Unworthy Recipients and the Mercy of God

Dāna as bhakti in the Sant Hagiographies of Anantadās

ABSTRACT: This article examines the ideology of gift in the Sant hagiographies (paracaī) of Anantadās (16th/17th century). It is assumed that understanding author’s implicit view of gift giving (dāna) is fundamental to unraveling the meaning of certain episodes of the paracaīs. These involve curious cases such as that of Kabīr abandoning his dāna-related duties or those of various Sants, for example, Pīpā, offering gifts to the brahmans (who are, nevertheless, depicted mainly as enemies of the bhakts). The approach of Anantadās to dāna seems to differ significantly from the ideas expounded by the medieval Brahmanic, Buddhist, and Jain sources as it transcends the notion of the gift as being motivated by the socioreligious status of the recipient. It also proves the existence of a certain God-bhakti reciprocity. As such, dāna works on a soteriological level, as a devotional act aimed at creating a relationship with Hari, and on a proselytic level as a tool for expanding the religious community.
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Introduction: The ideology of $dāna$

The role of generosity, gift giving, and the relationship between donor and benefactor is of paramount importance in vernacular early Hindi texts originating from religious communities within the Sant tradition. The cycle of Anantadās’s hagiographies ($paracaī$) (c. 1580–1610\(^1\)) of famous Sant figures is no exception.\(^2\) Throughout the text, we find numerous episodes that express high praise for the Sant’s acts of gift giving ($dāna$) and unparalleled, sometimes even excessive, generosity. It remains clear that $dāna$ is a factor that defines relationships between individuals within the Sant bhakti milieu, but it is also instrumental in fashioning relations with people beyond this community, especially those traditionally considered as worthy receivers of gifts, the brahmins. The significant role of $dāna$ in the regulation of interpersonal relationships as well as in the influence it has on the bond between man and God, together with the importance of generosity per se in defining the ideal image of a Sant in the work of Anantadās, prompts us to pose questions about the most vital functions of a gift. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of the knowledge of the gift emerging from the $paracaī$ cycle with the classic (Brahmanic, Buddhist, and Jain) theories (ancient and medieval) of $dāna$ allows for a limited critique of the said theories, especially pertaining to the notions of reciprocity and selflessness, as well as to the characteristic of the recipient as necessarily endowed with certain religious esteem and authority.

My departure point is obviously the hermeneutics of the text, and so the inspiration for writing this article came directly not from any of the $dāna$ theories themselves, but from the need to unpack the meaning(s) of the particular narratives in focus. Firstly, there is the case of three similar episodes of the $Kabīr-paracaī$ (KP). In all of them, the weaver-poet is seemingly faced with the inability to fulfil


\(^{2}\) When quoting from the $paracaī$s, I refer to the editions of the manuscripts in Callewaert (2000), except for the $Kabīr-paracaī$ which follows Lorenzen (1992).
his obligations as a benefactor and, apparently unable to find a solution, flees the scene and goes into hiding. This behavior is very perplexing, as it remains in stark contrast to Kabir’s usual bold and uncompromising demeanor witnessed in the very same work. Secondly, there are numerous episodes in all of the hagiographies (especially in the Pīpā-paracaī—henceforth PP) that depict brahmins as frequent recipients of gifts presented to them by or on behalf of the Sants. It would even seem that at times Anantadās is comfortable with the traditional brahmin-oriented dāna theory. This, of course, calls for an elucidation as most of the time the author does follow a pattern of depicting brahmins as inimical to the Sants and voices a fair amount of stinging critique towards them.

In short, this article aims at inquiring into the ideology of the gift in the early modern hagiographies of famous Sants, taking into special consideration, first, the main types and functions of the gift, and second, the notions of reciprocity and authority of the recipient. This, I hope, will allow for the elucidation of certain ambiguous narrative episodes and topoi in the text itself. To extract a coherent discourse on dāna (Skt.) from the early Hindi narrative by Anantadās, we need to establish a proper context by briefly focusing on the notions of reciprocity and gift recipient status in selected theories. As it turns out, these theories—one set derived from western anthropology and the other, from ancient and medieval Buddhist, Jain, and dharmaśāstric sources—carry contrasting ideas about the notions at the heart of the paracaī narratives on gift giving.

General theories of gift

According to the well-established theory of gift in western academia, the notion of reciprocity is central to the discussion of gift giving. Marcel Mauss, in his seminal Essai sur le don (1924), shows that “common wisdom is mistaken in assuming gifts to be free, disinterested, and voluntary,” because they are never without self-interest, and always involve an “expectation of compensation” (Pyyhtinen
2014: 16). According to Mauss, gift giving is characteristic of pre-market economy societies where it serves the main purpose of the exchange of goods. The gift economy promotes the redistribution of communal wealth (e.g., to the religious specialists and/or to the poor) and fosters mutual aid. As it has a strong moral foundation, the gift in some “archaic societies” fosters long-term human relationships, thus supporting social interconnectedness and solidarity. On the contrary, in more advanced societies, one-time money- and moneyless transactions (barter and trade) tend to produce rather opposite social effects (Whitaker 2017: 10–11, 39–41). The views of Mauss on gift and its reciprocity have been subjected to substantial critiques by researchers calling for a more serious treatment of the gift as more autonomous (“pure gift”) and not necessarily bound by mutualism and exchange (Pyyhtinen 2014: 22–24, 148). However, to bring out distinct characteristics of the Indian theories through a negative comparison, we shall treat the classic Maussian view as a point of departure. This allows for a clearer view of the subject matter in the available Indian sources. There, we observe that the concept of dāna underwent an evolution from the ancient to the medieval period. However, its core features were largely retained in the early modern era, i.e., in the times of Anantadās. The relation of these patterns of gift giving to those found in western anthropology is complex, but its dominant features, which are of special interest for our purposes, are easily recognized as challenging ideas sketched above.

