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INTRODUCTION

In the following pages an attempt has been made to give a comprehensive and authoritative picture of the Political Institutions and Administration of Northern India during c. 750 A. D. to 1200 A. D.

We have got monographs on the Mauryan and Gupta administration; the administration of the Rāśṭrakūṭas and the Cholas has been extensively dealt with by Dr. A. S. Altekar and Prof. Nilakantha Sastri in their works dealing with these dynasties. There is also a work by Dr. Mahalingam dealing with the South Indian Polity. Dr. R. S. Tripathi, Dr. D. C. Ganguli and Dr. Beni Prasad have got small sections in their work on the administration of Harsha, the Gūrjara Pratihāras, the Gāhaḍavālas and the Paramāras. But a work giving a comprehensive picture of the Political Institutions and Administration of Northern India as a whole during c. 750 to 1200 is still a desideratum.

Northern India during this period was divided into a large number of small kingdoms. Out of these, Kashmir and Kāmarūpa (Assam) led a sheltered life not much influenced by the currents outside their boundaries. Sindh had fallen under the Muslim rule and its Polity had become altogether changed. The history of the Punjab is shrouded in darkness for the greater part of this period. We get some clear picture of the events happening there under the Shāhis and the Tomaras. But our sources, especially epigraphical, are so scanty that we can hardly give any reliable picture of the administration that had developed there.

The Gūrjara-Pratihāras, the Chedis, the Chandellas, the Pālas, the Senas, the Paramāras, the Chaulukyas and the Chāhamānas were ruling over the rest of northern India during this period. They have left us numerous epigraphical records, which throw a lot of light on the administration of the age. Though these kingdoms were separate political entities, their records show that their political institutions and administrative machinery were on the whole of the same pattern. It is therefore quite feasible and reasonable to
delineate a picture of the Northern Indian Polity and Administration on the basis of a combined study of their epigraphs. It may also be observed that the records of each dynasty by itself are not copious enough to enable us to have a comprehensive picture of its administration.

The data of the epigraphical records has been supplemented by the information supplied by contemporary works on the political science (Niti) like the Sukraniti, the Kāmandakiya-Nitisāra, the Bārhaspatya-Arthaśāstra and the Purāṇas, which were most probably northern Indian in their origin, and by the Rājadarmakānda of Kṛityakalpataru of Lakshmīdhara and the Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja which were certainly north Indian. The evidence from these works has been supplemented by the data of the Mānasollāsa of Someśvara and the Nitiśākyāmṛita of Somadeva, which were written in the Deccān but in contemporary times.

The work deals with the period from c. 750 to 1200 A.D. During a part of this period, viz. from c. 840 to 950 A.D., greater part of northern India was under the political supremacy of a single dynasty viz. the Pratihāras. Its epigraphs, however, supply only scanty evidence about its administration. We have, therefore, supplemented this evidence with that supplied by the epigraphs of the Chedias, the Chandellas and the Paramāras, who were once its feudatories, and by those of the Gāḍāśavālas, the Chāhamānas and the Chaulukyas, who ruled over part of the territories once incorporated in the Pratihāra empire. The Pāla and the Sena dynasties are also included in our survey, because Bengal was usually coming into very close contact with the kingdoms in the Gangetic plane. It may here be pointed out that there was a general uniformity of cultural pattern in Ancient India. And hence the administrative structures of the different dynasties usually did not differ from one another in a striking manner. The account that one obtains from the evidence of a single dynasty is often fragmentary. The study of all the dynasties together gives us a comprehensive and comparative picture; we have therefore offered here a picture based on the records of all the dynasties taken together.

The first chapter deals with the different sources available for reconstructing the picture of the Indian Polity and
Administration of our period. They are mainly literary and epigraphical. In connection with the former, we have taken the opportunity to give a brief synopsis and to make an estimate of the contents of the different Niti works that were composed during our period. The dates of the Niti works as given in the authoritative books on the Dharmashastra literature have been generally accepted. In the case of the Sukrasu, however, we have discussed its date in great detail and it is hoped that our treatment of this topic will be found to be substantially original.

The second chapter deals with problems connected with the Kingship. It describes in the beginning how the institution of kingship had become hereditary. The reader will find how the Vedic form of coronation disappeared during our period and was replaced by the Pauranic one, where emphasis was laid upon the different propitiatory rites, the bath with Paushchagavya and the rubbing of the different limbs of the king with the earth collected from different localities. It is hoped that this contrast between the Vedic and Pauranic coronation, first pointed out in this work, will be found to be new and interesting. The scope of the king’s education was widened in our period; the curriculum now included the study of Silpastra, Kamastra, Arthashastra, Astronomy etc, in addition to the study of Dharmashastra, Mimamsa, Danashu and Varta, which were earlier included.

This chapter also deals with the problem of the Divinity of the king and shows how the school of political writers on the one hand was advocating the theory of functional resemblance between some of the deities and the virtuous kings, and how, the school of courtiers on the other hand was declaring the king to be an incarnation of God on the earth. It also describes how only the virtuous king was regarded as a divine incarnation or as people’s trustee by our political writers. The position of the junior princes of the royal family has been critically dealt with in the light of contemporary data. How the crown prince was regarded as indispensable in the administration, how younger princes also took prominent part in the Government, how proper provision was made for the maintenance of the queens and the younger
princes—all these problems are dealt with in this chapter. The reader may find here much that is new.

In the third chapter, the reader will find a vivid picture of the Ministry based on scores of contemporary inscriptions. Ministers do not figure so prominently in the records of the earlier period as they do in those of our age. The epigraphical material about the ministry is as rich as, if not richer than, the observations of the Śrīmad writers. As a consequence, the reader will find the account very realistic. The chapter reveals how the ministers were regarded indispensable for a good government, how their posts had tended to become hereditary and how their secretaries were sometimes eventually promoted to the ministry itself. There is also detailed information about the way in which the business of administration was carried on by the ministry and about the different formulas of approving the order by the ministers. In all this treatment, the reader may find much that is interesting and new.

In the fourth chapter, the reader will find a clear picture of the Central Secretariat and its various departments. How the secretariat used to control the provincial and district administrations through its inspecting staff is indicated by a number of documents. The records also throw light upon the various frauds committed in case of land grants and the steps taken by the state to counteract them. An attempt has been made here to correlate the data of the Nīti works and epigraphical records to give a connected account of the working of the different departments.

The fifth chapter deals with Army administration. It is mainly based on the information given by Śukra. It gives us an interesting account of the units, constituents and composition of the army. How soldiers were recruited from all the castes, how they had to maintain discipline, how they had to go through daily exercises, how they were paid regularly and were often rewarded by gifts, how pension was given to the families of dead soldiers—all these problems are dealt with in this chapter. It may be pointed out that most of this information is conspicuous by its absence in other Nīti works. The reader will therefore find a good deal of this chapter substantially new.
The sixth chapter deals with Territorial Divisions. The reader will find a variety in the extent and nomenclature of the different territorial and administrative divisions that prevailed in the various kingdoms during our period. The Provincial, District, Town and Village administrations have also been described in this chapter. Here also the information supplied by our inscriptions is checked, compared to and contrasted with the data supplied by the earlier and contemporary inscriptions as well as with that of the works on polity. The reader will not find much information about the provincial and district administrations. The provincial administration was probably carried on old lines. The district administration was apparently not so well organised, as it was in the Gupta period. We do not get any reference to the district council, supervising over the district administration.

As far as the Village Administration is concerned, the reader will find that it was not so well-organised as it was in the contemporary South India. An attempt has, however, been made, as far as possible, to correlate the data scattered over the Niti works and the contemporary South Indian inscriptions, to give a detailed account of the village administration.

The seventh chapter deals with Revenue and Expenditure. In the beginning, principles of taxation are discussed and then the problem whether the Brāhmaṇas were exempted from taxation has been briefly dealt with. Various aspects of the land tax have been considered in detail and along with it, the question of the ownership of land has been critically examined in the light of the valuable data supplied by the Niti works and by early and contemporary inscriptions. A number of taxes on ordinary articles of consumption like the tax on leaves, coconuts, barley, cattle fodder, cotton fabric, oil, butter, sugar, candied sugar, have come to light. There were also a number of miscellaneous taxes levied upon shops, houses, wells, water wheels, as well as on dancing girls and people indulging in gambling. Different sources of government income have also been critically dealt with. The chapter concludes with a discussion on state expenditure.
The eighth chapter deals with Judicial Administration. The functions and duties of the king as the head of the judicial administration, as well as those of the chief justice and lawyer, have been first dealt with. The fundamental principles followed by Hindu jurisprudence have then been critically discussed. Some light has also been thrown upon the popular courts. The judicial procedure is not dealt with because it belongs to the sphere of judicial and not general administration.

The ninth chapter deals with the relations between the Feudatories and the emperor. In the beginning reasons are given why the principle of non-annexation was followed in Ancient India, leading to the existence of a number of feudatories. Privileges enjoyed by the feudatories of different grades have also been dealt with.

It may be pointed out that continuity and conservatism were the characteristics of Indian polity and therefore the above picture may not appear to be strikingly new. This however cannot be helped. It may be, however, claimed that the book represents a critical study of almost all the available material, both literary and epigraphical, and seeks to give a comprehensive, comparative and critical picture of the nature and the working of the political institutions and administration of Northern India, which has so far not been available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.V.</td>
<td>Atharvaveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Br.</td>
<td>Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.Ś.</td>
<td>Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.S.I.W.G.</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of India, Western circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.S.I.A.R.</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.D.S.</td>
<td>Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.G.</td>
<td>Bombay Gazetteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.I.</td>
<td>Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions of Kathiawar, published by the Bhavanagar Archaeological Department, Bhavanagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛhaspatya</td>
<td>Bṛhaspatya-Arthaśāstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.I.I.</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.K.</td>
<td>Dvīḍrayakāvya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.I.</td>
<td>Epigraphia Indica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.</td>
<td>Epigraphia Carnatika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td>Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by her own Historians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.D.S.</td>
<td>Gautama Dharmasūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.</td>
<td>Indian Antiquary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.</td>
<td>Inscriptions from Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.H.Q.</td>
<td>Indian Historical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A.S.B.</td>
<td>Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B.B.R.A.S.</td>
<td>Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B.O.R.S.</td>
<td>Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.N.S.I.</td>
<td>Journal of the Numismatic Society of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.A.S.</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāmāndaka</td>
<td>Kāmāndakanītisāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. ktr.</td>
<td>Rājadharmakānda of Kṛityakalpataru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.bh.</td>
<td>Mahābhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu</td>
<td>Manuṃṛiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nārada</td>
<td>Nāradasṃṛiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nek</td>
<td>Nītivākyāṃṛita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
( xii )

Rāj
Rājatarangini
R.V.
Rigveda
Rāshtrakūṭas
Rāshtrakūtaś and their Times
Śukra
Śukranitisāra
Śat. Br.
Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa
S.I.I.
South Indian Inscriptions
T. Br.
Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa
V.S.
Vājasaneyā Samhitā
Walters
Walters, on Travels of Yuan Chwang
Yāj
Yājñavalikyaśmrīti

Transliteration

In the transliteration scheme followed in this work, the following are the main points to be noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>भा</th>
<th>बा</th>
<th>वा</th>
<th>शा</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>उ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>छ</td>
<td>च</td>
<td>च्छ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ट</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ड</td>
<td>ढ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व</td>
<td>व</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श</td>
<td>ष</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ष्ठ</td>
<td>ष्ट</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ध</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न</td>
<td>न</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न्त</td>
<td>न्त</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्त</td>
<td>त्त</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>थ</td>
<td>थ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ष्ठ</td>
<td>ष्ठ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ष्ट</td>
<td>ष्ट</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ध</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ध्व</td>
<td>ध्व</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न्त</td>
<td>न्त</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्त</td>
<td>त्त</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्व</td>
<td>त्व</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व</td>
<td>व</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व्ह</td>
<td>व्ह</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ळ</td>
<td>ळ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ळ्व</td>
<td>ळ्व</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व्ह</td>
<td>व्ह</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ळ्व</td>
<td>ळ्व</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER I

ORIGINAL SOURCES

A

Literary Sources, their Time and Nature

The work deals with the political institutions and administration of Northern India during medieval times from c. 750 to 1200 A.D. The sources on which we have to rely are mainly of two categories, literary and epigraphical. A few Muslim travellers visited the country during this period, but their observations on the government of the country are not important. Alberuni, the most famous among them, has written a voluminous account of India and its culture; but he usually confines himself to astronomy, mathematics, mythology and religious and social conditions. He makes a few observations about law, judicial procedure and punishments, but his information seems to be merely a summary of some of the Smṛitis, he had studied. There is nothing original about it.

Among the literary works, we have naturally to attach great importance to the books on Niti-śāstra. The important works in this category are Kāmandaṅkaniśāra of Kāmamandaka, Śukraniti of Śukra, Nītivākyāmrita of Somadeva, Bṛhaṅpatya-Arthasāstra of Bṛhaspati and Rājadharmanāṇa of Kṛtyakalpataru of Lakṣmīdhara. We have two other minor works, the Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja and the Mānasollāsa of Somesvara; but they are not of much importance to our enquiry. The Smṛiti writers of our age also make some stray observations about the political thought of the period, but these are of a minor nature. These works are mostly concerned with ritualistic matters. Some of the Purāṇas have chapters on topics connected with the administration, but originality is not their strong point. Commentators like Medhātithi, Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara also have a few observations to make about the political thought and administration, but they have hardly any new light to throw upon the subject.
DATES OF SOURCE BOOKS

There is some difficulty, however, in utilising the above literary data. The precise time of the majority of the above writers is not known. The dates of some of them are subjects of great controversy. It is not possible here to enter into a discussion of the rival views; that would fall in the province of the historian of Sanskrit literature. For the purpose of this study we have generally accepted the dates proposed by scholars like Mahāmāhopādhyāya P.V.Kane, Dr. A.B. Keith and Dr. R.C. Majumdar. The case of the Śukraṇīti has, however, been discussed in detail in this chapter, as doubts have been expressed as to whether it can be legitimately utilised for reconstructing a picture of the administration of this period.

The question whether all the Nīti writers belonged to Northern India is also difficult to answer. The Rājadharma-kāṇḍa of Kṛityakalpataru was written in Madhyadeśa, as its author Lakshmīdhara is definitely known to have served the Gālāvāla king Govindachandra as his minister of peace and war in the second quarter of the 12th century. Similarly the Nītiyākṣyāmrīta of Somadeva was written in the Deccan; the author, who was a Jain, is definitely known to have flourished during the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛiṣṇa III (c. 940-968). But as the Jain monks were usually travelling throughout India, it is very likely that Somadeva’s book would have been based upon his observations in India as a whole. The internal evidence shows that the book is mostly based on the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭīlya, which was certainly written in Northern India. Bhoja, the author of the Yuktikalpataru flourished in Mālwā in the first half of the 11th century and Someśvara, the author of the Mānasollāsa in the Deccan in the second quarter of the 12th century.

DATE OF KĀMANDAKA

As regards the remaining Nīti works, their dates and provenance are both unknown. K.P. Jayaswal had placed Kāmandaka in the 5th century; P.V. Kane in the period between 400 and 600 A.D., R.C. Majumdar in the 7th century (Ancient India, p. 471) and A.B. Keith in c. 700 A.D.
Out of these writers, P.V. Kane and R.C. Majumdar give no reasons for the dates they have accepted. Jayaswal's theory depends upon the identification of Kāmandaka with Śikharasvāmin of the Karmadaṇḍā inscription, for which there is no convincing evidence. A.B. Keith gives the following arguments:

"It (Kāmandakanīti) is not known to the Pañchatantra in its oldest form nor to Kālidāsa, who both rather use the Arthaśāstra; even Daṇḍin seems to be unaware of it, but Bhavabhūti's mention of the nun Kāmandakī may have significance, though that dramatist, like Viśākhadatta in his Mudrārākshasa, used the Arthaśāstra. Vāmana knows it (c. 800), so that the date may be c. 700, though others have put it contemporaneous with Varāhamihira. Its presence on the island of Bali in the Kawi literature is of no importance, as it was not till the tenth century that that literature flourished to the greatest extent."

The above arguments may not be weighty and conclusive, but it is not unlikely that the picture, which the book gives about the political thought, institutions and administration, may be true of the beginning of our period.

THE DATE OF THE ŚUKRANĪTI

It is necessary to fully discuss the problem of the date of Śukranīti as a wide divergence exists among scholars on the point. We therefore propose to discuss the question thoroughly, as we have utilised that work extensively in this study.

The date of the Śukranīti is still a question of great controversy among different scholars. G. Oppert, who edited the work first, thought that the book belonged to the same period which produced early Smṛiti and epic literature. His view was, however, based on the assumption that the use of fire-arms was not unknown to ancient India. Pradhan while writing on the kingship in the Śukranīti, placed the work in the 4th century A.D. (Modern Review, February, 1916); K.P. Jayaswal, while reviewing Criminal Justice in Ancient

2. As quoted in B.K. Sarkar's Positive Background of Hindu Sociology, p. 64.
India, expressed the opinion that the book is a product of the 8th century of the Christian era (Modern Review, February, 1916).

In his Ancient India (2nd edition), R.C. Majumdar has stated at one place (p. 471) that the Šukraniti is of quite a late date, as it refers to fire-arms; but in the same work, elsewhere on p. 442, he has pronounced the book as one of the latest political treatises written in ancient times and has utilised its contents to describe the political theory and administration between c. 300 to 1200 A.D. Beni Prasad holds that the book cannot be earlier than the 12th or the 13th century, and represents the last summing of Hindu political thought (Theory of Government, p. 245). B.K. Sircar points out that like the Mahābhārata and the Manusmṛti, the book is a composite one and that it went on being expanded through several centuries (The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology, pp. 63-71). He, however, holds that the passages referring to the nine gems (IV, 241ff.) and to the doctrine of seven metals, would have been added to the book in the 10th and 14th centuries respectively.

U.N. Ghoshal places the book at the beginning of the period, 1200 to 1625 A.D. and considers it to be the last notable achievement of the Hindu genius on political speculation (Political Theories, p. 249).

Rajendralal Mitter, P.C. Ray and Panchanan Niyogi placed the work in the 16th century (Positive Background, p. 64).

It appears that, as observed by B.K. Sircar, the work is a composite one containing several early passages along with later ones. We also agree with U.N. Ghoshal and R.C. Majumdar in holding the work as one of the latest political treatises of the ancient Indian period. There are, however, some curious passages in the book, which contain a combination of the terminology of the late Vedic period with the coinage of the Muslim age, as where the incomes of swarāṣ and virāṣ are given as 50 lakhs and 10 crores of silver karshas, each weighing 100 rattis (I, 183ff.). Passages like those, which prohibit the killing of the enemy, when he is asleep or without arms (IV, 7, 355-7) are mere copies of the earlier rules in Manu (VII, 90) and are
generally not true of our age; the same is the case of the statements, which deny any property to the wife and the son.

Let us first try to fix the approximate date of the passages referring to small and large guns and the composition of the gun-powder, which are probably the latest additions to the book. It is no doubt true that the most detailed information on these topics is supplied at IV. 7. 195-213; but this does not mean that the rest of the book was not at all touched by the latest redactor. In Chapter I, he refers to the soldiers with guns protecting the king (I. 231). In Chapter II also he insists that the commander-in-chief of the forces should be an expert in the use of the gun and the gun-powder (II, 95); he does not forget to garrison the forts with guns and the artillery corps (II, 195).

When did the latest redactor introduce these innovations? It is usually believed that as the gun-powder was used in India by the Mughal conquerors, the date of the latest additions to the book should be the 16th century. This view, however, need not be necessarily accepted, because we have now definite evidence to show that in the 14th century, Vijayanagar was not unaware of the use of the fire-arms. Firishtah, while describing the loot secured by the Muslim conquerors in the campaign of 1368 against Vijayanagar, includes three hundred gun-carriages in it (Saletore, Social and Political life in Vijayanagar, p. 430). Even if we reject this passage as of doubtful authenticity, we have the definite evidence of two Karnataka inscriptions, showing that guns were used by the Vijayanagar troops in the 14th century; one of them refers to the death of the matchlockman (Kapi-kara) Devayya Nayak in 1388 (E.C., VIII, Sh. 433, p. 8 and part II, p. 218), while the other refers to an attendant, whose duty it was to supply gun-powder to the fighters riding on an elephant (E.C., VIII, Sa., 68, p. 104, part II, p. 282). The epigraphical evidence thus clearly shows that in the 14th century, India was not unacquainted with the use of fire-arms and gun-powder and hence the date of even the latest additions in the Sukraniti need not be placed later than c. 1400 A.D.

In I. 385 ff., Sukra refers to a silver coin weighing 100 rattis and gives the revenues of villages and the incomes
of the different grades of rulers in that currency. It is to be noted that a silver coin weighing 100 rattis or about 170 grains was not current in the first millennium of the Christian era; it was first popularised in India by the Pathan kings, who issued silver currency of the standard of 165 to 175 grains from the 13th century. Hence the passages in the *Sukraniti* referring to the silver coin of 170 grains should also be taken to be added to it in the 13th or the 14th century.

The pattern of the book is however fundamentally different from that of the books on the Dharmaśāstra and Nitiśāstra, which were composed after 1150 A.D. These later works are of the nature of Nibandhas or digests, discuss each topic, give the views of earlier writers upon it, but do not necessarily conclude it with their own views. The digest writers usually choose prose for making such comments as they want to offer. We give below some specimen pages of the *Rājadharmakānda* of the *Kalpataru*, pp. 22 to 26.

**Athāmātyāḥ**

_Tatra narādhāpā iti anuvṛttau Tājñāvalkyāḥ:_

(One and half verse quoted)

_Manaḥ:_

One verse quoted with the remark, _labdhalakṣṇyāṃ pari-dṛśkaṇḍakamaṇaḥ._

(Four more verses of _Manu_ quoted).

_Matsyaśpurāṇa:_

(Three verses quoted).

_Rājaguhānuvṛttau Kātyājanāḥ:_

(Three verses quoted).

Commentary on them:_—_Mantriṇāḥ rājakṛityeshu. Sabhyāḥ prāyaśchittādau. Vaidyāḥ chikitsāyām._

_Mahābhārat:_

(One verse quoted).

_Tathā_ (Three anonymous verses quoted).

_Matsyaśpurāṇa:_

(Three verses quoted).

Commentary. *Vyūhatantra*vīdāhānajñāḥ, Chakradañḍādyākārāsainya-sannivesaḥ. Taṣṭa tantram śāstraṁ, tena vyūhaprakāram yo jānati._

(Five more verses from the _Matsyaśpurāṇa_ quoted).

Commentary. _Anākṛtyāḥ parairabhedaḥ._
(One more verse from the same Purāṇa quoted).
Commentary, Akṣarākṣhitā akṣaparipālakah.
(22 more verses from the Matsyapurāṇa quoted).
Commentary, Svāsana ṛṣidhāsanaḥ.

The above will give an idea of the style and pattern of the Rājadharmakāṇḍa of Lakshmīdhara and it is generally followed by the Rājanitiśākya of Devanabhaṭṭa (c. 1300 A.D.) the Rājanitiratnākara of Chanaḍeśvara (c. 1325), the Nītimayākha of Nilakanṭha (c. 1625) and the Rājanitipraṅkāta of Mitramiśra (c. 1650). The latest redactor of the Śukraniti does not follow this new pattern; on the other hand he copies the pattern followed by Kāmandaka, Bṛhaspati and Somadeva. The author discusses each topic, and gives his own independent view upon it in great detail; he, however, rarely refers to the views of earlier writers. The main body of the book therefore can hardly be later than c. 1200 A.D.

We have so far tried to show how the main portions of the book cannot be placed later than c. 1200 A.D.; we shall now see how far its polity reflects the condition of our period. It may be pointed out at the outset that though some portions were added to the book by c. 1400 A.D., the administrative structure and the designations of officers as given in the work do not show any points of contact with those of Vijayanagar, which was the most prominent Hindu kingdom in the 14th century. In Vijayanagar,¹ the provincial viceroys had their own ministers, but Śukra does not refer to them. The term Nāyaka, used to denote both the provincial viceroys and petty officers, is unknown to Śukra in that sense. In Vijayanagar, the secretary was called Rāyasa; Śukra calls him a Lekhaka; officers in Vijayanagar like Nirvāhaka, Kāryakartā, Sāsanāchārya are conspicuous by their absence in Śukra. Territorial divisions in Vijayanagar were known as Kheḍa, Kharvaṭa, Droṇamukha, Śimhāsana, Nādu, Koṭṭam, etc., Śukra, however, does not at all refer to them.

All this evidence clearly shows that the latest redactor has not borrowed anything from the Vijayanagar polity. There was hardly any well-settled Hindu Government in the north during the period 1200 to 1400 A.D., whose polity could have

¹. Salestère, Social and Political life in Vijayanagar, 263-268,
materially influenced the account of Sukra. We may therefore well conclude that the *Sukraniti* does not give much information about the polity of the period later than c. 1200 A.D., though it probably received its present final form in c. 1400. It may be further noted that words like the Diwān, the Kotwāl, the Peshvā and the Vakil, which became common in the Muslim period, are conspicuous by their absence in the *Sukraniti*.

It is felt in certain quarters that the designations of the different ministers have a modern air about them and may have been borrowed from the medieval Rajput polity. However, this is not corroborated by evidence from medieval Rajput History.¹ Out of the names of the ten ministers in Sukra, only Purohita and Pradhāna were current in Rajputana; Sachiva, Mantrin, Paṇḍita, Sumantra, Amātya and Prāḍvivāka were not at all known to Rajput polity.

We need not, however, suspect that the designations of the ten ministers may be modern merely because they are not referred to by any earlier writer on polity. It is interesting to note that Sukra alternatively speaks of a ministry of eight also (II, 71-72) and this is very nearly the position of Someśvara and Manu, who advise a ministry of seven or eight. In the Hindu period, we thus find a ministry of eight not unknown. When Shivaji performed his coronation, he formally constituted a ministry of eight, members of which were known as Ashtapradhānas at that time. The Rājaniti of Chittis and a contemporary paper known as Jābatā, both refer to eight ministers and their functions, while describing Shivaji’s coronation.² It is from these two sources that we learn that the designations of Shivaji’s ministers were similar to those of Sukra, though the functions of some of them were not identical. Out of the eight ministers of Shivaji’s ministry, Pradhāna, Paṇḍitarāo, Senāpati and Mantrī were discharging functions similar to those in the *Sukraniti*. Prāḍvivāka of Sukra becomes Nyāyādhīśa of Shivaji. Sachiva is the war minister according to Sukra and the contemporary Jābatā, but

¹. I am thankful to Dr. M.L. Sharma for information on this point.
Chief Secretary according to Chitnis. Sumantra, who is a treasurer according to Šukra, becomes a foreign minister according to Chitnis and the Jābatā. Purohita is included in the ministry by the Jābatā but not by Chitnis. Pratinidhi of Šukra has been excluded from Shivaji’s ministry, but when Rajaram had to leave Mahārāṣṭra and take refuge in Jinji, this post was created and given to Ramachandra Panta Amātya. We may well conclude that in the ancient period also, it was only when the king was unable to function that this post was created and filled.

It is well known that Shivaji was a revivalist and tried to base his polity on the ancient tradition. The original kernal of the Šukraniti must have been a book of established reputation, at least about 300 or 400 years old since Shivaji chose to name his ministers more or less on the pattern suggested by Šukra. These names given by Šukra may well have been in vogue even before his time; only Manu and others somehow did not mention them.

We have so far tried to show that the Šukraniti in its present form cannot be placed later than the 14th century, we shall now try to settle the earliest possible date for the book as a whole. It appears from a number of passages that the work cannot be earlier than c. 800 A.D. The inclusion of Dharmasāstra and Puraṇa in Trayī (I, 390), the numbering of Vidyās as 32 and not 14 (IV, 3, 24), the references to the Tantras and Tāntrikas (II, 184; II, 122), the mention of the bhāmas of metals (IV, 3, 33), all point out that the book cannot be earlier than c. 700 A.D. Then we have the references to Mlechchhas as residing in the north-west, and following their own scriptures (IV, 4, 35-36) and having their own Yāvana-mata, which maintained that God was invisible (IV, 3, 30). These would obviously show that the book cannot be much earlier than c. 800 A.D.

The book seems to be belonging to the age of the Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja (c. 1050 A.D.) and the Mānasollāsa of Somesvara (c. 1125 A.D.). Its long sections on the Khadgalakshana, (IV, 7, 215) atvaparītksha (IV, 7, 142-148). and gajalakshana (IV, 7, 32-42) are unknown to earlier works on polity, but recall similar sections in the Yuktikalpataru (pp. 140-147; 181-193; 193-205) and the Mānasollāsa (BR II, Chap. VI,
pp. 79-90). It may be therefore contemporaneous with them. Besides these points, there are a number of facts to show that the general outlook of the book is that of the period 800-1200 A.D.; they are the following:

1. The book refers to the use of the term Sāmanta both for a feudatory and a high official (I, 189); this was common in the Deccan of our period.¹

2. The price of gold is stated to be sixteen times the price of silver (IV, 2, 92); this ratio is accepted by Bhāskarāchārya (J.N.S.I., II. p. 2-12). In the Pathan period, the ratio was 10 to 1.

