

Response to Comments on Ancient and Medieval Agriculture of India

YL Nene

Asian Agri-History Foundation, Secunderabad 500 009, India
(email: yeshwantn2@gmail.com)

On May 14, 2014, Dr Janken Myrdal (Professor in Agrarian and Rural History, Uppsala, Sweden) placed his 62-page working paper on the web <http://swopec.hhs.se/suekhi> with the title “Agricultural Literature in Eurasia circa 200 BCE–1500 CE” as Stockholm Papers in Economic History, No. 15. Among other countries, Myrdal in this paper has discussed his views on ancient and medieval literature on agriculture in India. Since I do not agree with several of his statements in the paper, I decided to respond to his statements on Indian agriculture, which I am placing them here, point by point.

1. Myrdal: *The notion that older Indian agricultural literature is relatively sparse has been questioned and thus the matter of the extent of Indian agricultural literature must be addressed in some detail – even though the result may ultimately seem meager.*

Nene: Professor Myrdal has correctly described the situation; Indian agricultural literature certainly needs more attention than what the scholars had given it in the past. However, the last part of the statement connotes avoidable pessimism.

2. Myrdal: *An early overview of older Indian agricultural literature is provided in an appendix to Agriculture in Ancient India from 1964 (Indian Council of Agricultural Research – ICAR). The title of the appendix is “Published literature found in Indian languages,” but it also includes manuscripts, primarily in Sanskrit but in southern Indian languages like Tamil and Telugu.*

Nene: Professor Myrdal has correctly quoted the title of the appendix in the ICAR publication; however, he has failed to notice the subtitle under which the manuscripts have been listed.

3. Myrdal: *Surprisingly, many of the manuscripts are mentioned with no dates, but these are certainly later. Only one ancient agricultural treatise is mentioned here (to which I will return), along with a few writings from the 17th to the 19th centuries. M.S. Randhawa’s general work “A History of Agriculture in India” (ICAR – four volumes from 1980) includes a chapter on two of the most important older works.*

Nene: Why should Professor Myrdal express surprise over missing dates of manuscripts? As a historian he should be aware that dating ancient literature the world over has always been problematic.

Consider the peculiar problems found in dating texts from ancient calendars. One problem is that different cultures used different calendars, and no single culture even maintained the same calendar. Another problem is that ancient cultures largely did not date their years of existence from any common point (like modern scholars today use BC and AD, or BCE and CE). Many ancient cultures marked themselves as relative to a particular monarch's reign. To coordinate chronologies between those cultures, we must note the length of reign of different rulers and then chart cross-cultural events such as earthquakes, comets, wars, or treaties, relative to the number of years into or out of a particular reign. This is a workable solution, but is complicated by the fact that different cultures also used different methods of recording the years of a monarch's reign. These regnal years could be dated from when a new ruler was named, or when a new ruler began to co-reign with an existing ruler, or when a ruler actually assumed the throne, or at the beginning of the first year after a ruler had come to power. Other criteria have also been used.

4. Myrdal: *The aforementioned appendix mentions writings on horses and elephants, the earliest of which is dated circa 200 BCE. The elephant played a vital role in India not only as a war animal and riding animal for the upper class, but also as a draft animal for transporting heavy loads.*

Nene: The date 200 BCE indicates the period of copying early documentation of almost millennia old knowledge-body built by Palakapya on elephants between the periods of Ramayana events (c. 5000

BCE) and the Mahabharata events (c. 3000 BCE). Shortly after the Mahabharata events, Shalihotra brought together the knowledge of management of horses. The knowledge, as usual in India, was passed on verbatim to every succeeding generation until we reached the date above.

5. Myrdal: *The relatively limited extent of Indian agricultural literature known early on became the basis for the first comparative interpretations. In his article on Indian agriculture, "Filhāha. India" in the Encyclopaedia of Islam, Irfan Habib wrote in 1983: "Very few works seem to have been written in agriculture in medieval India, to judge from their extreme paucity in modern collections." When his text was reprinted in 2011 in the book Food Culture and Health in Pre-modern Islamic Societies, he had deleted this segment.*

Nene: It was correct on the part of Irfan Habib to delete his earlier statement about the sparseness of material on the Indian medieval agriculture. He must have seen that substantial literature was unearthed and published by 2011, and thus decided to delete his incorrect statement made in 1983.