Apart from the Vedic scriptures (Rgveda, Atharvaveda), the pre-medieval Indian literature dealing with dāna is represented by

---

3 Reciprocity has been a prominent point in the discussion of gift giving in western anthropology and sociology, so much so that the principle of reciprocity, apparently deeply embedded in the western rationalized view of the free market economy, became “something of a cliche” (Yan 2020). Mauss’s views on this matter have been commented on, expanded, and critiqued by Raymond Firth, Marshall Sahlins, Jonathan Parry, Jean-Luc Marion, Anette Weiner, Pierre Bourdieu, Maurice Godelier, and Jacques Derrida, to name a few (Yan 2020, Whitaker 2017: 68–72).
the dhārmaśastras, the pūraṇas, the Mahābhārata, as well as by diverse Buddhist and Jain canonical texts. In Vedic sources, dāna (and other Vedic terms synonymous with it, such as tuṃjhati and mamhati) could be seen both as a ritual offering and as a means to distribute wealth among the community (Nath 1987: 82). Later, during the era of heterodox śramaṇas, dāna acquired the sense of charity exemplified by giving alms to mendicant ascetics, especially, monks, as testified in the Pāli literature. Around the beginning of the first millennium dāna was understood by the dhārmaśastras as ritualized almsgiving practiced first by householders towards worthy religious specialists and, to a lesser extent, also to the poor and needy. For Manusmṛti dāna is one of the fundamentals of the moral and legal dharma and is treated as a duty of twice-born householders (4.227), an obligation allowing them to pay off the fourfold debt (ṛṇa) to gods, sages, ancestors, and all living beings. The duty of the brahmins is to accept gifts (10.75). Moreover, this śāstra diligently lists elements constitutive of a proper dāna (giver, recipient, śraddhā, the gift itself, the right place, and time), ranks brahmins as best among recipients (7.85), warns about donors whose gifts are not to be accepted (śūdras, musicians, prostitutes, etc.), and, finally, gives numerous examples of material and immaterial gains that can be obtained through gifting (Nath 1988: 13–18, 21, 37; Einicke 2018: 193, 199, 204, 217).

From the many notions connecting the above sources with the next phase of literature on dāna, the most crucial for our purpose is the question of reciprocity. However, we should also mention that in both ancient and medieval Buddhist, Jain, and dharmāśastric scriptures, Indian theorists see dāna as unilateral and asymmetric. As

---


5 Translated as ‘generosity’ by Einicke (2018: 198).

6 Examples of the dāna treatises from this period encompass, for example, Kṛtyakalpataru, a Brahmanic nibandha (compendium) on dharma (with the 5th
_dāna_ is mainly directed at recipients of exceptional moral and social status, it does not support interdependence and solidarity. The gift is expected to be disinterested, and the receiver is not bound to reciprocate. However, the donor is not left unrewarded, but the reward lies beyond mutual human relations and takes the form of a spiritual merit brought about by the mechanism of karma. _Dāna_ may be motivated by various intentions, although the given object _must_ be obtained by legitimate means.  

Gifting can bring all kinds of desirable this-worldly gains, but a gift of the highest caliber—offered without the desire of reward to a worthy recipient—can even bestow liberation. The figure of the beneficiary is of the utmost importance. A perfect recipient is often seen by the medieval sources as a representative of the religious elite: a brahmin, a monk, or a nun. He or she must be endowed with spiritual authority and should necessarily evoke ‘trust’ or ‘esteem’ (śraddhā) in the benefactor. However, śraddhā is directed in such a case more towards objective values and qualities represented by the individual, who

---

7 Einicke (2018: 197), referring to _Dānakāṇḍa_ and _Bhagavadgītā_, calls _dāna_ a “strictly one-directional” operation in which the giver does not expect any reaction from the recipient.

8 According to _Dānakāṇḍa_ (1.15) (Einicke 2018: 199).

9 The motivations for _dāna_ in the ancient sources encompass, for example, fear, hope for a beneficial rebirth, and for obtaining wholesome mental states, in the case of Buddhism (Aṅguttara-nikāya VIII, 237–238), and fear, pity, and desire for profits, in the case of Mahābhūrata (Anuśāsana Parva 138). As for the this-worldly benefits brought about by _dāna_, we may mention expiation of sins (Manusmṛti 4.288), long life (Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra 12.2), freedom from disease (Mahābhūrata, Anuśāsana Parva 57.38), and the gaining of various objects, such as a house or a vehicle (Vaiśiṣṭha Dharmasūtra 29.7–19) (Nath 1988: 26–29).

10 Liberation as the ultimate incentive for _dāna_ is mentioned in the _Bhagavadgītā_ and in medieval sources, such as the _Yogaśāstra_ (507.9) of Hemacandra, the Brahmanic _Dānasāgara_ (32) (c. 1168 CE) of Ballālasena, and in the Buddhist _Sārasaṅgha_ (181) of Siddhattha (c. 13th century) (Heim 2004: 35–38).
stands for an ethos, ideology, community, etc., rather than towards the individual himself or herself. It is more objective and impersonal than bhakti, which, according to Hara (1964: 126–142), is more directly connected to a specific person and has emotional connotations. As such, śraddhā serves a regulatory function that channels the emotional intentions of the donor towards respecting a tradition, identified with the donee (Heim 2004: 49). In this model, dāna always flows upward; the recipient is recognized as superior and is, therefore, beyond any possibility of critique, even if his/her faults are apparent. Furthermore, it is assumed that the appearance of the donee triggers an almost automatic response in the donor possessed of śraddhā: he/she is bound to give with joy and zeal to anyone who appears at the door and fits the category of a worthy receiver. The sources (e.g, Dānakāṇḍa) differentiate between giving out of śraddhā or bhakti to the eminent or out of compassion to the poor and needy of an uncertain moral status. In a system built on a hierarchy of moral esteem, generosity directed at those of low social standing was treated with some reserve. It was considered a separate category and differentiated from dāna proper, which was reserved for the worthy religious specialists. Giving motivated by compassion or pity was not discouraged but was seen to yield less merit. Only the Mahāyāna Buddhist scriptures challenged these views and ascribed a compassionate motivation to dāna. They abandoned the rule of giving to those of high merit, favoring instead gifts to all beings (including animals) encouraged by compassion (Heim 2004: 79–81).