3. The author does not like women to become officers (III, 44). It will be shown in Chapter II how women officers were practically non-existent in northern India of our period.

4. In IV, 2, 13, the author lays down the principle that the treasury should have a reserve equal to 20 years revenue; this principle seems to have been followed by the Hindu states during our period, for otherwise Mahmud of Ghazni and Mahmud of Ghor would not have been successful in carrying huge plunders from the defeated kings.

5. The inclusion of the delabhāshā (regional language) and Yāvanamatalam in 32 kalās (IV, 3, 30) would also indicate c. 1200 A.D. as the time of the work.

6. In IV, 3, 50, Śukra describes Vedānta as a doctrine, which advocates that Brahma alone is the reality without a second, that multiplicity has no real existence and that it is due to Māyā and Ajāna; this is the view of the Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara; apparently the Viśishtādvaita of Rāmānuja (c. 1200 A.D.) had not yet become popular.

7. The injunction that princes should not be made governors or allowed pensions (I, 345-347) was also followed in our period (J.A.S.B. XII. 104; X. 209; XIV. 104).

8. The tax on houses and shops, referred to by Śukra

¹ Datta, the foreign minister of Dhruva, was also a Sāmanta; E.L., X, p. 89.
in IV, 2, 129, also existed during our period (see Chap. VII. E.I., XIV. 309).

(9) In IV, 4, 63, Šukra refers to the building of the temples of Vishnû, Śaṅkara, Gañeṣa, the Sun and Devi; this Panchāyatana worship is believed to have been made popular by the great Śaṅkarāchārya.

(10) Šukra’s section on the building of a capital (1, 214) recalls a similar section in the Rājadharmaṇakānda of Kṛityakalpataru of Lakṣmīdhara written in c. 1150 A.D.

(11) The principle that the cavalry should be one-fourth the strength of the infantry (IV, 7, 19) was followed in our period at least by some states. In the Chandella army, that opposed Mahmud of Ghazni, there was the same proportion (Chap. V.).

(12) In I, 382, Šukra advocates resort to a strong fort in times of difficulty; many of the Hindu opponents of the Muslims were following this policy during c. 1000 to 1300 A.D.

(13) The injunction that peace should be concluded even with an Anārya, because otherwise he might uproot the kingdom (IV, 7, 243) recalls the conduct of many of the Hindu kings of the 11th to 13th century, who decided to make terms with the Muslim conquerors with the hope that they might thereby survive.

(14) In IV, 2, 95 ff, Šukra refers to the prices of a number of articles in silver pala, which was a coin weighing 320 rattis, equal to ten silver Kārshāpaṇas. Several Orissa inscriptions belonging to the early medieval period (c. 800 to 1000 A.D.) mention the annual revenues of villages in silver palas (J.N.S.I. XV, 139). So the time of Šukraniti would not be very much later than 1000 A.D.

Each of the above fourteen points by itself may not carry any definite conviction about the date of the work. But when they are taken together, they tend to show that the main kernal of the work, apart from the passages borrowed bodily from earlier works and later additions referring to silver
karshas, and gun-powder etc., belongs to the period, c. 800 to 1200 A.D.

I think that we are therefore well justified in utilising the work as a source book for our period.

We have utilised the political thought contained in the Niti works of our period in the body of the book. Nevertheless some remarks are necessary about the contents and important features of these books as works on polity. The account given in these books is sometimes traditional; sometimes it is merely a summary of the theories of earlier works like the Arthaśāstra and the Manusmṛiti. But there are several sections in some of them, which give us a glimpse into the new features of the polity as developed in our age.

Let us now discuss the important features of the above-mentioned Niti works. We shall give a brief and running commentary upon their contents, which will be useful in judging them as source-books.

KĀMANDAKANĪTISĀRA

The Kāmandakanītisāra need not detain us long, as it is merely a metrical version of certain portions of the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya. Kāmandaka himself has admitted that he is merely summarising the work of Kauṭilya; however, occasionally he gives his own views also. He recognises the importance of āṇāṇa and holds before us the traditional social and moral ideals. He discusses the ends and aims of the state and maintains that the interests of the ruler and the ruled are identical. He extols moral discipline in the king and describes his duties, functions and responsibilities. He refers to a number of rulers, who perished due to their wickedness and immoral character. Considerable space is also devoted to the education of the prince and the personal safety of the king. The duties of the smṛti (courtier) towards the king are also discussed in great detail. Valuable information is also supplied about the criminal (Kaṇṭakaśodhana) court. The seven constituents of the state are also discussed in detail. Importance is given to the proper control of the army. Considerable attention is paid towards the problem of the Maṇḍala.
There are certain important omissions in the Kāmanda-
kanītaśāra as compared to the original work. Kauṭilya devotes
one chapter to republics (or oligarchies), but Kāmandaka
does not do so, probably because they did not exist during
his period. Similarly chapters dealing with the personal,
civil and criminal law, which are among the important
contributions of the Arthaśāstra, are not at all touched and
discussed by Kāmandaka. The probable reason for this was
that during our period, some writers like Bṛhaspati and
Nārada had specialised in this branch and Kāmandaka did
not feel it necessary to cover the same ground again.

We may in vain look into the book for information either
about the ministry or about the departmental heads, either
about the provincial or about the district administration.
Taxation is also passed over. The king and the courtiers
dominate the picture indicating thereby that the royal court
with its numerous courtiers had now become the most im-
portant feature of the state.

ŚUKRANĪTI

The Śukranīti is a more comprehensive and important
book on the Political Science than any other book dealing
with the subject with the exception of the Arthaśāstra of
Kauṭilya. According to Śukra, it is the nīti, which is the
main cause of the stability of society, so necessary to secure
livelihood of the citizens. Nīti is the source of dharma, artha
and kāma. It enables us to follow the correct path of duty,
so that we may get salvation. It secures livelihood to all
and promotes social peace and order, rendering family life
and pleasures possible. Non-conformity to Nīti is usually
dangerous to a king; he should therefore always act accord-
ing to Nīti for the welfare and prosperity of his kingdom
and his subjects. The kingdom will become weak, the army
will be inefficient, the civil service will be disorganised and
the state will get topsyturvy, if the king will not follow the
rules of Nīti.²

1. Sarvopajñāvakaḥ lokasthitikṛnṛntiśāstraḥ,
Dharmārtha-kāmamālaḥ hi-smṛitur mokṣhapradām yataḥ, Śukra, I, 5.
2. Bhinnāṁ rāṣṭratam balaṁ bhinnāṁ bhinnomāthādikā gaṇāṁ,
Akausalyaṁ nṛpasyaitadānīturyasya sarvaśād. Śukra, I, 19.
Sukra deals only with the monarchical type of Government and divides his book into four chapters. The first chapter deals with the king and discusses in great detail his qualities, duties, functions and responsibilities. Valuable information is given about king's education. The problem of the divinity of the king has also been tackled in this chapter in an interesting manner. Unlike any other work, it supplies information about the different grades of feudatories and their incomes. The rules of inheritance are also discussed in great detail. While describing the lay-out of the capital, it informs us at what place the capital should be built, where the king's palace should be situated, how many courtyards it should have, where the court and the museums should be situated, what should be the length and width of the rāja-mārgas, mārgas, vithis and foot-paths. Considerable light is also thrown upon the construction of the council chamber. Town-planning is also discussed in detail. Interesting and minute instructions are given about the seating arrangement in the court. Where, how, and in what direction, the princes, their sons, the king's brothers, uncles, elder members of the royal family, the preceptor, the ministers, etc., should sit in the court, is described in an interesting way.

Incidentally there is a discussion in this chapter about the weights and coins, which is not relevant to its main theme. There are however many such obiter dicta in the book.

The second chapter mainly deals with the high officers of the state, their duties and functions and their relations with the king. The members of the ministry naturally come first in this connection, and their functions are fully described. We are also given a clear insight into the day-to-day working and functions of the ministry. The state expenditure is also discussed in this chapter, probably because the officers were mainly connected with it. It may be pointed out here that no other writer on polity has discussed the different items of state expenditure and the percentages to be spent on them. Valuable and detailed information is also given about the different kinds of state documents like jayapatra or the document of judgment, ajñāpatra or the document of order, prajñāpatra or the document of notification, sāsanapatra or the document of public notice, prasādapatra or the
document of royal favour, bhogapatra or the document of possession; these are not mentioned in the earlier works. It may be noted here that during our period, numerous royal grants were issued for different purposes and hence they were given different technical titles. The attitude of the king towards the courtiers and followers is also discussed in this chapter. How the courtiers are to be treated, how they should behave towards the king, what are their duties towards the ruler, all these questions are fully discussed.

The third chapter does not deal with the political thought or the administration. It describes certain customs and traditions and deals with some problems connected with social organisation. Problems connected with the family life like the attitude of the father towards his son, the attitude of men towards women, are also tackled here. There is also some discussion about the extent of the educational courses. Greater concern is shown towards the branches of learning like Mimāṃsā, Tarka, Itihāsa, Arthasastra, Kāmaśāstra, Silpaśāstra, Alankāra, Kavya, etc., and prejudice is expressed against the Vedic scholarship. Emphasis has been laid upon the importance of Āchāra and Dharma. The relative importance of Āchāra and Śruti is also discussed. The advantages of travel are also referred to.

The fourth chapter deals with a number of topics like the forts, allies, judicial and military administration, and the problem of taxation. There is also a section dealing with the different arts and sciences, and the social customs and institutions.

The section devoted to the 'forts' describes their eight kinds of varieties and discusses their importance. It may, however, be noted here that Kauṭilya refers to only four varieties of forts and is silent about the parikhā, parighā, sahāya and saivya forts mentioned by Śukra.

The section dealing with 'Allies' does not reveal any thing new. Like other political writers, Śukra also describes the nature of different kinds of policies, namely sāma, dāna, danda and bheda, and the circumstances under which they are to be followed. The use of danda is recommended to be avoided as far as possible. The king is advised to ascertain his own limitations as well as those of his subjects.
As regards the judicial administration a number of principles are laid down, but there is nothing new about the information given.

The section devoted to the army administration is very important. Nowhere else we get so detailed and interesting an account about the army, its constituents and administration. How the soldiers were recruited from all the castes, how they were trained, how they had to go through daily exercises, how they were paid and rewarded—all these topics are discussed in great detail. There is also interesting information about the different varieties of horses, camels and elephants, which formed part of the army. How to judge the age of these animals, how to select the best among them and how to train them—all these are dealt with in great detail. Different kinds of weapons are also described. The description of gun and gun-powder is a special feature of this chapter; it is not referred to by earlier writers. This section is perhaps the latest addition to the original work as already stated above.

As regards taxation, a number of interesting principles are enunciated. Valuable information is supplied about the different kinds of taxes that were imposed upon merchants, cultivators, shop-keepers, traders, etc. We are also given a clear insight into the nature and varieties of different kinds of gems and precious stones. The prices of a number of articles are referred to; this enables us to have an idea of the economic life during our period.

It is worth noting that there are several striking points of resemblance and difference between the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya and the Śukraniti of Śukra. Both discuss the duties and daily time-table of the king and hold similar views on the topic. Proper education of the prince is emphasised by both; Śukra, however, includes new sciences like astrology and useful arts in the king’s curriculum, which are not mentioned by Kauṭilya. Both deal with the topic ‘restraints of organs’, the discussion is, however, more systematic in the Arthaśāstra than in the Śukraniti. Necessity and importance of the ministry is recognised by both; Śukra, however, gives a better glimpse into the working of the ministry and into the functions of different ministers than Kauṭilya. Both attach importance to the careful selection of the ministers. Testing of ministers
is, however, more detailed systematic in the *Arthasastra* than in the *Śukranīti*. Distinction between *anātiya* and *mantrin* is made by Kauṭilya, while Śukra does not do so. Both deal with the topic *raja-patraraṇakaṇaṇa*; Śukra, however, deals with it in greater detail than Kauṭilya. Both discuss the topic *anujitivṛttam*; Śukra however gives more detailed information about it than Kauṭilya. The sixfold policy and the nature of alliance are discussed by both. In this connection, Kauṭilya gives a more comprehensive account about the nature of different kinds of expedients than Śukra, who only enumerates them. About the replenishment of treasury, Kauṭilya suggests a larger number of expedients than Śukra. Principles of taxation are discussed by both, but the treatment of Śukra is more vivid. Spies do not occupy a prominent place in the *Śukranīti*, while in the *Arthasastra*, there is a detailed description about the spy organisation.

Topics of civil and criminal law are not dealt with by Śukra as by Kauṭilya. Problems connected with the law of marriage, divorce, remarriage, maintenance of women, rules regarding the sale of buildings, boundary and field disputes, recovery of debts, taking of oaths, resumption of gifts, ownership, sale without ownership, robbery, gambling, protection of artisans and merchants etc. are not discussed by Śukra. The reason was probably that in this period Nārada and Br̥haṇapati had separately dealt with the civil and criminal law, and hence Śukra had merely touched some of the topics concerning them in order to make the book more comprehensive.

According to Śukra an ideal state is one where the use of force is non-existent and where every thing goes on right lines without any external compulsion;¹ society has become law-abiding by instinct and so there is no necessity for the use of force. The king and the subjects both should act according to law, for it is only by following Dharma that one gets happiness in this world.² The king is not above the law but subject to its jurisdiction.

---

¹. *Apreritaḥākaraṁ sarvarāṣṭram bhaved yathā,
   Tathā nītisvandhārya nyāpaveśāṁ mahatiyā vai.* Śukra. I, 18,
². Śukra, I, 24.
The state, as described by Śukra, is an organism composed of seven elements, namely the king, the minister, the treasure, the territory, the fort, the army and the ally. It may be noted that earlier writers had also recognised these seven constituents of the state and regarded them as the limbs of the body politic. Śukra, however, goes a step further in comparing them to the different limbs of the body, which hardly any writer before him had done. The king is compared to the head, the minister to the eye, the ally to the ear, the treasure to the mouth, the army to the mind, the fort to the arms and the country to the legs. The state has been thus regarded as a living organism; it may, however, be pointed out that the cells and limbs of the living organism have no separate existence of their own and cannot function independently, while the seven constituents of the state have their own separate existence. New states can also be established with the help of only some of the constituents like territory, treasure, forts and king.

The king, as the head of the body politic, is the main cause of social progress and prosperity. He is to identify his interest and welfare with those of his subjects and look upon them with equality. He has to promote dharma, artha, kāma and learning. He has to work hard for the material prosperity of the subjects and has to make arrangements for their amusement and recreation. He has to impose only just taxes and has to protect the properties of infants, minors, widows and of all persons, who are unable to manage their estates. He is further called upon to support the helpless, the aged, the blind, the cripple, the lunatics, the widows, the orphans and those suffering from diseases and calamities by giving them medicines, shelter, food, and clothing according to their requirements.

The king is to be virtuous and self-disciplined, for otherwise, he cannot rule successfully and cannot enjoy prosperity. He is also himself expected to be well-versed in the arts and sciences and to be skilled in the use of arms and weapons (1, 47-48).

1. Drigamātvyāḥ suhrit śrotroḥ mukham kośo balaṁ manah, Hastau pādau duṅga-rāshtrau rājyaṅgāni Smritāṇi hi. Śukra, I, 62.
As regards the theory of the divinity of the king, Śukra has merely conceded a certain functional resemblance between the king and the divine guardians. He only admits a good and virtuous king to be divine and boldly declares unlike any of his predecessors that a bad and vicious king is rākṣasa (demon) incarnate; he does not hesitate to add that the subjects do not owe the duty of obedience to such a ruler. He further states that the king, who forsakes his duty, oppresses his subjects and falls from the high ideal, is a dacoit in the form of a ruler (II, 257) and unhesitatingly allows the subjects to oust such a king and to put an end to his maladministration (II, 275).

Unlike any other political writer, Śukra has made a further advance in declaring the king to be a trustee, while describing his duties. He has asked him not to spend the royal treasury for his own private use. The king was of course to tax the people; but he must promise that in return of taxation he will protect them. The king is thus regarded as the servant of the people (IV, Sect. 2, 130).

The king is further not regarded as infallible. Śukra points out that it is the king, who sets the fashions, people follow them more or less due to helplessness. If, therefore, he leads a vicious life and the subjects follow his example, he is accountable to God for not only his own sins but for those of his subjects as well, and is thus liable to be condemned to hell (I, 87).

As regards the problem of the succession to the throne, the eldest son is to succeed the king. Other princes should be given an allowance equal to one-fourth of the privy purse of the king. They should also be appointed as governors of the provinces. In the absence of a son, the daughter's son is allowed to succeed. There is, however, no reference to an adopted son as a possible successor (II, 15, 32).

No other writer on polity except Śukra gives us the names of different departments held by various ministers, Śukra’s ministry consisted of the following 10 ministers, namely the Purohit, the Pratinidhi, the Pradhāna, the Sachiva, the Mantrī, the Prādhyāvāka, the Paṇḍita, the Sumantra, the Amātya and the Dūta. The functions of these ministers are described in detail in chapter III.
Officers, says Śukra, should be appointed not on caste consideration, but according to their capability, merit and character (II, 54). They should be promoted to the post of the minister in due course (II, 115), if they have proved their capacity by their merit and achievements. Śukra further recommends the occasional transfer of ministers from one department to another, so that an able minister may get the chance of working in a department, more important than the one to which he had been originally appointed. It is worth noting that the transfer of a minister from one department to another is not referred to by any earlier writer on politics.

Śukra also lays down that in disputes and complaints, the king should take the side not of his officers but of his subjects and should dismiss a government servant, who is accused by one hundred men. ¹ He should also dismiss those members of the public service, who go astray more than once.

The state, as envisaged by Śukra, was an organisation for the welfare of the subjects. It was not only to preserve law and order by suppressing crime and disorder and supervising and controlling gambling and drinking, but it was also to maintain hospitals and to establish rest houses, where new-comers should be allowed to take rest after proper examination of their bonafides. The State was to increase the resources of the country by developing forests and working mines. Agriculture was to be promoted by constructing and repairing tanks, dams, and canals and by bringing waste land under cultivation; Important economic transactions were to be under the supervision of the state. The state was not to tolerate counterfeit currency and false measures and weights (II, 358). It was to promote commerce by securing the safety of roads.

The state was not merely to be content with promoting the material prosperity of its citizens, it was to promote their

¹ Prajaśatena sauvīśiṣṭāṁ sauvīṣyāvedadhikāriṇām, Amātyamāpi sauv-
vikṣhya sakṛidanyāyaśāminām, Ekkante daṇḍayet spaśṭaṁmahābhyāśat-
pakritāṁ tyajet, Anyāyavartinām rājyaṁ sarvasvam cha hareṇgripāḥ. Śukra, I, 376-77.
moral and spiritual welfare also by appointing special religious inspectors. It was also to improve the social order and to encourage learning, education and art by subsidising learned academies and extending patronage to scholars.

Famine was to be provided against by keeping large stock of grains sufficient for the needs of three years. There were no war loans; in case of need, the state had to rely on the hoarded wealth of the rich people by promising them to return it, when prosperity returned.

Unlike any other book, the Śukraniti deals with the leave rules and holidays of the royal servants. In cases of illness, the servants were to get leave on 1/2 or 3/4 of the pay drawn by them. Men with forty years of service were to get pensions equal to half of the salary enjoyed by them; in cases of premature death, their wives and children were to receive pensions.

**NĪTIVĀKYĀMṚITA**

The Nītivākyāmṛita of Somadeva is a book mainly devoted to the political institutions and administration. Its value, however, is relatively not so great as that of the Kāmandakaniti. Somadeva, like Kāmandaka, also follows Kauṭilya, while discussing the political topics. He has got a happy way of expressing ideas in a concise form, as he had a nice command over Sanskrit. His work is characterised by pun, humour and short pithy sentences. He emphasises the harmony between the different Purushārthas and recommends a balanced synthesis, when he states that everything has got its own value except when it is carried to an excess.

Somadeva recognises the supreme importance of political discipline and regards the state as an end in itself. He lays great emphasis upon the proper education of the king, who was expected to be well-versed in the four branches of learn-

1. Śukra, IV, Sect II, 40.
2. Śukra, IV, Sect II, 26.
3. Śukra, I, 406.
4. Śukra, II, 410.
5. Śukra, II, 413.
ing, namely, āvākṣhiṃkī trayī, vārtā, and daṇḍanītī. He also discusses the qualities necessary for a good king, and gives us a clear insight into royal functions and duties. He recognises the importance and necessity of the ministry and insists upon the careful selection of the ministers and discusses their qualifications. He considers the problem of the strength of the ministry and gives a careful analysis of all the possibilities regarding its number. He describes in detail, how deliberations should be held in the council and how they were to be kept confidential. He warns the king against the dangers of over-taxation; taxes should not be unjust and excessive. He insists that the state expenditure must not exceed the income. He supplies interesting information regarding the oaths taken by the members of the four castes in the law courts.

While dealing with the army, Somadeva lays down that it should be kept under control and should be in readiness to ward off attacks. The forces should be regularly paid. He also recognises the importance of diplomacy and deprecates severity and treachery in war. He refers to a number of historical instances of bad kings perishing through misconduct. Some of these are known to us from earlier works, while some others like Śūdraka, Śaktikumāra, etc. have not yet been identified. He has obviously utilised some later events in history and does not rely merely upon old and traditional instances.

Along with the Rājanītī, Somadeva also deals with some social topics and problems. He recognises the social importance of castes and disapproves intercaste marriages. He, however, had no inherent prejudice against lower castes; he believes that even a Śūdra can be a pious and useful citizen, if he has sincerity and good conduct. He is harsh against those who take or offer bribes.

The Nīlivākyāṃśīta on the whole is not of much importance as a source of information on polity and administration, as it is mostly conventional in its information.

BĀRHASPUTYA ARTHASĀSTRA

The Arthasāstra of Bṛhaspati is a small book on polity, hardly of any important value. The book is written in the
Sūtra style, but its contents show that it does not belong to the Dharmasūtra period (c. 500 to 100 B.C.), it obviously belongs to a much later age. It professes to deal with the administration as a whole, but all the topics are not dealt with. Bṛhaspati exalts dandavāti to the rank of the supreme and only science. He lays down the qualities that are necessary both for the king and the ministers. He insists upon the proper selection of ministers; he is not in favour of young men being appointed to the office of the counsellor. He recognises the importance of ministerial advice and recommends the king to act according to it. While dealing with the working of ministry, he states that a policy is to be executed only after it has been carefully examined by councillors. The king is further advised to follow the policy of conciliation, diplomacy, and if necessary, that of gifts to ensure success.

The state, as envisaged by Bṛhaspati, has to preserve law and order. It was to promote religion by maintaining temples and encouraging festivals. Agriculture was to be promoted by constructing and repairing tanks. The state was to establish rest-houses for the convenience of travellers. It was to encourage education and to extend protection to all. Bṛhaspati, however, gives special privileges to Brāhmaṇas, for he exempts them from the capital punishment.

RĀJADHARMĀKĀṆDA OF KRITYAKALPATARU OF LAKSHMĪDHARA

The Rājadharmākāṇḍa of Krītyakalpataru is an important source for the polity of our period. It was composed by Lakshmīdhara, who was himself the foreign minister of the Gāhāḍavāla king Govindachandra. One may expect from the title of the book that it should be dealing with all the topics connected with the administration. But such is not the case. Lakshmīdhara gives unequal treatment to different topics. It is further to be noted that the book being a digest (nibandha) merely quotes the views of earlier writers like Manu, Yājñavalkya, Vishṇu, Kātyāyana, Śaṅkha, Gautama, Nārada and Bṛhaspati; the Purāṇas are also re-
quisitioned. It however occasionally gives the views of Lakshmīdhara himself in short explanatory notes.

The author divides his book mainly in three parts. The first part deals with the seven elements of the state. It begins with the rājaprastānasā and devotes about one hundred pages in describing the king's qualities and duties, the qualifications of the ministers and other royal officers, the different varieties of forts and the importance of treasury, kinds of allies, princes' training, judicial administration and the development of the kingdom's resources. The fundamental principles are hardly discussed by the author while dealing with these topics; he merely quotes the views of his predecessors. We are therefore not enabled to draw from the work any realistic picture of the actual administration during the 12th century.

The second part of the book deals with the six-fold policy and military march. In the discussion of these topics, nothing new is revealed.

Religion was in ascendency during this period; Lakshmīdhara therefore devotes one-fifth the portion of the book in describing the different rituals connected with coronation. Even while doing this, the author nowhere refers to the political importance of the ceremony; he only describes the different rites that are to be performed and the different mantras that are to be recited. The coronation oath, which once formed one of the most important features of the ceremony, is nowhere referred to. It may be noted that while describing the rituals, Lakshmīdhara attaches great importance to superhuman factors in ensuring worldly success. According to him, rituals should be correctly performed and certain deities should be worshipped for the welfare of the state. He further holds that every one should act according to Dharma; even the king cannot go against it. He has to maintain the norm in order that the society may progress and the individuals, who compose it, may succeed in the aims of life.

The main importance of the work lies in its giving us a glimpse into the new attitude of our age, where religion dominated. To Lakshmīdhara, rituals were of great consequence than the principles of administration and mantras were more important than the administrative details. The
impression left on our mind is that the ideal king of the author is more concerned in following the requirements of rituals than the rules of administration.

MĀNASOLLĀSA OF SOMEŚVARA

The Mānasollāsa, composed by or attributed to the Chālukya king Someśvara, who flourished in the first half of the eleventh century, professes to be a work on polity. It is divided into five viṃśatis, namely, Rājyapṛāptikāraṇa, Rājya-sthairyakāraṇa, Bharturupabhogakāraṇa, Pramodakāraṇa and the Kṛiḍāviniṃṭati; out of these, the second viṃśati alone deals with some aspects of polity.

The first viṃśati deals with the requisite qualifications of an ambitious king, who desires to extend his dominion. The king is advised to be truthful, to avoid excessive anger, to follow the correct path, etc. He is asked to offer oblations to his forefathers (pītytarpaṇa) and to respect and to take proper care of his guests (āśāpurājana).

The second viṃśati, as has been already pointed out deals with polity. The qualities of the king are enumerated first, but there is nothing noteworthy in the treatment of the subject. The author merely gives the summary of the views of the earlier writers in this connection. He then discusses the strength of the ministry and holds that it should consist of seven or eight ministers and that the king should consult them separately on important matters (II, 39-59). As regards the duties and qualifications of the different ministers and officers like the Koshādhyaksha, Pratihāra, Sārathī, Sūda, Vaidya and Antahpurādhyaksha, there is nothing particular about them, their functions are the same as those described by the earlier writers. The author, however, gives interesting information about the duties and qualifications of the Dharmādhikārīn, Sāndhivigrahika, and Senāpati. The Dharmādhikārīn was to be well-versed in Śrīdhīṣṭastra (II, 22). The Sāndhivigrahika was to summon the different feudatories at proper time, to have discussions with them and then to send them back with proper instructions (II, 138). The Senāpati, apart from possessing the military qualities, was required to have the knowledge of omens and
medicine; the former was probably for ensuring victory in the battlefield and the latter for the proper arrangement, and care of the wounded soldiers. The treasury should always be full of gold, silver, jewels, costly clothes, ornaments and nishkas in order to meet any national calamity (II 394-7). The king should keep one-fourth of the state revenue in the treasury, as a kind of national insurance and should spend the two-thirds for dharma, artha and kāma (II, 540). Land tax should be 16 per cent. The king should impose 6% tax upon honey, butter, meat, flowers, fruits, medicinal plants, etc. 10% duty should be levied upon the goods brought to the harbour by the sailors (II, 374-76). Brāhmaṇas should be exempted from taxation.

Forts should be constructed as protection against the enemies and they should be stored with plenty of cash, arms, drugs, horses, tigers, lions and serpents. The inclusion of lions, tigers and serpents in this list is rather unexpected. They were not intended for any zoo in the fort, but were to be let loose on the besieging army to create panic and confusion. Besides the six traditional types of forts, Someśvara refers to three more, those built with stones, bricks and mud (II, 5). It would appear that these new types of forts were getting popular in our period. He speaks of the traditional four-fold army and mentions a number of weapons like clubs, battle-axes, knives, tridents and machines to throw missiles. He also refers to a weapon called sella-chakra, whose nature is not clear (II, 683). According to him, warfare permits all kinds of acts, like the burning of houses, destruction of crops (II, 1076-78), breaking of dams (jalaśaya), amputation of the limbs of the civil population in enemy's country, etc. He refers to the different kinds of expedients, but interprets Āsana and Dwaidhiḥbhāva in a different sense. According to him Āsana is encampment of the army and not a policy of neutrality and Dwaidhiḥbhāva is duplicity and treachery and not the policy of war on one front and that of peace on another. The king should always protect his subjects from wicked persons, thieves, army officers and revenue officers (Kāyasthas). While

1. This latter is the view of Kauṭilya, A.S. VII. 1.
emphasising upon the duty of protection, the author puts before us a beautiful simile; just as a man loses his strength due to diseases, so also the king, due to rebellions (II, 158). As regards the internal administration, the author advises the king to appoint officers over one, ten and hundred villages, who are to report to the king about what is wrong within their jurisdiction.