6. Myrdal: *In making a comparison to the rich Chinese tradition, Francesca Bray has argued that mundane technology was rarely mentioned in the written sources in India because "the literate Brahmin elite tend to pass over technology in silence". She refers to a text by Marie-Claude Mahias in a themed issue on India in Techniques et culture in 1989. Mahias in turn refers to Habib. She argues that the Islamic gentry*

were also uninterested in technical details. It is thus not the case that the Muslim Habib is attacking the Hindu majority in India.

Nene: I had to read this paragraph several times before formulating my response. Francesca Bray's conjectural and sweeping statement about rare mention of "mundane technology" by "the literate Brahmin elite" is not new; many European and Arab historians/travelers have lost no opportunity for centuries to find fault with Brahmins and make unfair and vague statements. Myrdal apparently has visited our website (<http://www.asianagrihistory.org>) and must have seen one translation of Lokopakara, 1025 CE by Chavundaraya, who was a Brahmin. Lokopakara is a vade mecum of everyday life for commoners. I could not access the text by Marie-Claude Mahias and therefore I do not wish to comment upon it. Irfan Habib is known for finding faults, rightly or wrongly, with "Hindu history". It was therefore amusing to note the uncalled-for attempt to garb Irfan Habib with "secular" cover.

Nene: *Why should Professor Myrdal express surprise over missing dates of manuscripts? As a historian he should be aware that dating ancient literature the world over has always been problematic. Consider the peculiar problems found in dating texts from ancient calendars. One problem is that different cultures used different calendars, and no single culture even maintained the same calendar.*

7. Myrdal: *Partly as a reaction to this notion of the lack of literature on agrarian topics, a group of Indian scholars have argued in recent years for the existence of an agricultural literature. The Asian Agri-History Foundation (AAHF) was established in 1994 for the purpose of promoting "agricultural history" and "sustainable agriculture". On their website, they write that these works were unknown before 1996 but they want to call attention to "sages" who wrote agricultural treatises in Sanskrit.*

Nene: Please refer to the last sentence of Myrdal's statement no. 7 above. Nowhere in our website we have claimed that the "works were unknown". We have stated that our objective is "to unearth original documents or copies that contained information on ancient and medieval agriculture of Asia". Myrdal must not misquote us.

8. Myrdal: *A textbook published by this group (AAHF) in 2009 lists seven Stockholm Papers in Economic History, No. 15 seminal works, but five are treatises on botany or statecraft. Since this group's intention is to report as many agrarian literary works as possible, one may presume that there are not many more.*

Nene: This is a confusing statement. Myrdal refers to seven "agri-history bulletins" that we have published. He puts them in two categories: "botany or statecraft" and "agrarian literary works". It seems Myrdal places Krishi-Parashara and Kashyapiyakrishisukti in "agrarian literary work" and the remaining in "botany or statecraft". This is an erroneous

classification. In fact all our bulletins fall within the broad definition of agriculture. What is the basis of Myrdal's presumption that there are not many more agrarian literary works? We cannot even guess.

9. Myrdal: *Unfortunately, the group (AAHF) is part of a Hindu Nationalist movement that has systematically made use of history to assert that the Hindu Indian is superior to all other cultures and although one can use their translations of the works, the interpretations must be critically assessed.*