Quite in line with the Mahāyāna approach, Anantadās’s take on dāna seems to diverge from the patterns of the classic theories. Although there are strong arguments supporting the general notion of

---

a gift as unreciprocated, the importance of the status of the recipient is disputed, as is the ritualistic side of gift giving. Furthermore, it can be argued that Anantadās’s position on gifting amounts to a subtle critique of the rigid hierarchical relations that dominate the dāna mechanism. Since it is obvious that hitherto the practice of dāna was used to preserve the status quo of dominant religious institutions that benefited from gifts and to maintain established power relations, point of view espoused by Anantadās is undoubtedly critical, thus supportive of a general heterodox position of Sants on matters of social relations.

Before we proceed to the paracaīs, we must acknowledge that Anantadās’s Sants (from Nāmdev to Raidās) lived in the era when North India witnessed rapid development of a novel, syncretic, Indo-Islamic culture. Therefore, it is safe to assume that they would have been under some kind of Islamic influence (Burchett 2019: 73–74). Apart from being aware, maybe even receptive to Sufi teachings, the Sants operated in a political environment governed by Persianized, Muslim-dominated ruling classes (first, of the Delhi Sultanate, and later, of the Mughal Empire) that had their own specific gift giving practices (Siebenhüner 2013: 539, Morony 2011). To what extent Anantadās or his Sants were influenced by these practices is an open question. However, it seems that the clues provided by the paracaīs do not warrant an in-depth analysis in the context of the present discussion. In fact, the texts prove that Anantadās, himself a Rāmānandīn (Callewaert 2000: 7, Burchett 2019: 157), was mainly concerned with the Vaiṣṇava-dominated bhakti milieu. Muslims in his work are the religious (qāzīs and mulās) and political (Sikandar Lodi) elites, criticized for representing oppressive social hierarchy and religious obscurantism, just like the brahmins (KP 6.11–16, 7.1–7). Similarly, when examples of Muslim ideas of gift giving appear, they are treated in a manner consistent with Anan-

12 However, to contrast this statement, we might point to a feasible link between the Persian-inspired court custom of regifting to third parties (so that gifts “continue to go from one person to another”, Morony 2011: 41) and the Sant practices of gift redistribution (cf. below). The matter deserves further study.
tadās’s generally anti-establishment social and religious critique. Therefore, he seems to be distancing himself from the gifting and patronage practices of the ruling courts. When Anantadās presents Kabīr as rejecting gifts offered by Sikandar [Lodi], convinced now of Kabīr’s spiritual prowess, he may be doing so not only to teach a moral lesson, but also to disapprove of royal presents as well-known symbols of subordination,\(^\text{13}\) setting an example for Jangopāl and his hagiography of Dādū Dayāl (Dādū Janma Līlā [DJL, c. 1620]), in which Dādū refuses Akbar’s gifts, perceiving them as a threat to the integrity and autonomy of his own self and his community (DJL 5.25; 7.17–18, 21, 24\(^\text{14}\) ). Another analogy with the DJL shows a similar case. Falling within the same category, both works might have served a similar purpose and were used by itinerant preachers (Callewaert 2000: 8) among audiences sensitive to an anti-establishment discourse. Designed to encourage the support of merchant patrons, not royal courts, the hagiographies functioned outside the context of the Muslim rule dominated public sphere (Zapart 2022: 7–10, 16, 20).

**Dimensions of dāna in the paracaīs. Devotion of the “cowardly” Kabīr**

We can now deal with the role of gift giving in the formative period of the Sant community, taking Anantadās’s account of the life of Kabīr (1440–1518) as a representative example. Confronting the narrative portions of the KP with the classic dāna theory will allow

\(^{13}\) Here, the hagiographer possibly betrays some knowledge of Muslim court practices. At the Mughal court, a ritual exchange of gifts was used to control the hierarchy system and total dependence of the manṣabdārs (military commanders and civil officials possessing manṣab, a rank indicating social status) on the king. The ruler presented various gifts to the manṣabdārs and they were to reciprocate with a pīškaš—a (more or less) obligatory, cyclical, and institutionalized gift that sustained a political relationship and indicated subordination (Streusand 1989: 139–145, Siebenhüner 2013: 538–541).

\(^{14}\) Numbering of the DJL follows Callewaert (1988).
us to examine the extent of changes in gift theory in a heterodox religious community of the early modern era. We will also examine how the ideology of the gift has influenced the process of forming Kabīr’s authority.

Of the virtues of a true Sant, generosity comes second only to devotion. The fact that the communities of Sants were organized and expanded through institutionalized gift giving is well attested by the sources of Dādūpanth, such as the DJL of Jangopāl. By the same token, the authority and sanctity of a Sant was in a large part the effect of his generosity (Horstmann 2000: 518). Patrons of the Sants, recruited mainly from merchant classes, organized festive celebrations known as mahochau (‘great feast’), which included religious performances, sermons, donations, and the distribution of food in the form of prasād (Horstmann 2000: 519, 522). During these festive occasions, Dādū is shown to act with unbounded generosity and selflessness by distributing all gifts and keeping nothing for himself (DJL 14.9). He serves only as a conduit by which all the donations are sanctified and then shared among bhaktis. Dādū remains the one who takes only to give (DJL 8.6).

