Original Article
ISSN (Online): 2582-7472

ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts
June 2024 5(6), 2080–2087

SACRED GROVES AND ROYAL HUNTS: ENVIRONMENT & POWER IN MEDIEVAL INDIA

Rajeev Kumar [1], Dr. Neelam Rani [2]

[1] Research Scholar, Department of History & Archaeology, C.D.L.U., Sirsa, Haryana
[2] Department of History & Archaeology, C.D.L.U., Sirsa, Haryana

DOI
10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i6.2024.5257

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the intricate relationship between environment and political power in medieval India, focusing on two key dimensions: sacred groves and royal hunts. Sacred groves, protected for religious or cultural reasons, offer insights into indigenous ecological ethics, while royal hunting practices reflect elite control over nature and territorial authority. Using historical texts, inscriptions, and environmental studies, this paper argues that ecological spaces were not only natural entities but also deeply political and symbolic realms in premodern India.

Keywords: Environment, Inscription, Human, Political, Hunting, Society, Ecology, Culture, Mughal

1. INTRODUCTION

Actually, environmental history challenges the notion that nature is a passive backdrop to human history. Instead, it demonstrates how ecological systems and human societies shape each other. In medieval India, nature was not just a resource—it was embedded in political symbolism, religious practice, and cultural identity. Sacred groves were protected forests, often associated with deities or spirits, while royal hunts—shikars—were demonstrations of sovereignty and power. Together, these two domains represent contrasting yet connected attitudes toward the environment: conservation and control.

2. ENVIRONMENT AND POWER IN MEDIEVAL INDIA

Environmental history is an interdisciplinary field that reimagines the relationship between human societies and the natural world. Far from being a mere stage on which human history unfolds, nature is revealed as an active agent, influencing and being influenced by cultural, political, economic, and spiritual forces. In this framework, the environment is not just a backdrop but a participant in history, shaping human experiences and institutions. The study of

environmental history, therefore, involves exploring how societies have understood, used, managed, and symbolized their natural surroundings across time.

In the context of medieval India, this interaction between society and environment becomes especially vivid and complex. The subcontinent's diverse ecosystems—ranging from dense forests and sacred groves to floodplains and deserts—were deeply entwined with patterns of settlement, agriculture, warfare, and religious practices. Unlike modern notions of nature as an external, objective realm, medieval Indians—rulers, religious communities, and peasants alike—viewed natural spaces as intimately bound with the divine, the political, and the social order. Two particularly revealing cultural institutions in this period were sacred groves and royal hunts. Sacred groves—known by different names such as devarakadu in Karnataka, kavu in Kerala, and orans in Rajasthan—were forested tracts preserved by communities due to their association with deities, ancestors, or spirits. These groves were often governed by customary laws and religious taboos, prohibiting tree felling, hunting, or agricultural use. They functioned not only as spiritual sanctuaries but also as ecological refugees, conserving biodiversity and supporting water cycles. Their existence reflects an indigenous tradition of environmental ethics, in which reverence and restraint towards nature were embedded in cultural and religious frameworks. In contrast, the practice of royal hunting—or shikar—represented an elite mode of engagement with the natural world. For kings, sultans, and emperors, the hunt was not merely a form of recreation; it was a ritual of domination and an expression of political authority. By venturing into forests, tracking and killing dangerous animals like lions, tigers, and elephants, the monarch enacted his control over the wilderness and by extension, the territories and populations under his rule. Hunting grounds were often curated and controlled, and the hunt itself was a carefully staged spectacle, complete with attendants, musicians, and court chroniclers. These activities transformed nature into a political theatre, where the ruler displayed his valor, masculinity, and divine favor. Although sacred groves and royal hunts might seem opposed—one representing conservation, the other conquest—they were in fact interconnected. Both were symbolic engagements with the environment, shaped by the cosmologies, hierarchies, and power relations of their time. They reveal how the natural world was neither uniformly preserved or exploited, but negotiated through ritual, belief, and governance. This paper explores these two environmental forms—sacred groves and royal hunts—not as isolated phenomena but as culturally meaningful practices that reflect broader dynamics of power, religion, and ecological perception in medieval India. Through an analysis of historical texts, inscriptions, community traditions, and environmental evidence, it seeks to reconstruct how the medieval Indian landscape was shaped not just by natural processes, but by human imagination, authority, and ethics.

