brāhmaṇa by chance at a bathing ghāt and threatened to sink the boat with its contents unless he agreed to marry the girl. Madhu Maitra sent for his sons and insisted that one of them should marry her. But all refused. So he himself took her to wife. At the festival when food is first taken from the bride's hands, she scoffingly sang 'who is honourable and who is not and to whom shall I give bhāji and paramānna?' At this the guests believed her to be a Muslim daughter in disguise and departed in anger and declined to hold away further intercourse with the household. The annual Śrāddha in memory of his father coming round, Madhu Maitra, being anxious to pacify his relatives and to induce them to attend, went to the house of his brother-in-law, Rāmadhanu, to seek his advice, but finding him away from home, he accepted refreshment offered by his sister. He then gave her the riddle - 'If Rāmadhanu comes, he will perform his father's Śrāddha, if not, he will never do it'.

* Now generally spelt as 'Bagchi'.
On his return Rāmadhanu, being unable to solve the puzzle, went to Madhu's house, and learnt its meaning. Thereupon he summoned the chief Kulīnas and making light of the misunderstanding, told the guests that they had practised a foolish joke (Kāpa). The anger of the guests was not appeased and since then they lived apart, forming the Kāpa subdivision, while, according to Yogesā Chandra Sastree1, the Kāpa section was originated from the Kulīna under the following circumstances. One Narisimha Laurial of Santipur in the Nadia District of West Bengal, having been insulted in a dinner given by Sukadevācāryya of the village Brahmānvolā determined to raise his social position. In order to fulfil his object Narisimha persuaded Madhu Maitra of Mājagrāma, the most respectable Kulīna among the Kulīnas of the existing society, to marry his daughter. On account of this marriage Madhu Maitra was excommunicated from the society by the sons of his former wife. On the annual Śrāddha day of Madhu Maitra's father he invited Dhain (Rāmadhanu) Vāgci, his brother-in-law, to dine at his house, as he did not expect to get any Brāhmaṇa of his own village or its vicinity. On that day Dhain Vāgci having been obstructed by a fencing made by Madhu Maitra, while entering into his house, explained, "well Sir, what a Kāpa have you created here?" In reply, Madhu said, 'yes Sir, I have created a Kāpa there.'

1. Proceedings, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1903, pp. 92-93.
Afterwards, he heard everything from Madhu Maitra and convened a meeting of Kulinas and Srotriyas of Majagrama and its vicinity to judge the conduct of Madhu's sons. In that meeting Madhu's sons were found guilty of disregarding and illtreating their father. Thereupon Dhain Vāgci declared that the sons of Madhu Maitra by his first wife should not be henceforth classed among the Kulinas. They should be called Kāpa. Thus, the Kāpa section was formed. The Varendra Brāhmaṇas were, thus, classified into three grades, viz., Kulīna, Śrotriya and the Kāpa.

The Bhāduṣi Vamsāvalī states that Udayanācāryya Bhāduṣi (14th century A.D.) organised the Brāhmaṇas into eight groups called Pathis and made the rules of matrimony stricter. Udayana created the Parivarta - marvāda (exchange of marriage) according to which a Kulina daughter was to be married to a Kulina bridegroom and a Kulina lost his Kulinism by marrying the daughter of a Śrotriya. According to his regulations, the Kulina lost his social prestige even by a contact with water touched by a degraded Brāhmaṇa called Kāpa. A custom known as Karaya was also introduced by him. The names of the Pathis were as follows:

(i) Aliakhēi; (ii) Jonālī; (iii) Nibārīva; (iv) Bhūṣaṇā; (v) Bhavānīpurī; (vi) Rohitā; (vii) Beṇī and (viii) Pāncuḍiyā.