Right after providing initial information on Kabīr’s spiritual formation (his initiation by Rāmānanda), Anantadās underlines that the weaver-poet saw himself as providing a service (dāsatāna) to the community of bhaktis. He used the money from weaving to support his family, but the rest was spent feeding the community (KP 2.1–2). It is fitting that the first test he is subjected to by Hari directly involves his devotion measured by the extent of his largesse. Hari arrives at Kabīr’s doorstep in the form of an emaciated devotee, begging for some cloth to wear. Kabīr offers him a half of the piece he has, but Hari asks for the whole thing. The weaver responds by giving all that he has, without any delay (gahara nahī lāyau [KP 2.4]). However, Kabīr’s reaction to his own munificent act is surprising: he does not return home and remains in hiding for three days, while the people of his family go hungry (KP 2.5). The matter is resolved by Hari himself, who brings food to the weaver’s mother and his children. Having realized what has happened, Kabīr is
pleased with the grace (kṛpā) that Hari offered him (KP 2.14). David Lorenzen calls this hiding a “curious feature” and “something of an enigma”. While refraining from offering any kind of interpretation of Kabīr’s recourse, he suggests a psychological reading, according to which this, also the other two episodes, are supposed to tell us something about Kabīr’s “timid or even cowardly” character (Lorenzen 1992: 28). However, as Lorenzen himself notes, it is improbable that a hagiography posits its main character in an unfavorable light; therefore, interpreting the said behavior in the above way is rather dubious.

Let us now turn to two other scenes that follow a very similar scenario, before attempting to offer an alternative reading of Kabīr’s attitude. In the next episode, we see Kabīr after having organized a mahochau, during which, of course, he “kept nothing for himself, but gave everything away” (kachū na rākhyau, sagarau dinhau, KP 3.15). He is confronted by angry brahmins and sanyāsins who were apparently not given food during the festivity. They try to force him to provide them with a dāna of food. Having nothing to offer, Kabīr leaves the house and hides away (KP 3.10). Hari, having assumed the form of Kabīr, takes over the role of the host, procures the goods, and feeds the guests. At the end, Kabīr expresses his gratefulness to God for taking care of him (KP 4.3). The third episode also involves brahmins, but this time they confront Kabīr indirectly by sending an invitation to a fake festivity that will supposedly be organized by him (KP 10.3–5). People from all over flock to the poet’s hut on the bank of Ganges. Seeing them, he withdraws and hides himself (KP 10.8). Once again, Hari takes the stage: he magically multiplies himself as many Kabīrs, distributes the goods and gives cloth to all the gathered Sants.

As these scenes revolve around generosity, gifting, and the aftermath of the donor-donee relationship, one is tempted to formulate an answer to Kabīr’s aberrant behavior from the point of view of the dāna theory, or rather from the position of its implicit critique. Let

---

15 If not stated otherwise, all translations from the source texts are mine.
us first note the peculiar status of the recipient of Kabīr’s gift in the first episode. In the eyes of the weaver-poet, this man is a fellow bhakt, someone in dire need, and possibly of low caste. His true identity, that of a God in disguise, remains hidden from the donor, but is enough to make the listener/reader wonder about the meaning of his status in the light of the traditional dāna theories. I would argue that Anantadās deliberately designed this episode to put forward a subtle critique of the most vital element of dāna theory that is grounded in, and thus promotes, social inequality. Is not the whole scene, with Kabīr giving his last piece of cloth to the emaciated bhakt-cum-Hari, something of a mockery of the traditional dāna mechanism that impels one to give to esteemed persons of a recognized high moral and social authority in order to acquire merit? Even if we interpret this episode as being about compassion, the unusual status of the donee remains a factor that undermines the understanding of Kabīr’s reaction along traditional lines. Similarly, Hari’s response to Kabīr’s act also allows one to doubt whether pondering the recipient’s status is at all justified in the given context.

We will return to the matter of reciprocity below, but it must be realized that the sensitive matter of the “right” status is not completely bypassed by the text and it seems to be invested with some meaning. When testing Kabīr, Hari did, after all, take on the form of a bhakt, not an ascetic or a brahmin. Whether Kabīr gives cloth to the God in disguise, organizes a mahochau that leaves him resourceless, or finds himself the host of a surprise gathering of devotees, every time this involves (directly or indirectly) the community of bhakts/Sants, who are a part of the “natural” milieu of the weaver-poet. Now, if we could look at Kabīr not as a donor, but as a recipient, we would discover that in Anantadās’s hagiography, the gift and subsequently, the patronage play a socio-regulatory function. As noted by Horstmann (2000: 520), in order to fulfil his role, the Sant must remain impoverished, and, indeed, Kabīr is said to refrain from gifts of “gold, silver, and fabrics” (KP 4.7). Most probably he does not reject the gifts in the name of the community but simply does not take anything for himself, and, as noted above (KP 3.1), shares
everything that has been offered with others.\textsuperscript{16} However, we are told that Kabīr accepts specifically such gifts that are offered by the devotees (\textit{harijana}) with feeling (of love?) (\textit{bhāva sahata}, KP 4.8) (one might wonder whether they are accepted for personal use). In the very same \textit{pada} Anantadās underlines that Kabīr desists (\textit{tyāgai}) the persistence (\textit{haṭha}) of king (\textit{rājā}) and his subjects (\textit{parajā}) to patronize him; similarly, he rejects the lavish gifts of Sikandar Lodi bestowed on him after proving his saintly authority to the sultan.\textsuperscript{17} Here, I think, it would be justified to once again bring to attention the parallel of the topos of court patronage rejection from the DJL, used by Jangopāl to stress that in order to retain the autonomy of the nascent Dādūpanthī community, Dādū decides to keep the royal patrons at bay (Zapart 2022: 10–11). We can see that \textit{dāna} and patronage are utilized as tools to determine the extent of the Sant community and to delineate and protect its \textit{bhakti}-centered value system. This means that the choice of patron, as well as the choice of the beneficiary of \textit{dāna}, affects both the structure and the saintly status of the community, and therefore it has the capacity to determine its economic and ideological character. Bearing in mind that to determine the purposefulness of a gift, a superior position of the recipient is not necessary, what then does it mean to have the status of a Sant-\textit{bhakt} in the \textit{Kabīr-paracaī}? By the logic of comparison with the traditional \textit{dāna} theory, it seems, first, that being a Sant means being worthy of receiving gifts (the perfect donee) and worthy of giving (the perfect donor); second, it means having authority which does not rest on social prestige and birth, but on the adherence to the \textit{bhakti} ethos. For that reason, \textit{bhakts} are the preferred subjects on both sides of the transaction (at least on the prescriptive

\textsuperscript{16} Burchett (2022: 191–192) observes that gifting in Anantadās’s narratives serves a social and ethical role of creating a community built on a constant circulation of gifts and sharing that obliterates notions of ownership and reciprocation.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. the case of Nāmdev who rejects a gift of gold from a non-devotee merchant. The Sant deplores him for the desire to give in order to obtain religious merit and not ‘for the sake of Rām’ (\textit{rāma heti}) (Nāmdev-\textit{paracaī} 2.24).
However, as gifts in the *paracaīs* are presented to a very diversified crowd, we need to pinpoint a more universal level of *dāna*, which brings us back to the second episode with the unfed brahmins and to the notion of reciprocity.