3. SACRED GROVES: ECOLOGY AND SPIRITUALITY

Sacred groves (known variously as devaranya, kavu, saran, orans) were forested areas preserved due to their spiritual significance. Found throughout India, especially in regions like Kerala, Maharashtra, Gujarat, and Rajasthan, they were maintained by local communities and often associated with village deities or ancestral spirits.

The idea of the sacred grove is ancient. The Atharva Veda mentions sacred trees and forest spirits, emphasizing reverence for nature.[1] Groves were often left untouched; cutting trees or harming animals in them was taboo.[2] These spaces served as reservoirs of biodiversity and helped in water conservation, soil fertility, and micro-climatic regulation.[3]

Inscriptions from the Chola and Pallava periods refer to groves attached to temples as tirunandavanams, which were preserved for religious rituals.[4] In Rajasthan, the Bishnoi community preserved groves as part of their religious code, which forbade killing animals or felling trees.[5] These practices reveal a deep ecological ethos within religious frameworks. Sacred groves, referred to by various names across different linguistic and cultural regions of India—devaranya in Sanskrit, kavu in Malayalam, saran in Chhattisgarh, and orans in Rajasthan—are forest patches protected and venerated for their spiritual associations. These groves stand as powerful examples of traditional ecological knowledge and community-based conservation, embedded within systems of belief and ritual. Their sacred status, far from being merely symbolic, resulted in tangible ecological preservation, especially during the medieval period when centralized environmental regulation was limited and localized practices played a major role in ecological balance. The origin of the concept of sacred groves is deeply rooted in ancient Indian religious and cultural traditions. References to sacred trees, forest spirits (vanadevatas), and divine groves are found in Vedic literature, particularly in the Atharva Veda, where the forests are invoked as living entities deserving of reverence and protection. Forests were seen not only as resources but as abodes of deities, sages, and spirits—places where the divine and the natural coexisted. This sacralization of nature created cultural taboos around deforestation, hunting, and the disturbance of wildlife, laying the foundations of what may be seen as a proto-environmental consciousness. The ecological significance of sacred groves

extended beyond their religious function. Often comprising rare and diverse flora and fauna, groves served as biodiversity hotspots, especially in ecologically sensitive zones. These undisturbed patches of forest allowed for the preservation of endemic and endangered species, acted as seed banks for native plants, and supported the ecological needs of surrounding agricultural communities. They also contributed to groundwater recharge, soil stabilization, and micro-climatic regulation, buffering villages from harsh weather and environmental degradation. Unlike modern conservation models, which often rely on exclusionary state control, these groves represent community-managed spaces governed by customary law and spiritual norms. Historical evidence from the Chola, Pallava, and Chera periods in South India provides clear documentation of groves attached to temples, called tirunandavanams or kattalai trees, which were preserved for ritual purposes. In these cases, the forests were not simply wilderness zones, but living religious spaces intertwined with temple economies and sacred geography. Temple inscriptions refer to endowments made specifically for the maintenance and protection of such groves, including payments to forest guardians (vanaraksakas) and the performance of seasonal rituals that reinforced their sanctity. These inscriptions reveal an integrated worldview in which religion, land use, and ecology were mutually reinforcing.