Nene: This statement by Myrdal is an outrage. We are certainly proud of our Hindu heritage. However, on what basis Myrdal calls us to be a group of "Hindu Nationalist Movement" whose motive is "to assert the Hindu Indian is superior to all cultures"? We suspect Myrdal, like the majority of Western historians of the last few centuries, is in perpetual habit of turning a blind eye towards even solid evidences of ancient and medieval Hindus' scholarship. The five bulletins that he excluded from his present paper would have given him proof of Hindus' ancient wisdom and scholarship in the broad field of agriculture. Myrdal should know the enormous difficulty we faced in procuring a photocopy of the Persian manuscript of Nuskha Dar Fanni-Falahat from the library of the Aligarh Muslim University. If we wanted to promote only the Hindu superiority, why did we go through all the troubles in getting the manuscript copy from Aligarh, get it translated, and print it? Our Foundation is interested only in unearthing and publishing texts that relate to South and

Southeast Asia while maintaining complete scientific integrity. Myrdal should also know that ten of the eleven trustees (one is a political scientist) of our Foundation are agricultural scientists with impeccable scientific integrity and have held or are holding very senior positions in different international institutes and organizations. It is certainly an affront to the scientific stature of our trustees; to impute them for having hidden agenda is an unacceptable and unpardonable offense.

10. Myrdal: *The two agricultural texts covered by this group are also those discussed by reputable scholars. The first is Krishi-Parashara/Krsi-Parāsara. The 2009 textbook (of AAHF) dates this text to circa 400 BCE and identifies it as having been written by "Sage Parashara". This dating is far too early and the attribution (to a mythical Hindu sage) flies in the face of all notions of scholarly rigor.*

Nene: There is a definite reason why Parashara's time was estimated to be 400 BCE. The contents of Krishi-Parashara reflect very elementary and basic principles

Nene: *I had to read this paragraph several times before formulating my response. Francesca Bray's conjectural and sweeping statement about rare mention of "mundane technology" by "the literate Brahmin elite" is not new; many European and Arab historians/ travelers have lost no opportunity for centuries to find fault with Brahmins and make unfair and vague statements.*

and practices of farming and animal husbandry. Kautilya's Arthashastra (321–296 BCE) describes fairly advanced knowledge of agriculture and animal management. Is it not a reasonable estimate of Parashara's time (400 BCE)? We insist that our dating of Parashara is as sound as it could be and is not "far too early". Myrdal's statement that Krishni-Parashara's "attribution (to a mythical Hindu sage) flies in the face of all notions of scholarly rigor" is simply ridiculous. Myrdal needs to do in-depth reading of recent books on Indology to appreciate that Parashara of Krishni-Parashara actually lived on this earth. At this time, I am reminded of the centuries-old, futile debate whether Jesus Christ was real or mythical. There have been a few sages/scholars with the name Parashara. The first one finds a place in the World's oldest compilation in Sanskrit, the Rigveda. The second Parashara wrote Parashara Dharm Samhita (code of laws for Kaliyuga). The third Parashara was acknowledged as the speaker of one of the oldest Puranas, the Vishnu Purana. The fourth Parashara compiled Brhat Parashara Horasastra (a foundational text of astrology). The fifth well-known Parashara compiled Vrikshayurveda from which, we believe originated various versions of Krishni-Parashara. The following quote from "Western Indologists: A Study in Motives" by Purohit Bhagavan Dutt in 2008 (Google search) is worth reproducing below:

"... gave rise to the two interrelated diseases of Western Indologists; firstly the disease of myth, mythical and mythology, according to which Brahma, Indra, Vishnu, Narada, Kashyapa, Pururavas, Vasishtha and a host

of other ancient sages have been declared as mythical. Nobody ever tried to understand their true historical character apprehending that the dates of Bharatiya history would go to very ancient periods; and secondly, as a corollary to the above, the disease of 'attribution' and 'ascription', under which the works of these and other sages have been declared to be written by some very late anonymous persons who are said to have ascribed or attributed them to those 'mythical' sages."

