

当報告の内容は、それぞれの著者の著作物です。

Copyrighted materials of the authors.

タイトル: 「「インド世界」の形成: フロンティア地域を視座として」(令和元年度第 2 回研究会振替開催)

日時: 令和 2 年 8 月 26 日 (水曜日) 午後 2 時から 6 時 00 分

場所: Zoom によるオンライン開催

1. 馬場紀寿 (東京大学東洋文化研究所) 「仏教における史書の誕生ーインド本土とスリランカ」

年代記が存在しなかった古代南アジア世界にあって、例外的に史書の伝統が続いたのはスリランカである。拙稿「スリランカにおける史書の誕生」(『東方学』133 輯)では、スリランカ最初の史書、『島史』がどのような編集作業により成立したのかを論じた。本発表では、この研究結果を踏まえ、『島史』と、スリランカの「正史」となった『大史』が成立する過程について論じた。

まず、『島史』の編纂者は、「インドの仏教」「スリランカの王統」「スリランカの仏教」にかんする諸伝承を、<大寺の設立>を全体の核として組み合わせた。すなわち、インドとスリランカから成る空間を設定し、そこに仏陀にはじまる一本の時間軸を据えて、大寺において三種の諸伝承を一つに統合した。『大史』は、この『島史』の基本的特徴をほぼ全て継承した上で、ドゥッタガーマニ・アバヤ王の記述を大きく拡充し、アバヤ王による大寺における布薩堂と大塔の建設に本書の山場を置いた。『島史』『大史』を通して、スリランカの大寺派は、「仏」「法」「外護者」という三点から大寺を仏教世界の中心に置く歴史を創造したのである。

(文責: 馬場紀寿)

2. 申才恩 (AA 研共同研究員, AA 研フェロー) “Descending from Demons, Ascending to Kshatriyas: Genealogical Claims and Political Process in Pre-modern Northeast India”

Genealogies are perhaps one of the most ubiquitous materials used to record the pasts of families, clans, communities and dynasties. Their pattern, however, is not static but constantly dynamic in parallel with its social environment and political context. A particularly compelling example involves the demonic genealogy proclaimed by some ruling families of India’s Northeast, the perceived frontier (*pratyanta*) throughout its

history.

The earliest mention of this genealogy is in the two epigraphic records of Bhāskaravarman of the early seventh-century Kāmarūpa, located in the Brahmaputra valley, with present-day Guwahati as its node. It begins with Naraka *asura* being succeeded by Bhagadatta and then by Bhagadatta's son Vajradatta, and continued with twelve rulers having Varman ending names, from Puṣyavarman to Bhāskaravarman. As Naraka is always referred to as Bhauma (the son of Bhūmi), the Varman family tracing its descent from this progenitor is named *bhaumānvaya* (the lineage of Bhūmi's son) or *vasumatīsutakramā* (the succession of Vasumatī's son). This genealogy represents a major departure from existing epic-puranic traditions in which Naraka and Bhagadatta are not related to each other in any way. Their contrived connectedness is made by a common denominator: Prāgjyotiṣa, a mythical space associated with both Naraka and Bhagadatta. Though elusive of location, the Varmans came to conceptualize their immediate domain with Prāgjyotiṣa, as Puṣyavarman's title 'the lord of Prāgjyotiṣa' (*prāgjyotiṣendra*) attests. This new nomenclature confers both the temporal dimension and the spatial definition on their history and provides an alternative paradigm which cannot be subsumed into the normative legitimation model supported by Kshatriya decent lists of the *Purāṇas*. This alternative seemed to be made on the consideration of geo-political location of Kāmarūpa which was far away from Madhyadeśa, the cradle of Brahmanical tradition, but came close to the second strongest power next to Harṣa in eastern India for a very short period time. It must be remembered that Naraka was the adversary of Kṛṣṇa and Bhagadatta was that of Paṇḍavas. Putting together these 'two formidable antagonists' in a direct line of succession is an overt political articulation of Bhāskaravarman, the victorious frontier king.

Following the Varmans, two ruling families of Kāmarūpa, the Mlecchas and Pālas, continued to trace their ancestry from Naraka *asura* and maintained the basic structure of lineage between the eighth and twelfth centuries. However, their strategy for legitimizing status of Naraka has changed from the mid-tenth century. The Pāla rulers dropped the name Naraka or Bhauma from their epithet and started calling themselves Vārāha, son of the Boar incarnation of Viṣṇu. With the prefix Vārāha, they assumed the new imperial title: *śrīvārāha-parameśvara-paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādirāja*, meaning 'born in the family of illustrious Vārāha, the supreme master, the supreme lord and the king of kings'.

It became a regular feature of the Pāla's official records till about the close of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century. This epithet represents their descent from Naraka in a different fashion, emphasizing the progenitor's paternal side, Varāha-Viṣṇu. It is not merely a coincidence that Bhauma, the age-old epithet of Naraka stressing his maternal side Bhūmi, disappeared from the official records of the Pālas, and the lineage name *Bhaumānvaya* also lost its importance and relevance.

