

The Matsya Nyaya and The Conventional Danda System

Kangkana Barman

Lecturer,

Faculty of Law & Forensic Science,

Apex Professional University,

Pasighat Smart city, Arunachal Pradesh.

Abstract:

The idea of *danda*—meaning punishment or the power to enforce law—originated during the Vedic era and became a cornerstone of early Indian jurisprudence. In ancient society, the implementation of punishment was seen as vital for upholding justice and ensuring the smooth functioning of the state. Foundational scriptures like the *Ramayana* and *Manusmriti* advocate for the fair and balanced use of *danda*, emphasizing its role in safeguarding the kingdom's stability and the well-being of its people. The *Dharma Shastras* also place great importance on the court system, portraying it as a space for evaluating and protecting the moral, economic, and political interests of the population. The concept of *Matsya Nyaya*, explained in the *Matsya Purana*, warns of a society without law, where the strong overpower the weak—like big fish swallowing smaller ones. This metaphor illustrates the danger of neglecting legal authority and highlights the necessity of a structured justice system guided by clear principles. In this framework, *danda* was not merely a means of punishment but a tool to maintain *dharma*—the ethical and social order. It was considered essential for protecting individuals, preventing misconduct, and maintaining balance in society. Without the application of just punishment, the risk of exploitation and chaos would rise. Hence, *danda* served as a powerful mechanism for justice and governance in ancient Indian civilization.

Keywords: *Danda, Matsya Nyaya, Punishment and Justice.*

Introduction:

Danda: The Foundation of Justice in Ancient Indian Tradition: The concept of *danda*, meaning punishment in Sanskrit, has deep roots in the early Vedic civilization of India. It played a central role in maintaining law and order, being viewed as essential for ensuring justice in society. In the Indian philosophical and legal tradition, the imposition of *danda* was not merely punitive but also a moral necessity to uphold righteousness (*dharma*). In the *Ramayana*, a prominent ancient epic, punishments were meted out based on the severity of the crime, highlighting a justice system that was proportional and fair. The *Manusmriti*, one of the earliest and most influential Dharma Shastras, also advocated the careful and balanced application of *danda*. According to it, just punishment was crucial for the smooth functioning of the state and the satisfaction of its citizens. The legal role of the king was also well established in these ancient texts. As per *Manusmriti* (Chapter IV, Section IV, Verses 83–84), the court of justice was regarded as a sacred place where the socio-economic and political concerns of people were

examined under the principles laid down by *Dharma Shashtra*. Justice, thus, was seen as a deeply moral and spiritual pursuit.

The *Matsya Purana*—a significant Purana attributed to Lord Vishnu's incarnation as a fish—contains further elaborations on the theory of justice. It introduces the idea of *Matsya Nyaya*, or "the law of the fish," which metaphorically refers to a lawless society where the strong dominate the weak, akin to big fish devouring the small. This analogy illustrates the dangers of a society where the ruler fails to enforce justice. The absence of *danda*, it suggests, leads to chaos where vulnerable groups—like children, the elderly, saints, Brahmins, and widows—are at the mercy of the powerful (*Matsya Purana*, 10.225.9).

Further verses (10.225.10–15) emphasize the indispensability of *danda* by declaring that it governs all beings, ensures security, and remains vigilant even when all else is dormant. The text asserts that *danda* is recognized by the wise as a form of *dharma*, and it is through the fear of just punishment that people are deterred from engaging in wrongful deeds. In conclusion, the ancient Indian legal tradition regarded *danda* as an ethical, protective, and regulatory force. Rather than being synonymous with oppression, it symbolized righteous discipline—a tool for upholding order, justice, and the collective well-being of society.

The Concept

तस्माद्राजा विनीतेना धर्मशात्रानुसारतः।

दण्डप्रणयनं कार्यं लोकानुग्रहं काम्यया ॥ [10, Verse 225.7]

According to the **Matsya Purana**, a ruler is advised to implement punishment only after carefully considering the principles outlined in the **Dharma Shashtra**, and keeping the welfare of the citizens in mind. If individuals cannot be influenced through peaceful negotiation (**saama**), charitable offers (**daana**), or strategic division (**bheda**), then the use of force or punishment (**danda**) becomes necessary. The king is expected to consult learned scholars in Dharma and law before delivering justice, ensuring that punishment is in line with established legal codes. [10, Verse 225.2]

The Purana emphasizes that if offenders do not fear consequences, lawlessness will prevail, leading to widespread disorder. People refrain from wrongdoing primarily because they fear retribution. It is noted that even the gods appointed **Kumara** as the commander to combat the demon **Taraka**, motivated by the fear of defeat and chaos. [10, Verse 225.18]

When diplomatic efforts fail to resolve conflicts, the text endorses resorting to warfare. The *Matsya Purana* clearly lists punishable crimes such as theft, deceit, defamation, sexual misconduct, and consumption of impure food. Penalties vary, including both monetary fines and physical punishment, and are determined based on the offender's caste, age, status, and education. Severe crimes like treason attract capital punishment. However, justice must be impartial—the innocent should not suffer, and the guilty must not escape punishment. [10, Verse 227.213]

The punishment for theft as per the Matsya Purana is notably severe. A thief is required to compensate the victim and pay an equivalent sum to the state. Damaging public utility items like ropes or pots at communal wells invites hefty fines, such as paying the equivalent of five **gunja** seeds in gold. [10, Verse 227.92] In cases where grains are stolen, the punishment varies with the quantity: theft of more than ten pot-measures could lead to death, while smaller thefts attract fines eleven times the stolen value. [10, Verse 227.99] However, stealing food due to hunger is treated with leniency. Theft of valuable items like gems, animals, women, and medicines may result in the death penalty.