The second vināti on the whole does not give any new and valuable information about the polity of our age. The author is more concerned in displaying his knowledge of other subjects than that of politics. Thus while enumerating the king’s qualities, he devotes much space to the description of chemical science (Rasāyana) necessary for king’s health, and of the fevers and other diseases, from which he may suffer. Similarly, while describing the duties of Purohita, he deals with Pañchāṅga-nirṇaya in great detail. We also get detailed information about mathematics, multiplication, division, trairāśika and byihadrāśika in the section dealing with the Koshādhyaksha. Different kinds of nidhīs are mentioned in the section dealing with treasure troves and various popular beliefs are given as to how to discover them. We have also a discussion about the different ratnas, namely, mauktika, padma, indranīla, marakata, etc.; long sections are devoted to describe how to examine them. One whole chapter is devoted to Aśvavaidyaka (II, 570-619) and another to Gajachikitsā (II, 630-674) in connection with the section dealing with the army. The author also refers to a number of astronomical beliefs like Nakshatraśila Śvaśakuna, Kākaśakuna, Pingalāśakuna, etc. (II, 753-948), while dealing with an enemy’s invasion.

We thus see that there are many topics discussed in this book, which have no connection with its subject-matter. The author hardly refers to the administrative machinery of his age. We do not get sufficient and adequate information about the functions and duties of ministers and the departmental heads, the provincial and the district administration are hardly touched. The book, on the whole, discloses no originality of thought or treatment.

While the second vināti deals at least with some aspects of polity, the third, fourth and fifth vinātis deal with only
the personal and private life of the king, the administrative structure of the period, is altogether passed over in them.

The third vināśati deals with the twenty kinds of upabhogas or enjoyments. Long sections are devoted to describe the building of new houses (mandira-nirmāna), worship of Vāstu or the site of the palace, painting, iconometry, varieties of pictures, etc.

The fourth vināśati treats of the twenty kinds of Vinodas or royal sports among which the Gaja-vāhyālivinoda (the sport with elephants in the arena) and the turagavāhyāli-vinoda (Modern Polo) are quite interesting. There is also a long section on Music, which equals in length the whole of first two vināśatis. The fifth vināśati deals with different kṛidās or sports of the king and is not even remotely connected with government and administration.

YUKTIKALPATARU OF BHOJA

The Yuktikalpataru is traditionally attributed to the king Bhoja of the Paramāra dynasty, who flourished in the first half of the 11th century. It is a small and unimportant book on Niti containing hardly any new political thought or theory. The author’s interest in polity seems to be limited, he devotes only 20 pages out of 230 to the topic. The remaining portion of the book deals with diverse topics like the precious stones and their varieties and values, weapons, vehicles, ships, ship-building, animals like the elephant and the horse and their varieties etc. It also discusses at length town planning and its administrative machinery.

As observed above, the book devotes only twenty pages to polity and discusses a few topics without giving any new information. The first chapter deals with the importance of Niti and informs us, how the prosperity of a king, who does not follow Niti, fades away (p. 2, V. 10-11). Among the principal officers mentioned by it are the royal preceptor, the priest, the minister, the secretary, and officer of the harem, etc., who are to be appointed after a careful examination (p. 2, V. 13). The second chapter deals with the qualifications for the different officers; they are, however, traditional and do not reveal anything new. The third chapter, besides discussing
the qualifications, functions and duties of different superintendents like those of horses, elephants, forests, etc., emphasises upon the importance of the prosperous treasury. It may be pointed out here that like Ṣukra and Somadeva, Bhoja also states that the treasury is more valuable to the king than the breath itself (p. 5, Vs. 30-31). In order to meet the national calamities, the king is advised to keep an overflowing treasury (p. 5, V. 32). Agriculture is to be promoted by protecting and helping farmers, as it is the main source of prosperity (p. 6, V. 40). The fourth chapter deals with the four-fold divisions of the army, namely, the infantry, the cavalry, the elephants and the chariot corps, and informs us how the particular arm is useful for a particular place of warfare (p. 7, V. 45). The navy is also referred to. The Chapters V to XIII dilate at length on the problems of the foreign policy and warfare, but there is nothing new in the treatment as the author usually gives the views of his predecessors bearing upon these and similar topics. The 14th chapter deals with justice, law and punishment. Danda alone is the cause of the stability of the society. It promotes dharma, artha and kāma and establishes law and order in the society (p. 15, V. 103). The king is asked to inflict upon the offenders just punishment otherwise people will be distressed and will lose faith in him (p. 15, V. 106). A policy is to be settled in a secret meeting; women and foreigners should not be present at that time (p. 17, 116). The chapters XV to XVII deal with forts and their different varieties. It may be here noted that Bhoja gives a new term called dvandva to denote the fort; this is not used by any other writer.

The book, on the whole, possesses no intrinsic value to the student of political science, as it merely gives the summary of the views of the earlier writers. It hardly describes the administrative machinery of the state, nor does it inform us how the central secretariat used to function. Taxation is passed over. The provincial, the district and the village administrations are not touched at all.

**PURĀNAS**

The Purāṇas also help us to some extent in under-
standing the political ideals of the period. They are no doubt religious in character, but some of them like the Agni-Purāṇa and the Matsya-Purāṇa deal in great detail with the state and the administrative structure. They describe the origin of the state and inform us, how there was an ideal state of nature in the Kṛita Yuga, how later on people became greedy, how they began to fall foul with one another, how the law of the jungle began to prevail in society, how then Brahma Deva, the chief of gods, composed a code of law and created and appointed Virājas as a king. The Purāṇas also lay down elaborate rituals for coronation, which will be discussed in the second chapter. They also give us a clear insight into the different duties of the king. The king is advised to rule righteously, for otherwise he will be condemned to hell. The Purāṇas discuss the problem of the divinity of the king and while doing so, they usually accept only the functional resemblance between the king and some of the deities. They advocate the saptāṅga theory and regard the seven elements of the state as interdependent upon one another. They regard the ministry as essential for the good government and refer to a number of officers in charge of various departments. The conduct of courtiers is also discussed in great detail. Problems connected with taxation are also dealt with. The dishonesty in commercial dealings, the use of false weights, etc., are to be severely punished. Great space is also devoted to an exhaustive discussion on the problems connected with the foreign policy, peace and war. Considerable light is also thrown upon the maṇḍala of kings, and the policy to be followed in connection with its different members and the ways and means by which to establish one's ascendancy among them. They also comment upon the manner in which the warfare is to be carried on. They emphasise the importance of maintaining a powerful and efficient army. They also insist upon the proper administration of justice and deal with civil and criminal law.

It may, however, be noted that while dealing with these topics, the Purāṇas usually summarise the views of Śrīmītis and Nīti-writers and rarely enunciate their own theories. They therefore hardly throw any new light upon the subject under discussion.
The above account will give an idea of the light, which books on polity throw upon the political institutions and administration of our age. Their account is more than 75% traditional and based upon the views of earlier writers. To rely upon them for reconstructing the picture of the state and administration during our period would not be very sound. We shall have to check their views from purely historical evidence supplied by contemporary inscriptions. We shall therefore now make some observations about the inscriptions as a source material for our purpose.

B

EPIGRAPHICAL SOURCES

The stone and copper plate inscriptions are, as already observed, the most important source of information for reconstructing a picture of contemporary administration. They are no doubt usually donative in character, but they throw considerable light upon some of the aspects of the administrative system that prevailed during our period. It is true that all the statements made in these records may not be trustworthy, as they are mostly written by the court poets. But the eulogists would make exaggerative statements usually regarding the merits and achievements of kings and the nature of their victories in war, and not about the administrative structure and political ideals of the age. Inscriptions often discuss the duties and functions of the king. They sometimes enunciate interesting maxims about the aims and ideals of the Government. They also inform us how provision used to be often made for the maintenance of queens and princes by giving them land or revenue assignments. Now and then they reveal the important part played by the crown-prince and other princes in the administration.

Several inscriptions supply considerable information about the ministry. They refer to a number of ministers, describe their duties and dilate upon their relations with the king. They also inform us, how very often, the hereditary principle was followed in making ministerial appointments. How the ministers were honoured by the feudatory titles is revealed to us by some records.
Some inscriptions also give us a good insight into the working of the secretariat. How the secretariat used to control and inspect the provincial, district, town and village administrations, how it used to take steps to counteract fraudulent grants, how the documents concerning the land grants were kept carefully in the office, how they were renewed, is discussed by some of our epigraphs in an interesting way.

The inscriptions also give us valuable information regarding the different nomenclature used for the different territorial divisions that prevailed during our period.

Considerable information is also supplied by the epigraphs about the district, town and village administrations. They inform us how the popular elements played an important part in the local administration. They describe how the members of the village and town councils were elected or selected. They refer to the executive committees of these councils and inform us how they were constituted. They give us a clear insight into the different works of public utility carried out under the auspices of village and town councils.

The records also supply valuable information about the taxation, when they enumerate the dues from which the donees were exempted. Taxes collected from farmers and merchants often figure in our records. We see how the customs duties were levied upon ordinary articles of consumptions like leaves, barley, coconuts, fruits, grains and cattle-fodder, how the excise duties were levied upon oil, butter, sugar, and jaggery, how taxes were imposed upon the houses, wells and water wheels,—all these facts are disclosed by our records. The inscriptions also refer to a number of taxes imposed upon the shopkeepers, dancing girls, gamblers and distillers. Besides, these taxes, some epigraphs also refer to a number of other sources of state income. They will be discussed in detail in the chapter VII.

Our records often throw light on interstate relations and give us an idea about the relations between the suzerain and the feudatories. They often describe the causes of the war and the punishment that was inflicted upon the rebels. They sometimes refer to a number of indignities inflicted upon the feudatories, when the former had rebelled and were deposed from the throne,—how they were forced to surrender their
forces, treasures, horses and elephants for their disloyalty and how they had to do the menial work in the camp of the emperor. The records sometimes give us a clear insight into the measure of the internal autonomy enjoyed by the feudatories of different grades. They also inform us how the activities and the affairs of the kingdoms of the feudatories were often controlled and supervised by some imperial officers. The inscriptions are thus a very important source of information about the political ideals, institutions and administration of our period, if they are used with proper circumspection.
CHAPTER II

KINGSHIP

Section A : The King

King-in-ministry was the normal form of government throughout India during our period of survey. The feudatory states were also governed by the same machinery. So far we have not yet come across any literary or epigraphic evidence, which can prove the existence of the non-monarchical form of government during our period. The foreign travellers also do not speak of any republic existing during our period, they refer to the existence of monarchy only.

(1) Kingship hereditary, not elective

Kingship at this time was hereditary. References to a king's election occur extremely rarely, and they are more figurative than real. Gopāla, the founder of the Pāla dynasty, is no doubt described in one record as being elected by the prakṛiti.¹ Since this statement is made in the course of an eulogy, we should carefully examine it to find out whether it is true. The record clearly declares that Gopāla had put an end to anarchy and restored law and order in Bengal, people therefore must have welcomed his rule enthusiastically. This circumstance would have led the court poet to state that Gopāla was elected by the prakṛitis.² Even if such was the case, numerous Pāla records show that none of his successors owed his crown to any election, the principle of heredity, and not the method of election, governed the succession in the Pāla dynasty.

In the Deccan also we come across a similar case. In

---

2. Prakṛiti can denote the people, ministers or high officials. If Gopāla was at all elected king, it was probably by his ministers rather than by the people. Harṣa was offered the crown of Kāñcān by its ministers, and not by its people.
one of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records, we are told that Amogha-
varsha III was requested by the feudatories to accept the
throne for supporting the glory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire;
but as pointed out by Dr. Altekar, such a statement appears
to be rather figurative than real.\(^1\) From other Rāṣṭrakūṭa
records we learn how Amoghavarsha III owed the throne
more to the exertions of his crown prince Krishṇa than to
the votes of his feudatories.

These two instances of Gopāla and Amoghavarsha III
will thus show that when owing to unusual circumstances,
there was a change in dynasty or a claimant other than the
heir-presumptive came to the throne, the latter's supporters
often described his accession as due to the election. If there
was at all any election, only ministers and feudatories took
part in it.

Normally we see that kingship was hereditary in our
period both in the North and in the South. There is of
course no doubt that something like a real election did occur
once in Kashmir during our period; for the Rājatarāṅgiṇī
clearly informs us that at the end of the Utpala dynasty in
939 A.D., when general Kamalavardhana had got an effective
control of the situation and was in possession of the palace,
he asked the Brāhmaṇas to elect some one as king\(^2\) instead
of ascending the throne himself. This he did, says Kalhaṇa,
'because he was deluded by Karman or guided by bad
advisers......Encountering alone a young woman, who has
been difficult to meet, in private and flushed with drink, he
who being inexperienced does not have the joy of love with
her and prays for favours the next day through a procuress,
and he who having by his dash gained glory, gives it up
at the moment and woos through diplomacy the next day,
who else is to be pitied more than these two?' The above
remaks of Kalhaṇa make it quite clear that the election of
king was regarded in our period as quite a foolish procedure

\(^1\) Sāmantairatba Raṭṭarājyamahimālambārathamabhyarthīteḥ, E.J.,
XI. Chitaldrug, No. 76.
\(^2\) Rāj., V. 454-55. In this particular case the Brāhmaṇas did not elect
Kamalavardhana to the throne, but Yaśasakara, who had got the
control of the capital in the meanwhile.
and must therefore have gone out of vogue long ago. The tradition of an elective king was however remembered in some quarters.

We have a large number of inscriptions of different dynasties, and they generally show the crown passing from the father to the son or to some other member of the royal family.

The books on polity of our period like the Śukranīti, the Kāmanda-kautīṣāra, etc. also do not refer to the election of the king. Nor have we any evidence to show that in our period there existed any institution like the Parliament or the Paura-

jānapada with power to elect the king.

(2) Order of Succession

Let us now consider some problems connected with the hereditary monarchy. As far as succession to the throne is concerned, the law of the primogeniture normally prevailed in all the dynasties of Northern India. The crown therefore usually passed from the father to the eldest son, who was installed to the office of the heir-apparent, when he had come of age and finished his education and training. That the heir-apparent was selected during the life-time of the ruling king is evident not only from the epigraphical evidence but also from the accounts of foreign travellers. The Arab writer Sulaiman, who flourished during our period, observes that "the princes in India used to select their own successors."¹ This clearly indicates that the practice of the nomination of the Yuvarāja by the king during his life-time was widely prevalent. There are a number of epigraphical cases to show that the heir-apparent was selected during the life-time of the king.² Thus under the Gāhaḍavālas, Madanapāla was selected as Yuvarāja by his father.³ The Basahi grant,

1. Elliot and Dowson, I, 6.
2. This practice was followed in the Deccan also; for instance, the Rāṣṭra-
kūṭa King Kṛṣṇa I had installed his son Govinda as Yuvarāja before the latter was sent to lead the expedition against Vengi (E. I. VI, pp. 210-3).
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dated 1104 A.D., and the Kamauli grant, dated 1105 A.D., inform us that Govindachandra was acting as Yuvaraja during his father’s rule. The same was the case with Asphoja-chandra, who was the son of Govindachandra. Jayachandra was selected as the heir-apparent by his father Vijayachandra. Some records of the Chahmanas of Nadol also mention Yuvaraja along with the reigning king. Thus when Ashwara was ruling as a king, his son Kaṭukaraja was discharging the duties of the heir-apparent. Similarly when Kaṭukaraja and Sāmantasimha were the kings, they selected Jayantasiṅha and Kānhaṇadeva respectively as their heirs-apparent. Under the Pālas also the same practice generally prevailed. Tribhuvanapala and Rājyapala were selected as Yuvaraja by their fathers Dharmapala and Devapala respectively in their old age. Probably the same was the case with Nārāyaṇapala; v. 15 of the Bhagalpur plate of this ruler states, ‘Let asceticism be mine and kingdom thine’ thus two men have spoken to two others, Vigrahapala to him and Sāgara to Bhagiratha’ (I.A., XV, 305). If Vigrahapala had abdicated the throne for his son, it is not unlikely that he might have earlier invested him with the powers of Yuvaraja. The coronation of the Chedi king Yasaskarna, in which his father Karṇa participated, marked most probably his selection as heir-apparent. We thus see that the advice of the Niti writers that an heir-apparent should be selected in the life-time of the ruling king was generally followed. The prince usually selected was the eldest son and his selection was often formalised by a regular Yuvarājābhisheka, which is expressly referred to in several Gahaḍavāla records. The formality of this abhisheka

2. I.A., XIX, 101-104.
3. E.I., VIII; 155-6.
4. E.I. IV, 118.
8. E.I., 1, part 1, p. 294.
9. Asmatsammatyā samastarāja-prakriyopeta-
    ūauvarājābhishekma-mahārājaputra-Sri-Jayachandradevena.
    E.I., IV, 118; E.I., VIII, 155-6.
would suggest that the prince was usually not recognised as Yuvarāja before the actual ceremony was performed.

Yuvarāja is often seen issuing land grants and actively participating in the military and administrative duties but he was not a co-ruler or a joint ruler. Theoretically he was always subordinate to the ruling monarch. The idea of dual or joint rulership was unknown in our period.

It is, however, important to note that our writers on polity have not allowed the crown to pass on to the eldest son, if he suffered from any physical or mental defect. Śukra has clearly stated that if the eldest prince suffers from deafness, dumbness, blindness, leprosy or importance, he is unfit to rule and that in such a case, his brother or son should succeed. Such evidence is sufficient to show that when the eldest son happened to be less competent and a younger brother more promising, the latter was selected for the throne. This would of course sometimes lead to the internecine war, as happened at the accession of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III, which had resulted in the supersession of his elder brother, Stambha in 793 A.D. Such wars, however, are so far not known in the case of Northern dynasties; they were also rather an exception than the rule in the Deccan. The younger princes as we shall see later on, were usually given land grants or revenue assignments to maintain their high status; they were also appointed to high administrative posts.

There is hardly any evidence to show that an actual division of the kingdom took place either in the south or in the north during our period to satisfy the claims of rival princes, as probably happened under the Vākāṭaka dynasty, where Pravarasena I seems to have entrusted the different parts of his empire under the charge of his sons, who established practically independent houses, after their father's death and thus weakened the empire. Śukra also is not in favour of the

1. Jyeṣṭhopi badhirah kushtīḥi mūkā’ndhah shayḍa eva hi, Sa rājyārōha bhavennaiva bhrātā tatputra eva hi. Śukra, i, 348.
partition of the kingdom, for he says 'the kingdom divided into parts is exposed to the enemies'.

If the king had no son, the crown usually passed to his younger brother. Thus under the Chandellas, Devavarmā had no son; he therefore appointed his younger brother Kirtivarmā, as an heir to the throne. Under the Chedis, Lakshmanarāja was succeeded by his younger brother Yuvarāja II, as he left no issue. When the Chedi king Narasimha died in c. A.D. 1155, his younger brother Jayasimha became the king, because his elder brother had no issue. Under the Paramāras when the kings Lakshmadeva and Jaitugi left no issue, they were succeeded by their younger brothers, Nara- varma and Jayavarman II respectively. Under the Chāhamānas Vigrahāraja was succeeded by his younger brother Durlabhāraja (c 999 A.D.) and Jājalla by his younger brother Āśarāja or Āśvarāja (c 1110 A.D.), because the elder brothers had left no sons to succeed them.

In the absence of a son or a brother, a nephew was sometimes succeeded by his uncle. Thus when the Chandella king Jayavarmadeva died without leaving any issue, his uncle Prithvīvarmadeva, who was the younger brother of his father Sallakshaṇa, ascended the throne. Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dantidurga was also succeeded by his uncle Kṛishṇa I, probably because the former had left no son.

Sometimes a war of succession used to take place between the uncle and nephew. The Sevadi Inscription of Ratnapāla informs us how he ousted his uncle Āśarāja from Nadol by carrying out a rebellion against him. There are many such cases in the course of Indian history of ancient, medieval and modern periods. The uncle being the most experienced
claimant was usually allowed to succeed. Thus under the Yādavas, Mahādeva worked as a crown prince during the reign of his elder brother Kṛṣṇa and also succeeded him on the throne; as Kṛṣṇa’s son Rāmchandra was too young to rule, it is however important to note that his efforts to secure the crown for his own son Ammaña in supersession of his nephew Rāmchandra did not meet with ultimate success. Under the Chālukyas also Maṅgaleśa tried to secure the throne for his own son, superseding the claim of his elder brother’s son Pulakeśin, but failed in the effort.

It is interesting to note that Sukra also suggests that if a king has no male issue, then his uncle or younger brother or his elder brother’s son, or his daughter’s son or his sisters’ son should be selected as a crown prince.¹ The Nittivākyāmyita of Somadeva also lays down a more or less similar order of succession.² It states that if the king has no son, the crown should then pass to the full brother, failing him to half-brother failing him to uncle, failing him to the male of the same family, failing him to daughter’s son, failing him to a stranger.

It is interesting to note that this order of succession given by Sukra and Somadeva postpones the succession of the daughter’s son to a stage much later than that contemplated by Yājñavalkya. It appears that the patriarchal conception was more powerful in the case of the royal succession than in the case of the succession to private or individual property.

Whether the throne passed to a member of a collateral branch on the failure of heirs in the main line is not known from northern Indian inscriptions. Such was sometimes the case in South India; when Parameśvaravarman died leaving behind no son, the crown passed on to Nandivarman, who belonged to a collateral Pallava branch.

The succession was usually limited to males during our period. There is hardly any epigraphical or literary evidence

¹ Svakanishṭhaṁ pitrivyāṁ vānujaṁ vāgrasambhavam. Putram prītikātthāṁ datam yuvarāje bhūshechayet. Šukra, II, 15.

² Suta-sodara-sapatna-pitrivyā-kulyадānitrāgantukēśu purvapurvābhāve bhavatyattaraśya rājapadāvāptīḥ. (Rājarakṣāśāsumuddeśāḥ), Nāk, p. 247.
to show a female becoming a sovereign as the first choice after the death of the last king. In the history of Kashmir and Orissa, we come across some cases of women rulers or regents, but it is clear that they were usually exceptions due to dire difficulties. It is no doubt true that Sugandhā, the widow of Śaṅkaravarman (c. 883—900 A.D.) became a queen for the short period of two years, 902—04 A.D., but it was merely a stop gap arrangement. It was upon the prayer of her subjects that she ascended the throne, when two sons of her husband had died after short reigns and there was the prospect of anarchy. (Rājarājasaṅgīti, V. 243). She was waiting for the birth of a grandson to succeed her and when this hope came to an end, she had to summon a conference of ministers and grandees, Tantrins and Ekāṅgas, to select a successor. Their choice fell upon Pārtha and Sugandhā had to vacate the throne for him. The Kashmir historian says, ‘Shorn of royal power Sugandhā went out of royal residence and the failing tear-drops served her as her necklace’ (V. 257). The case of Diddā is of a different nature; she ruled Kashmir effectively for about 22 years, (981 to 1003 A.D.). But even this woman of extraordinary energy and ability had to wait for 22 years after the death of her husband Kshemagupta and work for the removal of three kings Abhimanyu, Nandigupta and Tribhuvanagupta before she could get the coveted throne. In the Kara dynasty of Orissa, the accession of Tribhuvanamahādevi must be regarded as an unusual event. Her husband Śaṅtikaradeva I had been succeeded by her son Śubhakaradeva III, but he also died soon. Tribhuvanamahādevi was unwilling to ascend the throne, but was persuaded to do so by the assembly of great feudatories; she however abdicated when her grandson Śaṅtikaradeva II came of age. Towards the end of the Kara dynasty, we have the phenomenon of four queens Gaurī, Daṇḍamahādevī, Bakulamahādevī and Dharmamahādevī ruling one after the other. But this was not a regular instance of normal succession, it indicates, as observed by Dr. R.C. Majumdar, troublesome times on the eve of the downfall of the dynasty.¹ Śubhakara V, the

¹ R.C. Majumdar, The Age of Imperial Kanauj, p. 67.
husband of the first of the above queens Gaurī, had probably no son, so his widow succeeded him and was followed by his daughter, Daṇḍīmāhādevī. But how she should have been succeeded by her step-mother Bakulamahādevī and the latter by a widowed queen of the predecessor of her husband Śubhakara V passes one’s comprehension. Obviously there was something wrong in the Kara kingdom and most of these queens were probably mere puppets in the hands of interested parties seeking power. To conclude, in normal times in the northern India of our period, society did not welcome women as ruling monarchs. They did not succeed as first choice to the last ruler.

A number of queens do appear in the records of our dynasties under consideration, but as a general rule they do not seem to be entrusted with any administrative duties. Somaladevi, queen of the Chāhamāna king Ajayarāja (c. 1125) was apparently authorised by her husband to issue coins in her own name with the legend Śrī-Somaladevi, but whether she was entrusted with any administrative duties, we do not know.

(3) Minority Administration

How the administration was carried on, when a king died leaving a minor heir behind, is not disclosed by our epigraphs. Under the Vākāṭakas, dowager queens used to supervise and direct the administration, if the heir-apparent to the throne happened to be a minor. Thus Prabhāvatīguptā, the widow of Rudrasena II, is known to have successfully steered the ship of the state through troubled waters for a long time.¹ Queen Tribhuvanamahādevī, the widow of king Śāntikaradeva I of the Kara dynasty, is stated to have been persuaded by the feudatories to ascend the throne after her son’s death, but she was really acting as a regent, for she abdicated the throne on her grandson attaining majority. We, however, do not get any instance of women as regents in the dynasties included in this work. Even Śukra is silent on the point; he does not give any suggestion as to who should look after the

¹ I.A., XVII-37.
administration during the king's minority. Very likely a male relative was usually appointed to act as the regent, as was the case under the Rāshtrakūṭas.\(^1\) The case of Tribhuvanamahādevi acting as regent in the Kāra dynasty is unusual for the northern India of our period.

(4) *Training of the princes*

Our writers on polity have laid considerable emphasis on the proper training of the princes, but unfortunately our epigraphs give us no glimpse of the actual arrangement made during our age. In the earlier period, we find that sometimes the princes were sent to the famous university centres like Takshaśilā for training. In the 7th century A.D., an arrangement of a special school with expert teachers was made for the training of princes, as shown by the Kādambaraš of Bāṇa; in our period also most probably the same method might have been followed.

As regards the course of instruction for the prince, our writers on polity devote a good deal of space to it and maintain that the would-be king should master the four Vidyās namely Ānvikshiki, (the study of Logic and Philosophy), Trayī\(^2\) (the study of three Vedas), Vārtā (the science of agriculture and commerce) and Daṇḍaniti (the science of administration). Besides this theoretical study, our writers on polity have also prescribed practical education, which included training in the administration and proficiency in the military art and tactics. The *Agni-Purāṇa* maintains that the king should be a good Bowman, a skilful horseman and an expert controller of elephants. It also prescribes the study of various arts and crafts.\(^3\)

How far in actual practice the king's curriculum

---

1. A.S. Altekar, *Rāshtrakūṭa*, p. 159. During the minority of Amoghasrava I his cousin Karkka was appointed to carry on the administration on behalf of the emperor.

2. In the earlier period the study of Trayī included the study of three Vedas. Its meaning however changed during our period. It included a number of sciences, namely *Mīśākāra*, *Dharmaśastras* and *Purāṇas*, which had no connection with Trayī at all.

included all these subjects it is difficult to state. Naturally, the study of Dharmāśāstras, Mīmāṁsā and Purāṇas, which Śukra includes in Trayī, must have been not very deep. Emphasis must obviously have been laid on Daṇḍanīti, Vārtā and practical training in the military art.

Such evidence as we get from contemporary records shows that not Trayī and Āvikṣikī but law and classical Sanskrit literature were king’s favourite subjects in humanities. Thus the Charakhāri plate of the Chandella king Devavarmā informs us, how king Devavarmā had mastered the Kāvya, Alakāra and Chhandas.1 The Paramāra king Vākpati was a great orator, poet, logician and had mastered all the śastras.2 The Gāhaḍavāla king Chandradeva is described as an abode of all the Vidyās and arts.3 The Chandella king Sallakshaṇa-Varman is described as a leader of those versed in sacred lore, a kinsman of the virtuous, a store of arts and abode of good conduct.4 The Chedi king Yuvarāja was the lover of classical literature.5 The Gāhaḍavāla king Chandradeva is described as solely devoted to the logic.6 The Paramāra king Jayasimha was also expert in law.7 All this evidence shows that the views of our political writers, who emphasise the necessity of training the princes in Dharmāśāstra, law and political science were generally followed in practice.

After the training was over, the prince was made a Yuvarāja. A major crown-prince became king immediately after the death of his father. Al Masudi’s statement that no one could become a king before he was forty does not appear to be correct (Elliot I p. 20).