The focal point of the second episode is obviously Kabīr slipping away from the scene. In his demeanor we see the desperation and embarrassment of a man who has nothing left to give but feels strongly committed to giving. This shows the strength of the cultural obligation to present *dāna* to those deemed as worthy, which is not diminished by the fact that the worthy ones are openly hostile toward their benefactor. Depicting the brahmins in this way and Kabīr as a desperate but willing benefactor is, of course, intentional as it makes the weaver-poet appear a particularly benevolent and moral individual. However, knowing the value system of Sants and seeing how the narrative unfolds it is doubtful if the obligation to present *dāna* would be a sufficient motivation for a Sant to try to feed a group of “worthy by default” brahmins and that it would make him feel ashamed of not being able to succeed. I believe that the real impulse behind Kabīr’s willingness to offer *dāna*, must be sought in the motif of the supernatural response of Hari. God is put on the scene, not because the Sant is anticipating him, but to underline that it is God’s presence in the *bhakti*-oriented life of the Sant that encourages him to offer any kind of *dāna*, especially to the brahmins. In other words, as all the actions of a Sant are directed towards God, so is *dāna*, and, in fact, it is Rām who is the actual recipient of all gifts. This makes the practice of *dāna* a personal and emotionally engaging affair and eventually shapes gift giving into the practice of *bhakti*.

---

18 As beneficiaries, Sants have a documented history of accepting both royal and merchant patronage. The Dādūpanth community of the 17th and 18th centuries provides good examples (Horstmann 2000: 539–558).

19 The idea of God being the sole recipient of all sacrificial acts (*yajña*) is well attested in the *Bhagavadgīta* (*ahaṃ hi sarvayajñānāṃ bhoktā ca prabhur eva ca* [9.24]. “I am the enjoyer and lord of all sacrifices.” Cf. also 9.16 and 9.23).
The notion of reciprocity springs to mind here, as it seems that a divine intervention must have a fitting cause and in all three episodes the reaction of Hari is distinctly related to dāna. In the first, Hari “repays” Kabīr for his generosity, in the second for the very intention of feeding the brahmans. In the third, he simply helps the weaver to fulfill an act of service for the gathered bhakts. Nowhere is it mentioned that Kabīr expects God to intervene, as the pious acts of the Sants are not carried out to bring rewards. Kabīr himself is shown as simply “doing his thing”, that is, cultivating his mind (“meditating on the feet of Rām”, KP 2.16, dohā) or “setting his heart on the name of Rām”, KP 3.7) and... practicing generosity. For Anantadās it is precisely this selfless service to God and the community that opens the possibility of divine intervention. To become a bhakt, one must be generous to the extent of offering everything one has. As Kabīr himself states, “great is the one who consumes wealth by sharing” (bađau ju bāṭi bāṭi dhana khāi, KP 6.5). We find numerous examples of a similar attitude especially in the Pīpā-paracaī. It is by excessive generosity (giving ‘all you have’ [sarabasa]) directed to the bhakts, but eventually to all living beings (sakala ātmahi) that one becomes a true devotee (PP 29.9–12). Proper dāna directed to the bhakts is so important that it is allowed to be procured even by immoral means (thagi mūsi, lit. by ‘cheating and stealing’) (PP 33.14–16)! But most importantly, Anantadās acknowledges the possibility of God responding to generosity when offered that what is most valuable (PP 15.23), or, similarly, that service to the community (by offering one’s “body [tana], mind [mana], and wealth [dhana]”) is a way to make God show his mercy (nivājasī) (Dhanā-paracaī [DP], 7.1). Thus, the fruit of religious life and the otherwise unreturned gift is reciprocated as a spiritual boon in the form of Rām’s mercy. This would be an equivalent of the

20 According to Kabīr himself, abandoning worldly hopes (jagata kī āsa) (for benefits) is a way to attain the favors of Rām (Kabīr Granthāvali, quoted in DJL 10.27) (Callewaert 1988: 66). Cf. the well-known notion of a selfless action, understood as a desireless sacrifice to God that does not produce karmic effects, in Bhagavadgīta 3.9; 5.10; 9.27.
karmic response for dāna acknowledged by the medieval sources mentioned above (Heim 2004: 37).

**God as the only receiver of gifts**

If we assume that Hari is the only beneficiary of gifts, it does not matter to whom the material gift is really directed: dāna follows bhakti and both land at Hari’s feet. This approach could help to explain the rather frequent appearances of brahmins in the work of Anantadās. Often portrayed as enemies of the Sants, in the paracaīs brahmins are depicted as either demanding and coercing donations or as unfortunate, needy individuals. In both cases, they are perhaps not acknowledged as worthy beneficiaries of dāna, but nevertheless still dependent on it. This fact, as well as the self-proclaimed position of the brahmins, is used by Anantadās to present the Sants as exceedingly generous and empathetic individuals who, although practice giving to the brahmins, do it for the sake of Rām bhakti. God as accepting gifts brings us to a metaphysical paradox that, in turn, determines the soteriological dimension of dāna. It is clear to Kabīr that whatever gift he can offer Rām, it is his already (Vaudeville 1997: 256). Pīpā also exclaims that everything belongs to God

---

21 According to Heim (2004: 44), in the dharmaśāstras dāna can be motivated *either* by ‘esteem’ (śraddhā) or by ‘devotion’ (bhakti). In the paracaīs, while the matter is not entirely clear, I would argue in the favor of conflating both factors. Even if the esteem-driven aspect of gifting could motivate Sants (God surely possesses esteem in the eyes of the bhaktis), it seems clear that, at least on a psychological level, devotion is considered a sufficient incentive for generosity and dominates over śraddhā or even completely obliterates it.