11. Myrdal: *The scholarly edition from 1960 is based on three late manuscripts. Several datings are given, but one places the compilation of the text from various sources (such as proverbs) to circa 950–1100. The dating is given as 500–1000 in Agriculture in Ancient India, which also refers to manuscripts from the 19th century and later. M.S. Randhawa discussed this text in depth in A History of Agriculture in India from 1980 and concurs with this dating. Two completely different dates are presented in History of Agriculture in India up to 1200 AD from 2008, the first at 11th to 16th century, the second from 6th to 11th century. That year, Ranabir Chakravarti also wrote a superb article about Indian agricultural techniques and dates the book to the mid 11th century. In Table 1, I have chosen to place the text in the 11th century with a note that the dating is uncertain.*

Nene: Our explanation about suggesting 400 BCE is sufficient to support our stand. The various time periods mentioned above by Myrdal suggest that handwritten copies of Krishni-Parashara were made in those periods.

Myrdal: *Unfortunately, the group (AAHF) is part of a Hindu Nationalist movement that has systematically made use of history to assert that the Hindu Indian is superior to all other cultures and although one can use their translations of the works, the interpretations must be critically assessed.*

Nene: *This statement by Myrdal is an outrage. We are certainly proud of our Hindu heritage. However, on what basis Myrdal calls us to be a group of “Hindu Nationalist Movement” whose motive is “to assert the Hindu Indian is superior to all cultures”? ... Our Foundation is interested only in unearthing and publishing texts that relate to South and Southeast Asia while maintaining complete scientific integrity. Myrdal should also know that ten of the eleven trustees (one is a political scientist) of our Foundation are agricultural scientists with impeccable scientific integrity and have held or are holding very senior positions in different international institutes and organizations. It is certainly an affront to the scientific stature of our trustees; to impute them for having hidden agenda is an unacceptable and unpardonable offense.*

12. Myrdal: *That these two are the only extant texts in Sanskrit is noted by several authors. The fact is that most believe Krishi-Parashara is the only one. This is argued in the edition published in 1960.*

In a 2008 article, Ranabir Chakravarti has reviewed a number of texts from medieval India that discuss agriculture; in addition to Krishi Parashara, about ten texts, such as the 12th century lexicon Desinemamala. None of these are texts devoted exclusively to agriculture. He does not mention Kashyapiyakrishisukti, perhaps because this text cannot be used as evidence of medieval conditions.

Nene: Wojtilla has concluded on the basis of his studies that the Kashyapiyakrishisukti was compiled around 800–900 CE. After our scrutiny we supported Wojtilla’s dates but were more inclined to place 800 CE. Omission of Kashyapiyakrishisukti by Ranabir Chakravarti could be his ignorance about the existence of a copy of Kashyapiyakrishisukti. Thus Myrdal’s argument that Krishi-Parashara was the only one extant text is misleading. We believe Kashyapiyakrishisukti is an extant text that belongs to medieval period. Krishi-Parashara belongs to the ancient period.

13. Myrdal: *One possibility that must be kept open is that Indian research is so undeveloped that many more manuscripts are lying around waiting to be discovered. However, this seems unlikely in view of the interest in promoting very old agricultural literature found among influential groups for a couple of decades.*

Nene: Myrdal has noted pessimistically about unearthing ancient agricultural literature. I do not share his pessimism because many old libraries still exist and painstaking searches are likely to reveal existence of information on the

broad subject of ancient and medieval agriculture. One should look not only for independent texts on field crop farming, but also on horticulture, animal husbandry, economics, food science, herbal products for marketing, and others. It should be mentioned here that the barbarians from West Asia, Central Asia, and Arabia like the infamous Bakhtiar Khilji (12th century CE) destroyed the Nalanda University in Bihar, slaughtered thousands of scholars and burnt a huge collection in the library. India was invaded from time to time by these uncivilized savages who made it a practice not only to destroy temples and stone carvings that had historical accounts, but also libraries at centers of learning such as Ujjain (Madhya Pradesh), Pusphagiri (Odisha), Nagarjunakonda (Andhra Pradesh), Vikramasila (Bihar), Valabhi (Gujarat), Varanasi (Uttar Pradesh), Kanchipuram (Tamil Nadu), Manyakheta (Karnataka), and others. Later, the European colonizers looted, among many things, the libraries of Maharajas and Nawabs. Myrdal should realize that India still has ancient and medieval texts after all the burning and looting that took place for centuries, until India became independent in 1947 CE.