3. Ākaraḥ survavidyānāh ālayaḥ kalānām...E. I. XV, 193...
5. Sāhitya-vidyā-lalasā-bhujaṅgaḥ... E.I. XXIV, 111
(5) *King's Qualities and Qualifications*

Let us now discuss the necessary qualities required for the king. The theoretical qualifications laid down by Śukra and Kāmandaṅka are numerous but we need not devote much space to them, as they are the same as those described by the earlier political writers. Inscriptions and works on polity of our age emphasise that a king can become a successful ruler only if he waits upon the elders, studies the art of government, cultivates righteousness and protects his subjects as efficiently as the divine guardians. He was expected to be always in constant association with virtuous and learned men in order to derive the benefit of their experience and advice. He was to be kind-hearted and was not to oppress his subjects for his own selfish interest. A king, says Śukra, who is virtuous is divine in nature, one who is otherwise is devilish, he is destined for hell.\(^1\) The king had to observe discipline, for it brings prosperity to him. He was to be well-versed in Śāstras and in different branches of learning. A king, who is well-grounded in all the Vidyās, is respected by the good; he can never be inclined to a wrong course even if impelled by evil advisers.\(^2\) Prowess, strength, intelligence and valour were other necessary qualities required for the king, a king devoid of these qualities, says the *Matsya Purāṇa*, though wealthy, can never administer even a small kingdom.\(^3\) The king is also advised to keep an even balance between dharma, artha and kāma.

On the negative side the king is advised to give up excessive gambling and hunting. He was not expected to sleep by day, nor was he to be too much talkative. Over-indulgence in music and dancing was to be avoided. Six enemies namely excessive indulgence, anger, intoxication, envy, covetousness, and self-delusion were to be carefully guarded against. All the āyānas were to be avoided. According to Somadeva, 'A

\(^1\) Guṇijuṣṭastu yo rājā sa jñeyo devatāḥśakāḥ, Viparītastu rakṣoṁśaḥ sa vai naraṁbhājānāḥ. *Śukra*, I, 86-87.


\(^3\) *Agni-Purāṇa*, 239, 2-5 enumerates similar qualities.
single āyārana is enough to destroy a powerful king, even possessing four kinds of armies, what to say if there are all of them combined. A good king should exert to eradicate these evils, keeping himself in the association of the learned men and away from the evil-doers.

The records of our period usually describe the kings as possessing the above qualities prescribed by the Niti works. The Ratnapur inscription of the Chedi king Jājalladeva, dated 1114 A.D., informs us how king Prithvīdeva possessed nobility, bravery and depth. The Khajuraho inscription dated c. 954 A.D. states that the king Harsha combined in himself eloquence, statesmanship, heroism, vigour, ambition, modesty and self-confidence. The Chandella king Sallakshaṇavarman is described as a master of the sacred lore, a kinsman of the virtuous, a store of arts and an abode of good conduct. The Pratihāra records usually describe the kings as endowed with bravery, valour and modesty. The Chedi king Jājalladeva (c. 1160 A.D.) is described as the sun of prowess, who secured success and prosperity by his heroism. Prithvīdeva (c. 1141 A.D.) is described as the sun, endowed with the most intense brilliancy. Generosity, truth, statesmanship and heroism were the qualities of the Chandelā king Jayavarmadeva (c. 1117 A.D.). The king Vairisirīha is described as endowed with might, generosity, bravery, resoluteness and good fortune. Intelligence, bravery, religiousness, truthfulness and gratitude were the qualities possessed by the Chandella king Devavarman (c. 1051 A.D.), who had full control over all his senses. The Chedi king Kokkalla (c. 875 A.D.) possessed generosity and was a man of active habits. King Kakka of the Pratihāra dynasty was

2. Ibid., "
3. E.I., I, 35.
5. E.I., I, 195.
7. E.I., I, 23.
8. E.I., I, 205.
10. I.A., XVI, 205.
11. E.I., I, 152.
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the master of prosody, grammar, logic and astronomy. He was also a store of arts and could compose poetry in many languages. The Paramāra king Bhoja (c. 1025 A.D.) was also a great poet. The Udayapur record describes him as a king among poets (Kavirāja). The Pāla king Vigrahapāla III (c. 1055 A.D.) was acquainted with fine arts.

(6) Divinity of the King

The precise attitude of our period towards the doctrine of the divinity of the king is not easy to determine. The political writers of our age have, as a rule, postulated the functional resemblance between the king and some of the deities, as is generally done by earlier works like the Manu-Smṛti and the Mahābhārata. Thus Śukra states ‘Like Indra, the king protects the wealth; like Vāyu, he is the cause of good and evil actions; like Yama, he is the punisher of offences; like Agni, he is the purifier and enjoyer of all the gifts; like Varuṇa, he nourishes his subjects and like Chandra, he delights everybody by virtuous activities.’ The Agnipurāṇa does the same, when it states that the king assumes the forms of nine deities, namely, the Sun, the Moon, Vāyu, Yama, Agni, Kubera, Varuṇa and Prithu, when he discharges the different regal functions, e.g., like Chandra; the king gives delight to his subjects; like Vāyu, he surveys the whole kingdom by means of spies etc. Several other Purāṇas like the Matsya, the Padma and the Mārkandeya also accept the functional resemblance between the king and some of the deities. All this evidence shows that the king was not regarded by our political writers as divine, though they regarded the king’s office as such. They generally state that the king resembles the deities only in the performance of his regal functions. It is further to be noted

1. E.I., XVIII, 95.
2. E.I., I, 235; V.18.
3. E.I., XV, 296.
4. Śukra, I, 73-77.
5. Agni-Purāṇa, 225, 16.
6. Matsya-Purāṇa; Ch. 22.
that if they compare the king to some deities, they also compare him to the father, the mother and the preceptor because of a similar resemblance of functions.\(^1\)

Śukra, the principal writer for our period, further emphatically points out at one place that kingship is due to previous merit (Prāk-karma)\(^2\) and at another place attributes it to mere valour and bravery.\(^3\) But at no place does he state that the kingship arises because particles of different gods enter into the body of a king, as has been crudely done by Manu. He neither invests him with infallibility, nor enjoins absolute obedience to him, even if he was a wicked or worthless ruler, as was done by Nārada in the earlier period.\(^4\) On the other hand, he regards the bad, vicious and reprobate king as a demon incarnate, and advises the subjects not to obey him.\(^5\) He further calls that king a dacoit, if he, forsakes his duty, disobeys the high ideal of kingship and oppresses the subjects.\(^6\) According to Śukra the question does not arise at all as to whether the subjects are to obey such a king; he openly encourages them to intrigue and conspire against him,


2. Tapāśa teja ādāte śāstā pātā cha raṇjakāḥ, Nripāḥ svaprāktanāddhatte tapāśa cha mahīṁimāṁ. Śukra, I 20.


6. Hitāhitam na śṛṣṭi rājā mantrimukhāḥcha yaḥ, Sa dasyū rājarājena prajāṇāṁ dhanahāraṇāḥ. Śukra, II, 257.
and even to attempt to dethrone him with the help of neighbouring or feudatory kings, and to offer the crown to a virtuous prince or to any other capable member of the royal family. This advice was not so difficult to follow in the past, when there were several feudatory rulers aspiring to the imperial position and when the ruler possessed an army not much more efficient than the forces that could be raised by the oppressed subjects in co-operation with the feudatory, whom they wanted to enthrone.

There was however another school, probably of courtiers, which was inclined to accept the divinity of the king more or less in a literal sense. According to this school, the king was regarded as a divine incarnation. Some of the epigraphs of our age were written by authors, who subscribed to this view. Thus the Chaulukya king Kumārapāla is described as an incarnation of God Hari, who had descended from heaven. The Chedi king Prithvīdeva is stated to be an incarnation of God and the guardian of the world. Gāhaḍawāla rulers Chandradeva, Govinda Chandra and Jayachandra are described as incarnations of Brahmā, Hari and Rāma in contemporary records. Piṭhvrāja II was regarded as an incarnation of Rāma, as also Rāmpāla of the Pāla dynasty. The Dāwara followers of Bhikshachara proclaimed him as a divine incarnation in order to secure popular support for his cause (Raj. VIII. 305).

The climax of this tendency is to be seen in the practice of building temples not only in honour of dead kings, as was the case under the Kushāṇas, but even of living kings. In

3. Devaḥ (sotha) kumārapālamārtipatiḥ Śrī-rājyachodāmaśiḥ ... gāṇavaliṇpaśān Haririti jaśtaḥ prabhāvājamānaiḥ.  E.I., I, 33, V. 75.
5. E.I., IX.319.
7. Prithvīrājस्वीत्याय, VII. 620.
one of the Chāhamāna records, king Luntigadeva is said to have set up images of himself and his queen; this obviously must have been done for being enshrined in the temple.\(^1\) It is quite possible that the prevailing tendency of ascribing divinity to the royal personages and of regarding them as divine incarnations may be responsible for the erection of temples to living kings.

Whether the advocates of this school, which regarded the king as a divine incarnation, were prepared to hold him as infallible and above public scrutiny, we do not know. Probably they did so, as would appear from a passage in the Kādambarī.\(^2\) It is very likely that the political writers of our period like Śukra may have propounded their theories as a reply to the extreme views advocated by the courtiers and expressed in some of our epigraphs.

(7) King’s functions

The king was the supreme head of the executive, judicial and military administration. His paramount duty as the head of the Government was to protect the people and work for their welfare. Śukra clearly states at one place that the highest Dharma of the king is to protect the subjects and to put down the wicked.\(^3\) Kāmandaka says that the protection of the subjects is possible only if law and order are preserved in society; the king should take proper steps to achieve this goal.\(^4\)

Being the head of the judicial administration, the king was to administer law impartially and to ascertain carefully whether proper justice was administered by lower courts. The monarch, states Śukra, who proceeds according to the dictates

---

1. *E. l., IX, 79-81, We have got only a summary of this record here; the original text has not been given. Statues of secular for decorative purposes were not common in temples.

2. Śukranāsa’s address, Kādambarī, p. 206.


of law, is blessed with virtue, wealth and enjoyment. Kāmandaka advises the king to impose just punishment upon the culprits according to the offences committed by them.

Being the head of the military administration, the king look after the proper maintenance of the army and had to take steps to increase its efficiency. He was to make proper arrangements for the training and discipline of the fighting forces. The king, who does not increase the strength of his army, who does not protect his subjects and who does not make other princes to pay him tributes is compared to barren sesame.

Besides these functions, the king had to promote Dharma, Artha and Kāma for the religious, socio-economic and aesthetic progress of the society. He was to encourage virtue and morality. He was to help all the religious sects. He was to maintain or support hospitals, rest houses and educational institutions, and had to encourage trade, industry, agriculture and fine arts.

(8) Coronation

In our period, the coronation ceremony was usually performed soon after the death of the last ruler. There is no evidence to show that it was postponed to the time when the king attained majority. Of course if a king was minor at the time of the ceremony, a regent carried on the administration for him.

The coronation ceremony of our period differed considerable from that in the Vedic and post-Vedic times; it will be therefore necessary to survey its earlier history in

1. Nyāyapraṇāśito nṛpatiṛṇātmānamathā cha prajāḥ, Trivargaṃopasaṇidhatte nihanti dhruvamanyathā. 
   Sukra, I, 67.
2. Udvejayati tīkṣhṇena mṛdunā paribbhuyate, Tasmād yathārhatu daṇḍaṁ nayet paksamānayitaḥ. 
   Kāmandaka, VI, 15.
3. Na vṛdhitaṁ balāṁ yaistu na bhūpāḥ karadikritāḥ, Na prajāḥ pālītāḥ samyak te vai shandhatiṣāniṇīpāḥ. 
   Sukra, I, 126.
4. Amoghasavaṭha I was a minor of 12 at the time of his formal coronation and king Karikala of the Sangam age a boy of 5 only.
some details in order to understand the new developments in our age.

The history of coronation goes back to hoary antiquity. Even in the Vedic period we find it being solemnly performed with sacred mantras. It consisted of several rituals among which the Rājasūya was the most important one; next to it were the Vājapeya and the Sarvamedha. According to the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, the king would secure Sāmrājya, bhaujya, svarājya. Vairajya, etc., by performing the Rājasūya sacrifice. According to the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, however, the ceremony was not to be undertaken to achieve a particular distinction, but to inaugurate the reign of the king, however small. In this sacrifice the king used to take an oath undertaking not to work against the interest of the priestly order.

The Vājapeya sacrifice lays down some rituals, which are followed by the chariot race, which was its main feature. The king was of course expected to win in this race and was then proclaimed and installed to the high office. It is however important to note that in the Vedic period the Vājapeya was of lesser political importance than the Rājasūya. In the later Vedic period the Vājapeya however obtained the higher rank than the Rājasūya because it was believed that by performing the former, one secures the imperial position, while by performing the latter, one attains to mere royalty.

Another important feature of the Vājapeya sacrifice was the Ratnīn oblations, which were offered by the king to the Ratnins, (important courtiers and officials) by repairing to their houses.

In the epic period, the royal oath formed an important part in the coronation ceremony. The Mahābhārata admonishes

3. A. Br., VIII, 15.
4. The oath is wrongly taken by some scholars as corresponding to the coronation oath of the modern times. It only means that the royal power should be in harmony with the priestly power, for it is the priest who invokes the divine powers at the time of coronation for the safety and prosperity of the king. The context of the passage contains no undertaking given by the king to the people to rule according to Dharma for their welfare. Neither does it indicate that the officiating priest was the representative of the society.
the king "Take the oath in mind, word and deed, namely I shall always look after the welfare of the people, regarding it as supreme; whatever is prescribed by the rules of ethics, I shall always abide by, I shall never be self-willed."\(^1\)

In the coronation ceremony of our period, however, the Vedic rituals like the Vājapeya and the Rājasūya do not figure at all. The Vedic mantras had become unintelligible; due to the complicated and complex nature of the sacrificial rituals and greater repugnance for sacrificial slaughter, Vedic religion had gone out of vogue. The Ratnins, who played an important part in the Vājapeya sacrifice of the Vedic period also disappear in our age. There is no doubt that the ministers had taken their place, but it was no longer customary for the king to go to their houses to offer any oblations at the time of the coronation.

During our age king's power was regarded as supreme and the tendency to deify him was getting stronger. That the king should take an oath to rule without oppressing the people was probably regarded as incompatible with his power and dignity. Chariot race and the dice play also ceased to be important elements of the ceremony.

We thus see that the Vedic form of coronation had gone out of vogue. Some Vedic rituals like Vasodhārā were performed and a number of Vedic mantras were recited, but they do not appear to be connected with coronation. A number of Paurānic rituals like Graha and Nakshatra-śānti were introduced, attesting to the faith in astrology of the age. These rites are described by Lakshmīdhara in the Rājadharmakāṇḍa of Kṛṣṇa-Kalpataru, relying upon the authority of epics and Purāṇas.

Let us now survey the important features of the coronation ceremony of our period.\(^2\) The proper date and auspicious time for the coronation were first settled by the court astrologer. It may be noted here that the Vedic rituals do not refer to any astrological considerations; in our period,

---

1. MBh., XII, 58, 115-6.

2. Epigraphs refer only to the holy bath in connection with this ceremony; other religious details are not mentioned.
however, astrology became a popular science and people began to have more faith in it, so the advice of the astrologer was usually taken on every important occasion. A chief priest was then chosen, who was to direct the rites. It was essential that he should not be the chief priest of any other ruler; only in that case he can pray to God for the paramount sovereignty and prosperity of only one ruler and none else. The preceptor of the king and the ministers were then to be presented to the king.

A number of preliminary arrangements were made for the coronation. The palace and the capital were beautifully decorated. The main roads were washed by clean and fresh water. Gold, precious stones, jewels white garlands, fried rice, honey, ghee, weapons, new raiments, a white umbrella, a complete tiger skin and many other similar things required for the occasion were collected. An elephant with auspicious marks was also brought for the state procession after the coronation. Similarly a chariot was also made ready, so that the king might mount on it before going to make a circuit of the capital.

The ceremony started with a ceremonial bath, given to the king by the water procured from the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā at Prayāga and from other holy streams as well. The king then performed a number of propitiatory rites, among which the Vināyaka-śānti, the Grahaśanti, the Aindrī-śānti and the Abhyudaya-śrāddha were the most important. The Vināyaka-śānti, was performed to overcome obstacles, the Graha- or Nakshatra-śānti was intended to ward off evil influences of the planets and stars. Then followed the Abhyudaya- or Nāndī-śrāddha, which was

2. If the coronation pandal was away from the palace, the king must have been taken there in a procession, at the end of which he must have been received by the officials assembled there.
3. Abhishechanikam dravyam sarvamevopakaalpitam.
   Gaṅgā-Yamunayotchaiva sangamādāhritam jalam.
   Yāśchāṁyāḥ saritāḥ puṇyāstābhyaścha jalamāḥhitam.
   Sarva-hijāni gandhāścha ratnāni vividhāni cha.
4. Ādau kyāvā mahāsaṁtāṁ puṇyāṁ vacāyāṁśu sūbhāṁ,
   Grahaśāntāṁ tathā śreshṭāṁ śrītyāmāhūṁ tathā.
an inevitable ritual to be observed on every auspicious occasion. After the Abhyudaya-srāddha, the king used to worship Vishnu and Divine Mothers. The Vasordhārā sacrifice, which followed this worship consisted of 401 ghee offerings made continuously to fire in order to fulfil all varieties of desires. For a long time, it was connected with the royal coronation and was performed at the time of the consecration ceremony, as is shown by the Nándsā inscription. It was regarded as a kind of superior consecration ceremony for the royal sacrificer himself, more potent than the Rājasūya or the Vājapeya.

The Aindri-sānti, the most important rite, which was performed before the actual coronation, followed the Vasordhārā sacrifice. Its aim was to overcome internal and external enemies of the king. It was thus an important element in the coronation ceremony.

On the day of the actual Abhisheka, the priest decorated with turban and earrings, used to start the ceremony by propitiating the sacred fire with offerings. A few Vedic Mantras were then recited, but they are really not connected with the royal coronation. Some of them like Ritāshādi and Yata-Indra are calculated to make the king powerful and to promote the prosperity of the nation. Majority of Mantras, however, like Indriganya, which is not yet traced, Aśūh-sīhāṇa which, describes the power of Indra, Āgatsatya, which refers to the oblation to truth, Yaste-agne which refers to the sanctification of fire on an altar and Svastidā, in which, Indra is asked to drink Soma juice, have no connection at all with the coronation ceremony, and thus are not of any political significance.

After the recitation of the Vedic Mantras, the king was

1. E.I., XXVII, 263.
2. V.S., 18.38.
3. A.V., 19.15.1; R.V., 8.61, 13.
5. T.Br., 3.12.32.
6. T.Br., 1, 1.7.3.
again given a bath\(^1\) with Pañchagavyā,\(^2\) consisting of Milk, curds, ghee, sugar and honey. It is interesting to note that the bath with Pañchagavyā is not referred to by the Vedic texts; it is therefore an innovation of the Paurāṇic age. Further, in the Vedic period, it was the priest only, who used to give this bath to the king; none others enjoyed this privilege. In our period, such was not however the case. Representatives of all the four castes, including the Śūdra, were permitted to besprinkle the king. The Śūdras, the Vaiśayās, the Kṣatriyās, and the Brāhmaṇas standing respectively to the west, south, east and north used to besprinkle the king by the water, milk, curd and ghee (also described as nectar) using earthen, copper, silver and gold pots\(^3\) respectively. This perhaps indicates that the king was anxious to have the good-will of all the classes of his subjects on the occasion of his coronation.

After the bath, the limbs of the king were rubbed by the earth collected from twelve different localities.\(^4\) The selection of the spots from which the earth was collected is not quite at random; some of them have symbolic importance. For instance, the mountain is the highest place on the earth, and the rubbing of the king's head with the earth obtained from the summits of mountains was naturally believed to make the king as prominent as a mountain peak. The right hand of the king was rubbed with the dust dug with the tusk of an elephant and the left hand with that found adhering to the horns of a bull. Now we know that the elephant and the bull are both the symbols of strength and power and the earth dug by them was thought to make the king most powerful. The temple was regarded as the most holy place, and

---

1. The coronation baths were believed to make the person of the king holy, as is expressly mentioned in Rāṣṭrakūṭa record describing the coronation of Amoghavarsa III, Altekar, Rāṣṭrakūṭas, p. 109.
2. Rājanāthaśa punaḥ snāpya pañchagavyayena devavarat,
Mrītāṃvra-rāpya-hemotthāṣiṣyaṣaṃ gṛhaṭiḥ.

3. Toṣyata Śūdrāśa snāpyāṅgaḥ paścimām dīṇaṃṣitaḥ,
Tataḥ kṣaṇoṣa vaiṣayās'cha dākṣiṇāyaṃ diśi sthitaḥ.
Kṣatriyāśaḥ tato dādānā pūrvasyaṃ dīṇavasthitaiḥ,
Amūlōna tato vipraṇaṃ gṛhyoṣṭḥtaraṇāṃ sthitaiah.

**Kāt. R.** Chap. II, p. 11.
the earth obtained from it was used to rub the king's face. The face is the most significant limb of a person, and its rubbing with this holy earth was obviously to sanctify the entire person of the king. The rubbing of the remaining of the king's limbs with the earth obtained from other diverse localities like an ant-hill, a house of a prostitute, a confluence of streams, a horse-stable, a cowshed and a river bed had probably similar significance, though it cannot be now fully understood.

After this symbolic rubbing, the king was asked by the priest to sit on a bhadrāsana; he was then besprinkled with water falling through a golden sieve (having hundred and eight holes) by the members of four castes, by chaste women and by women with living husband and children. The king then used to see hundred auspicious objects and hundred and eight holy articles. The remaining rites were then performed and lastly the pūrṇāhuti or the final oblation was offered to the fire. All these are new details in the coronation ritual introduced in our age reflecting to changed outlook.

Later on the king used to worship Gaṇeśa, Brahmā, Vishṇu and Śiva and also other deities popular in contemporary times. For the satisfaction of the planets, the gods and the manes, he used to bestow gifts on worthy recipients; an assurance of safety was also given to all living beings. The prisoners were then released. It is interesting to note that the custom of releasing the prisoners was prevalent in India since very early times; we find the great emperor Aśoka releasing the prisoners on every anniversary of his coronation.

1. Maṅgalānāṁ śatāṁ paśyetpunyamashaṭottarāṁ śatām,
   Śāntyai prādhānike sthāne sarvametadyākramam.

2. Kṛtvā śeshāṁ tato huvā dadyātpūrṇāhutiṁ tataḥ,
   Abhishākastato rājā sahāpājyādau Vināyakam.

3. Paṭṭabandha, the tying of the fillet round the forehead and mukula dhārana, 
   wearing the crown, are curiously enough not described by Lakṣmīdhara. Probably these were secular elements in the coronation ceremony 
   for which there were no mantras prescribed and hence Lakṣmīdhara 
   omits them. They are not referred in this Vedic coronation ceremony 
   also.

4. Athātasīṭhānagāṁ sarvāṁ paśūnaṁ vimochayet.
   Bandhāṇa-sthāna-saṁsthāṁścha pramocheṣyaṁ ṣāstravat.
The release of cattle, advocated by Lakshmidhara, is perhaps a grotesque extension of the principle of the release of all under confinement at the coronation time. Probably only a few cattle were let loose as a matter of formality.

When this was done, the king was seated on a lion throne covered with a tiger skin and the chief priest used to present him the customary madhuparka offering. Having worshipped his weapons and royal umbrella (Chhatra), he used to give audience to his subjects. Then started the coronation procession. For a time the king used to ride a charger, but after a short while, he used to exchange the horse for an elephant. The royal procession went through the principal thorough-fares of the metropolis. The city gods in temples were visited and worshipped at that time and largesses were scattered all the way. After returning to the palace, royal servants and guests were offered a feast, which marked the end of the coronation.

Comparison with the modern English coronation

Before concluding this topic, we may passingly compare the Indian coronation with its English counterpart. It is interesting to note that the principle features of the modern English coronation show a striking resemblance to that of India. In both we find the ceremony essentially religious in character, the difference lies only in degree. In English coronation, prayers and offerings are given to God, his Son and the Holy Ghost, so that they may bless the sovereign and secure the welfare of his kingdom, while in Indian coronation, the divinities together with various natural and supernatural forces credited with power for good and evil were propitiated through prayers, offerings and other religious rites. In both the systems there occur, crowning, blessing for universal dominion, presentation of nobles and officials, jail delivery, and the state procession through the metropolis. The coronation oath, which is the principal feature of modern English coronation, was of course not taken by kings during our period, though it was not unknown earlier.

(9) King's titles

We will now discuss the different royal titles in use in
our period. During the last half of the 1st millennium before the Christian era, Indian kings were content with the simple title Rāja. In all his records, the great Mauryan emperor Asoka calls himself merely a Rājā; he does not bear any high sounding epithet. When the Scythians and the Kushāṇas established themselves in northern India, they popularised the imperial title Rājātirāja, 'king of kings'. Later on when the Guptas became imperial rulers, they transformed the title Rājātirāja into Mahārajādhirāja, which soon became popular with the great conquerors and imperial rulers of India.

During our period the title Mahārajādhirāja was usually used by emperors. In Rajasthan, Bihar and Bengal kings used to have variations of this title like samastirājāvalivirājita, paramēśvara and paramabhaṭṭāraka.

Many Gāhaḍavāla kings assumed the title Vividhavidyā-vichāra-vāchaśpati, 'deep scholar engaged in pondering over the different branches of learning'. This shows that some kings were anxious to assume titles testifying to their scholarship or patronage of learning. In one of his inscriptions, the king Hammīravarmadeva calls himself Paramabhaṭṭāraka Shāhānīra (c. I. XX, 185). The title Shāhānīra was undoubtedly adopted by him from the Muslims, who had established themselves in the northwest by his time. In earlier times, of course, this title was used by the Kushāṇas.

It is somewhat surprising to note, that the title Mahārajādhirāja was sometimes used by the feudatories also. Thus for instance, Mathanadeva, who was a feudatory of the king Vijayapāladeva calls himself Mahārajādhirāja Paramēśvara in the Rājor inscription.1 Dhārāvarsha, the feudatory of the king Yaśovarman, is described as Mahārajādhirāja Mahāmanḍaleśvara in the Kalavan plates.2 This tendency probably indicates the growing aspirations of feudatories and the waving power of their overlords.

There were also some titles in use, indicating the king's faith in a particular religion or sect. Thus Dharmapāla and Devapāla, the two great Pāla rulers, called themselves as

2. I.A., LVI, 50.
Paramasaukata in their records, clearly showing that they were the followers of Buddhism. The title Paramamāheśvara which was assumed by a number of kings of the dynasties in Northern India, indicates that the rulers were the worshippers of Siva. Similarly some of the Pratihāra kings assumed the title Paramaśaktibhaktas, which indicates their faith in the worship of Sakti.

The records of our period refer to some additional epithets assumed by the rulers of the Gāhaḍavāla, Pratihāra, Chedi, Pāla and Sena dynasties. These epithets were Aśvapati, Gajapati and Narapati. Of these titles Narapati was a general one and could hardly have had any special significance. But there is some evidence to show that originally the titles Aśvapati and Gajapati might have been used by the Gurjara-Pratihāras and the Pālas respectively. A verse in a Śilāhāra record of Aparājitārajadeva, dated 993 A.D. refers to the Gajapati taking refuge in a cave on the bank of the Gaṅgā and to the Vājīśa being constantly tormented as a consequence of the military exploits of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa emperor Kṛiṣṇa III.1 Gajapati’s taking refuge in a cave on the bank of the Gaṅgā can well be applicable to a Pāla ruler of Bengal; the Vājīśa of the record was probably the Pratihāra ruler; the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were at constant wars with the Pālas and the Pratihāras. Sulaiman also informs us that the Pratihāras were strong in cavalry and the Pālas in the elephant force. It is therefore not improbable that for sometime the kings of the Pāla and the Pratihāra dynasties were known as Gajapatis and Aśvapatis. Very soon, however, these titles ceased to have any dynastic significance; for instance, we find the Gāhaḍavālas describing themselves as both Aśvapatis and Gajapatis;2 the same was the case with the Chedis and Senas.

(10) *Was monarchy limited?*

It is important to note that though the king was the centre of all military, political, administrative and judicial

1. Cholo Lobo bhīyābhūḍgajapatirvāśādjaḥnavi gavḥaṁantaḥ
   Vājījastraṁśeṣah samalabhavadāhavat śāilārandhre tathāndhraḥ.
powers, he was expected not to behave arbitrarily. Hindu political writers have imposed a number of checks upon the king to prevent him from becoming an autocrat.

In ancient India, sovereignty was executive rather than legislative. In other words, the king had no legislative power. He was expected to act according to the rules and laws framed not by himself but by the wise sages and immemorial custom. He had to respect desadharma (local customs), jātīdharma (caste rules), kuladharma (family traditions), and śrenidharma (guild regulations), which together constituted the law of the land. Sukra clearly says that it is only by following the Dharma or law that the king can earn fame in the world.¹ He could not however make the law, nor could he act against it, because the law was regarded as more divine, than the king himself. He was made to realise that there was nothing higher than Dharma and that he must and he should act according to it. Kāmanda says that it is only by following the law that the king can enjoy the kingdom for a long time. One, who acts against the rules of Dharma, goes to hell.² Dharma alone brings prosperity to the kingdom and fame to the king. The king should therefore act according to its dictates.