The Kulaśatrakṣumudī, as pointed out by N.N. Vasu¹, mentions that Rāja Kamsanārāyana (16th century A.D.) who reorganised the Śrotriyas into Siddha, Sāddhya, Susiddha and Kaṇṭha modified the marriage rules in the following ways. Kulīna's marriage with a Kāpa would not lead to the loss of the former's social status if the Kulīna would marry the daughter of the Kāpa or offer his daughter to a Kāpa before contracting Karana between them. In order to remove the difficulty caused by the absence of daughter or sister in arranging Parivarta, as introduced by Udayana, a bridegroom and daughter made of grass (Kuṣā) was introduced. The Śrotriya could give his daughter in marriage to a Kulīna by marrying one of his daughters to a Kāpa. A Kāpa giving his daughter in marriage to a Śrotriya would also be ranked as Śrotriya. To marry the daughter of Kulīna and daughter to a Kulīna after making Karana with them would be the matter of fame for a Kāpa. The fame of Śrotriya would increase if he marries his daughter to Kulīna and marries a kulīna daughter. A Kulīna would be a Kāpa if he makes Karana with the latter and would be a Śrotriya if he offers his daughter to the former?

DEVELOPMENT AMONG OTHER CASTES

The development of Kulinism among other castes will be discussed in the following two sections:

(A.) Development among the Kāyasthas and
(B.) Development among the Vaidyas.

A. DEVELOPMENT AMONG THE KĀYASTHAS

As mentioned above, along with the five Brāhmaṇas the five Kāyasthas are alleged to have come to Bengal. Dhruvānanda Misra's Kārikā supplies a list of the said five Kāyasthas. They are:

(i) Makaranda Ghoṣa of the Saukālīṇa - gotra;
(ii) Daśaratha Vasu of the Gautama - gotra;
(iii) Vīrāṭa Guha of the Kāśyapa - gotra;
(iv) Kālidāsa Mitra of the Viśvāmitra - gotra and
(v) Puruṣottama Datta of the Maudgalya-gotra.

S.B. Nandi also gives a list of the said five Kāyasthas. They are as follows:

(i) Makaranda Ghoṣa of the Saukālīṇa-gotra;
(ii) Daśaratha Vasu of the Gautama-gotra;

(iii) Daśaratha Guha of the Kāśyapa-gotra;
(iv) Kālidāsa Mitra of the Viśvāmitra-gotra and
(v) Puruṣottama Datta of the Bharadvāja-gotra.

Another list of the said five Kāyasthas is furnished by B.S. Mitra¹. The list runs as follows:

(i) Makaranda Ghosa of the Saukālīna-gotra;
(ii) Puśana Vasu or Daśaratha Vasu of the Gautama-gotra;
(iii) Vīrāṭa Guha or Daśaratha Guha of the Kāśyapa-gotra;
(iv) Kālidāsa Mitra or Tārāpati Mitra of the Viśvāmitra-gotra and
(v) Puruṣottama Datta of the Madhukulya-gotra.

It is evident from a study of the three lists that while the names of the four Kāyasthas, viz., Makaranda Ghosa, Daśaratha Vasu², Kālidāsa Mitra³ and Puruṣottama Datta occur in all the lists, the name of Vīrāṭa Guha appears in the lists of Misra and Mitra, the latter also mentioning the alternative name Daśaratha Guha and the name of Daśaratha Guha is given in the lists of Nandi and Mitra, the latter also having mentioned the alternative name Vīrāṭa Guha.

Further, it may be seen that while all the three lists contain the names of the four gotras, viz., Saukālīna-gotra, Gautama-gotra, Kāśyapa-gotra and Viśvāmitra-gotra, Puruṣottama Datta, mentioned in all the three lists, as

2. Mitra's list also containing the alternative name Puśana Vasu.
3. Mitra's list also mentioning the alternative name Tārāpati Mitra.
seen above, is described as belonging to the Maudgalya-gotra in Misra's list, to the Bharadvāja-gotra in the list of Nandī and to the Madhukulya-gotra in that of Mitra.