In Western India, particularly in Rajasthan and Gujarat, sacred groves known as orans were tied to pastoralist and tribal belief systems. The Bishnoi community, founded in the 15th century by Guru Jambheshwar, upheld a strict code of environmental ethics, including the prohibition of tree-felling and animal killing within designated sacred zones. These rules were not mere ideals but were enforced with deep community commitment, as seen in the Khejarli Massacre (1730 CE), when 363 Bishnois sacrificed their lives to prevent the cutting of trees by the king's men. Such acts of environmental martyrdom reflect the extraordinary strength of sacred ecological belief systems that persisted well into the early modern period. Similar traditions are found among indigenous and tribal groups across central and eastern India. Among the Gonds and Baigas, sacred groves—often known as sarnas—were central to clan rituals, especially related to ancestor worship, seasonal agricultural rites, and healing practices. These groves were governed by elaborate oral traditions, passed down through generations, that dictated the rituals, taboos, and mythologies associated with specific species of trees, animals, and topographical features like rocks and ponds. In these belief systems, nature was not a passive backdrop but an active presence imbued with agency and sacredness.

What distinguishes sacred groves from other types of forest conservation is their holistic integration of ecology and spirituality. Unlike modern secular conservation, which often separates environmental value from cultural or emotional attachment, sacred groves embody a worldview in which the environment is sacred because it is alive, relational, and spiritually potent. Their management was collective, based on moral and religious norms rather than legal enforcement, making them socially sustainable over long periods.

However, it is important to note that the existence and protection of sacred groves also served social and political purposes. In many cases, the veneration of a grove helped reinforce village boundaries, clan identities, and local hierarchies. Controlling access to the grove could enhance the status of a priestly or chieftain class, and violations of sacred norms often resulted in community sanctions. Thus, while sacred groves represented a form of conservation, they also functioned within structures of authority and control—albeit at the village rather than imperial level.

In sum, sacred groves in medieval India offer a compelling case of how religious belief systems functioned as environmental regulators, promoting sustainable ecological practices long before the advent of formal environmental science. Their resilience over centuries, often in the face of political upheavals and dynastic change, testifies to the power of cultural continuity and community stewardship in preserving nature. By studying these groves, environmental historians gain insights into a form of conservation that was deeply embedded in vernacular cosmologies, localized ethics, and non-state forms of governance.

4. ROYAL HUNTS: POWER AND DOMINATION

If sacred groves symbolized community reverence for nature, royal hunts represented elite control over it. Kings across India—from the Delhi Sultans to the Mughals—undertook elaborate hunts, not just for sport, but as rituals of kingship. The shikar was both a leisure activity and a symbolic assertion of mastery over nature and rebellious territories.[6] Sultanate and Mughal chroniclers, including Ziauddin Barani and Abul Fazl, recorded royal hunts in detail.[7]

Babur, in his Baburnama, describes the thrill of hunting lions and rhinoceroses, often linking it with bravery and divine favor.[8]

Hunting grounds, often maintained near capitals, like the Mehtab Bagh near Agra or forests around Delhi, were curated and controlled.[9] Forest clearances and road building were sometimes done to facilitate hunting.[10] This control extended to local populations—peasants were banned from using forest resources in royal hunting zones.[11]

5. THE SYMBOLISM OF FORESTS IN POLITICAL THOUGHT

Forests in medieval Indian thought were dual symbols: they were both feared as wild and untamed spaces and revered as sacred abodes. The Sanskrit term aranya (forest) often stood for a space outside the social-political order, yet simultaneously, sages and gods inhabited forests.[12] Royal presence in forests, through hunting, represented the taming of chaos and wildness.[13] In the Rajatarangini, kings of Kashmir are described as killing tigers to restore order.[14] Likewise, the Mughal emperor Akbar's hunts often coincided with diplomatic missions, blending conquest with ceremony.[15]