The political writers of our period like those of the earlier ages³ regard the king as a servant of the people appointed to protect them. Nārada says that taxation is nothing but king’s pay for the protection of his subjects.⁴ According to Aparārka, who flourished in our period, no one ever makes a payment without expecting a return; the taxes are therefore paid in return for protection expected from the king.⁵ Sukra goes a step further and says that since the people pay him

---

¹ Desadharma jātīdharmāḥ kuladharmaḥ sanātanāḥ,
Muniproktāścha ye dharmāḥ prāchīnā nātanāścha ye.
Te rāṣṭraguptai saridhāryāḥ jñātā yatraṁma samuṣṭaṁ,
Dharmasaṁsāthāpanādṛajā śriyāṁ kṛitrāṁ prayavindati.

² Kāmanda, I, 14-15.
³ B.D.S., I, 10, 6; A.S. X, 3.
⁴ Nārada, XVIII, 48.
⁵ On Yaj, I, 366.
taxes, the king should serve them as a dāsa or a servant.1 The above statements are not to be taken literally; but they are obviously intended to convey to the king that if the people paid the taxes, it was his duty to protect them as their servant, specially appointed for this work.

The political writers of our period have gone a step further and declared the king to be a trustee for the people. They have advised him not to spend the state revenues for his own personal enjoyment. They have clearly maintained that the taxes, which the king collects, are held by him only as a trust for the subjects, and are to be used only for their welfare. The king is repeatedly informed that the treasury is not his own personal or private property. Śukra maintains that the king, who spends the revenues for the maintenance of the army, for the welfare of the subjects and for the performance of sacrifices, gets the happiness in this as well as in the next life, but the king, who spends it otherwise, goes down to hell.2

The Agni-Purāṇa, however, goes a step still further and declares that the king's responsibilities are greater than those of a trustee; the latter is not called upon to sacrifice his own interests in favour of the object of trust; the king has to do so. This authority compares the king to an expectant mother and states that just as the latter sacrifices her own pleasures and conveniences for promoting the growth and welfare of the baby in her womb, in the same way the king must sacrifice his own case, convenience and happiness, so that the subjects committed to his care may prosper both materially and spiritually.3 The Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa also advocates the same view, when it states that the body of the king is not meant for pleasures and enjoyment; it has to put up with great troubles

1. Sarvataḥ phalabhungbhūtvā dāsavat syāttu rakṣaṇe. 
Śukra, IV, Sect. II, 130.

2. Bala-prajā-rakṣanārtham yajñārtham kaṇāstvāgraḥ,
Parātre cha sukhadā nripasyaṇyāsa dhūkhkādaḥ.
Śri-puṭrārtham kyāla yaśeṣa svopabheṣayā kavalām,
Narakāyālāva sa jhāyo na purātra sukhapradāh.
Śukra, IV, Sect. II, 3-4.

3. Nityam rājāḥ tathā bhāvyam garbhāṁ sahādharmini,
Yathā svam sukhamsūrajya garbhāsya sukkhamāvakhet.
Agni-Purāṇa, 222, 8.
and worries, while carrying out the royal duty of protecting the subjects and fulfilling the Dharma.¹

To sum up, a passage in Śukra, I, 78-81 gives us perhaps a very good glimpse into the views of the age about the king. Like a father, the king was to promote the building up of good character in his subjects; like a mother, he was to forgive them; like a teacher, he was to offer them good advice; like a brother, he was to ensure them a proper share in the revenues of the states; like a friend, he was to guard their secrets; like Kubera, he was to grant them wealth and like Yama, he was to mete out just punishments. In IV, 2, 131 Śukra sums up the whole position, when he maintains that the king was a servant of the people as he received his wages from them, but he was also their lord as he offered them protection.

A functionary, who was to discharge so many diverse duties, could of course not afford to act capriciously. He is at every step asked to act after consulting his ministers, preceptors and Brāhmaṇas. Śukra advises the king to act normally according to the advice of his ministers and preceptors. He clearly states that the king, who does not listen to his ministers and acts according to his own whims, will be soon destroyed. Even the wisest king cannot know everything, for different persons have different aptitudes.² Even Manu, who has put forth the rather crude theory that the king’s body is fashioned out of the particles from the bodies of Dikpālas, reminds him that he can never hope to govern the kingdom well, except with the genuine co-operation of his ministers and advisers. We thus see that the ministers are expected to play an important part in preventing the king from becoming an autocrat.

Kings usually become arbitrary when they are not given good education and training. Our political writers have therefore insisted that proper steps should be taken in this direction. The training of the king taught him to be

¹ Rājñāṁ śrīra-grahaṇāṁ na bhogāya maṁpate. Kleśāya maṁate prīthvi-svadharmaparipāhere.
² Śukra, II, 2-7.
⁴ Markandeya-Purāṇa, 130, 39.
pious and religious to cultivate good manners and to respect
the public opinion.

Our political writers have also imposed a number of
religious and moral checks upon the king in order to prevent
him from becoming an arbitrary ruler. They assert that a
king, who does not rule according to the law and oppresses
the subjects, will go to hell. This threat of hell had a
great terror in ancient times and it served as a great
deterrent.

Public opinion was also expected to play an important
part in checking the arbitrary powers of the king. Through
his spies, he was to ascertain what his subjects thought of
him and his administration and was to mend matters, if
necessary.¹

We thus see that the political writers of our period
have devised a number of administrative, moral and religious
checks in order to prevent the king from becoming an auto-
crat. The records of our period, however, further reveal
how a great decentralization of the functions of the Govern-
ment was brought about, and how it served to protect the
interests of the people. Large powers were vested in district,
town and village administrations, which could be effectively
supervised and controlled by local non-official councils, in
which the voice of the people had the upper hand. The
village and town councils of our period discharged almost
all the functions of Government, except that of organising a
regular army, determining foreign policy and declaring and
conducting a war. This extensive decentralization was an
effective check upon the powers of the king in ancient India.

¹ Svadurguna-āravanato lokānām paripīḍakaḥ
Nṛipyayādā tadā lokāḥ kāśābhīyate bhikṣyate yataḥ
Gūḍhācāraśā śrāvayītvā svavyātām dūshāhantāṁ ke
Bhūshāhantā cha kāśābhāvairāmātyāśāścha tadvidāḥ
Mayi īkṣāk cha saṃpratiḥ keshāmāpritiṁe vā

Śrāvaka, I, 13-12.

Prājñopavāla (just into death) resorted to by Brāhmaṇas in
Kashmir can hardly be described as a form of public opinion. It was
usually undertaken for the class privileges e.g. exemption from forced
labour (Rāj, VII 1888); very often it was at the instigation of interested
political parties, as in the case of prājñopavāla against minister Tunga
(Rāj, VII, 19).
How far the above checks and devices were successful in serving as breaks on royal power and in preventing it from becoming arbitrary is however difficult to determine. During our period there were some virtuous and able kings, who worked hard for the welfare of the people and for the all round progress of their kingdoms. But there were also some tyrants, who oppressed the subjects and ruled arbitrarily. The Rajatarangini supplies many instances of such cruel and unprincipled rulers, who were helped by the Damara, Ekaṅgas and Kayastha in their oppressive activities. Very probably some of the monarchs of the dynasties surveyed in this work might have belonged to the same category. An account of their maladministration does not occur in our inscriptions probably because they were composed by their court poets. Or it may be that normally a successful rival to the throne did not care to describe the administration of the ruler, he had ousted. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amoghavarsha III describes the maladministration of his predecessor Govinda IV, but such cases are few. What was the percentage of tyrants to good rulers cannot be unfortunately ascertained at present.

The kings, who ruled in an arbitrary way in our period, could do so, because moral checks like those described above, were not always effective and constitutional checks like those in modern times did not exist in our age. In the Vedic period, the Samiti apparently functioned as a constitutional check and controlled the king more or less like a modern Parliament. But during our period, there was no such body, which could control a wicked ruler or bring his administration to a standstill. It may be noted that the same was the case in Europe also in contemporary times. The ministry could sometimes control a king, but normally this was difficult for it because ministers were appointed by king and held office during his pleasure.

The philosophy of the resistance to misrule was not properly developed by our age. We have already shown how our political writers regarded the king to be a servant and the kingdom to be a trust. What action was to be taken by people, if the august servant and trustee did not discharge the duties properly is not discussed by our writers. Rights of the people have not received that attention, which the modern
age would have liked to be paid to them. The result was that there were no constitutional checks developed in our period, as was the case everywhere else.

(11) King’s Privy Purse

The question of what may be conveniently described as king’s privy purse has been discussed by the writers of the age; some epigraphical records also throw light upon it. Proceeds of taxes and revenues were regarded as the state income and a portion of it was given to the king as his privy purse. Śukra states that one-sixth of the state revenue should be allotted to the king for his own expenditure. He, however, does not inform us how this amount was made up. Most probably the king would have received a part of it as a cash allowance and a part as income from the crown lands. The inscriptions of our period do not mention the cash allowance, probably because there was no occasion to do so in land grants. They usually refer to royal fields and villages allotted to kings.

The extent of the crown lands naturally differed from time to time and place to place. The Chaulukya king Bhima-deva II enjoyed a number of Pathakas, namely Gambhūta pathaka,¹ Chālisā-pathaka,² Daṇḍahī-pathaka,³ Daṇḍāhāra-pathaka⁴ and Vālauya-pathaka. Pathakas were normally equal to a Tehsil or Taluka of the modern period.

Sometimes kings received as part of their privy purse, revenues of an entire Maṇḍala, or a Vishaya or a town. Thus under the Chaulukyas, Bhima-deva II was enjoing the revenues of the entire Kaccha Maṇḍala⁵ in 1030 A.D.; under the Paramāras, Devarāja was receiving the revenues of an entire Vishaya⁶ or district. Under the Chedis, the king Karṇa

1. E. I., XXI, 172.
2. I. A., VI, 194-5.
5. E. I., XXI, 172.
enjoyed the revenues of the town of Änandapur.¹ Unfortunately we do not know what was the exact amount of the income derived from these different Maṇḍalas or Vishayas or Pathakas, as the records are silent on this point.

(12) Abdication and Suicide

The kings during our period are sometimes seen abdicating the throne in favour of their sons; usually under the influence of the theory of Vānaprastha and Sannyāsa. Thus under the Pālas, Vigrahapāla is stated to have entrusted the reins of the government to his son Nārāyaṇapāla and become an ascetic. 'Let asceticism be mine and kingdom thine', says he, in his Bhagalapur grant.² Under the Chandellas, the king Jayavarman is also stated to have abdicated the throne. The Kālañjara inscription clearly declares that being wearied of administration, this monarch handed over the government to Prithvirāman and went to the Gaṅgā to wash his sins.³ The Jodhapur inscription of Bauka informs us that Bhillāditya, after entrusting the reins of the Government to his son, went to the Gaṅgā and lived there for eighteen years, he then observed a fast unto death and then went to heaven.⁴ Jhoja, the father of Bhillāditya, is also said to have proceeded to the Bhāgirathī after enjoying the pleasures of the kingdom.⁵ It is very likely that he also renounced the worldly life sometime during his old age. Jāta, a member of the family of Pratihāra Bauka, also retired to the pious hermitage of Māṇḍavya, adorned with streams and rivers, after entrusting the administration to his younger brother Bhoja, and practised there the rites of pure religion.⁶ In the Sena dynasty, Sāmantasena is said to have frequented the sacred hermitages in the woods by the sandy banks of the Gaṅgā where he

1. B. I., I, 317.
2. I. A., XV, 906.
4. E. I., XVIII, 95.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
spent a long time. The Chedi king Lakshmikarna probably abdicated the throne in favour of his son, though it is difficult to say whether he did it due to the desire of renunciation. The inscription merely states that Lakshmikarna took part in his son's coronation; it does not, however, inform us whether he accepted Sanajya in his old age.

Besides the epigraphical evidence, the Jain sources record a number of cases of such abdications. Thus the Prabhavaka-carita informs us that the king Ama, a son of Yaogarman of Kanauj, abdicated the throne in favour of his son Duncuha and spent his life in religious devotions. The Devatraya-Kavya also informs us that Durlabharaja of Chaulelyka dynasty abdicated the throne in favour of his nephew Bhima and devoted his remaining life to religious pursuits. Bhima I is also stated to have abdicated the throne in favour of his son Karana. The Hammiramahakavya also states that Jaitrasimha handed over the administration to his son Hammira and himself went to the forest. The contemporary South Indian records also refer to a number of instances of kings' abdications. Both Amoghavarsha I of the Rashtrakuta dynasty and Marasimha of the Gang family are stated to have abdicated the throne in favour of their sons in order to pursue spiritual ideals.

All this evidence clearly indicates that some of the pious rulers of our period actually followed the teachings of Hinduism and Jainism which lay down that a person should retire from life at the advent of old age in order to realise the spiritual ideal of human life. In the earlier periods, such instances are relatively few. This may perhaps indicate that the ideal of renunciation was becoming more popular in Hinduism in our period.

2. E. I., XII, 205; E. I., II, 1-17.
5. Ibid. IX, V. 74.
8. Ibid, p. 132. The Sanjana plate states that Amoghavarsha I gave away his kingdom more than once saying 'Of what account are external objects to me?'
There are only two instances in northern India of kings committing suicide under religious motif, that of the Chandelā King Dhaṅga and the Chedi King Gāṅgeyadeva. The Mau inscription of Madanavarmā states that Dhaṅga after living for more than hundred years 'at last abandoned the body in the waters of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā and entered into beatitude, closing the eyes, fixing his thought on Rudra and muttering holy prayers'.¹ The Chedi king Gāṅgeyadeva is also stated to have thrown himself into the Gaṅgā.² In the Deccan also during our period, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra IV³ and the Gāṅga king Mārasiṃha are stated to have committed suicide⁴ by fasting unto death, as recommended by the Jain religion.

Jainism permits an old man to commit suicide by fasting. Manusmṛiti⁵ allows a Vānaprastha to walk straight in north eastern direction, till he meets his death, by falling into water or fire. It is these teachings which were responsible for the above religious suicides. Examples of Hindu rulers followings the advice of Manu in the earlier periods are not known. Probably the growing influence of Jainism was responsible for their decisions.

SECTION B : MEMBERS OF THE ROYAL FAMILY

(1) Yuvarāja

We now turn to a discussion of the role of the various members of the royal family in the administration of our period. The first person to consider is the Yuvarāja or the crown prince. It may be observed at the outset that the Yuvarāja was regarded as an important member of the administration by our political writers. Sukra compares him to the right eye and the right ear of the king; he was to be consulted on important administrative problems.⁶

1. E. I., I, 195.
5. Manu, VI 31.
Naturally great care was bestowed upon the proper training of the crown prince; we have already referred to this topic (pp. 43-44). The crown prince is particularly warned that he should not become insolent on account of his privileged position. He was to be respectful to the king and considerate to his brothers. He was to help his father in carrying on the administration on proper lines and to the satisfaction of the subjects.¹

Though the Yuvarāja was an important member of the administration, our political writers do not include him in the ministry, probably because an heir-apparent, old enough to participate in administration, was not always available. We may presume that when a Yuvarāja, old enough to bear the burden of administration, was available, he was included in the ministry. Possibly he may have occupied the status of the Pratīnīdhi in Śukra’s cabinet.

We often find the Yuvarāja exercising the royal prerogative of granting villages, of course with the permission of the reigning king. Thus under the Gāhaḍavālas, Yuvarāja Govinda-chandra is seen granting a village in 1104 A.D., after taking his father’s permission.² Similarly Yuvarāja Jayachandradeva donated the village of Haripur to Praharājaśarman with the consent of his father.³ Yuvarāja Āśpoṭachandra issued a copper-plate in 1134 A.D., bearing his father Govinda-chandra’s seal.⁴ All this evidence shows that under the Gāhaḍavālas, the crown prince enjoyed the right of making land grants after taking the emperor’s permission. Probably such was also the case with other dynasties, though it is not revealed by their records.

Some records of the Chāhamānas of Nadol refer to the rule of both the king and the crown prince at the beginning. Thus the Sevadi inscription refers both to Mahārājādhirāja Aśvarāja and the Yuvarāja Kaṭukarāja.⁵ Another inscription

1. Śukra, II, 35-50.
3. E. I., IV, 118.
4. E. I., VIII, 155-56.
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from the same place refers to the king Kaṭukarāja along with the heir-apparent Jayantasimha.1

These cases would show that when the ruling kings were old, or incapacitated, the heir-apparent naturally exercised almost all the powers of the ruling king. The seal of the Yuvarāja was often regarded as necessary even when the seal of the king was there. Thus Madanapāla as Yuvarāja put his own seal on his father’s grant.2

(2) Queens

Let us now see what was the position of the queens during our period. It is important to note that a number of queens figure in the records of the different dynasties of our period, but we hardly find any one of them being entrusted with any administrative duties in Northern India. There is no doubt that in two of the records of the Gāhaḍavāla king Madanapāla, the crown prince Govindachandra is stated to have taken consent not only of his ministers and Purohita but also of the queen Rālhāṇadevi at the time of the land grant;3 whether her permission was a mere formal affair or whether it was due to her being a member of the government is difficult to say. It appears very probable that the queen-mother being the most important member of the royal family, the crown prince would have thought to honour her by taking her formal consent at the time of making the grant, and that she did not occupy any important post in the administration. The consent was thus probably a formal affair in her case; and more certainly in the case of other persons like Pratihāra and Mahattama mentioned in the record.

The queens during our period hardly played an important part in the administration. In the copper-plate records they are sometimes seen making land grants, but we should remember that they could do this only after taking the

1. E. I., XI, 34.
permission of the king. Thus, when under the Gāhadavālas, the crowned queen Prithviśrīkā wanted to grant the village of Bahuvarā to Purohitā Devavarmā and other Brāhmaṇas, she had to take the consent of the emperor Govindachandra.\(^1\) Nayanakelidevi, another queen of Govindachandra, had to supplicate for the king's permission, while granting the village of Daravali to Mahāpurohitā Jāguśarman.\(^2\) Ghośalādevi, another queen of Govindachandra, took her husband's permission while granting the village of Ghaṭīrā to Thakkura Kulhe.\(^3\) Under the Chedis also the same practice prevailed. The Karatalai inscription informs us that the queen Rahaḍā granted the village of Chakrāhaḍi to the temple of Vīṣṇu with the permission of the king Lakshmaṇarāja\(^4\). Similarly queen Ghośalādevi took the consent of king Vijayāsimha when in 1180 A.D., she donated the village of Coralaya in the Semvala-pattala to a Brāhmaṇa named Sītha-Sarmā\(^5\). All this evidence clearly indicates that the queens during our period were not given the right to make land grants with their independent authority.

There is of course one rare instance, where we find the queen making a grant without taking the permission of the king. Thus the Chedi queen Ālhaṇadevi, widow of the king Gayakarnaḍa eva and the mother of the reigning king Narasimha, is seen assigning the income from the villages of Nāmmaṇḍi in the Jāutipattala; but the document is silent about any permission taken for the transaction.\(^6\) The non-reference to the permission may however be accidental. Or it may be that the reigning king, out of his regard for his mother, did not like the permission to be formally recorded in the copper-plate.

The queens are also sometimes seen making land grants along with their sons. Thus under the Gāhadavālas, in 1124 A.D., the queen Rālhaṇadevi granted the village of
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1. \(E.\ I.,\ II,\ 187-88.\)
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Triabhāṇḍa to Brāhmaṇa Paṇḍita Bhūpatiśarman along with her son Govindachandra. Another inscription of the same dynasty informs us that the same queen along with her son Govindachandra granted 10 Nālukas of land to Thakkura Jayaśarman in 1133 A.D. The association of the dowager queen with the son in the land grant seems to be due more to religious feeling than to any administrative necessity. Even now the mother is associated with the son, when she visits sacred places like Banaras and offers Śrāddha to her departed husband.

For their private expenditure, the queens during our period were often given land allotments known as Rājakiya-bhoga under the Gāhāḍavālas and Grāsabhūmi under the Chāhamānas. They perhaps correspond to modern pin-money or Stridhana. Due to want of evidence it is difficult to say with certainty whether the queens of all the dynasties enjoyed such grants. Nor can we say definitely whether they enjoyed full proprietary rights over their Rājakiyabhaga. In one case, we find the Gāhāḍavāla queen Analadevi granting one plough of land from her own Rājakiyabhaga to Tirthaṅkara Mahāvīra without taking the king’s permission. It is very likely that under the Gāhāḍavālas, queens could if they liked, make land grants from their own Rājakiyabhaga, if the land to be given was a small piece. It is, however, not unlikely that the omission of the king’s permission in the above grant may be accidental.

Sometimes taxes were assigned to the queens as part of their income, probably in addition to the Rājakiyabhaga lands. In one of the Chāhamāna records, three queens are stated

2. E. I., V, 114.
3. One of the Nasik inscriptions (E. I., VIII, Nasik No. 5) refers to an order of Gautampitāma Sātakarṇi and his mother Balāśrī to an officer at Govardhana in connection with a religious grant. Here also mother’s association may be due to the religious desire to associate her with charity.
4. E.I., IX, 47.
5. E.I., XX, 33.
6. It is worth noting that the inscriptions of the earlier period do not refer to such grants to queens; they were probably becoming common in our period.
7. E. I., IX, 47.
to have made a grant of two ghānakas of oil from their own royal share. This of course, they could have done, only if the tax had been assigned to them for their own personal use.

The question of dowager queens functioning as regents has been discussed already (ante, pp. 42-43).

The contemporary South Indian records show that queens and princesses in the royal family were appointed frequently to important administrative posts; for instance Revakanimdi, a daughter of Amoghavarsha I and the wife of Erragaṅga, was the governor of the important district of Edatore in c. 850 A.D. Similarly under the Western Chālukyas, Vijayabhaṭṭārikā, the senior wife of Chandrāditya, the elder brother of Vikramāditya I, also acted as a governor. Under the later Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi also, we have several examples of queens being appointed to important government offices. Thus Mailladevi, one of the wives of Someśvara, was the governor of Banavāsī in 1053 A.D.; Ketaladevi, another wife of the same monarch, was the governor of the Agrahāra of Poonavada; Akkadevi, an elder sister of Jayasimha III, was ruling over the district of Kirsukad in 1022 A.D. Kumkumadevi, an elder sister of Vijayāditya, was administering Purigere 300 in 1077 A.D. Lakshmidevi, who was the chief queen of Vikramāditya VI, was in charge of 18 Agrahāras in 1095 A.D. Under the Yādavas also, queens and princesses are seen taking part in the administration. Lakshmī, who was a sister of Khoḷeśvara, the Khandesh feudatory of Singhana, is seen governing her brother’s principality during her nephew’s minority. Bhāgubāi, who was probably a relation of Singhana, was in charge of Tarewadi. Under the Gaṅgas also, the queens exercised considerable political power. Their inscriptions

1. E. I., XI, 35.
clearly inform us how the queens of Śripurusha, Bātuga and Paramadi were taking active part in administration, acting as governors, making land grants, etc. It is difficult to say why such cases are altogether unknown to Northern India. Is it likely that due to the influence of the matriarchal notions, the queens in the Deccan and Southern India might have been allowed to take an active part in the administration?

(3) Younger Princes

The younger princes during our period enjoyed suitable titles; thus Rājayapāla, a younger son of Gāhadavadāla king Govindachandra, is described as ‘Samastarāja-prakṛtyopeta’. They were often appointed to some important posts in the administration. Sometimes they were in the ministry also. Thus under the Chāhamānas, prince Sallakshanapāla was appointed as the prime minister by his own father, king Visaladeva. This practice does not seem to be very common, for there was the danger in such cases that the junior prince may conspire to secure the succession for himself.

Princes are often seen taking keen interest in the administration. One of the Chāhamāna inscriptions describes prince Jājalla as Rājyachintaka, i.e. supervising or pondring over the problems of the administration. Another inscription of the same dynasty informs us, how even the king sometimes used to take help from the princes in the important administrative matters. Thus in the Amaridakshini proclamation of the king Ālaṅadeva, his two sons, Gajasimha and Kelhaṇadeva, are both stated to be concurring with him. This clearly shows that grown-up princes under the Chāhamānas exercised considerable influence in the administration. It is also possible that Ālaṅadeva had become old by this time and was being assisted in administration by his two sons.

Princes more frequently appear as the governors of towns in our records. Thus under the Chāhamānas, king Gaja-simha appointed his son Chāmuṇḍarāja as the governor of Māṇḍavyapura in 1170 A.D.\(^1\) Similarly the king Kelhaṇa appointed his son Vikramasimha to the same post in 1180 A.D.\(^2\) In 1185 A.D. Māṇḍavyapura had another royal governor Soṭala, who was also a son of king Kelhaṇa\(^3\) We thus see that different princes were appointed as governors of Māṇḍavyapura at different times. Even if they would have enjoyed it as a sīf, they could do so only for a short period, for it was regranted in succession. The above cases hail from Rajasthan only, but it is not unlikely that the same was the case with other provinces also.

To carry on the town administration properly, the prince governors were aided by military officers. Thus when Gajasimha was acting as a governor of Māṇḍavyapura, Sauliki Jasadhana assisted him as his Balādhīpa; this officer had been allotted the revenues of village Jhamara, probably as part of his pay.\(^4\) He, however, could not make any alienations from his income, for we are told that when he was assigning a drāmma from his income, he had to take the consent of the royal governor Gajasimha.

Sometimes princes also enjoyed considerable prestige. Thus when Mahārājaputra Rājyapāla, younger son of the Gāhaḍavāla king Govindachandra, granted the village of Čəmawāmi together with some pattaḷas to Paṇḍita Dāmodaraśarman, he was allowed to put his own seal on the charter, though he had to take the permission of his father for the grant of the village.\(^5\)

For their personal enjoyment and expenses, princes were usually given sīfṣ known as Sējā under the Chāhamānas. It is, however, important to note that usually the princes had no full rights over their sīfṣ, i.e. they were not regarded as their personal property. For sometimes we find the central
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1. J. A. S. B., XII, 104.
government exercising the power of assigning revenues out of these fiefs. Thus Kelhaṇadeva granted a well in 1165 A.D., which was situated within the fief of Ajayapāladeva.¹ We may well presume that similar practice prevailed in other dynasties also.

Princes usually could not alienate land out of their fiefs. But they seem to have often enjoyed the right of assigning small portion of the income as a gift for a charitable purpose without taking the king's permission. Thus the Chāhamāna prince Kṛtipāla, who was given a fief of twelve villages, granted a yearly sum of two drammas from each of the twelve villages to the Jina Mahāvīra at Naddulai.²

Prabably the extent of a prince's fief differed according to circumstances. Sometimes we find that a number of villages were given as a fief, as was the case with the Chāhamāna prince Kṛtipāla, who was enjoying twelve villages as his fief.³ On the other hand, sometimes, only one village was given as a fief to two princes, as was the case with the Rājaputras Lākhaṇapāla and Abhayapāla, who were both enjoying one village as a fief in 1177 A.D.⁴ It appears that the extent of the fief depended upon the extent and resources of the kingdom and the importance of the grantee.

² E. I., IX, 68.
³ E. I., IX, 68.
⁴ E. I., XI, 50.
CHAPTER III

MINISTRY

(1) Niti Writers on Ministry

The writers on the Hindu political science, as a rule regarded the ministry as an indispensable wheel of the administrative machinery, next in importance only to the king. Śukra, the most important writer for our period, attaches great importance to the ministry. He observes, 'it is difficult for a person single-handed to accomplish even an easy task; how then can a kingdom, which entails heavy responsibility, be managed by an individual without the aid of assistants?' The king should therefore never act without the advice of his ministers, though he may be well grounded in all the sciences and a past-master in state-craft. The king, who relies only on himself, will generally be in calamities. He will create hatred for himself among his subjects and will be soon deposed from the throne. It is therefore necessary for a king to act according to the advice of his ministers, so that there may be neither any disorder in the kingdom, nor any danger to the head of the state. There are diversities in human aptitudes and they should be utilised to meet the different situations. It is, however, difficult for a single individual to be well-grounded in all spheres; the king should therefore enlist the help of competent ministers; otherwise he will bring about the destruc-

1. Yadyapyalpataram karma tadapyekeṇa dushkaram. Purusheṣāsahāyena kimu rājyaṁ mahodyayam. Śakra, II, 1

2. Sarvavidyāsu kuśalo nṛpī hy api sūmantravit. Mantrībhīṣṭu vinā mantrāṁ naiko'rtam chintayet kvachit. Śakra, II, 2

3. Prabhuḥ svātantryamāpanno hyaṇarthāyaiva kalpate. Bhinnatāś-trō bhavet sadyo bhinna-prakṛitireva cha. Śakra, II, 4
tion of himself, as also that of his kingdom.\textsuperscript{1} Śukra further compares an autocratic king, who does not listen to the counsel of his ministers to a thief in the form of a ruler, and calls him an exploiter of the people's wealth.\textsuperscript{2} It was the delicate duty of the minister to bring him round to the correct path.\textsuperscript{3} 'A king' says Somadeva, 'who is assisted by his ministers, Purohita and Senāpati, is generally victorious and successful.'\textsuperscript{4} He further states that even an unintelligent king can get success in his administration, if he acts in consonance with the advice of his ministers. He may himself have no sterling merit, yet he will be honoured.\textsuperscript{5} Kāmandak also regards the ministry as one of the limbs of the body politic and advises the king to appoint good ministers and regard them as his best friends, because they can check him from following a wrong course.\textsuperscript{6} He says that the king will never be able to rule successfully and will himself soon perish, if his council will consist of wicked ministers.\textsuperscript{7} The Matya-Purāṇā observes, 'The king, while his head is still wet with the waters of coronation, should act according to the advice of his ministers, and thereby secure stability for his kingdom'.\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{1} Purushe purushe bhinnam driṣṭaye buddhivaṁbhavam. Aptaśaṁyairamubbhavairārgamairanumaṁntaṁ. Na hi tat sakalarājātāṁ nareṇaṁkena śakyate Ataḥ sahāyān varavedṛjā rājyaṁvṛddhaṁ. Śukra, II, 57.