22 Brahmins are especially often mentioned in the Pīpā-paracaī; cf. the case of a despairing brahmin who commits suicide over losing Pīpā, his sponsor, but is revived by Rāmānanda (PP 9.1–19); of Pīpā giving an oxen that did not belong to him to a brahmin in need (26.13–28); of Pīpā helping a robbed brahmin (31.19–32); or of the same Sant offering his whole wealth (sabu darabu) to a brahmin who is impoverished (32.11–13) (note “the complete confidence [bharausai] in Hari” as the justification of this act). For an account of the most telling appearances of brahmins in the paracaīs, see Callewaert (2000: 13–16).
(PP 26.16) and his generosity rests on the assumption that for a pure-minded Sant offering something that does not belong to him (oxen gift, PP 26.13–28) is not a breach of morality; quite the opposite: the ability to select the right gift determines the strength of one’s bhakti and denotes a close relationship with God.

If God is indeed the sole receiver of dāna, no gift offered with the right intention can ever be wasted, regardless of the status of the beneficiary. The most blatant example of this attitude is to be observed when Pīpā offers a gift to robbers who have just looted his house (PP 28.19–20). When chasing after the robbers to give them the 22 coins they have overlooked, Pīpā considers the benefit (par- 
amahitū) of this situation. This benefit appears to have a two-phase dynamic, as observed above: first, Pīpā shows an unconditional largesse that wins him Hari’s favor/grace, due to which he changes the gift into a proselytic tool that allows him to convert the robbers (PP 28.27); it is inferred that as long as there is the intention to serve Rām (PP 8.24), even material offerings to immoral recipients can bring spiritual merit and a promise of a spiritual reward.

Another way of looking at the donor-recipient dynamics is through the notion of debt. A brahmin repays the debt to the Gods by performing ritual sacrifices, and to ṛṣis by studying the Veda. A householder, in turn, pays off his debt to the sages (i.e., learned brahmins) through dāna. To put it differently, when offering dāna to the brahmans, the householder is simply “discharging an already existing debt” (Nath 1988: 205). It would be natural to see the analogy to the Sant’s gifts to Rām in the deva ṛṇa, but this kind of debt was envisioned to be paid off by sacrificial rites, so it does not fit easily into the anti-ritualistic ethos of the Sants. However, the debt to ṛṣis seems a more likely candidate as, according to Manusmṛti

---

23 Cf. different episodes following a similar scenario: robbers steal Pīpā’s buffalos and are converted by the force of his unexpected generosity (PP 17.14–19); also see the episode of Pīpā and the yoghurt selling girl who (together with her family) becomes a convert after receiving an excessive payment from the Sant (PP 27); finally, see the case of the lustful merchant who becomes a bhakt after having been ‘offered’ Sītā, Pīpā’s wife, as a ‘gift’ (PP 20.14–16).
(1.100), it is the brahmins who are considered the (self-proclaimed) owners of all things in existence,\textsuperscript{24} and therefore they can be put in a position analogous to that of Rām in the \textit{paracāīs}. The Sants would be, of course, seen as the ones with a debt to settle.\textsuperscript{25}

Thus, the concept of \textit{ṛṇa} may serve as yet another hermeneutical instrument to reinforce the hypothesis of the Sant \textit{dāna} as being directed solely to God. It is perhaps best applied to the \textit{Trilocan-paracāī} (TP), which is built around a single event. One day, Hari, in the disguise of a scruffy-looking man, arrives at the doorstep of Trilocan to offer him service. Hari is motivated by love (\textit{prīti}) (TP 3), but he also wants to put the Sant to a test, just as he did with Kabīr. He promises to serve Trilocan under two conditions: he must pay him due respect (\textit{ādara}) and satisfy his endless hunger (TP 12) (the Hari-servant is “always hungry and never satisfied” [\textit{bhūkhau rahau, na kabahī aghānau}, TP 8]). Once again God demands to be cared for by a Sant, but this time the gifting is not left unreciprocated, and the narrative establishes a straightforward mutualism between the giver and the receiver. Even if this \textit{paracāī} hints at a direct, material “a gift for a gift” transaction, the spiritual element is still present: after all, Trilocan can expect a reward for doing good bhakti, not for caring for his servant. As the owner of all gifts, the God-servant capitalizes on his right to be fed. Caring for him is like paying off the debt for the very possibility of performing bhakti. Moreover, this transaction between God and the \	extit{bhakt} lasts as long as the debt is settled: the moment Trilocan’s wife expresses her doubts, Hari disappears (TP 23–24). Even if God is the sole owner of all things (gifts included), as the only receiver of \textit{dāna} he remains somehow ‘dependent’ (\textit{ādhiṇā}, TP 17) on the \textit{bhakts}. In what way? I assume that here the matter is closely related to the economy (or circulation) of a gift, as sketched above. Endowed with

\textsuperscript{24} “Whatever exists in the world is the property of the Brahmana; on account of the excellence of his origin the Brahmana is, indeed, entitled to all” (Bühler 1886: 26).