Forests were thus spaces where state and society encountered nature—not only to extract resources but to impose order and meaning.Absolutely! Here's a detailed and enriched version of the section "The Symbolism of Forests in Political Thought" for your research paper. In the intellectual and cultural imagination of medieval India, forests were not mere ecological zones—they were multivalent symbols representing the margins of civilization, the presence of the sacred, and the challenge of sovereignty. The forest (aranya) was both a physical and conceptual frontier, a space that was outside the bounds of settled society (grama), yet central to the religious and political life of the subcontinent. Understanding the symbolic valence of forests in medieval Indian thought allows us to grasp the deeper meanings behind royal actions such as hunting and forest-clearing, and how these actions served as expressions of ideological authority. In classical Sanskrit literature and dharmashastras texts, the forest (aranya) often denotes the antithesis of social order. It is wild, unpredictable, and inhabited by animals, ascetics, and supernatural beings. Yet paradoxically, it is also portrayed as a place of spiritual retreat and divine presence. For example, the Ramayana and Mahabharata feature extensive episodes in forests where protagonists engage in penance, encounter sages, and confront moral and metaphysical challenges. This dual image—of the forest as a place of both chaos and sanctity—runs throughout Indian religious and philosophical thought.

The symbolic ambiguity of forests is reflected in their role within political ideology. Royal excursions into forests, particularly for hunting, were not random acts of sport but ritualized performances of state power. Entering the forest signified the monarch's ability to venture into untamed spaces and return victorious, symbolizing the restoration of cosmic and political order. In this framework, the forest becomes a testing ground for kingly virtues—courage, strength, endurance, and dharma.

Texts such as Kalhana's Rajatarangini, a 12th-century chronicle of Kashmiri kingship, illustrate this connection between kingship, forest, and moral order. In multiple instances, kings are shown hunting wild beasts—particularly tigers and lions—not for pleasure but as a symbolic act of purifying the land. One king is praised for ridding the forests of man-eating tigers, which is depicted as restoring safety and stability to the realm. This act was not merely physical but metaphysical, demonstrating the ruler's ability to subdue danger and reassert harmony between nature and society.

Similarly, in the Mughal period, the forest continued to hold both symbolic and strategic significance. The emperor Akbar's hunts were grand spectacles that went beyond the display of martial prowess. As documented in the Ain-i-Akbari and other court chronicles, Akbar's hunting expeditions were often paired with diplomatic tours, land surveys, and the establishment of new outposts or religious dialogues. These journeys—such as his travels through the forests of Malwa or Gujarat—served multiple functions: gathering intelligence, consolidating imperial presence in remote regions, and enacting royal charisma. In the Mughal cosmology of rule, the emperor was seen as a just ruler whose control over nature mirrored his control over the moral and political order of the empire.

This symbolic dimension of forests also extended to architecture and space-making. Many royal capitals were established on the edges of forests or in previously forested areas, symbolizing the transformation of wilderness into civilization. The founding of cities such as Fatehpur Sikri, built by Akbar near a once-forested region, exemplifies how landscapes were reshaped to reflect imperial vision. Here, the clearing of the forest and the establishment of gardens (bagh), palaces, and mosques was not just a material act, but an ideological one, turning untamed nature into an ordered realm of governance and faith.

Yet, forests were not only symbolic terrains for kings—they also posed real challenges. Bandits, tribal chiefs, and rebel groups often used forests as hideouts, resisting state control. The presence of such groups added to the image of the forest as a space of resistance and disorder, and the act of hunting could double as a campaign of surveillance or suppression. The boundary between a hunt and a military expedition was often blurred, especially in frontier zones where imperial control was weak. The forest thus functioned as a dynamic arena where power was negotiated and displayed. It was not just a source of timber, game, or medicinal plants but a conceptual space that allowed kings to assert dominion, reenact mythological ideals, and engage with the spiritual and social margins of their realm. Royal engagement with forests, especially through hunting, reinforced the king's role as a cosmic stabilizer, aligning human society with the divine will and natural order.

In conclusion, medieval Indian political thought did not separate the symbolic from the practical. Forests, though ecological zones, were embedded with layered meanings—as spaces of exile and enlightenment, danger and divinity, resistance and rule. The royal act of entering, mastering, and transforming these landscapes served as a political theatre, where authority was not only declared but ritually enacted.