\textsuperscript{2} Vinā prakṛtisammantrādṛjyaṁasō bhaved dhivram Rodhānaṁ na bhavet tusmad rājāntaṁ syuḥ suamantriṣaṁ. Śukra, II, 81

\textsuperscript{3} Hitāhitāṁ na śripoti rājā mantrimukhāḥ chhaṁ Sa dasyuḥ rājarūpoṇa prajāntāṁ dhanalāraṇaṁ. Śukra, II, 257

\textsuperscript{4} Kumārgaṇamapi niṁpaṁ buddhyodhartaṁ kṣhamāṁ śuchīṁ. Śukra, II, 9

\textsuperscript{5} Mantri-purohita-senaṁpatināṁ yo yuktamuktaṁ karoti sa ahāryabuddhiḥ. Nek, Chap. 10

\textsuperscript{6} Asugandhamapi sūtraṁ kusumasanaṁsargātkiṁ nārohati devaśirāṁaṁ? Nek., Chap. 10.

\textsuperscript{7} Niṁpaśya ta eva suhrdastā eva guravo maṁaṁ, ya enamutpathagataṁ vārayantyanivārītaṁ. Kāmandaka, IV, 51

\textsuperscript{8} Nirundhānāṁ satāṁ mārgaṁ bhakshayanāṁ mahśpatim, Dushtāṁmānaṁ saccivastamātaṁsusachivo bhavet. Kāmandaka, IV, 12

\textsuperscript{8} Matya-Purāṇa, 215-2.
"The Agni-Purāṇa also asks the king to consult ministers on weighty problems. Writers of the earlier age also hold similar views about the importance and the necessity of the ministry."

(2) Epigraphs on Ministry

Ministry was a regular feature of administration since early times and the same was the case in our age. Ministers are invariably mentioned in the records of Gāḥaḍavāla rulers. The records of the Chandella kings of Mahoba refer to several ministerial families. The Badal pillar inscription of Nārāyanaṇapāla states that several generations of the Brāhmaṇa family of Garga served as ministers under successive Pāla rulers. The Parmāra inscriptions refer to Mahāpradhānas and Amātyas. Mahāmantrins and Mahāmātyas are both mentioned in the Chedi records. Śaṅkaradhāra appears as the chief of hundred councillors in the India office plate of Lakṣmaṇasena. The Chaulukya and the Chāhmāna inscriptions also frequently refer to Mahāmātyas. They should not, however, be taken as the chief ministers; for in one of the Chaulukya inscriptions, the finance minister is also called Mahāmātya. This shows that the title Mahāmātya was probably given to other important ministers also in the Chaulukya administration.

(3) Ministry under Provincial Government

In ancient India, not only the king used to have his own ministry, but the same was often the case with some provin-

cial governors. We have ample evidence to show that the provincial governors were guided by the ministers in carrying out the administration successfully. This clearly indicates how ministry was regarded as indispensable for good government. Even as early as the time of the Mauryas, the province of Taxila was governed by a viceroy assisted by a ministry. There is evidence to show, how the subjects at Taxila revolted against the ministers and how Aśoka was sent there by Bindusāra to establish peace and to restore order. The Mālavīkāgnimitra informs us that Agnimitra, the crown prince of Pushyamitra and the governor of Mālwa, had his own council of ministers.

It is difficult to say whether such a council of ministers existed under provincial viceroy during our period of survey. Our inscriptions supply very little information about provincial government. The officers called Kumārāṃtyas do occur in the Pāla records, but they should not be taken as ministers to the prince of the blood royal, who was appointed as an heir-apparent or viceroy. It is very likely that the Kumārāṃtyas were something like I.C.S. officers under the British administration, who sometimes worked in the district and sometimes in the provincial and sometimes in the Central secretariat. They were also sometimes appointed as the members of the government.

The contemporary south Indian records, however, point to the existence of ministries functioning under the crown-prince and governors. In one of the records of the Yādava dynasty, a minister of the crown prince Jaitugi is referred to in one place, while in another inscription there is a mention of the premier of Tikkamadevārāya, the Southern Viceroy of Rāmachandra.¹

(4) Influence of the Ministry

The ministers exercised great power and influence in the administration of different dynasties. They were respected even by kings, as is suggested by the Badal pillar inscription, which informs us how Darbhapāṇi, the minister of Devapāla, kept

his king waiting at his door. This is no doubt an exaggeration, but the inscription leaves no doubt that the king showed utmost reverence to this minister. The Baghari stone inscription graphically states how through the advice of the minister Sallakshaṇa, the king Paramadideva became as it were the lord of the earth (Śiva) with three eyes. Obviously the minister was regarded as the third eye of the king.

Good and able ministers were highly honoured and respected; and others were urged to follow their example. The Mau inscription declares how Mahāpāla, the prime minister of the Chandella king Vijayapāla, became the standard of comparison among the good ministers due to his blameless policy.

Success in foreign policy depended upon the efficiency of ministers. It is described how the minister Śivanāga secured for the king Vidyādharā a paramount position in the circle of kings by means of his clever policy. It was due to the policy of Darbhapāga that the Pāla emperor Devapāla was able to make tributary the earth between Revā’s parents (Vindhyā Mountains) and Gaurī’s father (Himalayas) and enjoyed it ‘as far as Rama’s bridge in the South’. It was by following the advice of Kedāramiśra that Devapāla was successful in eradicating the race of the Utkalas. He also humbled the pride of the Hūṇas and scattered the conceit of the rulers of Draviḍa and Gurjara. These statements, even though exaggerated, undoubtedly indicate that ministers did take a leading part in determining the foreign policy of the king.

Ministers were also regarded as the main cause of the prosperity of the kingdom and the happiness of the subjects. The Karitalai Inscription states how the kingdom of the Chedi king Yuvarāja went on prospering during the ministership of Brāhmaṇa Bhākamiśra. It was the minister

4. Ibid., 199, V. 24.
5. E.I., II, 161 V. 5.
6. Ibid., V. 13.
Gaṅgādhara, who through his wonderful ability, made the kingdom of Ratnadeva III free from all foes and thus restored peace and prosperity.¹ The Paramāra king Jājalladeva was able to maintain the stability and prosperity of his kingdom only through his minister Lālārka, who is said to have crushed forcibly the powerful enemies.²

The ministers’ advice was also expected to bring to the king the three objects of life, Dharma, Artha and Kāma. The Chandella kings Dhaṅga and Gaṅda are stated to have obtained them by following the advice of the minister, Prabhāsa.³

In the Deccan also during our period of survey, ministers were highly respected and honoured by their kings and were able to exercise considerable influence on the administration. In the Salotgi inscription of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛishṇa III, his foreign minister Nārāyaṇa is described to be as dear to him as his own right hand.⁴ The Pathari pillar inscription of Parabala, who was a Rāṣṭrakūṭa feudatory, informs us how he used to regard his premier as worthy of salutation.⁵ The Yādava king Kṛishṇa compares his minister to his own tongue and right hand in one of his records.⁶ Another inscription of the same ruler states, how his premier’s feet were brightened by the crest jewels on the head of the feudatories.⁷ All this evidence clearly indicates that ministers occupied a place of honour in the Deccan also.

We have thus seen that the status of ministers was very high. The contemporary Deccan records show how sometimes they were honoured with the feudatory titles and how they were entitled to the use of Pañchamahāśabdas. Thus Dalla, who was a foreign minister of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhruya, was invested with the title Sāmanta and also authorised to use five great musical instruments.⁸ Kālidāsa,

---

¹ E.I., XXI, 164.
² E.I., XXII, p. 159-62.
³ E.I., I, 195.
⁴ E.I., IV, 60.
⁵ E.I., IX, 254.
⁶ I.A. XIV, 60.
⁷ A.S. Altekar, Rāṣṭrakūṭas, 161.
⁸ E.I., X, 89.
the war minister of the Chālukya king Jagadekamalla, is described as entitled to the Pañchamahāśabdas.¹

It is difficult to say whether such a practice prevailed in the North also during our period of survey. Our inscriptions do not confer any such titles upon the ministers. There is no doubt that in one inscription Ajayadeva, who was the prime minister of the Paramāra king Jayavarman II, is designated as Rājā,² but it is difficult to say whether it was a feudatory title.

(5) Ministers' Qualifications

Let us now see what were regarded as the main qualifications for a minister. The views of the writers of our period are generally the same as those of their predecessors. According to Śukra, the minister should belong to a good and well-to-do family, should have studied the political science, should be a man of character and personality and should be pre-eminent for his modesty in behaviour, courage in action and sweetness in speech.³ He further states that while selecting a minister, one should not attach an undue importance to the caste and family.⁴ Somadeva says 'Ministers must be endowed with real character, for lack of principles vitiates all personal merits and qualities. They must be well-born, since an ill-bred person is proof against all shame and is capable of misdeeds. They must be free from passions, for to possess a sensual minister is like riding a mischievous elephant. They must be resourceful and courageous, for there is no use of a minister who is not of help in adversity.⁵' Bṛihaspati says 'Ministers must be men of high character, free from the vices of gambling, drinking, sensuality and recklessness. They must be acquainted with the Śāstras also.⁶' The Agni-Purāṇa pres-

¹. I.A., VI, 140.
². E.I., XX, 79.
³. Śukra; II, 52–64.
⁴. Naiva jātirna cha kulaṁ kevalam lakshayedapi
   Karmaśīlaṁ pūjyaśatathä jātkule na hi.
   Śukra, II, 54
⁶. Bṛihaspatya, II, 42.
cribes similar moral and intellectual qualifications for ministers.  

All this evidence clearly indicates that while selecting the ministers great attention was paid towards loyalty, efficiency, character, merit and family extraction.

Let us now see how far ministers conformed to this high standard in actual practice during our period of survey. A number of epigraphical passages give us a vivid idea of the qualities regarded as indispensable to the minister. Thus Prabhāsa, the minister of the Chandella kings Dhara and Gaṇḍa, besides possessing excellent qualities, is described as expert in the science of politics. Ananta, the minister of the Chandella kings Kirtivarman and Sallakasanaivarman, combined in himself 'spotless sacred knowledge, bravery and efficiency in the very high office of counsellors.' He is described as upright, intelligent, eloquent, versed in the sciences, resolute and yet compassionate and well grounded in practical administration. Rudrarāja, the minister of the Paramāra king Naravarman, was well grounded in the Śāstras. Śivanāga, the minister of the Chandella king Vidyādhara, was a past-master of sacred knowledge and also an expert in military art. Mahīpāla, the minister of the Chandella king Vijayapāla, is described as 'fulfilling the purport of his word by truth, that of his understanding by actions, which bore good fruits, and that of his wealth by pious and beneficial deeds.' This shows that he was always truthful, active and pious. Gadādhara, the premier of the Chandella kings Prīthvivarman and Madanavarman, is stated to have surpas-

1. Agni-Purāṇa. 121, 16-17.

2. It may be noted in this connection that some of the writers on Hindu polity hold that only loyal persons should be selected as ministers, while others attach more importance to efficiency than to loyalty. Some writers also hold that the selection of ministers should be made from among king's school companions; others thought that the choice should be restricted to the members of certain loyal and tested families. Cf. Manu Smātī VII, 60-64; A.S, I Chap. 5. It is difficult to say which of the above views prevailed in actual practice. Most probably persons combining in themselves both efficiency and loyalty were appointed to the posts of ministers.

4. Tr. R.A.S., I, 266.
sed the preceptor of gods in understanding. Lāhaḍā, the premier of the Chandella king Madanavarman, was well-versed in sacred lore and different arts. Gadādhara, the minister of peace and war of the king Paramarddi of the same dynasty, is expressly described as an excellent poet. Vatsaraːja, the premier of Kīrtivarman, was like Vāchaspati in both counsel and action. The Badal Praːasti of the time of Nārāyaṇapāla graphically describes the qualifications of the ministers, who served under the Pāla rulers. Thus Garga, the minister of Dharmapāla, is said to have excelled Bṛihaspati in knowledge. His son Darbhapāṇi was well versed in the four Vidyās. His son Someśvara, the minister of Devapāla, was very liberal and was like Dhanaṅjaya in point of prowess. His son Kedāramiśra, the minister of Śūrapāla, was a liberal donor and a great scholar. His son Gauravamiśra, the minister of Nārāyaṇapāla, was a great orator and was well-grounded in the Āgamas, Vedas and Astrology. Narapati, the minister of both Jaitrasiriha and Hammira of Raṅathambhor, is described as a master of the science of politics. Gaṅgādhara, the minister of the Chedi king Ratnadeva III, besides being brave, courageous, kind and intelligent, was of upright behaviour and well-grounded in the science of polity and law. Lālārka, the minister of the Paramāra king Jagaddeva, was brave, truthful and pure-hearted. Bhākamiśra, the minister of the Chedi king Yuvarāja, was a great poet and was well-versed in the sacred lores.

It is important to note that our writers on Hindu polity rarely refer to military proficiency as an essential qualification for the ministers. There is no doubt that Kāmandaka observes at one place that the ministers should be brave and Soma-

3. E.I., 211, V. 20.
6. E.I., XIX, 49.
7. E.I., XXI, 164.
8. E.I., XII, 174-76.
deva adds that they should know the use of missiles, but even such general statements are not made in this connection by any of the remaining writers of our period. A perusal of the epigraphical evidence, however, shows that ministers were usually military leaders or generals. Thus Ananta, the minister of Kirtivarman, is said to have been expert in controlling the elephants, horses and chariots. He was also skilled in archery. Jagapāla alias Jayasimha, the minister of Jájalla, assisted the latter in his victories. Vatsarāja, the minister of Kirtivarman, was also a general, who had wrested away from the enemy a whole district by his counsel and valour.

The contemporary South Indian records also show that ministers were generally military leaders. Jaitrapāla, the prime minister of the first Yādava emperor Bhillama V, was as great a general as a statesman. Nāgarasa, the premier of Yādava king Kṛishṇa, was also as great a general as a scholar. Chāmunḍarāja, the minister of the Gaṅga king Mārasiṁha, was a great military leader, for he is said to have won the battle of Gonur for his king. In 1024 A.D. the Minister of Records and the Director-General of Registration in the administration of the later Chāluṅkyas, had the title Mahāprachandaṇḍaṇāyaka, showing that he was a high military officer. All this evidence clearly indicates that both in the north and south, military leadership and ability were considered to be necessary qualifications for ministers during our period. Shivaji’s ministers were also good generals with the exception of the Purohita (royal priest).

Most of the works on Hindu polity prescribe that the ministers should be hereditary. This hereditary character is

1. A.S. Altekar, Rādhakāśaj, p. 163.
2. E.I., I, 197.
3. I.A., XVII, 35.
6. I.A., XIV, 76.
9. Manu, VII, 54 and Tājñāvalkya, I, 312 use the word Mana in con-nection with ministers, which is interpreted as hereditary by Kullūka and Vījñāneśvara.
also borne out by many inscriptions. The Mau inscription of the time of Madanavarman informs us that under the Chandellas, five generations of one family, Prabhāsa, his son and grandson Śivanāga and Mahīpāla, the latter’s son and grandson Ananta and Gadādhara, served as ministers under nine generations of the dynasty represented by Dhaṅga, his son, grandson and great grandson Gaṅḍa, Vidyādhara and Vijayapāla, the latter’s son Devavarman, his brother Kirtivarman, the latter’s sons Sallakṣaṇavarma and Prithvīvarman, and the former’s son Jayavarman.¹ A little later under the same dynasty, we find that Lāhaḍā was a minister under Madanavarman and his son Sallakṣaṇa and grandson Purushottama under Paramarddideva, the grandson of Madanavarman.² Under the Pālas, the hereditary principle was followed in appointing the ministers. The Badal Praśasti of the time of Nārāyaṇapāla associates the members of the ministerial Brāhmaṇa family representing Garga, his son Darbhapani, his son Someśvara, his son Kedārāmiśra and his son Gauravamishra, with four successive Pāla rulers, namely Dharmapāla, Devapāla, Śūrapāla and Nārāyaṇapāla.³ Similarly, Brāhmaṇa Bhākamishra and his son Someśvara acted as chief ministers in the reign of the Chedi kings Yuvarāja and Lakṣmaṇarāja.⁴ It is thus clear that the hereditary principle in appointing the ministers was often followed in actual practice. A later work, the Rājaniṣṭi-Prakāśa, expressly states that this hereditary principle is to be given up, if the son of a former minister has not the requisite qualifications; under such circumstances the descendant is to be employed only in such state work as is suited for his attainments.⁵ Probably this practice was followed in our age also.

An analysis of the above evidence indicates that an ideal minister, besides being the citizen of the state and belonging if possible to a hereditary ministerial family, was expected to be an administrator of character and ability, well versed in

¹ E.I., I, 197.
² E.I., 208-11.
³ E.I., II, 161.
⁴ E.I., II, 174-76.
⁵ Rājaniṣṭi-prakāśa, p. 176.
the political science and able to lead the army in case of necessity.

In actual practice not all ministers came up to the ideal standard. Just as there were oppressive kings, there were also greedy and unscrupulous ministers. It is interesting to note that Mānasollāsa\(^1\) couples them with robbers and exHORTS the king to protect his subjects from both.

Sometimes ministerial appointments were made from among the members of the royal family. Thus under the Chāhamāna king Visaladeva, his own son Sallakshaṇapāla was functioning as a minister.\(^2\) The Rājatarangini also informs us that in Kashmir, the king Harsha had appointed two sons of a former ruler as his ministers.\(^3\) It appears that this practice of selecting ministers from the members of the royal family was not very common in Northern India, for we come across very few such cases during our period. The main reason for this appears to be that it was feared that the royal minister may revolt against the king and usurp the throne for himself.

Early Śrīritis have laid down the dictum that only Brāhmaṇas should be appointed to the post of ministers. We do not know how far this principle was followed in actual practice. Our inscriptions do not always refer to the caste of any minister; but it appears very probable that members of all the four castes were often represented in the ministry. Śukra expressly observes that the ministerial appointments should not be made on caste considerations.\(^4\) It is only on the occasion of marriage and dinner that one should enquire about the caste; but while selecting ministers, consideration of caste should not be taken as important.\(^5\) Somadeva recommends that the king should select ministers only from among the members of the three regenerate castes, namely Brāhmaṇa, Kshatriya and Vaiśya.\(^6\) Śukra, however, allows even a Śūdra

1. Mānasollāsa, I, 155.
4. Śukra, II, 54.
5. Śukra, II, 55.

Nuk., Chap. 25
to be in charge of the military department, if he is capable and loyal. It is thus clear that in the ministry, the three twice born castes were usually represented, and also the Sudra caste on some occasions. During our period, kings were usually non-Brahmans; it is therefore very likely that they might have often preferred to have at least a few ministers from their own caste.

(6) Composition of the Ministry

Let us first consider the strength of the ministry. Unfortunately due to divergence of views among the writers on Hindu polity, we are not able to make any definite statement on this point. The Mahabharata is in favour of a ministry of eight. According to Manu, this number may be reduced to seven also. The Arthaashastra quotes the different views on the topic from which we learn that the Mahaavara, Bhraspatya and the Asanasa schools were in favour of a council of 12, 16 and 20 members respectively. Kautilya himself, however, is in favour of a small ministry of three or four members.

The writers of our period also do not insist upon any particular number of ministers. Kamaunda mentions the different views of the three schools given by Kautilya. Somadeva is of opinion that there should be three, seven or eight ministers. He also suggests that if one minister possesses all the qualifications necessary for the proper administration of the kingdom, more need not be appointed. Obviously Somadeva was in favour of a very small ministry. Sukra, however,

   
   *Sukra, II, 139*

2. Ashtānāṁ mantriṣṭām madhye mantraṁ rājopadbhārayet.
   
   *Mbh, XII, 85.*

3. Sachiivaḥ saṁta chāṣṭau va kurvita sauparikshitān.
   
   *Manu, VII, 54.*

4. *A.S., I, Chap. 15.*
5. *A.S., I, Chap. 15.*
7. *A.S., I, 15.*
10. *Nuk., Chap. 10*
recommends a ministry of ten but refers to another view recommending a ministry of eight only. *Mānasollāsa* refers to a ministry of seven or eight, as recommended by Manu.

Let us now see what was the cause of the difference of opinion among the political writers on this point. It appears very probable that the divergence of views arose due to the divergent needs of the different states. Kauṭilya states that the actual number of ministers should depend upon the needs of the state or the exigency of the situation. If the state was a small one and its activities were limited, a small ministry of four or five members would have been quite sufficient in carrying out its administration successfully. In the case of a bigger state, of course, the number of ministers would have been a large one, as its administrative requirements were extensive. The epigraphical evidence also shows that the foreign minister was assisted in his work by a number of assistants. Even in a small kingdom like that of the Śilāhāras, we find that there were more than one foreign minister, each having full ministerial status. Now if a small kingdom like that of the Śilāhāra had two foreign ministers, it is very likely that the bigger states would have had even more foreign ministers. All this evidence clearly indicates that the strength of the ministry varied according to the extent and power of different states. Generally the ministry consisted of eight or ten members as is suggested by the evidence of the *Sukranīti* and the *Mānasollāsa*, whose opinion seems to be based upon the views of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Manusmṛiti*. But if it was found that this number would not be sufficient to carry out the administration efficiently, then more persons were appointed either as ministers or as secretaries to the ministers.

   *A.S.*, I, Chap. 15
5. The number eight for the council of ministers seems to have been followed by long tradition. When Shivaji wanted to revive the old Hindu administrative system in 1674 A.D., he also thought of a ministry of eight.
The jurisdiction of the ministry covered the whole field of administration. From the study of the functions of the different ministers given by Sukra, it appears that the ministry had to preserve law and order, to promote prosperity and avert disasters, to ensure proper administration of justice, to supervise the collection of revenue and sanction the necessary expenditure. It had also to take a survey of the socio-religious structure of society and to sanction the changes necessitated by new factors and circumstances.

The Smritis and most of the writers on Hindu polity do not inform us how the ministers used to discharge the above functions, and how the departments were distributed. Unfortunately the epigraphical records of our period also do not supply any information on these topics; they give us only a long list of officers without stating anything about their functions. It is the Šukraniti, the most comprehensive literary work on polity for our period, which throws considerable light upon this topic; earlier works including the Arthaśāstra are silent on the point. To judge from this work, it is clear that the ministry consisted of the Purohita, Pratinidhi, Pradhāna, Sachiva, Mantri, Prādvivāka, Paṇḍita, Sumantra, Amātya and Dūta. It is important to note that many of the above ministers also figure in our records either with the same or equivalent titles, and hence it is very likely that ministers would have divided the departments on the lines suggested by Sukra.

Let us now survey the duties and functions of the different ministers.

PUROHITA

The Purohita or the Royal Priest was an important member of the ministry in early times. He figures prominently in the council of Ratnins in the age of the later Samhitās. Following the old tradition, Sukra1 also includes him in the ministry and regards him as superior to all. But whether such was the case in the administrations of our

1. Purodhāḥ prathamam śresṭhāḥ sarvebhyaḥ rājarāśtrakṛtvān. Sukra, II, 74
period, may be doubted. The records of the Chedis, the Senas and the Gāhaḍawālas separate him from Mantrins or ministers in the list of royal officers. He may therefore have not been included in the ministry in some governments. Sukra may be allotting him the first place out of the traditional reverence for him. Shivaji's ministry did not include him.

Besides having the knowledge of the technique of sacrificial rites and ceremonies, the Purohita was expected to be well-grounded in the different branches of learning; he had to master the three Vedas, the six Vedāṅgas, the Dharmaśāstra and the Niti-Śāstra. He was also to be adept in the art of warfare. This last qualification appears, no doubt strange, but it is more or less true, for even in the Vedic period we find him often accompanying the king to the battlefield in order to ensure his victory by his prayers, charms and incantations.

Under the Gāhaḍavālas, the royal priest had also to discharge the duties of the royal preceptor (Mahārāja-jaguru). Thus Prahlādaśarman was both the Mahāpurohita and Mahārāja-jaguru of the king Jayachandra. Probably the same was the case with other dynasties also. Purohita became associated more with the rituals of the royal household than with details of administration; he therefore gradually lost his seat in the ministry, though he was honoured even more highly than a minister.

The Purohita was sometimes entrusted with the work of composing the text of the royal charters. Thus the Purohita Trivikramanātha was the writer of the Partapgarh inscription of the Pāla king Mahendrapāla II. The royal priest Someśvara was also the composer of Dabohi inscription, dated 1254 A.D. The selection of the royal priest for this work, that

1. E.I., XVIII, p. 221.
3. E.I., IV, 121.
was sometime made, is not difficult to understand. He was usually a scholar and the charters were mainly religious in their character, as they recorded grants for Brāhmaṇas, temples, etc.

**PRATINIDHī**

The Pratinidhī or the Viceroy was the next important member of the ministry. He however does not figure in any of the records of the dynasties under consideration, probably because he was appointed only when the king was ill or absent from the kingdom. His main duty was to deputise for the king. Shivaji's ministry of eight did not include a Pratinidhī; but later on when Rājārām had to leave Mahārāṣṭra and take refuge in the fort of Ginji, a Pratinidhī was appointed. The status of the Pratinidhī family in the Kolhapur Durbar was higher than that of any other official or feudatory.

**PRADHĀNA**

The Pradhāna, or the Prime Minister, was the most important member of the ministry. He is described as sarvadarśa or the general supervisor over the entire administration. He figures very frequently but with different designations. Thus Brāhmaṇa Bhākamiśra, who is styled as the Mahāpradhāna of the Chedi king Yuvarāja, Someśvara, who is designated as Mantri-tilaka in one of the records of Chedi king Lakshamanarāja, Mantrindra Vatsarāja of the Chandella king Kirtivarman, Mahāmantri, Mahāpradhāna Purushottamadeva of the Paramāra king Yaśovarman, Rājā Ajayadeva, the Mahāpradhāna of the Paramāra king Jayavarman, II, the Mantrimukhya Māladiva of the Chaulukya king

1. Kāryyākāryyapraṇijnātā smṛitaḥ pratinidhistu sab. 
   Śukra, II, 84.

2. The term Pradhāna denoted the prime-minister in the state of Jodhpur and Jaipur till modern times.

3. Sarvadarśa pradhānastu senāvīt saclavasthā. 
   Śukra, II, 84.

7. E.I., I, 208-211.
8. E.I., XX, 79.
Arjunadeva,—these were probably all discharging the functions of the Prime Minister. In Kashmir, he was called Sarvādhikarin and his status was lower than that of the king only. The same term was used for him under the Kalachūris of South Kośala, one of whose records refers to Purushottama-deva, the Sarvādhikarin under Ratnadeva II.

Several Mahāmātyas figure in the Chaulukya and Paramāra records, which expressly describe them as Sakalamudrāyāpārān pariṇaṃihayati'—i.e. in charge of the issue of all the sealed documents. Thus the Kirādu inscription of Kumārapāla refers to Māhāmātya Mahādeva. The Nādol grant, as well as the Udayapur stone inscription of Kumārapāla, mention Mahāmātyas Bahadadeva and Yaśodhavala. Mahāmātyas Ratnapāla and Nagāda appear in the Royal Asiatic Society's grant of the Chaulukya king Bhima II and in the Kadi plates of the Chaulukya king Visaladeva. Mahāmātya Śrikantha figures in the Khokhrā stone inscription of Sāraṅgadeva. Probably all these Mahāmātyas were functioning as Prime-ministers.

As in modern times, so also during our period of survey the premier was in special charge of one department. Thus Madhusūdana, who was the premier of Sāraṅgadeva, was in charge of the foreign department also; he is described both as Mahāsandhivigrahika and Mahāmātya in one record. Mahāmātya Śri Ambā-prasāda was in charge of finance under Trailokyavarman. It is very likely that other premiers may have taken other departments according to their choice.

The Prime Minister probably had several secretaries working under him. One of them is referred to in a Chedi record. Thus Mahāpradhānārthalekhi Thakkura Śri Daśamūlika, who

figures in the Jabalpur plate of the king Jayasiṅhadeva\textsuperscript{1}, was obviously a secretary (*arthalekhi*) to the Prime Minister. It may be noted that this arrangement corresponds to that of Śukra, who lays down that each minister should have a secretary under him.\textsuperscript{2} It may be pointed out that in Shivaji’s ministry, the Prime Minister was known as Pradhāna. In the states of Jodhpur and Jaipur, the same title was given to the same dignitary till the integration of the states with the Indian republic.

The status of the Prime Minister was naturally next only to that of the king only. His position probably resembled that of the Turkish Grand Vazier or the Mughal Vakil.