14. Myrdal: *There are a few additional 16th and 17th century agricultural texts from India, but they are offshoots of the Islamic tradition. The Asian Agri-History Foundation has published one text in Persian, Nuskha Dar Fanni-Falahat. The preserved manuscript is dated circa 1700, and according to the modern editors, the text was written in the mid 17th century rather than the late 16th century. The basis for this assumption is weak – they want to associate*

the text with “a great scholar”, which is ideology, not argument. I have, taking into account the age of the manuscript and the historical circumstances, assumed that it is 16th century. The text is about 11,000 words in the English translation.

Nene: Some scholars have conjectured that the manuscript of Nuskha Dar Fanni-Falahat was compiled in the 16th century. We have given full justification for giving credit to Mogul Prince Dara Shikoh, who was undoubtedly a great, open-minded scholar, for compiling Nuskha Dar Fanni-Falahat. We think mid-17th century is correct. Myrdal needs to read more about Dara Shikoh.

15. Myrdal: *In summary, one must concede that Irfan Habib was essentially right. Extant texts from India are few and relatively brief. The question he formulated is therefore central: why was there such lack of interest in practical agriculture among Indian intellectuals and the Indian elite? The answer may lie in Krishi-Parashara. This text differs from many others in Sanskrit*

Nene: ... It should be mentioned here that the barbarians from West Asia, Central Asia, and Arabia like the infamous Bakhtiar Khilji (12th century CE) destroyed the Nalanda University in Bihar, slaughtered thousands of scholars and burnt a huge collection in the library. India was invaded from time to time by these uncivilized savages who made it a practice not only to destroy temples and stone carvings that had historical accounts, but also libraries at centers of learning ...

in that caste is simply not mentioned. The Brahmins who were the custodians of the intellectual tradition were obviously not interested in spending any appreciable amount of time on the practical matters that are the subject of agricultural literature. (That other texts that concern agriculture exist has nothing to do with the matter; such texts are found in isolated documents, laws, proverbs, etc., in all cultural spheres.)

Nene: What a summary! Some non-Hindus like to unfairly drag the caste factor and the Brahmins in a negative shade, which is what Irfan Habib and Myrdal have done here. Since it seems very likely that Krishiparashara was a large compilation that was split into several smaller texts relevant to local interests (situation similar to Dead Sea Scrolls?), omission of ‘caste factor’ and ‘Brahmin’ in the available texts should not be given any importance. It must be remembered that Parashara was a Brahmin. One of our publications “Visvavallabha” that focuses on horticulture has no word like ‘caste’ or ‘Brahmin’, but the author Chakrapani Mishra was a Brahmin. Thus the ‘summary’ given above by Myrdal is meaningless and irrelevant.

Agricultural literature in Eurasia before 1500 – India compared with Islamic countries and China

Janken Myrdal¹

In the copy of The Upanishads that I inherited from my grandfather Kali Ghosh (born in Bengal c. 1900) he has marked the

following sentence: “There is the path of wisdom and there is the path of ignorance”. Let us try together to follow the path of wisdom. I start with three statements, then two recognitions and four critical comments and in the end one advice.

Three statements

1. Indian agriculture history is a history of great advances and the main factor was the ordinary peasant. In no respect advances in Indian agriculture stands back to other regions in the world.
2. What I have done is to compare all longer agricultural treatises that I have found in Eurasia before 1500. In a global comparison the goal is not to find as many as possible, but to find comparable units. Thus I have chosen longer texts (more than c. 10 000 words) and only included those mainly about agriculture. I have certainly missed several. In international overviews a scholar is always dependent on national surveys.
3. It is thus valuable that AAFH (*sic*) (AAHF) publishes old texts about agriculture – that was important for my study and my conclusions. I know that the texts AAFH (*sic*) has published were often already mentioned or published before, and I have taken some effort to find as many of these earlier editions as possible.