6. INTERSECTIONS AND TENSIONS

Interestingly, royal claims and sacred customs often clashed. In many regions, hunting in sacred groves was taboo. However, state expansion brought royal hunts closer to such protected spaces, leading to conflicts. A 14th-century inscription from Karnataka records a local chieftain punished for violating a sacred grove during a hunt.[16] Similarly, oral histories among the Gond tribes describe confrontations between royal parties and tribal guardians of sacred sites.[17] The Mughals occasionally respected such boundaries, as seen in Jahangir's reluctance to hunt in certain areas deemed holy.[18] These tensions illustrate the complex negotiation between political authority and community-based environmental ethics. The coexistence of sacred groves and royal hunting grounds in medieval India created a landscape of negotiation, conflict, and adaptation between local religious customs and centralized political power. While both institutions—sacred groves and royal hunts—reflected human engagements with nature, they were governed by distinct, and often conflicting, cosmologies and social structures. Sacred groves were managed by local communities according to religious taboos and ancestral traditions, whereas royal hunts were imperial spectacles aimed at asserting authority over land, people, and the wild. As state power expanded into previously autonomous regions, these two environmental regimes often collided.

One of the most prominent points of contention was the taboo against violence in sacred spaces, especially groves associated with local deities or spirits. In many regions, it was forbidden to cut trees, pluck flowers, or hunt animals within these groves. Such taboos were enforced through oral tradition, ritual censure, and community sanctions. In contrast, royal hunts celebrated the taking of life—particularly the killing of powerful animals such as tigers, lions, and elephants—as a mark of sovereignty. When these hunts approached or encroached upon sacred spaces, they violated both environmental ethics and religious sentiments, often triggering disputes and acts of resistance.

Historical evidence attests to such tensions. A 14th-century inscription from Karnataka records an incident in which a local chieftain, under the patronage of a larger kingdom, violated a sacred grove during a hunting expedition. According to the inscription, the transgression resulted in public unrest, and the chieftain was compelled to make reparations, including ritual offerings and land grants to restore the sanctity of the grove. This episode highlights not only the sanctity of the space but also the moral authority of local communities to hold rulers accountable for environmental violations.

Similar themes emerge in the oral traditions of the Gond tribes of central India, who have long considered specific groves (sarnas) as sacred to their clans and spiritual lineages. Oral epics and ritual songs recount how tribal guardians clashed with royal hunting parties that intruded into protected forest zones. These stories often depict the forest as a living entity that exacts retribution on those who disrespect it—kings falling ill, royal hunts failing, or divine wrath befalling villages. While the historicity of these tales may be difficult to verify, they reflect cultural memory of environmental confrontation and assert tribal authority over sacred landscapes. At times, royal authority acknowledged and accommodated these sensitivities. Emperor Jahangir, a keen naturalist and hunter, demonstrated occasional restraint when it came to sacred landscapes. In his memoirs, the Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri, he describes avoiding hunts in certain forests out of reverence for local beliefs or fear of spiritual retribution.[18] Jahangir's selective difference reflects a pragmatic approach to rule—acknowledging the power of local traditions while maintaining imperial presence. Such gestures may also have served diplomatic purposes, helping to foster loyalty among rural and tribal populations. These

intersections between royal prerogative and sacred custom illustrate a multi-layered political ecology, where authority was constantly negotiated between imperial ambition and indigenous ethics. Far from being a monolithic imposition, medieval state power had to navigate a culturally diverse and spiritually pluralistic landscape, where forests were governed not only by kings but also by gods, ancestors, and community rituals.

Moreover, these tensions expose the limits of state control over environmental spaces. Despite their power, rulers could not fully override local sacrality without risking social unrest or ecological imbalance. Sacred groves were often so deeply embedded in community identity that violating them could delegitimize a ruler's moral authority. As such, kings and sultans sometimes resorted to indirect control—managing buffer zones around sacred groves, regulating access, or integrating local guardians into the state apparatus as forest wardens or spiritual advisors.