SACHIVA

Sachiva or the war minister was the next important member of the ministry.\textsuperscript{3} It is important to note that Somadeva does not include him in the list of the ministers though Śukra does so. The epigraphical evidence both from the North and the South shows that he was given a place in the ministerial council. The war minister was expected to be well-grounded in the theory and practice of war and also in the art of organisation. It was his duty to keep all the branches of the army well-equipped and to see whether all the forts were properly provisioned.\textsuperscript{4}

The records of our period designate the war minister by different names. Under the Gāhaḍavālas and the Chandellas, he is merely called Senāpati,\textsuperscript{5} while the Pāla and Sena records give him the more high-sounding title Mahāsenāpati.\textsuperscript{6} The records of the Chedi, the Chāhamāna, the Paramāra and the Chaulukya dynasties, however, do not mention him, though they refer to a number of military officers. The non-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{E.I.}, XXI, 95.
  \item Śukra, II, 109-10.
  \item In Shivaji’s ministry, according to one authority (Chitnis), Sachiva denoted the chief secretary; according to another authority, he denoted the war minister (Jabata).
  \item Śukra II, 91-95.
  \item \textit{E.I.}, XVIII, 221; \textit{I.A.}, XXV, 205-8.
  \item \textit{E.I.}, XXVI, 7; \textit{I.A.}, XV, 306.
\end{itemize}
mention of his office may be accidental. It may be due to the Prime Minister being also the war minister, as was the case with the premier of the Chalukya ruler Jagaddekhallama of the contemporary Deccan.\(^1\)

The status of the war minister was very high. The contemporary South Indian records show that they were supplied with palatial buildings and were permitted to use elephants for riding and invested with brilliant robes and cunningly worked staffs, which were the insignia of their office. They had, like the Mahāśāmanatas, the great musical instruments of their own office.\(^2\) Whether such privileges were enjoyed by the war ministers in Northern India during our period cannot be stated with certainty, for our inscriptions do not throw any light on this topic.

**MANTRI**

The Mantri or the foreign minister is the next important member of the ministry.\(^3\) The records of our period invariably call him Mahāsandhivigrahika, the chief officer in charge of peace and war. According to Śukra, he was to be well grounded in the fourfold policy of Śāma, Dāma, Daṇḍa and Bheda, while according to Lakshmīdhara, he was to be adept in all aspects of the sixfold policy, a judge of opportunity and a past-master in diplomacy.\(^4\)

The work of the foreign minister was very heavy and exacting. As a general rule, each state had a large number of feudatories and had to deal with several neighbouring states throughout our period. The foreign minister was assisted in his work by a number of sandhivigrahikas in the contemporary Deccan, each probably in charge of the foreign affairs relating to one or two particular regions in the empire. Thus under the Śilāhāras, we find that even though their kingdom was not a big one, there was one chief foreign

---

1. *J.A.*, VI, 139.
3. In Shivaji's cabinet, the foreign minister was known by this designation.
minister and another foreign minister, working as his subordinate for Karnāṭaka affairs.¹ This would remind us of the minister of Kashmir affairs in Pakistan in modern times. The states in northern India also had probably several foreign ministers, though they do not figure in our records. If a small kingdom like the Śilāhāras had two foreign ministers, it is not unlikely that in big kingdoms like those of the Pratihāras, the Pālas and the Chaulukyas, there would have been more than one foreign minister or at least several secretaries working under him.

A number of records show that the foreign minister was usually entrusted with the drafting of the copper plate charters, granting lands and villages to Brāhmaṇas and temples. Thus sandhivigrahika Mahāndaka was the writer of Haddāla grant of Mahipāla;² sandhivigrahika Khelāditya of the Kiradu stone pillar inscription³ of the Chaulukya king Kumārapāla; sandhivigrahika Vāmana of two Paramāra inscriptions;⁴ sandhivigrahikas Nārāyaṇadatta and Śankaradhara⁵ of the Govindapur and the India office plates of Lakṣhamaṇasena.⁶ There is nothing strange in this procedure. The sandhivigrahika was entrusted with this work probably because it was rightly thought that he could usually give very reliable information about the genealogy and exploits of the grantor and his ancestors, which the charter had to describe at its beginning. It is interesting to note that Yājñavalkya also states that ‘the drafter (of a copper plate charter) should be the foreign minister; he should draft the charter at the dictate of the king himself.’⁷

The Mahā-sandhivigrahika not only drafted the charters, but was often appointed to deliver them to the grantees.

1. I.A., V, 277
2. I.A., XII, 192-95.
3. E.I., IX, 63-65.
4. E.I., XXI, 50.
5. I.B., 92-98.
7. Sandhivigrahakāri tu bhavedyasasya lekhakaḥ Svayaṁ rājñā samādihṣṭaṁ līkedhrājaśasanam. Yāj. I, 319-20
Thus sandhivigrahikas Bhīmaka Thakkura¹, Sudhā² and Vāhu-deva³ acted as Dūtakas in the Kadi plates of Bhīma II. The Dūtaka of the Radhanapur plate of the Chaulukya king Bhīma was the sandhivigrahika Chandraśarman⁴ and that of the Suṇaka plate of the Chedi king Karṇadeva was Chāhila.⁵ Similarly Tripurinātha, the Dūtaka of the Śaktipur plate of Laskhamanasena,⁶ Bhogāditya of the Pālanpur plate of Bhīma II,⁷ Harighosha of the Naihati grant of Ballālasena,⁸ Nārāyaṇadatta of the Anulia grant of Lakshamanasena,⁹ and Kapivishṇu of the Madanapur plate of Vishvarūpasena,¹⁰ were all sandhivigrahikas. The foreign minister had also to keep under proper control the numerous feudatories of the empire by summoning them to the capital for periodical visits and by stationing the representatives of the Imperial power at their courts.¹¹

PRĀDVIVĀKA

The minister Prādvivāka was in charge of the judicial department. While explaining the word, Śukra states that it denotes an officer, who first interpellates and then decides. More intelligible terms for the office were also current. This minister is for instance called Mahādharmādhyaksha under the Senas.¹² His non-mention in the records of other dynasties may be accidental. He was to be well-versed in the traditional and Saṃriti law and an expert in evaluating evidence.¹³ Usually the king used to preside over the highest court, but if owing to ill health or pressure of work, he was unable to discharge this duty, the chief justice used to act

². I.A., VI, 194.
³. I.A., VI, 199.
⁴. I.A., VI, 193.
⁵. E.I., I, 317.
⁷. E.I., XXI, 171.
⁸. E.I., XIV, 168.
¹¹. Mānasollāsa, II, 128.
¹². E.I., XII, 8.
¹³. Śukra, II, 97-98.
for him in the highest court of appeal and decide cases with the help of jurors.

PANDITA

Śukra is the first writer to mention the portfolio of Paṇḍita; he is not mentioned in any earlier Smṛiti or Niti works. His office came into prominence, probably because society was changing and old laws were becoming inoperative. The functions of the Paṇḍita resembled those of the Parishad of the earlier period. He was to be well-versed in Dharmaśāstras. His duty was to advise the king concerning the suitable changes that may become necessary in socio-religious matters owing to changed times and customs after surveying the whole situation. It is perhaps likely that the Dharmamahāmātras under the Mauryas, the Śramaṇamahāmātras under the Sātavāhanas, the Vinayasthitisthāpakas under the Guptas, and the Dharmāṅkuśas under the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were officers of this department, discharging similar but somewhat restricted functions in the earlier periods. This minister was included in Shivaji’s ministry and was known as Paṇḍitrāo, a title almost identical with that of Śukra.

SUMANTRA

Sumantra or the treasurer was the next member of the ministry. His office seems to have existed since very early times. The Saṅgrahītā, who figures in the list of the Ratnins of the Vedic period, and the officer called Samāhartā in the Arthaśāstra were probably discharging functions similar to those of Sumantra. The Gāhadavāla records obviously refer to this minister as Bhāṇḍāgārika. It may be noted that during our period as in earlier days, land tax was usually collected in kind and so the title Bhāṇḍāgārika given to the minister in charge of treasury was quite appropriate. His non-

1. Mantri tu nītikusalaḥ paṇḍito dharmatātvavit.
   Śukra, II, 85.
Vartamanāscha praśchāna dharmamāḥ ke lokasaṁśṛitaḥ
Śrātrashu ke samuddaśīṣṭa vírudhyante cha ke'dhunā
Lokāṅkṣāraviruddhāḥ ke paṇḍitastān vichintya cha
Nṛpaṁ saṁbodhavya taṁcha paratreha sukha-pradaṁ,
Śukra, II, 99-100
mention in the records of other dynasties may be accidental. His duty was to find out what were the total collections and disbursements for the year and what was the balance at its end. He had to sell old corn and replace it by fresh stock every now and then, lest the contents of the stores should become useless.¹

The term Šumantra was used to denote the foreign minister and not the treasurer in the ministry of Shivaji.

AMĀTYA

Amātya or the revenue minister is the last to be mentioned by Šukra. He however does not figure in the records of our dynasties under consideration. His duty was to keep a correct account of the income derived from forests, mines, villages, towns and the country and to keep correct records of the land under cultivation and the land lying fallow.² The minister of this title in Shivaji’s ministry was performing almost identical functions.

(7) Functioning of the ministry

Unfortunately we have no epigraphical evidence to show as to how the daily business of the administration was carried on by the ministry. Early political writers also do not supply us sufficient information about the actual functioning of the ministry. It is very likely that the king usually presided over the council of ministers. He is advised not to lose his temper in the council meeting.³ Manu asks the king to consult the ministers first individually and then collectively, and then to decide the point himself.⁴ Kauṭilya also recommends joint consultation with three or four ministers, whose departments may be connected with the matter under dis-

1. Iyaccha sanchitam dravyam vatsaresmin triṇādikam
   Vyāyibhūtamiṣyaḥchaiva ṣesam ahāvāra-jāṅganesam
   Iyadasthitī vai rājāe sumantro vinivedayet. Šukra, II, 101

2. Šukra, II, 103-5.
5. A.S., I, Chap. 15.
cussion. Śukra, however, states that it is very likely that the ministers may hesitate in giving their free and independent views in the presence of the king in the council. He therefore asks the ministers to send their opinions in separate memoranda, explaining fully the grounds for the same. Someśvara also is in favour of separate consultation with the ministers. The Rājatarāgīṇī shows that the Kashmirian kings followed all these alternatives; the king Harsha is seen to have consulted his ministers jointly in VII, 1043 and 1145, while in VIII, 3082-3, king Jayasimha is found to be consulting only a few ministers.

Consultations with the ministry must have been very frequent, but they are rarely referred to in epigraphical records. We get one reference to it in a Chāhamāna record. The Chāhamāna king Vigravarāja is stated to have consulted his Mantri Śrīdhara as to the course of conduct on the impending struggle. This is a solitary example one has of the consultation of the king with his minister in Northern India, though we get a similar case under the Śilāhāras of the Deccan.

Let us now discuss the routine working of the ministry. Here also we have to note that not a single writer on Hindu polity except Śukra has discussed this topic in detail. It is only from the Śukraṇīti that we learn that the minister should be assisted by two or more secretaries according to the magnitude of his work. If, however, the work was not exacting, the minister was to do it alone. A secretary was often promoted to the position of the minister in due course, if he had proved his capacity by his work and achievements; Śukra recommends a regular system of promotion to successively higher posts leading ultimately to the ministership. He

1. Rāgāloobbhādhhayādrājñāh syyrmūkā iva mantriṇaḥ
   Na tanaunuṭān vidyān nipatiḥ svārthasiddhaye
   Prāthakprāthak mataḥ teshān lekhayitvā anādhanam
   Vinirīt svametaivāv tat kuryād bahusammatam.
   Śukra. I, 969–64

3. I.A., XX, 211.
5. Adhikārībahnā drishyā yojayeddarśakān bahuṅ.
   Adhikāryaṁekaraṁ vā yojayeddarśaṁkrivāṁ
   Śukra, II, 116
6. Yathāyathā Śreṣṭhāpade hyadhikārī yadā bhavet
   Anukramaṇa saṁyogyo hiyante tam prakṛtiṁ nayet.
   Śukra, II, 290
further suggests the transfer of a minister from one department to another. That such transfers were often taking place in actual practice is also evident from epigraphical evidence. The Mau inscription of the time of Madanavarman informs us how Gadâdhara, who was at first discharging the duties of Pratihâra, was promoted to the post of a minister by Prithri- varman.\(^1\) Ananta, who held various responsible posts under the Chandella king Kârtivarman, later on became the Prime Minister during the reign of Sallakshañavarman.\(^2\) Sañkara-dhara, who was at first a foreign minister of Lakshmanasena, was subsequently promoted to the post of Chief Councillor.\(^3\)

As in modern times, a capable minister was often put in charge of two departments in ancient India. This would have happened only when the minister was very efficient and was able to discharge the duties of both the offices. Thus under the Paramâra king Dhaúga, Yañodhara was acting both as his Purohita and chief justice.\(^4\) In the Chedi ministry under king Sârañgadeva, Madhusûdana was discharging the duties of both the Prime Minister and foreign minister.\(^5\) The inscriptions of our period do not give us many such instances. It is therefore probable that this practice was not very common, and normally a minister was put in charge of only one department.

The king is advised to consult his ministers, while executing a particular policy. He is also required to keep carefully all the confidential records of business of the council. Even early writers like Manu and Kauñîlya, recommend that the consultation with ministers should be held in a guarded place. Somadeva, the writer of our period, also states that the deliberations in the council should be conducted in utmost secrecy. He advises the king not to hold council meeting in places which echo human voices. This advice about secrecy must obviously have been followed in actual practice.

Let us now see how the actual business of the council

\(1\). *E.I., I, 197.*
\(2\). *E.I., I, 197.*
\(3\). *E.I., XXVI, 12.*
\(4\). *E.I., I, 140-7.*
\(5\). *I.A., 1912, 20-21.*
was conducted. Sukra recommends that the agenda and the minutes should be recorded in writing. The written document is the best guide, for oral orders are liable to be misunderstood or forgotten. The ministers therefore should not do anything without a written order; nor should the king issue any command orally on any matter, however unimportant. Sukra expressly states that the seal is the king and not the person of the ruler. Brihaspati is also in favour of business being conducted in writing. According to him a king or an officer, who does state business by oral orders practises fraud on the state.

Each minister managed the affairs of his own department with the help of his assistants. He had to submit written reports of his work to the king either daily or monthly or yearly according to circumstances. The king had to read the report and if approved, he was to put his signature on it. If, however, due to heavy work, he was unable to see the report personally, then the crown prince was asked to examine it and to put his signature on behalf of the king. The report was then sent to the department concerned and then the order which it contained was given effect to.

Sukra gives us an interesting and detailed description of the different expressions to be used for the approval of the order by different ministers. The Mantri, the Pradvivaka, the Pundita and the Dutta were to give their consent by the expression svavruddham (not opposed to our views). The expressions of approval to be used by the Amatya, the Sumantra, the Pradhana, the Pratinidhi, the Yuvaraja and the Purohita were sadhulikhitam (well-written) sanyagvicharitam (well-considered) satyam yatharthamiti (true) angikritam (it is approved) angikartayamiti (it should be accepted) and lekhyam.

1. Na karyan bhritaka kuryannripalekhadviśa kvachit
   Nājñāpayellekhaṇena vināśpaṁ va mahanripaṁ
   Sukra, II, 290
2. Nripasamichilinitam lekhyam nripastanna nripo nripah.
   Sukra, II, 292
4. Dainikaṁ mālikatā vrtaṁ vārshikāṁ bahuvārshikam
   Tatkarṣajñatalekhyaṁtu rājē samyak nivedayet.
   Sukra, II, 295
5. Sukra, II, 364.
swābhimātam (opinion is acceptable) respectively. The order was lastly sent to the king and he had to express his approval by the expression drīśtam (seen).\textsuperscript{1} It is thus clear that when any new policy was to be carried out or when any new order was to be executed, it was to be approved by the ministers. Whether the absent minister was expected to give his opinion is not known. Śukra is silent on this point. Kauṭilyya, however, suggests that absent members should send their views in writing, as they may be helpful in assessing the situation.

We have now finished the discussion about the different problems connected with the ministry; let us now survey the relation between the king and the minister. It may be observed at the outset that during our period, there existed no popular central assembly; the ministers were therefore directly responsible for their work to the king and their influence largely depended upon personal factors and not upon the constitutional backing of a popular assembly.

It has been already stated in the beginning that ministers possessed large powers even in normal times. These powers tended to increase, when the king happened to be a minor or a weak ruler. There is also an actual instance to show that at such times, they even used to play the role of king-makers. Thus the Jabalpur copper plate of the Chedi king Yaśakarṇadeva informs us how Kokalla II was placed on the throne by the Chief-minister (Amātyamukhya) of Yuvarāja II.\textsuperscript{2}

The picture would of course change, if there was a powerful and self-willed ruler upon the throne. He could disregard the advice of ministers as was done by the Paramāra king Munja, when he decided to launch his expedition against the Chaulukyas in the teeth of the opposition of his minister,

\textsuperscript{1} Śukra, II, 362-367.
This expression occurs in several Vākāśaka records in the margin of their plates. \textit{E.I.}, VI, 36.

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{E.I.}, II, 3-4, V. 8.
It may be pointed out that in Kashmir history, ministers had often an effective voice in the selection of the successor. Thus Sugandhā had to accept Pārtha as her successor, as the ministers would not consent to accept her nominee Śravavarman.

\textit{Rāj.} V. 253-5.
Rudraditya. He could even dismiss a minister giving bad advice. Sukra clearly states that the king should first rebuke and then dismiss him from his office.

Normally speaking the relation between the king and the ministers was a cordial one. The ministers were no doubt the servants of the king, but they were also at the same time trustees for the people. We have already seen how kings normally had a high regard for their ministers. It was the duty of ministers to prevent the king from following a wrong path and to oppose measures against the interest of the people. The kingdom is bound to perish, states Sukra, if the king does not follow the advice of his ministers. Kāmandaka, as has been stated already, calls those ministers as the real friends of the king, who prevent him from following a dangerous path.

---

1. Prabandhachintāmani, 33.
2. Amātyamapi saṁvākhyā sakrīdanyāyagāminam
   Ekānte daṇḍayet spashṭamabhyāṣātprakṛitam tyajet. 
   Sukra, I, 376-77
3. Hitah rājñāśchāhitarah yallokānāh tanna kārayet
   Navinakaraśulkādyairloka udvijate tatah. 
   Sukra, II, 273
5. Kāmandaka, IV, 41.
CHAPTER IV
SECRETARIAT AND THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

We have discussed in the last chapter the powers and functions of ministers; we shall now survey the organisation of what in modern terminology might be conveniently called the Central Secretariat and its various departments. Here also it may be noted that the records of our period supply us no direct and detailed information about the machinery of the central government; and hence it is difficult to say, how the secretariat and its various departments were organised and how they used to function. The records of our period merely give us a long list of officers, but they do not throw much light upon their powers and functions. We can, however, form a general idea of the secretariat and its different branches on the basis of the list of officers, supplied by the records of the different dynasties of our period. The contemporary Niti writers also help us a good deal in this respect.

(1) Qualifications of Secretariat Officials

The success of administration depends largely upon the efficiency and ability of the secretariat officers and the accuracy with which they draft the orders of the central government. Ancient Indian political writers have therefore advised the king to take great care in the selection of the Secretariat officers. Sukra states that the king should appoint officers in the secretariat only after examining their fitness for the work. The Secretariat officers were also expected to be well trained and were required to possess almost as high qualifications as ministers, as far as ability and reliability were con-

1. Parikshakairdravyayitvā yathā svāraṇān parikshyate.
Kārmmanā sahavisena gunaiḥ śīlakālaśīhīḥ.
Bhrityam parikshayamīpyaṁ viśvasyaṁ viśvate tatha.
Sukra. II, 53
cerned. We have already seen in the last chapter, how our Niti writers have attached great importance to the business of the government being conducted in writing; the officers in the secretariat were therefore expected to be expert in drafting.

(2) Working of the Secretariat

The secretariat was known as Śṛṅkaraṇa under the Chāhamānas and Chaulukyas. Its head was usually a Mahāmātya. It had a big record office, where official documents were carefully kept. The account of Abdur Razak shows that the Diwānhāna of the Vijayanagar ministry was a big hall of 40 pillars with a gallery of 90' × 18' for accommodating the secretariat. We may presume that similar arrangements existed in our period. In its normal work the secretariat had to deal with a considerable amount of correspondence. It received the reports from the districts and replied to them. Śukra lays down that daily monthly or periodical reports were to be submitted.

The secretariat had also its inspecting staff to control provincial and district officers and find out whether its orders were being properly carried out or not by the subordinates. The inspection machinery of the central government is but rarely referred to in the records of our period; so far we have come across only one such instance in Northern India during our period. The Partāpgarha inscription of Mahendrapāla refers to a touring officer called Mādhava designated as Tantrapāla. He is stated to have made a tour to Ujjayini to investigate certain matters as desired by the king. It may be, however, added that the inspecting officers are referred to in the Vākāṭaka, Gupta and Chola records. Śukra also, while recommending tours of inspection, observes that the king or the higher officers should inspect the villages and towns in order to have a first hand information about the real condition and feelings of their residents. The solitary reference

1. E. I., 1X, 63
2. Saileshore; Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagar Empire I, 252.
3. Śukra, II, 294-5.
5. Grāmān purāṇa delānāhcha swāyam sarīvākṣhya vatsare, Adhikariganaśāh kāścha rūjitaśā kāścha karahitab. Śukra, I, 374.
to the inspection agency in our epigraphs may be accidental. Administration is hardly possible without an efficient inspecting machinery.

Our records are usually land transfer documents, and they frequently refer to the work of the secretariat in connection with land-grants. That some secretariats used to keep duplicate copies of at least some land grants is suggested by the epigraphical evidence. One Palimpsest plate, containing an original inscription of the Rāṣṭrākūtas and a later one of the Paramāras, has been found. It is plausible to suggest that the plate was obtained by the Paramāras, when they looted the Rāṣṭrākūta treasury at Malkhed. If such was the case, then it may be permissible to conclude that office copies of some charters were kept in some secretariats. The evidence however is very insufficient to arrive at a definite conclusion.

Sometimes the donees wanted to exchange the village granted to them earlier. Thus the Nagpur Praśasti of the Paramāra king Naravarman informs us that the king donated three new villages in lieu of the two assigned earlier by his predecessor. This must have been done after consulting the original charter.

Sometimes when the letters of the grant used to become blurred due to lapse of time, steps were taken to replace the charter by a new one. This was done by the Chāhamāna king Ratnapāla, when he renewed the grant of the village in the Saptasata Vishaya, originally made by Mahārāja Jindarāja to the Brāhmaṇa residents in that village, as its letters became blurred due to lapse of time.

The central government used to take proper and immediate steps to annul fraudulent grants. Sometimes government officers themselves went astray, took bribes and issued false copper plates. When such things occurred, the central government used to punish such officers. Thus in the Tārāchandī inscription we find that when an officer of the Gāhaḍavāla king Vijayachandra made a certain unauthorised

2. E. I., II, 183.
land grant to some Brähmaṇas after receiving from them some bribe, the local ruler of Jāpila at once declared it to be fraudulent.¹

Sometime owing to anarchy also the donees could not enjoy their full rights given to them under the land grants; when however order was re-established, the land grants were re-examined and renewed. The Barah Copper plate of the Pratihāra king Bhoja informs us that the possession of the village Vālkāgrahāra, lying in the Udumbara Vishaya of the Kālaniṃa Maṇḍala, which had been originally granted by Nāgabhaṭṭa, was disturbed by the prevailing anarchy in the reign of Rāmabhadra. When sufficient evidence was adduced, the grant was renewed.² From another inscription of the same king we learn that the king Bhoja revived a grant in the year 893 A.D. in Gurjaratrā-bhūmi, originally made by Vatsarāja and later confirmed by Nāgabhaṭṭa, but subsequently fallen into desuetude during the time of Rāmabhadra owing to anarchy.³

All these records clearly show how the central secretariat was very careful in revenue transactions.

In modern administration, the minister is an official different from the head of his department; in ancient times, the two posts were often held by the same individual. We often find an officer rising to the position of a minister. The cases of Pratihāra Gadādhara and Ananta rising to the ministerial position have been already referred to. This procedure is in accordance with the practice recommended by Śukra, according to whom the king should promote an officer successively to higher positions leading ultimately to the post of a minister, when he proves himself fully qualified and competent.⁴

(4) Number of Departments

As regards the number of the departments of the secretariat, there is no unanimity among the writers on polity.

---

¹ E. I., XIV, 182-8
² E. I., XIX, 15-19.
³ E. I., V, 213.
⁴ Śukra, II, 115.
The epics\(^1\) and the *Arthaśāstra* usually refer to eighteen departments;\(^2\) the latter however, shows that their number was often increased by five or six if necessary.\(^3\) According to Śukra, there should be twenty departments in the secretariat;\(^4\) supervised by the superintendents of elephants, horses, chariots, infantry, cattle, camels, deer, birds, gold, jewels, silver, clothes, parks, buildings, palaces, religion and charity. The records of our period, however, disclose some further departments, which are referred to by neither the Śrīmī nor the Nīti writers. As it is difficult to enumerate them separately, we shall for the sake of convenience group them under the different heads of administration.

(5) *Royal Household Department*

Monarchy being the normal form of government, we shall at the outset discuss the royal household department. The royal palaces and buildings were\(^6\) in charge of an officer called Saudhagehādhipa by Śukra and Āvasathika by Pāla inscriptions.\(^8\) Probably he might have had an assistant to issue permits to the intending visitors. Under him worked Dvārapāla,\(^7\) who used to check visitors’ entry into and exit from the palace premises. The officer, who used to take the visitors to the royal presence, was known as Mahā-Pratihāra.\(^8\) His assistants were known as Pratihāras. The position of Mahā-pratihāra was similar to that of the modern aid-de-camp. Besides having a fine personality, he was expected to possess tact, charm and suavity.\(^9\) Mahāpratihāras were assisted by Vetradhāras, who used to instruct the visitors in the formality of the proper department. The king was always

1. *Rāmāyana* II 100.36; *Mbh.* 5.38.
2. In the *Rāj I.* 118-28 Jalauka is said to have increased the number of departments to 18 from their original number of seven. It appears that 18 had become a traditional number.
4. Śukra, II, 117.
5. Śukra, II, 119.
8. Śukra, II, 273.
guarded by his body-guards designated as Angrarakshakas by Pāla inscriptions and Anɡanigūhakas by Chaulukya records.

Mahārāja-guru or the royal preceptor is the next officer that we have to consider. He figures frequently in our records. In the Khajurāho inscription, Vāsavachandra appears as Mahārāja-guru of the Chandella king Dhanāga. Being a very learned man, he was sometimes asked to compose the copper plate grants; probably it was thought that he would compose them elegantly. Thus under the Paramāras, the Bhopal plates of 1214 and 1215 A.D. were both composed by Rājaguru Madana with the consent of Mahāsandhivigrāhikas Rājasalana and Bilaṇa. Sometimes he used to act as a witness, when the king made a land grant. For instance, when the Paramāra king Devarāja made a grant in V.S. 1059, the witness was his Guru Matvāka. Sometimes the duties of the royal priest and preceptor were combined in the same person. In the Kamauli grant, king Jayachandra is stated to have granted the village of Osia to his Mahāpurohitamahā, who was also his royal preceptor.

Besides the royal preceptor there was also a royal physician in the king’s court. He has been called Bhishak in the Gādaḍavāla records and Antarānga in the Sena ones. Lakshmīdhara describes him as Vaidya. He was expected to be well grounded in the eight branches of the medical science.

The ‘science’ of astrology had become well-established during our period and we find the king’s court usually having a court astrologer. He was called Naimittika under the Gādaḍavālas, and Jyotishi under the Chāhamānas and

1. R.C. Majumdar, History of Bengal, p. 285.
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7. E. I., XVIII, 221.
8. E. I., XXII, 217.
11. (1) E. I., II, 343. (2) Peterson, M. S. S., 887, 97.
Mahāmāhūrtika under the Chaulukyas. Lakshmīdhara calls him Riju, a word whose derivation is difficult to make out. He was not only expected to be a master of omens but also of medicine. It may be noted that even in modern times Ayurvedic physicians often start their treatment after satisfying themselves that the day is auspicious. Just as we now sometimes have physicians-cum-astrologers, in the past, there were probably astrologers-cum-physicians. Being a learned man, he was sometimes entrusted with the drafting of the land grants. The Delhi Śiwalik pillar inscription of the Chāhamāna king Viśaladeva was written by the astrologer according to the orders of the king.

Since very early times, the royal courts used to have their own poet laureates. The practice was continued during our period also. Under the Chandellas, they were often given the title Kaviḥakravartī. The Khajurāho inscription of the Chandella king Dhaṅga refers to Kaviḥakravartī Nandana.

The internal management of the royal palace was looked after by several officers. Sambhārapa was one of them; his duty was to keep a proper stock of the things necessary for the maintenance of the royal household. Under him worked the superintendent of kitchen, who had to take particular precaution to see that no attempt was made to poison the king.

The royal harem was put in charge of an officer designated by Śukra as Antaḥapurayogapurusha. Lakshmīdhara calls him Antaḥpurādhyaksha. He was to be sexless, truthful and sweet-tongued. The officer called Śayyāpāla, mentioned only in the Chaulukya records, was probably in charge of the king’s bed; he must have worked under the Antaḥapurādhipa.