Two recognitions

1. AAFH (*sic*) does not claim any superiority of Hindu culture to other cultures. This is good and important

1. Professor in Agrarian and Rural History, Uppsala, Sweden (email: janken.myrdal@slu.se).
Comments on response from Dr YL Nene, Founder and Chairman Emeritus, AAHF reproduced – Eds.

information, and I wish that you could claim that clearly on your homepage. Romila Thapar (who I never meet) has written that every culture is its own miracle. The South Asian culture, the West Asian culture, the East Asian culture, etc. are important miracles in human history. Also cultures without written sources have contributed enormously to the advances of human history.

2. If scholars in AAFH (*sic*), or other scholars, in their searches in libraries and archives find a number of Indian agricultural treatises from before 1500 I am prepared to change my conclusions. As I will come back to in my critical remarks, rather many agricultural treatises must then be found, in comparison with the other major cultural regions (West Asia, China). It is certainly not enough to include other texts partly about agriculture, because thus we must do the same for other regions and they count in hundreds.

Four critical remarks

1. Dating of manuscripts cannot be made with attributions to named individuals. There have been many more Parashara than those mentioned by Dr. Nene. A number of other indications have to be utilized. One such is linguistic evidence – is their words or formulations that point at a certain period (and in all dating we must be aware of the tendency to use archaic language to make a document seem more sincere). Realia or historical indicators is the next point. Can we find evidence of items or customs that can be attributed to a certain period? Events or rulers mentioned are of importance. The

manuscript itself is very important: which is the oldest manuscript? The relation between different manuscripts must be explored. A “stemma” (a kind of family tree for the manuscripts) must be established.

I seldom see such scrutinizing of texts in the Indian editions I have studied. If the oldest manuscript is of a recent date, as so often in India, the dating is doomed to be uncertain. In my survey I have tried to give different datings found in the scholarly literature, and I cannot find that the dating made by AAFH (*sic*) is less of a “guestimate” than other datings – rather is (it) seems to be old fashioned and divergent from most other reliable scholars.

2. From this follows another important point: if the oldest manuscript is much later than the creation of the original text, we will have different time layers in the manuscripts. Again this has to be handled with a critical edition of the text, where different parts of the text are commented and their content considered. I do not find this kind of comments in the publications of the Indian agricultural treatises.

That the content was passed verbatim unchanged through generations is a hypothesis, not a fact. It must be proved. Compare with another and typical example: the Iliad, where we can find traces from the Bronze Age, when it was conceptualized, and the Iron Age when it was written down.

3. Dr. Nene has read my working paper and certainly noticed that from the period c. 1000–1500, according to my survey, we have 1 Indian longer agricultural

treatises and 22 from China (not including 2 from Korea) and 13 from the Islamic countries (geographically from Spain to Persia). Among these we have really large agricultural treatises, for instance one Arabic agricultural treatise contains more than half a million words. If not a mass of Indian agricultural treatises are found we have to come up with an explanation why the Indian culture, which was at the same, refined intellectual level as China and the Islamic countries, did not produce as many agricultural treatises. If this comparison is not recognized and discussed in AAFH (*sic*) I am maintaining my critical standpoint to AAFH (*sic*) – and at the same time, as mentioned, notes the important work with publishing texts.

To this I must again point out that there is no direct connection between agricultural expansion and the number of agricultural treatises. In Northwestern Europe, where I live, great strides forward were made in agriculture during the High Medieval period (1000–1300) but no extant agricultural treatises are known.

4. Destruction of manuscripts by humans is nothing particular for South Asia. War and plunder has destroyed an immense number of important texts all over Eurasia. An interesting fact is that in China we have

Myrdal: *Indian agriculture history is a history of great advances and the main factor was the ordinary peasant. In no respect advances in Indian agriculture stands back to other regions in the world.*

Myrdal: *It is thus valuable that AAFH (sic) (AAHF) publishes old texts about agriculture – that was important for my study and my conclusions. I know that the texts AAFH (sic) has published were often already mentioned or published before, and I have taken some effort to find as many of these earlier editions as possible.*

many agricultural treatises mentioned in other documents, but not preserved.