In other words, in place of Maudgalya-gotra of Misra's list is found mentioned the Bharadvāja-gotra in Nandi's list and Madhukulya-gotra in Misra's list.

However, the Kulīna Kāyasthas often claim their descent from the said five Kāyasthas. But there are certain scholars who do not accept such origin of the Kulīna Kāyasthas. Thus, R.C. Dutt¹ opines that 'the claim is very theoretical.'

In support of Dutt, R.P. Chanda² observes that the Rādhīya and the Varendra Brāhmaṇas are mostly thirty to thirty-five generations removed from the five Kolānca Brāhmaṇas, while, the present generations 'of Booses, Ghoshes', Guhas, Mitras and Dattas are mostly twenty-two to twenty-five generations away from the five Kolānca Kāyasthas who accompanied the said Kolānca Brāhmaṇas. Chanda³, further, notices that in Kolānca and its neighbourhood (U.P.) and even in Bihar Kāyasthas with such surnames cannot be traced, while men with the cognomen of Ghosa, Mitra and Datta are met with in Bengal long before the time (Saka 654=732 A.D.) of the alleged immigration of the five Kāyasthas. In support of Dutta, N.N. Vasu⁴ is of the opinion that 'the

1. CAL.Rev., Vol. 75, p.239.
3. Loc.cit.,
tradition,' viz., the story of Adisūra as mentioned above, 'has no foundation in fact so far as the Kāyasthas are concerned.' D.C. Bhattacharyya appears to support Dutt when he observes by referring to Edumiśra's Karikā that there had been no advent of the said five Kāyasthas in Bengal.

Two sections of the kulīna Kāyasthas of Bengal, viz., Vaṅgaja Kāyasthas and Dakṣina Rādhiya Kāyasthas, being known, development of Kulinism among the Kāyasthas will be dealt with in two different sections:

(a) Development among the Vaṅgaja Kāyasthas and
(b) Development among the Dakṣina Rādhiya Kāyasthas.

(a) DEVELOPMENT AMONG THE VAṅGAJA KĀYASTHAS

Before discussing the development of Kulinism among the Vaṅgaja Kāyasthas, we should know first who the Vaṅgaja Kāyastha were. According to J.N. Mitra, some of the descendants of the Ghosa, Vasu, Guha and Mitra family, about whom we shall discuss below, came to be called the Vaṅgaja Kāyasthas during the reign of Ballālasena according to the name of the locality in which they lived.

Ballālasena is generally held responsible in the Kulapañjikās for introducing Kulinism among the Vaṅgaja Kayasthas on the basis of the same qualifications as in the case of the Brāhmaṇas, mentioned above. Some difference is, however, noticed in the names of persons mentioned in different sources as having been declared by the Sena king. Thus, while according to L.M. Bhattacharyya, the Sena king declared Subhāṣita Ghoṣa, Caturbhūja Ghoṣa, Parama Vasu, Āśvpati Mitra and Daśaratha Guha as Kulīnas, B.S. Mitra holds that Subhāṣiva Ghoṣa, Divākara Vasu, Nārāyaṇa Guha and Gōṭa Mitra were made Kulīnas. Further, while J.N. Mitra mentions that Lākṣmaṇa Vasu, Puṣana Vasu, Caturbhūja Ghoṣa, Daśaratha Guha and Tārāpati Mitra were declared Kulīnas, according to N.N. Vasu, Soma Vasu, Aharpati Vasu, Subha Ghoṣa, Ananta Ghoṣa, Haḍa Guha, Pitāmbara Guha and Jaya Mitra were made Kulīnas.

B.S. Mitra refers to some people and adds that the post of Ghatakas (match-makers) was created by Ballālasena.