This change is not unrelated to a shift of royal devotion from Śaiva to Vaiṣṇava and their increased patronage to the Brahmins with distinguished academic qualification and ritual performance, mostly originated from Madhyadeśa and Bengal. It was not rare in this period that Brahmin donees or their ancestors migrated from established Brahmanical centres to peripheral areas with the direct intervention of kings in the form of land and village donations. The presence of qualified Brahmins in the eleventh-century Kāmarūpa reflects a newly instituted policy to facilitate Brahmanical ideas and ethics in the society, albeit on a very limited scale. The tendency towards Vaiṣṇavism taking the orthodox view has continued till the end of Kāmarūpa history and even after, confirming the general trend of religion in eastern India. The impact of such changes manifests itself in an invented story of Naraka narrated in the *Kālikāpurāṇa* of the first half of the eleventh century: according to which he was supposed to be born as a divine being but became a demon because the conception had taken place at the period of his mother Bhūmi's menstruation. He nevertheless earned Kshatriya status as the adopted son of king Janaka of Videha kingdom belonging to the Ikṣvāku family of the Sūryavaṃśa (Solar Lineage). The *Kālikāpurāṇa* offers ruling families of the periphery a new legitimation model which is far more conducive to patrilineal system. From the thirteenth century onwards, the spread of state formation, from the lower Brahmaputra valley to other areas of the northeast, facilitated the dissemination of this legitimation model through the agency of Brahmins. A relationship of asymmetrical cultural authority between migrant Brahmins and peripheral rulers was crucial in this process.

Examples are found in the Chutiyas and the Dimasas, two medieval local powers tracing their line of descent from demonic beings. Epigraphic and numismatic evidence suggests that their demonic genealogy came to be claimed only after they moved down from hills to plains, although the time of movement was different: the Chutiyas migrated from the mountainous areas of the north of the Brahmaputra to the plains of Sadiya region

in the thirteenth century, whereas the Dimasas shifted their centre from the north Cachar hills to the Cachar plains in the mid-eighteenth century. This spatial change coincided with a political transition from a chiefdom to a state in the case of the Chutiyas and from an early state to a mature state in the case of the Dimasas. When they were on the relatively isolated hill location, the small-scale polity was dependent on the stratification of clans or sub-clans, and the legitimacy of chieftaincy or kingship was derived from a distinguished tribal lineage. The rulers claimed their lineal descent from an actual or mythical ancestor having strong military power and a non-Sanskrit name. The best example comes from the epithet of Dimasa rulers, ‘the one born to the Hāchengsā lineage’ (*hāchengsā-vamśaja*), which continued to be used in their coins until the mid-seventeenth century.

When their centre moved to the plains, a more complex political organisation was achieved by involving migrant Brahmins from other parts of India, induced to settle in the Sadiya and Cachar plains by land grants. The rulers’ aspirations to establish a new identity led to severance of tribal affiliation of their lineage and create a fictitious genealogy connecting them with mythical figures of Brahmanical traditions. Nevertheless, the aspirations for upward mobility did not result in the making of a respectable genealogy in both the cases. To the contrary, it made them descendants of demonic beings: the Chutiya rulers of Sadiya claimed to belong to the lineage of *asura* (*suraripuvamśa*) following the king’s maternal uncle called Daitya, and the Dimasa kings of Khaspur to the lineage of Ghaṭotkaca, son of demoness Hiḍimbā. However, if ruling families were represented only as the descendants of demonic beings, they would remain as perpetual others contesting Brahmanical norms, deprived of acceptability and respectability within society and outside. Brahmins who engaged in myth making of the two royal families tried to solve this dilemma by attributing the demonic ancestry to their maternal side and by depicting their paternal side as a proper kshatriya family. This provided the rationale for accepting rising local rulers with indigenous origin into the existing social hierarchy, but with reservations.

The history, however, does not end there. Different voices began to emerge in the early nineteenth century when the dominant section of the Chutiyas and the Dimasas reinvented the past to fulfil their aspirations for upward social mobility. Instead of remaining passive recipients of the legitimation model designed by Brahmins, they tried to turn it to their advantage, either by redefining demonic beings or eliminating their presence from the

lineage. In some cases, the demonic lineage itself is endorsed for forging a unilineal political history of regional rulers, including those of Kāmarūpa, Koch, Mech, Chutiya, Kachari, etc. At present some arguments extend further and connect the demonic ancestry to the pre-Vedic Indus civilisation! Whether opposed or endorsed, eliminated or retained, the demonic lineage assumes a new importance in ongoing identity constructions and burgeoning regional history writings. India's northeast, perceived as the frontier since ancient times, is still left in a situation that layers paradox upon paradox.

(文責: 申才恩)