One advice

1. Agricultural history is important to understand the society and the history as a whole. In India the texts seem to be of relative less importance (though of course valuable as such) and then we have to find other sources. Archeology is probably of paramount importance. Let me put some questions:

In The Deccan there is apparently an enormous expansion during the Medieval period, equal to the contemporary European Medieval Agricultural Revolution, or the expansion in China during Song. How did this come about? Can we date the wells? Can we date the irrigation systems? Can a survey of when and how new villages were established be made? To investigate this is a major task for Indian agricultural historians.

Conclusion

I am glad to have been invited to answer Dr. Nene's critical remarks. I hope that I

Myrdal: *If scholars in AAFH (sic), or other scholars, in their searches in libraries and archives find a number of Indian agricultural treatises from before 1500 I am prepared to change my conclusions.*

have made it clear that I support publishing of texts on agricultural history and work with agricultural history in India, but also emphasize critical research and that I am not fond of research to defend a predetermined opinion. I am open for new information, and eager to hear about the searches in libraries and archives. The datings is not unimportant, and here I ask for critical editions using the methodology at hand (I am a medievalist and have edited manuscripts).

Even more important is the comparison. Nothing that Dr. Nene presented in the Response has changed my basic opinion. India had agricultural treatises (many parts of Eurasia had not), but much less so than West Asia or East Asia during Antiquity or the Medieval period. We have to find an explanation for this. Disinterest from the learned classes seems to be a plausible explanation.

Final comments from Dr YL Nene, AAHF

We thank Professor Janken Myrdal for mailing us, at our request, his reply to our comments made on his Paper. While we would like to maintain our stand on most issues being debated, we accept Professor Myrdal's suggestion of getting

more professional archeologists and agri-historians involved in future researches in ancient and medieval South Asia than at present.

However, I think four items in the response of Dr Myrdal need my comments:

Myrdal's Third 'statement': "*I know that the texts AAFH (sic) has published were often already mentioned or published before ...*"

Nene: This is not true. Those that had been published had no critical reviews by agricultural experts. As far as I know, Krishi Gita, Vishvavallabha, Mriga.pakshi.sashtra (biology and ecology of animals and birds are of interest to farmers), and a part of Lokopakara have not been published before. Please correct me if I am wrong.

Myrdal's First 'recognition': "*AAFH (sic) does not claim any superiority of Hindu culture to other cultures. This is good and important information, and I wish that you could claim that clearly on your homepage.*"

Nene: I do not know how I should react to your suggestion that we state on home page that we do not claim 'superiority of Hindu culture'. Do you know of any national history society of a predominantly Christian country that puts a statement of the kind you are suggesting to me? There are multi-religious countries such as the US, UK, Canada, Australia, India, etc. Would you advise them in a similar way? India is a secular country and every person living in the country is an Indian, just as the Americans in the US.

Myrdal: *If not a mass of Indian agricultural treatises are found we have to come up with an explanation why the Indian culture, which was at the same, refined intellectual level as China and the Islamic countries, did not produce as many agricultural treatises.*

Nene: *Do you know of any national history society of a predominantly Christian country that puts a statement of the kind you are suggesting to me? There are multi-religious countries such as the US, UK, Canada, Australia, India, etc. Would you advise them in a similar way?*

Myrdal's First 'critical remark, first paragraph: *"There have been many more Parashara than those mentioned by Dr. Nene."*

Nene: I am not aware of any more Parashara other than I had mentioned. Would you kindly let me know about 'other' Parashara?

Myrdal's First 'critical remark', second paragraph: *"In my survey I have tried to give different datings found in the scholarly literature, and I cannot find that the dating made by AAFH (sic) is less of a*

"guesstimate" than other datings – rather is (it) seems to be old fashioned and divergent from most other reliable scholars."

Nene: I think you are unfair to AAHF in labeling the datings as "guesstimates". Our interpretation of datings is based on relevant research in old literature available to us. Interpretations can be tentative, just as your claim of Kashyapa's text belonging to ninth century CE is tentative. I do not wish to label your tentative dating of Kashyapa's text as "guesstimate".