5. Rajanyakanda, p. 333, note.
J.N. Mitra\(^1\), on the evidence supplied by the Kuladipika, mentions Ballālasena to have introduced certain rules to be followed by the Vaṅgaja Kulīna Kāyasthas, although N.N. Vasu\(^2\) ascribes those rules to Danaujāmādhava, mentioned above\(^3\), on the basis of the Vaṅgajaghataka Kārikā. D. C. Sircar\(^4\) also supports Vasu when he suggests that Kulinism of the Vaṅgaja kulīna Kāyasthas had been influenced by that of the Brāhmaṇas and gradually standardised by the Samajapatis Kulapaṇjikāras and Ghatakas, as mentioned above\(^5\).

The general rules are, however, as follows: The Kula (nobility) of the Vaṅgaja kulīna Kāyasthas rests on the marriage of daughter. Matrimonial connection between the kulīna bridegroom and the bride having equal succession of descent should be considered the best connection. The Kula may also be maintained if kulīna in the absence of a real living daughter, gives a toy-daughter made of Kuśa (grass) to a kulīna or binds himself down with a promise to marry his daughter, if born hereafter to him.

Adāna (acceptance), Pradāna (gift), Kuśatyāga, (sacrifice of the grass) and promise made to marry are the four ways in which betrothal is to be made valid. Kulīna's daughter should not be given in marriage very close to or at a great

---

3. See Chapter III above, p. 87.
5. See Chapter II above, p. 68.
distance from her home; to a person who is involved in debts, who is wicked, or who bears a bad moral character, who is illiterate, who is sickly or suffering from disease. A kulīna who marries Anyapūrba daughter, who marries his daughter to a adopted son and Dehgarā (low class) Kāyasthas would lose his higher social status. A kulīna who has not performed marriage through three generations, with a kulīna loses his Kulinism. A kulīna who has made forbidden acts in respect of marriage through generations loses his Kulinism. Such a kulīna is considered to be an Acala. With the latter if any kulīna forms matrimonial relation, his Kula becomes stained.¹

In the development of Kulinism among the Vaṅgaja Kulīna Kāyasthas Paramānanda Ray² (Vasu), the President of the Candradvīpa Samaṇa, and who is said to have flourished towards the last quarter of the 15th century, formulated the following rules for the observance of kulīnas.

The resting place of a kulīna lies in a Kulaja, Madhyalya and Mahāpātra (it means that a kulīna may contract marriages with a Kulaja, a Madhyalya and a Mahāpātra without losing his Kulinism).

Although a kulīna may marry in the above families, he must within three generations form matrimonial connection with a kulīna, otherwise his Kulinism would be jeopardised.

---

The Kulīnas from their connection with Kulīnas receive in order the position of Ārti (Ātma), Ucita, Grha and Kāḍī. Marriage of a Kulīna daughter in the father's generation is called Ārti; marriage of a Kulīna's son in the same Paryāya (generation) is known as 'Ucita; marriage of a daughter with a son in the same generation, having some fault and living in the daughter's house is called Grha and marriage of a daughter with a son in the same generation, both of them having much blemishes, is called Kāḍī.

When a Kulīna contracts a marriage with a Kulaja (he who has lost his Kulinism by violating the rules of Kulinism) he gets into the position of Upabhāva and this act of his is called Upakarma.

From matrimonial relation with a Madhyālya a Kulīna descends to the position of Kṣamabhāva and with Mahāpātras of Apabhāva.

If a Kulīna forms a connection with a Kulīna superior to him, he places himself in the position of Satbhāva.

A Kulīna who continuously forms relation with Kulīna and who by considering the propriety and impropriety of gift and acceptance, becomes free from all blemishes, will raise his family to the rank of a Gaṅgāsrota Kula or the purest and highest Kula.

The *Gaudavāmsāvalī*, as N.N. Vasu\(^1\) points out, mentions that the said president declared that the Vaṅgaja kulīna Kāyasthas inhabiting the locality bounded on the east by the Brahmaputra, on the north by the Ichāmatī, on the West by Madhumatī and on the South by the Bay of Bengal have become the best by their acts. To live in any place beyond this area is derogatory to a Kulīna. Besides, Śālimābād, Fatebād, Ghodāghāṭ, Bāju, Telihāṭi, Caturmandal, Cádni and Bejāgrāma are also unworthy of the habitation of a Kulīna. By living therein he would be deprived of his Kulinism.