\textsuperscript{25} Note that in \textit{Manusmṛti} (6.94) for the twice-born being ‘free from debt’ (\textit{anṛṇa}) is one of the prerequisites for becoming a renunciant.
the capacity to perform bhakti resulting from regulating their debt to Hari (or bestowing gifts), the Sants are able to perform generous deeds (for example, during communal feasts) and act on Hari’s grace to expand the community. Needless to say, the debt to Hari is essentially unrepayable, because it is infinite; therefore, the act of repaying (by seva, bhakti, and dāna) could be seen as perpetual, never finished, and as unbound as Hari’s grace that has put the whole process in motion. We can only speculate that Anantadās wanted to draw on the concept of īṣṇa to further bind bhaktis to their practice and to Hari, while distancing himself from the ritualistic, brahmanical roots of the notion of the fourfold debt.26

The Sant’s behavior in the dynamics of the gift is similar to the notion of God “producing” prasād: he is to receive, sanctify, and then give away.27 We must examine this process more closely. Every gift of a Sant is directed to Rām (when Anantadās claims that “Pīpā honors God in others”28 [pīpā pujai ātma deī], this also ap-

26 The notions of dependency and debt brings us to areas of possible further inquiry. It would be interesting to investigate the idea of God being dependent on his devotees (TP 17) and “returning” what has been given to him (PP 15.23) as a possible analogy to the Vedic yajña. In Vedic sources, men were given a duty that was to be fulfilled through ritual action (which regulated their debt to the devas). Gods were summoned to act for the benefit of the sacrificers and part with gifts only they could bestow (e.g., prosperity and health) (Geaves 2008: 1024). In other words, “men sustained gods, so that gods could sustain men” (Dhavamony 1974: 109). Thus, there appear some questions that deserve further study. Is it so that modified by the Upaniṣadic understanding of sacrifice as the internalized practice of tapas and filtered through the attitude of nonattachment, as prescribed in the Bhagavadgītā (17.11), in the Sant milieu the ritual sacrifice was substituted and performed through internal worship, but also through the circulation of gifts bearing a salvific capacity? To what extent does the God–bhakt dependency—acknowledged in the Sant milieu, where ritual action was entirely abandoned—retain an affinity to the Vedic patterns and could be seen as a form of exchange analogous to the Vedic sacrifice?


plies to honoring through dāna [PP 19.14]²⁹; if it has the right intention, it is reciprocated as grace, power, or Hari’s protection (rakhavārā, lit. ‘protector’) (KP 10.1); only then the gift (in random form) becomes spiritually charged and can be conceptualized as offered by Hari through the Sant (to an individual of random social standing). As such, the gift denotes liberation and can be used for pedagogical and/or proselytizing purposes (see below). In other words, the one who knows that Rām is the ultimate giver and has an intimate relationship with Rām (who “speaks through the bodies of devotees” [bhagavanta bhagatana kai ghati bolai, KP 13.11]) can bestow the highest form of gift in God’s name. And since God created everyone equal, as Kabīr himself repeatedly stresses (Vaudeville 1997: 216, 218), giving and generosity cannot conjure any form of social or moral hierarchy.

**Dāna and renunciation**

Anantadās often underlines the straightforward interdependence of dāna and bhakti in terms of their intensity: the deeper the devotion, the greater the generosity (and *vice versa*). A Sant who exceeds in devotion should also exceed in his/her commitment to dāna.³⁰ For this reason, Pīpā instructs Sūraj Sen, who wants to be initiated, on the necessity of “offering his wife and all of his possessions” (nāri sahita sarabasa de) to the guru (PP 16.15–16; 17.1–6). In the canonical dharmaśāstric, Buddhist, and Jain sources there was a general consensus that dāna can mean ‘giving up’ (tyāga) in the sense

---

²⁹ For the notion of perceiving God as internalized and universal, which supports “impartiality of mind” (see below); cf. also DP 2.9 when Dhanā is said to see God as ātmarāma.

³⁰ Cf. the episode in which Pīpā and his wife find a pot full of money and immediately spend it, since giving away everything one has (tanu, manu, dhanu) is a measure of love (prīti) (PP 33.12; 33.14); also, the description of Pīpā as practicing bhakti while giving away tana, mana, and dhana (PP 19.15) (see also KP 2.4 and 3.1 above). In the same vein, Dhanā is described as giving his house (ghara), wife (gharanī), possessions (sampati), and the whole wealth (darbu) to Hari (DP 2.10).
of renunciation (Heim 2004: 39). In the paracaīs dāna is also marked by the giving up of one’s social standing (PP 5.6; 7.16) and by maintaining an egoless position. 31 Both virtues, dāna and renunciation, are necessary for one who wishes to become a bhakt, therefore Pīpā advises a generous but lustful merchant that taking on the path of bhakti means “giving up everything” (sarabasa arapai) and “serving all devotees” (bhagatana kī sevā) (PP 20.14–19). Here, the particular context reveals that the spiritual aspect of “giving up” is rather secondary and that for a well-off householder renunciation should mean primarily the practice of dāna. However, even at this “mundane” level, dāna understood as a kind of “qualified renunciation” is a way to cultivate bhakti. Consequently, for a Sant like Kabīr or Pīpā, we can presume that the more generosity resembles self-renunciation, the greater the possibility for a Sant to act on the salvific power bestowed by Hari (in response to dāna).

At this point, it would perhaps be stimulating to consider if the ethos of renunciation could serve as a hermeneutical tool for unpacking the three Kabīr-fleeing-from-the-scene episodes. If Anantadās highly values Pīpā, who abandoned his kingdom to become a bhakt, for giving up (chāḍī) the caste (jāti), clan (pāṭi), and family (kula) (PP 7.16), it might be possible that Kabīr’s atypical behavior is for Anantadās an opportunity to show the complete detachment of the Sant from all things worldly. There is an internal logic at play here, as the stake of renunciation rises together with its objects. Each time, when he is right in the middle of doing mundane business, Kabīr escapes responsibility and symbolically casts off the chains of, respectively, family ties, social relations (represented by the brahmins), and finally even of the community of bhaktis. The only thing that remains unrepudiated is his bond with Hari. Maybe by incorporating the three puzzling episodes Anantadās attempted to restate the well-known truth that no worldly business, no matter how

31 Cf. PP 3.2 on the necessity of being like a dead man and remaining under the protection of Rām (mṛtaka samāna sarana hoi rahiye). See also PP 24.3: the one who is detached (nyārā) (as a consequence of offering everything to Hari) has God as his/her protector (rakhavārā).
lofty, can bind a Sant who needs to maintain a position of indifference and impartiality.\(^\text{32}\)