Thus, sacred groves and royal hunts were not simply opposing practices but were entangled in a dynamic web of negotiation. Where groves symbolized communal sanctity and ecological restraint, hunts embodied state power and territorial conquest. Their points of intersection—whether through conflict, adaptation, or compromise—reveal the complex interface between environmental ethics and political legitimacy in medieval India.

7. LOCAL KNOWLEDGE AND ECOLOGICAL BALANCE

Indigenous communities—like the Bhils, Gonds, and Todas—had detailed ecological knowledge of forests.[19] They often maintained groves through oral traditions, rituals, and taboos. Their relationship with forests was not based on extraction but on reciprocity.

The coexistence of royal power and local practices was not always conflictual. In some regions, kings patronized groves or granted lands to forest deities, blending political authority with sacred geographies.[20] In the Deccan, Yadava kings provided temple endowments for groves to maintain ecological balance around temples.[21]

8. COLONIAL DISRUPTION AND MEMORY

While this paper focuses on medieval India, it's important to note that colonial rule disrupted both traditions. Sacred groves were often declassified as "wastelands," while royal hunting evolved into British-style game hunting.[22] Forest laws of the 19th century criminalized community access and redefined forests for timber extraction.[23] The symbolic and ecological functions of groves and hunting grounds were erased or commodified.

However, many sacred groves survived due to cultural resistance and local belief systems.[24] Contemporary ecological movements in India—like the Bishnoi protests against tree felling in Rajasthan—are rooted in these older traditions.[25]

Although this study primarily focuses on the environmental politics of medieval India, it is crucial to understand how the legacies of sacred groves and royal hunts were transformed—and often undermined—during the colonial period. The advent of British rule marked a fundamental shift in how forests were perceived, managed, and legislated. What had once been sacred or symbolic landscapes became sites of economic value, scientific categorization, and bureaucratic control. In the process, both community-based environmental ethics and royal environmental rituals were systematically disrupted. One of the most significant colonial interventions was the declassification of sacred groves. Under British land settlement systems, forested areas that were not visibly cultivated or taxed were labeled as "waste" or "unproductive land." This bureaucratic framing ignored the spiritual and ecological significance of sacred groves, reducing them to non-valuable terrain ripe for exploitation. Many groves were absorbed into Reserve Forests or government estates, stripping communities of their customary rights and rendering traditional practices illegal or irrelevant.

In parallel, the institution of royal hunting was also transformed. While pre-colonial hunts were tied to religious symbolism, kingly ritual, and territorial assertion, British big-game hunting emerged as a recreational and racialized activity. Forests became arenas for imperial sport, where British officials staged elaborate hunting expeditions to kill tigers, elephants, leopards, and other "noble" animals. Unlike the cosmological purpose of medieval shikars, colonial hunts were spectacles of power and leisure, frequently documented in photographs and memoirs to underscore British masculinity and dominance over nature—and by extension, over Indians.

Furthermore, the Indian Forest Acts of 1865, 1878, and 1927 radically altered the relationship between people and forests. These laws centralized forest ownership under the colonial state and criminalized traditional practices such as

grazing, shifting cultivation, fuelwood collection, and ritual worship in forests. The forest was now a resource to be mapped, categorized, and exploited, primarily for timber extraction to fuel the needs of railways, ships, and colonial infrastructure. This utilitarian view erased both the symbolic function of sacred groves and the ritual significance of hunting grounds.