If a Kulīna lives in an infamous place, he would be deprived of his Kulīna status, but, if his family goes on forming relation with Kulīnas, it would be regarded as Kulāja.

Before Paramānanda Ray the order of titles of Kulīnas was Ghoṣa, Vasu, Guha and Mitra; but in his time the counting of order began with Vasu, Ghoṣa, Guha and Mitra. Mitra family lost Kulinism by adopting a son. He entrusted the Brāhmaṇas with the task of keeping the genealogy of the Vaṅgaja kulīna Kāyasthas incorporating the number of their marriage contracted with the families - Kulīna and non-Kulīna.\(^2\)

---

The Vaṅgaja Kulīna Kāyastha Samāja (commune) is grouped into five divisions, such as Candradvipa Samāja founded by Danaujamādhava, Vikrampura Samāja set up by Kēdār Ray and Cand Ray, Bhūṣaṇa Samāja (also known as Fateyābād Samāja) founded by Mukunda Ray, Yośora Samāja founded by Pratāpāditya¹.

The following Vaṅgaja kulīna Kāyastha families are still now reputed in Bangladesh:

(i) The Vasu families of Mālkhāngar in the Dacca District;
(ii) The Raychaudhuri (Vasu) families of Olpur in the Faridpur District;
(iii) The Vasu family known as 'Milbakar' of Nathullabad in the Barisal District;
(iv) The Vasu family of Bamarail in the Barisal District;
(v) The Ghoṣa family known as 'Dastidāra', of Gabhar and Laḵmaṇakati in the Barisal District;
(vi) The Ghoṣa family of Bhatshala in the Barisal District;
(vii) The Ghoṣa family of Kashipur in the Barisal District;
(viii) The Ghoṣa family of Narthomapur in the Barisal District;

(ix) The Ghoṣa family of Bharaikai in the Dacca District;

(x) The Guha family known as 'Thākurtā' of Banaripur in the Barisal District;

(xi) The Guha family known as 'Biswaś' of Kachabaliar in the Barisal District and

(xii) The Guha family known as 'Hanuā' in the Barisal District.\(^1\)

(b) DEVELOPMENT AMONG THE DAKŚIŅA RĀDHĪYA KĀYASTHAS

Some of the descendants of the five Kāyasthas, who are believed to have settled in the Dakśiṇa (South) Rādhā, came to be known as the Dakśiṇa Rādhīya Kāyasthas according to the name of the locality in which they lived during the rule of Ballālasena. As regards the development of Kulinism among the Dakśiṇa Rādhīya Kāyasthas, Ballālasena, according to the Kāyastha-Purāṇa\(^2\), declared as Kulīnas Prabhākara Ghoṣa of the Āknā group (Samāja) and Niśāpati Ghoṣa of the Bālī group, the sixth descendants of Makaranda Ghoṣa; Śakti Vasu of the Bagāṇḍā group and Mukti Vasu of the Māhīnagara group, the fifth descendants of Daśaratha Vasu; Duṇī Mitra of the Barisa group, Guṇī Mitra

---

of the Tekā group, the eighth descendants of Kaḷidāsa Mitra. The Choṣa family of the Akna and Bālī represented the Mukhya Kulīna, while the Vasu and Mitra families came in order respectively. The rest were made Vaṃśaja (i.e. born of the Kulīna family). The following are the names of the Vaṃśaja groups: Āmaḍēśvara, Dīrghāṅga, Karāṭī, Sęyākhālā, Khaniā and Sākarāṭī of the Choṣa family; Nimarkā, Sāṭhuli, Citrapur, Dīrghāṅga, Gohari and Paṇcamutī of the Vasu family; Dābdā, Kupī, Cāndḍā, Dāntiyā, Ķāklāi, Kumāraḥṭa and Bāliā groups from the Mitra family.1 S.C. Mitra observes that nothing more can be ascribed to the Sena king.