In the verses attributed to Dādū Dayāl (Dādūvāṇī), as well as in the Dādūpanthī sectarian scriptures (DJL), impartiality is denoted by the term nirpakha, known by the Dādūpanthī author Rajab (Sarvāṅgī) and Kabīr as samatā or samasarasa (Callewaert 1978: 328). In the Dādūpanthī sources nirpakha has three semantic layers indicating internal worship, “nonsectarianism” (one path to God transcending a particular orthopraxis, Chandra 1992: 34), and nondifferentiation (seeing all things as having equal value). In paraccaīs the idea behind nirpakha, understood as non-differentiation, has a particularly strong presence, but is expressed by words such as samatuli (“of equal value”) (PP 29.12), barābari (“equal”) (PP 7.16), and samađišti (“seeing as equal”, “impartial view”) (PP 18.1; 15.2: kings and beggars as equals; DP 2.9). For a Sant to have an impartial mind is to distribute equally to any kind of recipient. Furthermore, keeping such a view of reality would surely be adequate for a Sant-renunciant, and since dāna can be a form of “giving up”, then all the dāna-related Kabīr-paraccaī episodes in question may be read as advertising an uncompromising, God-centered renunciation presented in this manner to create the saintly authority of Kabīr.

Before any closing reflections, let us briefly systematize the main functions-cum-dimensions of dāna in the paraccaīs of Anantadās from the material gathered thus far. The first two are closely related to the Sant’s declarative heterodoxy. First, the social dimension of dāna is visible due to its role in regulating the extent of the community (centered on antiritualistic and antihierarchical notions), while its proselytic dimension regulates the expansion of the community. Heading towards a more abstract territory, we have the metaphysical dimension together with the soteriological dimension, because the claim that Rām/Hari is the sole owner of all gifts and the receiver of

\(^{32}\) This position can be seen as the individual, psychological dimension of the topos of autonomy as witnessed in the DJL (cf. Zapart 2022: 10).


\textit{dāna} is meaningful only with the assumption that gifting is ultimately an act aimed at liberation.

\textbf{Concluding remarks: \textit{dāna} as \textit{bhakti}}

Considering the medieval “dharmaśāstric”, Buddhist and Jain theories of gift outlined at the beginning of this article, Anantadās’s take on \textit{dāna} is as unconventional as it is deeply rooted in the \textit{bhakti} ethos. Seen in this way, it constitutes an intuitive and non-systematic reworking of the mentioned approaches to gift giving. Anantadās considers all the most vital elements of these theories but appropriates them in such a manner that they become impossible to unravel without acknowledging their entanglement with the ideals of \textit{bhakti}. For example, when matters of (traditional) social and religious status appear—embedded or not in the context of \textit{dāna}—they are often a disruptive element that is obliterated by the egalitarian spirit of Rām \textit{bhakti}, so much so that Callewaert (2000: 22) notes that “seeing all individuals as equals and giving up honour and status (…) are favourite themes of Anantadās”. For that reason, to fully appreciate the author’s position, one needs to assume that in his work gift giving denotes egoless and devotional acts driven by a spirit of renunciation. As such, every gift is intended for the deity, independently of the identity and socioreligious status of the “physical” recipient. Therefore, regardless of whether gifts are offered to non-devotees, people of low moral status, individual \textit{bhaks} or \textit{bhakt} communities, or even if the gift itself is obtained deceitfully, for the benefactor \textit{dāna} serves as a means of cultivating individual devotion aimed at creating an intimate relationship with Hari. The potential of gifting to transcend cultural norms allows the Sants to present gifts to brahmins, even if they are perceived as representing values alien to the Sant ethos and are ascribed the role of persecutors of the \textit{bhakts}. Thus, at least at a declarative level, the ideal of \textit{dāna} is to be of service to an egalitarian social vision, albeit theologically grounded.
Even if directly not reciprocated, dāna remains a circulatory process. In the paracaīs the gifting workflow has the salvific power of Rām as its real driving force. Therefore, when considering this process, some form of reciprocity needs to be taken into account. A gift is surely not designed to commit the immediate recipient, but to put into motion a movement of grace (or mercy, kindness) (kṛpā)\textsuperscript{33} of Hari. This circular flow of kṛpā can be described briefly as follows: the Sant, a donor, chooses deserving recipients (whose social and religious status, birth, and even morality are of secondary importance), but directs his real intent to please Hari, the real donee; Hari responds by sanctifying the gift, endowing it with his grace and returning the gift, now fashioned into a salvific tool; the Sant can now act as a conduit of grace and offer a material gift (of random form, often accompanied by moral teaching) endowed with salvific power.

All in all, we can see that the bhakti-oriented ideology of gift-giving (dāna), although understood necessarily as renunciation achieved with an impartial mind, can be taken as the key to unravelling the three episodes of the Kabīr-paracaī. For Anantadās dāna and generosity are the foundations of the bhakti ethos, given their community-forming and proselytic potential, but it is the unmediated relationship of the Sant with Hari that is given precedence. This is manifested by the divine interventions that occur when the obligation of dāna becomes too burdensome for Kabīr. In the first episode, having offered dāna, Kabīr is left without material means, but the devotional intent of his gift evokes Hari’s mercy (dayā) (KP 2.6). In the second and third episodes the stress is also laid on the relationship with Hari, but Anantadās seems to voice an implicit critique of the very obligation of dāna when treated instrumentally, as a means of extortion and deceit. Anantadās makes the brahmins use dāna as an offensive weapon, which can mean that he wishes to express his distrust towards dāna as a form of hierarchy-based coercion. In this vision, we can find an alternative explanation of the behavior of

\textsuperscript{33} Also rendered as “compassion” by Lorenzen (1992: 98, 117).
Kabīr (at least in the second and third episodes): it is the obligation of dāna turned into violent oppression that could have forced the Sant to run away. Regardless, the weaver-poet still prevails owing to his pure devotion. Thus, it seems that Anantadās may be trying to suggest that if dāna is to lose its coercive potential, it must necessarily be rethought as an inherent part of the bhakti-mārga.
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