In contrast, **Section 379** of the **Indian Penal Code** provides that theft is punishable with imprisonment for up to three years, or a fine, or both. The **Matsya Nyaya** prescribes strict penalties for crimes against vulnerable or respected members of society such as Brahmins, women, children, elders, and public officials. For example, defaming sacred texts, rituals, or respected individuals results in a heavy fine. [10, Verse 227.187] Government officials who misuse their power face double the punishment they wrongfully imposed. Destruction of crucial public infrastructure like forts, gates, or moats may lead to banishment. [10, Verse 227.182] Crimes such as damaging crops, boundary markers, and water bodies are punishable by death. [10, Verse 227.183] Likewise, destroying community resources like lakes, temples, or storage facilities also warrants the death penalty. [10, Verse 227.172–174]

However, killing an animal in self-defense is not considered an offence, a view that aligns with **Section 11(2)** of the **Wildlife Protection Act, 1972**, which permits killing or injuring a wild animal in genuine self-defense.

सकामां दूषयाणस्तु प्राप्नुयात्द्विशतं दमं।

यश्च संचारकस्तत्र पुरुषः स तथा भवेत् ||[10, Verse 227.125]

In the **Matsya Purana**, the punishment for **forcible rape** is severe and includes the **death penalty**. In the case of **adultery**, the offender is fined two hundred coins. Interestingly, the Purana also holds accountable those who assist or facilitate the act of adultery, subjecting them to the same punishment as the perpetrator. Importantly, the woman who has been a victim of sexual assault is not to be penalized.

One controversial directive states that if a young woman independently chooses a suitable partner and falls in love, she should be allowed to marry him. However, if her choice is deemed inappropriate, she may be confined within her home. Additionally, the text prescribes death for a man who marries a woman of a higher **varna**, or caste. A woman who disobeys a just command of her husband, or who is accused by a man of higher varna, or who engages in a romantic relationship outside marriage, is deemed punishable.

In contrast, the **Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2018** brought significant reforms to India's rape laws under the **Indian Penal Code (IPC)**. **Section 376AB** of the IPC mandates a minimum punishment of **20 years of rigorous imprisonment**, which may extend to **life imprisonment or**

even the **death penalty** for the rape of a child under 12 years of age. Section **376DA** deals with **gang rape** of a girl under 16, prescribing **life imprisonment** and a fine. Section **376DB** addresses **gang rape of a child below 12 years**, for which the punishment is **life imprisonment or death**.

Further, the IPC now strictly prohibits **non-consensual sexual intercourse** under all circumstances. Notably, **adultery** is no longer a criminal offence in India as per the Supreme Court's ruling, emphasizing that it intrudes into the private domain of marriage. Instead, it is treated as a **civil matter** and may serve as a valid **ground for divorce**. However, if one spouse takes their own life due to the adulterous behavior of the other, the case may fall under **abetment to suicide**.

Conclusion

The **Matsya Nyaya** reflects a stern and hierarchical approach to justice, emphasizing the sovereign power of the king to preserve order. It places immense authority in the hands of the ruler, which, if unchecked, could result in the oppression of weaker groups by the powerful. The punishments, including capital punishment for both major and minor infractions, mirror the rigid social structure of the time. In contrast, **modern Indian law** has evolved to be more progressive, favoring the **reformatory theory of punishment**, which emphasizes rehabilitation over retribution. This approach is reflected in the Supreme Court's decision in **Narotam Singh v. State of Punjab**, where it was noted that criminal law should focus on **reformation**, not just deterrence, to ensure **social justice** while maintaining the conscience of the society.

References

1. Dikshitar Ramachandra V.R, (1935), The Matsya Purana, A study, University of Madras.
2. Basu, B. D. (1974). The Sukraniti: The Sacred Books of the Hindus Vol. XIII (B. K. Sarkar, Ed.). AMS Press, Inc. The Indian Penal Code 1860. Government of India.
3. Joseph Shine vs. Union of India, 2018 SC 1676.
4. K.P. Suresh Kumar vs Sayyith Hydros Fazal on 6 November (2008).
5. Narotam Singh v. State of Punjab, AIR 1978 SC 1542
- 6.
7. The Wildlife Protection Act, 1972. Government of India.
8. Talukdar, A. (1917). Punishment. In The Matsya Puranam Part II (pp. 240–251). Sudhindra Natha Vasu, From the Panini Office, Bhuvanewari Ashrama.
9. The Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2018. Government of India.