The rules as prescribed by Daṇauṭāmādhva for the Vaṅgaḷa Kulīna Kāyasthas, as N.N.Vasu2 observes, were also followed by the Daksīṇa Rādhīya Kulīna Kāyasthas.

According to S.C. Mitra, Kulinism, as found among the Daksīṇa Rādhīya Kulīna Kāyasthas, was introduced by Purandarakhāṇ (Gopinatha Vasu) in the 15th century A.D. Purandara Khāṇ organised Samīkarana of the 13th generations of the Kulīna families and thus came to be known as the president of the Kulīna society.3 He made the following rules:

5. Ibid., p. 12.
The Kula (nobility) of the kulīna Kāyasthas are of nine sorts, out of which five are known as Mūla or original and four as Sākha or branch. The original Kula are Mukhya, Kaniṣṭha, Saḍabhratā, Madhyāṁśa and Turjyaka or Teyaja. The branches are Kaniṣṭha's Dvitiya - po (the second son of Kaniṣṭha), Saḍabhratā's Dvitiya - po (the second son of Saḍabhratā), Madhyāṁśa's Dvitiya - po (the second son of Madhyāṁśa) and Turjya's Dvitiya - po (the second son of Turjya).

Kulīnas belong to one or other of these nine varieties. Mukhya Kulīnas are of three kinds - Prakṛta, Sahaja and Komala. Only the eldest son of each has the right to hold that title. Their other sons will descend or rise in social estimation according to their observance of the marriage rule. Prakṛta Mukhya can marry the daughter of Prakṛta, Sahaja and Komala. Prakṛta Mukhya marrying the daughter from Prakṛta is regarded as the best kulīna. No fame is secured by Prakṛta marrying daughter from Sahaja and Komala. In such a case, the latter is raised in social estimation. Kaniṣṭha cannot marry daughter belonging to the lower degree. Sahaja and Komala can marry daughters from Mukhya. Sahaja Bāḍimukhya forming the matrimonial relation with Komala's daughter will descend to the latter ¹.

It is a great distinction for the Mukhya Kulīna to observe the 'Navaraṅga' or nine-grade Kula (nobility), the rules regarding which are—(i) the eldest daughter of a Mukhya should be given in marriage to a Mukhya; (ii) the second to a Kaniṣṭha; (iii) the third to a Saḍabhṛatā; (iv) the fourth to a Madhyāmśa and (v) the fifth to a Teyaja Kulīna. Conversely, the eldest son of a Mukhya Kulīna should be given in marriage to a Mukhya girl; the second to a Kaniṣṭha girl; the third to a Madhyāmśa girl and the fourth to a Teyaja girl. The Mukhya Kulīna who observes these rules of marriage earns the title of 'Navaraṅga'.

'Pañcaraṅga' Kula is observed in the following manner. The first son of a Kaniṣṭha Kulīna should marry the second daughter of a Mukhya Kulīna; the second son that of a Madhyāmśa Kulīna; the third son that of a Teyaja Kulīna. The Kaniṣṭha Kulīna who observes these rules is held in honour by his fellows and is called 'Pañcaraṅga'.

Purandara Khān prescribed that matrimonial relation could be contracted between Kulīna and Sādhyā Maulika.

A Kulīna ceases to be as such by marrying or giving in marriage outside the Paryāya (generation) to which he himself belongs, counting from the first advent of the Kāyasthas in Bengal. Whoever does so becomes a Maulika. One does not remain

3. Ibid., p. 106.
a Kulīna if he marries a Randa, or daughter of a Kulīna having no male issue, or if he, even by accident, marries a Svagotra or Svapiṇḍa. An adopted son of a Kulīna is not a Kulīna. A Kulīna by marrying the daughter of a Kulīna of a lower degree descends to the level of the latter. A Kulīna should not give in marriage his daughter one after another to Kulīnas of the same degree. In such a case, both the giver and receiver become degraded.