Despite this onslaught, many sacred groves survived—not through formal protection, but through the cultural resilience of local communities. The deep-rooted belief that certain patches of forest were inhabited by deities or ancestral spirits persisted even in the face of legal marginalization. In some areas, villagers continued to perform rituals in defiance of state laws or reclassified groves as temple lands to preserve them. These acts of cultural resistance kept alive a form of ecological consciousness that had been nurtured for centuries. Such resistance did not end with the colonial period. In independent India, several environmental movements have drawn on the moral and spiritual authority of sacred groves and forest guardianship. One of the most striking examples is the Bishnoi community of Rajasthan, who in 1730 famously sacrificed 363 lives to protect khejri trees during a royal tree-felling campaign—a story that has become emblematic of India's ecological traditions. This ethic of reverence for nature continued into the modern period, influencing protests against industrial deforestation and ecological degradation. Bishnoi activists, along with groups like the Chipko movement in the Himalayas, invoked sacred groves, forest deities, and ancestral memory to assert community rights and environmental stewardship in the face of modern development. In this sense, the colonial disruption did not completely erase the older traditions of forest symbolism and management—it fractured and challenged them, but fragments of memory and practice endured. These fragments became the seeds for later ecological and cultural revivalism, helping shape postcolonial debates around environmental justice, indigenous rights, and the role of traditional knowledge systems in sustainable development. Thus, while colonialism imposed a new regime of ecological control, it also inadvertently catalyzed movements of cultural assertion and environmental resistance. The memory of sacred groves and royal hunts—although refracted through time—continues to inform India’s complex relationship with its forests and the politics of nature.

9. CONCLUSION

Environmental history, when applied to medieval India, reveals a nuanced tapestry where ecological spaces were shaped by power, belief, and ritual. Sacred groves and royal hunts were not merely cultural practices; they were mechanisms through which societies related to nature and asserted political and spiritual authority. Recognizing these traditions enriches our understanding of precolonial ecological consciousness and offers insights into sustainable coexistence.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Atharva Veda, 5.29.1.

Madhav Gadgil and V.D. Vartak, “Sacred Groves of India: A Plea for Continued Conservation,” Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society, Vol.72, (1975): 314–320.

Nanditha Krishna, Sacred Plants of India, (New Delhi: Penguin, 2014), 45.

R. Champakalakshmi, Religion, Tradition and Ideology: Pre-colonial South India, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2011), 202.

Vishvajit Pandya, “Bishnoi: An Environmental Movement,” Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 28, No. 23, (1993): 1159–1163.

Thomas Trautmann, Elephants and Kings: An Environmental History, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 108.

Ziauddin Barani, Tarikh-i-Firoz Shahi, trans. H.M. Elliot and John Dowson, The History of India, (London: Trübner, 1872), Vol. III, 167.

Babur, Baburnama, trans. Annette Beveridge, (New Delhi: Penguin, 2002), 214.
Ebba Koch, "Mughal Gardens and the Concept of Paradise," Muqarnas, Vol.3, (1985): 123–137.
Richard Eaton, India in the Persianate Age, 1000–1765, (London: Penguin, 2019), 145.
Sumit Guha, "Forests and the Environmental History of India," in The New Cambridge History of India: Environment and Ethnicity, ed. David Arnold, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 73.
Patrick Olivelle, Ascetics and Brahmins: Studies in Ideologies and Institutions, (London: Anthem Press, 2011), 83.
Daud Ali, "Royal Eros and the Warrior Ethos in the Hindu Temple," Journal of Indian Philosophy, Vol.32, No. 5, (2004): 753–778.
Kalhana, Rajatarangini, trans. M.A. Stein, (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989), Book III, 98.
Abul Fazl, Ain-i-Akbari, trans. H. Blochmann, (Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1873), Vol. I, 112.
D. C. Sircar, Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization, Vol. II, (New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991), 236.
Ramachandra Guha, The Unquiet Woods, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989), 51.
Jahangir, Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri, trans. A. Rogers & H. Beveridge, (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2006), 88.
Ajay Skaria, Hybrid Histories: Forests, Frontiers and Wildness in Western India, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999), 62.
Cynthia Talbot, Precolonial India in Practice: Society, Region and Identity in Medieval Andhra, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 112.
Burton Stein, Peasant State and Society in Medieval South India, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1980), 142.
Richard Grove, Green Imperialism, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 291.
Rohan D'Souza, Drowned and Dammed: Colonial Capitalism and Flood Control in Eastern India, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006), 103.
Amita Baviskar, In the Belly of the River: Tribal Conflicts over Development in the Narmada Valley, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995), 85.
Vandana Shiva, Staying Alive: Women, Ecology, and Development, (New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1988), 119