B. DEVELOPMENT AMONG THE VAIDYAS

As regards the development of Kulinism among the Vaidyas, Rāmakānta Dāsa Kavikaṇṭhahāra (1653 A.D.) mentions that Ballālasena selected in order of nobility the Sena, Dāsa and Gupta families of the Dhananvantari - gotra, Maudgalya - gotra and Kāśyapa - gotra respectively. On the basis of the marks of virtues such as ācāro vinavo vidyā pratiṣṭhā tīrtha - darśanam I nīghthā vṛttis = tapodānamā navadhā kula - Laksānām, the Sena king ranked Vināyakasena of the Sena family, Čayudāsa and Paṇṭhadāsa of the Dāsa family and Kāyugupta and Tripuragupta of the Gupta family as Kulīna. Other members of the said Sena, Dāsa and Gupta families were declared as Maulika. Of the Maulikas those of good conduct and those who had established good matrimonial relationship were called San-Maulikas. The Kulīnas were classified into Siddha, Sāddhya and Kaṣṭha. A Siddha Vaidya who took a wife from the Sāddhya

2. Sadvaidyakulapaṇjiḍā, p. 2.
3. Ibid., pp. 1-2.
5. Loc. cit.
or Kaṇṭha class sank at once to their level, and his
descendants could not recover their social status by
marrying into a higher class\(^1\).

Marriage of the Kulīnas determined their rise and fall
in social esteem. A Kulīna must marry his daughter to a
Kulīna, but he himself could marry either a Kulīna or a
girl of lower degree belonging to the good family\(^2\). If he
married a non-Kulīna woman, his family was, to a certain
extent, dishonoured, but the stain could be wiped out by
marrying his sister or a daughter to a Kulīna\(^3\). A Kulīna of
the noble family fell into the state of Kṣemya if his
matrimonial relationship was not established according to
the specifications. He could, however, regain his status of
Kulīna by contracting matrimonial relation with the Kulīnas\(^4\).

Bharatamallika\(^5\) (1675 A.D.) mentions that the
descendants of Tripuragupta were lost of Kulinism in his
time. He also points out that the descendants of Vināyakasena
lost their higher social status by not contracting matrimony
according to marriage rules and so came to be called
Maulika and they having not performed matrimonial relation
with Kulīnas were, however, known as Adhama-Maulika\(^6\).

---

1. Cf. Sadvaidvakulanāñjikā, p.3.
According to him, the Vaidyas holding surname of Datta, Kar, Dhar etc., were called Hina-Maulika. The Kulīnas contracting matrimonial relation with Hina Maulika became affected in respect of higher social status and fell into the state of Āghāta. The Kulīnas having matrimonial relation with unknown Sena family were described as Mahāghāta.1

Ballālasena distributed the Vaidyas of his time into twenty-seven Sthānas or communes, beyond which no one could reside without losing caste.2

Bharatamallika3 mentions that Mālāṇca, Dhalahaṇḍa, Betada, Naḍahaṇṭra, Khānā and Maṅgalakotha are the six Samājjas belonging to the descendants of Vināyakasena. The above-mentioned places are the places of residence of the Kulīnas having the title Sena. He also states that Tehaṭra, Mālikāhāra, Vglināchī, Fālīgṇā and Maṇḍalajana are the places of residence of the Kulīnas belonging to the family of Cāyudāsa and Paṇṭhadāsa. The Kulinism of the Kulīnas holding the cognomen of Dāsa is determined with reference to the names of the above five Samājjas4. He further, states that Varāhanagar and Paṇīnāla are the two Samājjas belonging to the descendants of the Kāyugupta family. Kulinism of the Gupta family is determined with reference to the above Samājjas.5

1. Loc.cit.
4. Loc.cit.
5. Loc.cit.