1. Nimūte śaṅkumānāye vettā chaiva chikitsite.
   Kṛtaṇāḥ karmaṇāṁ śūrastathā kiefasahu riṣūḥ.

4. Śukra, II, 162.
5. Śukra, II, 157.
6. Śukra, II, 185.
8. A.S.I.W. C., 1907-08, 55.
Besides him there were also maid-servants or Parichārikās, working in the inner apartments. They were expected to be skilful in serving and to take part in the diverse work of the royal harem allotted to them.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT

We shall now consider the different departments of the state administration. Among these the military department was the most important one. The commander-in-chief, who was in charge of this department, was known by different designations under different dynasties. The Gāhaḍavāla and the Paramāra records call him by the simple name senāpati, while those of the Pālas and Senas give him the more high-sounding title of Mahāsenāpati. The title Kampanādhipati was in use in Kashmir. The commander-in-chief was usually a member of the ministry also, as shown in the last chapter. His duty was to organise the fighting forces and to maintain them at maximum efficiency.

The Senāpati was assisted in his work by a number of subordinate military officers. The fighting force during our period had three main arms; infantry, cavalry, and elephant corps—each being in charge of one separate commander. The Pāla kingdom, which had the sea coast, had a naval arm as well. We do not know whether the Chaulukyas maintained a navy to protect their coast.

The superintendent of infantry was probably called Baladhipa under the Chāhamānas and Balādhyaksha under the Pālas. He had under him a number of officers of lower rank, who are referred to by Śukra. The Pattipāla was the lowest among them; he was in charge of five or six foot soldiers and corresponded to a modern lance Naik. The next officer,
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called Gaulmika\(^1\) was in charge of thirty foot soldiers according to Śukra; he corresponded to the modern Jamadar. He appears in the Pāla and Sena records also, but unfortunately they do not throw any light upon his functions. Dr. R.C. Majumdar suggests that Gaulmika was an officer in charge of a military squadron called Gulma consisting of nine elephants, nine chariots, twenty-seven horses and forty-five foot soldiers.\(^8\) Dr. U.N. Ghoshal takes him to be a collector of customs duties and refers to the term Gulmadeya\(^3\) used in the Arthatāstra in the sense of dues paid at the military or the police stations. While justifying his interpretation, he points out that in the Pāla records, Šaulkika is immediately followed by Gaulmika and hence he must be an officer connected with the revenue department.

Dr. R.C. Majumdar, however, does not agree with Dr. U.N. Ghoshal and he, while criticising the latter’s view, argues that in the Sena records, Gaulmika immediately follows the military officers and hence he must be a member of that category. It is difficult to say which of the above views is correct, for neither in the Pāla records nor in the Sena epigraphs are the functions of Gaulmika referred to anywhere. It would appear that the functions of the Gaulmika may have differed in different administrations. However, it may be pointed out that Dr. R.C. Majumdar’s view is supported by Śukra, who definitely states that he was a military officer.\(^4\)

The next higher officer mentioned by Śukra is Šatānikā.\(^5\) He was the head of one hundred foot-soldiers. He was expected to be well-grounded in the art of warfare and its different tactics. His duty was to train the soldiers both in the morning and evening and supervise military parades. He was assisted in his work by an officer called Anuśatāka.\(^6\) who was also of the same rank as that of Šatānikā.

The next higher officers referred to by Śukra were

---
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Sāhasrika¹ and Āyutika² in charge of a thousand and ten thousand foot soldiers respectively.

The bow, the spear and the sword were the main weapons of the age and soldiers used to fight generally with them. Lakshmīdhara, while describing the army, refers to Dhanurdhāris and Khaḍgadhāris³ The swordsman and the bow-man had to fight sometimes on foot and sometimes from the back of the horse or the elephant. Lakshmīdhara therefore insists that swordsmen and bow-men should be able to manage the horse as well as the elephant. Probably the same was expected of the spearmen, though they are not referred to in this connection in the Rājadharma Kāṇḍa of Kṛityakalpataru.

Among the minor weapons of the army referred to in the Mānasollāsa (II. 681-83) may be mentioned clubs (mudgara), battle-axes, knives (ksurikās), tridents and machines to throw missiles (yantramukta-yudhāh kechit). The work also refers to sellachakra, whose nature is not clear. Śukra refers to fire-arms and artillery (IV, 7, 213) but these passages are later than our period, as already pointed out. There is no evidence so far forthcoming to show that fire-arms were used by the Hindus before c. 1370 A.D.

The superintendent of cavalry is called Aśvapati⁴ by Śukra. He was to be adept in military parades and was expected to know how to guide, train and treat the horses. Mahāśādhanika mentioned in some Chaulukya records⁵ and Mahāśvāsādhanika⁶ figuring in some Chedi inscriptions were the designations of cavalry officers working under Aśvapati. Sāhanī⁷ of the Chāhamāna epigraphs was perhaps the master of stables.

The Mahāśādhanika appears to have been an important officer, for sometimes he is seen enjoying the revenues of a town or a village without the power of alienation. Thus Āśni, the wife of Mahāśādhanika Māhāika, owned a plot of

---
¹ Śukra, II, 142.
² Śukra, II, 142.
⁴ Śukra, II, 190.
⁵ I.A., XVIII, 341.
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land in Sēnvalapuraka Grāma, which was enjoyed by her husband, but she had to supplicate for the permission of the Paramāra king Vākpatirāja\(^1\) when she wanted to alienate a portion of it.

The superintendent of the elephant corps was designated as Mahāplupati\(^2\) by the Sena records and Pilupati\(^3\) by the Pāla ones. Sukra describes him as Gajapati.\(^4\) He was expected to have the knowledge of differentiating the three kinds of elephants and also of nourishing them properly; when they were ill, he was to make adequate arrangements to treat them. The officer called Nāyaka,\(^5\) who used to be in charge of twenty elephants, worked under him.

The superintendent of chariots does not appear in the records of our dynasties under survey, probably because the chariot corps had ceased to be a part of the fighting force. But it appears that the army still used to require some chariots, probably for the use of high officials on ceremonial occasions. It therefore had a chariot superintendent. Sukra calls him Rathādhyaksha\(^6\) and states that he should be skilled in moving, turning and controlling the chariots. He was also expected to know how to manufacture strong and durable chariots.

The officer called Mahāvyūhapati,\(^7\) who is referred to only in the Pāla and Sena inscriptions, was one of the highest officers of the military department. His position was similar to that of the chief of the military staff in modern times. Unfortunately the precise nature of his work is not described anywhere in inscriptions, but there is no doubt that he had to study the different kinds of battle arrays, which formed an important part in military strategy.

The officer called Mahāgaṇapastha,\(^8\) appearing in the Sena records was probably a military officer, for according to Sukra

---

5. Sukra, II, 147.
Gaṇa denotes a body of troops consisting of 27 chariots, as many elephants, 81 horses and 135 foot. Unfortunately we are not in a position to ascertain how and what functions this officer used to discharge, for the inscriptions throw no light upon the point.

Forts as units of defence were very important in our age, and the army had to supply the personnel for their garrison. Each fort was in charge of a capable and experienced officer. He was known as Koṭţapāla² under the Pratihāras. Śukra calls him Durgādhyaṅkṣha.

The warden of the marches called Maryādādhurya³ by the Pratihāra and Prāntapāla by the Pāla records was an important military officer. His duty was to watch over the frontier and to prevent undesirable or hostile persons from entering the kingdom. In Kashmir, he was known as Dvārapāla. He worked in close cooperation with the superintendents of forts in his vicinity.

Sometimes government used to appoint the same individual in charge of a fort and the adjoining frontier. Thus under the Pratihāra dynasty, Gwalior, which was a very important fort, had only one officer, who was discharging the duties of both the Koṭţapāla and Maryādādhurya.³ This would have happened only when one officer was found efficient enough to discharge both the duties.

The military department had its own store of weapons. Under the Imperial Guptas, there used to be a separate office called Raṇabhaṅgārādhikaraṇa, which was in charge of the stores and weapons. Whether such an office existed during our period also, we do not know, for there are no references to it in any of the records of our dynasties. It is, however, natural to assume that a separate officer was put in charge of stores of weapons during our period also, though he is not mentioned in the inscriptions.

The military department also looked after the distribution of the army in the different territories. It is important to note that as the means of communications were poor, the big

empires in ancient India used to have battalions of their army stationed in the different directions. Thus under the Pratihāras, we find that there was a southern army to watch over the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, an eastern army to check the Pālas and a western army to oppose the Muslims.\footnote{Elliot, I, p. 23.} Not only in the North but in the South also during our period of survey there were provincial headquarters for the army. It is interesting to note that even today our army has its different commands like the southern, the northern and the eastern ones.

Most of the kingdoms of our period were land bound and hence had no navy. The Pālas and the Senas, however, were maritime powers, and we find them maintaining a navy. Their records frequently refer to navy or naubala.\footnote{\textit{I.A.}, XV, 306, \textit{IOA.}, XXI, 217.} The officer known as Nākādhyaṇkha also appears in the Pāla records; according to Dr. R.C. Majumdar this title is a corrupt form of Nāvādhyaṇkha or Naukādhyaṇkha.\footnote{R.C. Majumdar, \textit{History of Bengal}, p. 306.} It is not possible to say how the navy was organised and how its administration was carried on, as both the literary and epigraphical sources are silent on the point.

FOREIGN DEPARTMENT

The Foreign Department was another important department at the centre. The minister in its charge is generally called Mahāśandhivigrāhika in the records of our period. There were a number of subordinate officers in the foreign department to help the foreign minister whose work, as we have already seen in the last chapter, was very heavy, as he had to look after the feudatories and neighbouring powers. His work in connection with the former has been described in an interesting manner by Somesvara in the \textit{Mānasollāsa} (II. 128). He was to summon the different feudatories at proper time to have discussions with them and then to dismiss them.

The officer called Mahāmudrādhikrīta appearing in the
Sena records probably worked in this department. His duty was probably to grant passports to foreigners for entering the country. The Pāla records refer to another officer called Dūtapreshaṇika, who seems to have been in charge of the dispatch of the envoys to other states on diplomatic business. The next officer concerned with this department was Gamāgamika. Gamāgamika literally means one, who comes and goes. It is also not unlikely, as suggested by Dr. U.N. Ghoshal, that he would have been carrying out functions of an urgent character in connection with the diplomatic department of the state, requiring frequent visits to the neighbouring kingdoms or to the dominions of vassals.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

The police department may be conveniently considered at this point. Unfortunately the records of our period do not clearly distinguish between the police and military officers. It is likely that Daṇḍanāyakas of our period were both military and police officers. Sometimes the military officers did the duty of the police officers and vice versa. They had a number of subordinate officers like Daṇḍapāśikas, Chauroddharaṇikas, Daṇḍikas, Daṇḍaśaktis, Chātas and Bhaṭas, who are frequently referred to in our records.

The Daṇḍapāśika, who is referred to only by the Pāla and Sena records, was probably of the status of the modern district superintendent of police. As his designation indicates, his duty was to catch the thieves. Sometimes he was entrusted with the important work of discharging the functions of a Dūtaka in connection with the delivery of a land-grant.

The Chauroddharaṇikas were mainly concerned with the detection of thefts and the punishment of the concerned thieves. The Kālavān plates of Yaśovarman refer to an officer called
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Chaurika, but he was probably not different from Chauroddharaṇika.

The duty of the officer called Daśāparādhika is most probably to collect fines for the ten traditional criminal offences. Some of these crimes were serious like murder, adultery, abortion, etc., while others were relatively lighter like defamation, obscene speech, etc.

Daṇḍaśakti and Daṇḍika figure only in the Pāla records. Dr. R.C. Majumdar is of opinion that Daṇḍaśakti was responsible for his duties to the military department, but this view does not seem to be a convincing one. The Daṇḍaśakti may as well have been in charge of the execution of punishment imposed upon criminals. It is important to note that this officer figures only in the Khalimpur plate of Dharmapāla. His place in the lists is taken by Daṇḍika in other Pāla inscriptions. It is therefore very likely that Daṇḍaśakti and Daṇḍika were not two different officers. Probably the same office was denoted by both the expressions.

The functions of the officer called Mahādauhasādhasādhanika are difficult to determine. Most probably officers of this cadre were entrusted with specially difficult tasks. The Jabalpur plates of the Chedi king Jayasimhadeva refers to an officer called Dusṭaśādhyā; he is probably the same as Dauhasādhasādhanika.

The state in ancient India controlled the institution of prostitution since very early times and it is not unlikely that the officer entrusted with this work, who is called Gaṇikādhyāksha by Kautilya, worked under the police department. It was his duty to have full information about the persons who used to visit prostitutes. This was often useful to detect persons who were of bad character and to watch their movements and activities. Very probably these officers worked under police department; it is however not improbable that in cities they may have worked under city superintendents.

1. Śukra, IV, 5, 83-4.
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The functions of the officer called Khola\(^1\) have not yet been correctly ascertained. The meaning of this term, as revealed by Sanskrit dictionaries, is a lame person; it can hardly have any thing to do with this officer. If the term is connected with Khala (wicked person), he would be an officer working under the police department; if it is connected with Khalaka, he would be an officer under the revenue department.

**REVENUE DEPARTMENT**

The revenue department was in charge of the income of the state from taxes and state properties and concerns. Lakshmihara in his \textit{Kṛtyakalpataru} mentions an officer called Aksharakshita,\(^2\) who had to keep a comprehensive account of income and expenditure of the state. He must have been the right hand man of the revenue minister. As we have already seen in the last chapter, the revenue department had to supervise the collection of taxes and revenues, which were usually paid partly in kind and partly in cash. It is therefore but natural that his office had to make elaborate arrangements for the proper administration of government granaries. He was probably keeping the duplicate copies of the land grants; for sometimes it so happened that people showed forged charters in their own names. When such frauds took place, the revenue department used to consult the original documents and arrive at a decision about the genuineness of the disputed records. The steps taken by the government in this connection have been already referred to earlier.

The revenue department had a large number of officers. The Mahākṣapataḷika, who was in charge of records, was an important one among them. During our period of survey, he is often seen composing copper plate charters. Thus Mahākṣapataḷika Thakkura Vosarin,\(^3\) Mahākṣapataḷika Thak-

---

kura Kumyāra,1 Mahākṣapaṭalika Thakkura Govinda2 and Akṣapaṭalika Kāyastha Somasiṅhadeva3 were the writers of the different documents known as Kādi plates of the Chaulukya king Bhima II. The writer of the Lucknow Museum plate of the Gāhaḍavāla king Jayachandradeva was Akṣapaṭalika Śrīpati,4 while that of the Sunak grant of the Chedi king Karṇadeva was Akṣapaṭalika Kekkaka.5 We have already seen in the last chapter that in some administrations, the Sandhivigrahika was also doing this duty. It is not unlikely that the historical part of the grant was drafted by the Sandhivigrahika and the details about land and taxes were supplied by Akṣapaṭalika. For convenience sake, drafting of the document, though done by two persons, might have been ascribed to one of them.

The next officer of this department, who was in charge of collecting the revenue, was known as Mahākaraṇīka under the Chedis.6 He and his assistants Karanīkas were stationed in the different provinces, towns and cities. The Karanīkas are sometimes seen as the writers of copper plate charters. Thus the writer of the Gohrwa grant of the Chedi king Karṇa was the Karanīka Sarvānanda.7 Karanīka Dhīra was the writer of the Bilhari stone inscription of the Chedi king Yuvarāja I8. Karanīka Jaddha was the writer of the Khaḍjuraho inscription of the Chandella king Dhaṅga.9 Karanīka Śrīṣakti was the writer of the Bayānā inscription of Chitralekā.10 Sometimes the post of Karanīkas used to be hereditary.

It is important to note that in Mahārāṣṭra, the village revenue officer was till recently known as Kulkarnī—a name derived from Kula-karaṇīka—i.e., an officer in charge of the land revenues of different families in a village.
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The Chedi records refer to another officer called Mahā-
pramātā, who was probably assisted by an officer known as
Pramātrī under the Pālas and Senas. The functions of both
these officers are difficult to determine. Some scholars take
them to be judicial officers in charge of recording evidence, while
others take them to be judges concerned with civil cases only. Both
these conjectures, however, do not seem to be probable.
The term Pramātrī is derived from the root mā to
measure. Pramātrī therefore should be taken as a land measur-
ing officer working under the Mahākshapaṭālīka. He was thus
similar to the Rajjukas of Aśoka inscriptions. The Jabalpur
grant of the Chedi king Jayasimhadeva refers to an officer
called Pramattavāra. The term may be a Prakrit derivative
from Pramātrī.

Another officer of the revenue department was Kshetrapa. His
function is difficult to determine; it is not improbable
that he might have been in charge of some matters concerning
cultivated lands. Probably he was keeping an account of
every holding paying taxes to the king, and as such his activi-
ties were correlated to those of the Mahākshapaṭālīka and
his staff. He figures only in the Pāla inscriptions.

The Pāla records mention an officer called Shashṭẖā-
dhikṛita. We have no information about his jurisdiction.
Whether he was a Tāluka or district officer, we do not know.
Most probably he worked under the revenue department.
Land tax was traditionally to be one sixth of the produce
and so the officer Shashṭẖādhikṛita might have been in charge
of collecting it from the cultivators.

Besides the Shashṭẖādhikṛita, there was another officer
called Bhogapati, who probably collected the tax known as
Bhoa, which was most probably a periodical supply of fuel,
fruits, firewoods, flowers and the like, which the villagers
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had to furnish to the king. This officer is called Mahābhogika in the Sena records.

The term Bhoktri abbreviated into Bho was often used to denote a certain class of officers in Rajasthan under the Chāhamānas. They had often octroi dues assigned to them. Whether they were the same as Bhogapatis, it is difficult to say.

Taxes, as we already know, were paid both in kind and cash during our period. Tax in cash was called Hiraṇya under the Pālas and the Senas and it was perhaps levied upon certain special kinds of crops. The officer, who was entrusted with the work of collecting taxes in cash, was known as Hiraṇyasāmudāyika in Bengal.

Cattle-breeding was an important element in the economic life and the state did not neglect it. The officer, who was in charge of the herds, was known as Gokulika in the Paramāra and Gāhaḍavāla kingdoms. Śukra also refers to officers in charge of camels, cattle, deer and birds; they were expected to be skilled in breeding and rearing them.

Royal parks and forests were an important item of state property. The superintendent of parks was known as Ārāmādhipati. One of his duties was to develop the resources by supplying proper manure at the suitable time. He was also expected to know the medicinal properties of the trees and plants. The forests also had a superintendent, though he does not figure in our records. He had a suitable staff to assist him.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The treasury department was in charge of a superintendent, who is called Koshādhyaksha both by Kauṭilya and Śukra. Paramāra records call him Koshādhikārī. He was

1. E.I., XXI, 217.
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expected to be well-versed in financial administration. The work of this department was onerous; it had to look after the government balance in kind and cash and to keep it in safe custody. It naturally engaged a number of officers. Among them the superintendent of granary, who is called Dhānyādhyaksha by Śukra, was the most important one. Gāhadavāla inscriptions refer to him as Bhāndāgārādhiṅkṛita. His duty was to store properly the corn collected as tax in the government granary and to replace it periodically by new stock. He was expected to know how to store corn and how to dispose it off at profit at suitable time.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Unfortunately there is hardly any reference to the finance department in the records of the dynasties surveyed by us. In the Chaulukya administration only, we come across an officer in charge of the expenditure known as Vyayakaraṇamahāmātṛtya, who probably belonged to this department. It is very likely that the work of this department was being discharged by the treasury department and hence there are no frequent references to the officers of finance. The superintendent of treasury himself would have looked after the allotment of revenue and expenditure of the state. In this connection, it may be noted that the Smritis also rarely refer to the officers working under the finance department.

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRY DEPARTMENT

There were several officers working under this department. The first among them was the superintendent of markets; he was called Drāṅgiṅka in Kathiawad and Haṭṭapati in Bengal. According to Kauṭilya, his duty was to fix the rates of different articles and to put the government products in the market under favourable condition. He also organised imports
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of goods required in the locality and supervised their sales at reasonable rates.\footnote{1}

Another officer, who worked under this department, was the toll superintendent, who is designated as Šaulkika\footnote{2} in the Pâla records. He was to collect the octroi duties from the merchants at the gate of a town before they imported their articles for sale.

The third officer working under this department was Tarika or Tarapati.\footnote{3} He figures only in the Pâla records. He was probably in charge of ferry service. He had also to look after the construction of ferries, their repairs and upkeep.

Mining, spinning, weaving and Jewelry-making seem to have been the principal industries of the age. The state paid great attention to the mining industry, as the mines produced a large part of the wealth of the country. The superintendent of mines is called Ākarādhipati\footnote{4} in the Gâhaḍavâla records. His duties must have been similar to those described in the \textit{Arthaśāstra}, \textit{i.e.}, to exploit the resources of existing mines and to carry out operations, which might lead to the discovery of new ones.

Cloth industry was another flourishing industry of our period, and government took keen interest in it. The superintendent of this department is designated as Sūtrādhyaksha by Kauṭilya and Vastrādhipa by Śukra.\footnote{5} He was expected to have the knowledge of the fineness and roughness of texture of the cotton, woollen and silken cloth as well as of their durability. According to Kauṭilya, the employees of this department used to send cotton to the homes of weak and destitute persons and get the yarn spun through them at agreed rates;\footnote{6} whether this was being done in our period, we do not know.
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Sometimes, the state used to give licence to goldsmiths for the manufacture of silver and golden wares and ornaments. The officer, who was entrusted with this work, is called by Śukra as Suvarṇādhyaśka. He was expected to have the knowledge of distinguishing the values of different metals by their weight, lustre and colour.

Slaughter houses were also under strict state control, their superintendent is called Śaunika¹ in the Pāla records. According to Kautilya, it was the duty of this officer to prevent the outsiders from killing the animals in the game forests. How he discharged his duty during our period, we do not know.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

The administration of justice was also carried on with the help of a number of officers. The king was at the head of this department and he administered justice, when he was present at the capital. If, however, due to ill health or the pressure of other work, he was unable to discharge this duty, the chief justice or Prāḍvivāka presided over the court at the capital. It is rather strange that the records of the dynasties under consideration do not refer to him. The non-mention of his office may be accidental.

The chief justice was assisted in his work by a number of judges known as Mahādharmādhyakshas² under the Senas and probably Dharmapradhānas³ under the Chedis. It is difficult to say whether the Dharmalekhs,⁴ who figure in the Chandella and Chedi records, were the pleaders, who wrote the complaints or judicial officers, who wrote the judgments. Probably they were state judicial officers, since they are sometimes seen as drafting the copper plate charters. Thus under the Chandellas, the writer of the Banda plate of Madanavarman was the Darmalekhī Dāsisūdha,⁵ and that
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of the Semra plate was the Dharmlekhi Prithvidhara. The writer of the Pacher plate of the Chandella king Paramardi was Dharmalekhī Shubhananda and of Mahoba plate was Dharmalekhī Prithvidhara. The writer of the Kharhā grant of the Chedi king Yaśakarnā was the Dharmalekhī Vacchukā.

The chief justice used to have his own office in charge of an officer named as Mahādhamādhikaranaṇika under the Chedis. He was probably in charge of the records of the office, where all documents concerning important cases were kept. The officer called Daśāparādhika, who collected fines imposed upon criminals, probably worked under the chief justice or his assistants.

The judicial department probably looked after the management of jails also. The epigraphs of our period, however, do not refer to the jail officer and hence we do not know how he used to function. The non-mention of the jail officer may be probably due to the fact that imprisonment was only one of the ten modes of punishment in our period.

ECCLESIASTICAL DEPARTMENT

The last department that we have to consider is the ecclesiastical department, which was in charge of an officer called Paṇḍita by Śukra. An officer with this title does not figure at all in any of the records of the dynasties under consideration; it is unlikely that his function might have been discharged by the Purohita or Rājaguru, who figures in some of our records. His duty as we have already seen, was to advise the king in religious matters. He must have been assisted in his work by a number of subordinate officers, though they do not appear in our records. Their duty was to supervise all
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religions and sects. These officers were called Dharmamahā-
mātras under the Mauryas, Vinayasthitisthāpakas under the
Guptas and Dharmāṅkuśas under the Rāshṭrakūṭas.

The superintendent of religious establishments, institutions
and charities is described as Dānādhyaksha by Śukra.¹ It is
very likely that the donation made on the recommendation
of this officer to the Brāhmaṇas and temples would have been
utilised by them in organising schools, colleges, hospitals and
poor-houses. The officer called Dharmādhikārin appearing
in the Chedi records probably discharged similar functions.²

An officer called Agraḥārika, appearing in the Pāla records,
might have worked under this department. He probably
looked after the administration of the villages granted to
temples and Brāhmaṇas. It was his duty to see that there
were no difficulties created in the enjoyment of grants given
to the donees.

¹. Śukra, II, 163.
². E.I., XXI, 165.
CHAPTER V

ADMINISTRATION OF ARMY

The higher directorate of the army has been already discussed in the last chapter; we shall now review the army organisation and its administration. It is important to note that the army was regarded by all the political writers of our period as an important constituent of the state organisation. "The army" states Šukra, "is the chief means of overpowering the enemy; the king should, therefore, maintain a formidable force." He gives us a beautiful simile, while emphasising the importance of the army. "What mind is to the human body, the army is to a state." It is only by maintaining the army that the treasury and the kingdom prosper and the enemy is destroyed. Kāmandaka, while recognising the importance of the army, states that the king with a strong fighting force rules the earth unhindered and even the foes of a king possessing an efficient army are turned into friends.

Kauṭilya includes the army among the seven constituents of the state. He, however, does not regard it as the most important element. For, while discussing the relative importance of the army and the treasury, he holds the latter to be more important than the former. "The army", states Kauṭilya, "may go to the enemy or murder the king himself and bring about every kind of trouble, but the treasury is the chief means of performing virtuous acts and fulfilling desires." The king should pay first attention to the preservation of an over-flowing treasury. The writers of our period like Kāmandaka

1. Balamaṇa ripornityāṁ parājayaakaśaṁ param
   Tasmād bhalamanabhedyaṁ tu dhārayedvatnato niśayāṁ.
   Šukra, IV, 2, 1

2. Śukra, I, 62.

3. Sainyāśtvāṁ naiva rājyaṁ na dhanaṁ na parākramaṁ.
   Šukra, IV, 4, 4

Balamaṇaṁrakṣaṇāṁ kośarāśtvāśtravṛddhirāśtvayāḥ.
   Šukra, IV, 5, 14


5. A.S., VIII, Chap. 1.
and Sukra, however, appear to have regarded army as more important than treasury.

Most of the writers of our period like those of the earlier age do not throw any light upon the army organisation, nor upon its administration. It is only Sukra, who gives us an interesting and detailed account about the army, its constituents and its administration.

As has already been pointed out, the commander-in-chief was the head of the army. He was expected to be skilled in the science and tactics of warfare and to be familiar with the use of all kinds of weapons. He was also expected to be well-grounded in forming the different kinds of battle-arrays demanded by the occasion. "If there be danger ahead" states Sukra, "the commander should normally march in crocodile array, if there be danger behind, in the Sakaṭa array, if on the sides, then in the Vajra array; if on all sides then in the Sarvatobhadra or Chakra or Vyāla array. In these arrays, the strength of the army was concentrated at points, where danger was most apprehended.

Under the commander-in-chief each section of the army had its own sub-commanders. They were the commanders of infantry, cavalry and elephant corps. Their duties and functions have already been discussed in the last chapter (pp. 116-117).

UNITS OF THE ARMY

Subordinate to the above commanders, were other officers of different grades. They were the Pattipāla, in charge of five or six foot-soldiers, Gaulmika, in charge of thirty foot-soldiers, Satānika, the officer over a hundred foot-soldiers, Sāhasrīka, the leader of one thousand foot-soldiers and Ayutika, the commander of ten thousand foot-soldiers. The head of twenty horses or twenty elephants was known as
Nāyaka. The functions and duties of these officers have already been described in the last chapter. It is quite likely that these official designations were not used in all the administrations, but we can well presume that an organisation of somewhat similar type prevailed in all the governments.

The army had its own record office, where all the important documents concerning the military administration were kept. The officer in charge of this office was called Lekhaka according to Śukra. He kept a regular record of soldiers actually serving in the army and also of those, who had been discharged. His duty was to keep a correct account of the amount paid to the soldiers by way of salaries and rewards after taking regular receipts for the payments made. The caste, the stature, the age, the province and the residence of the soldiers were recorded, as also their scales of pay.

CONSTITUENTS OF THE ARMY

Our records do not refer to the traditional Chaturāṅga army, which was an important feature of the military forces for a long time. They mention only the three arms of the fighting forces namely, the infantry, the cavalry and the elephant corps; the chariot forces and the chariot officers are altogether omitted in our epigraphs. Even the contemporary Muslim writers are silent about the chariot forces. Śukra no doubt refers to an officer called Rathādhyaksha. But as has already been stated, he was probably an officer in charge of the chariots used as military insignia by distinguished generals, military officers and ministers. The use of the chariot was allowed to military officers above the grade of the commander of a thousand troops.

In IV. 7. 194 ff. Śukra refers to matchlockmen and artillery
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3. Kātī dattaḥ hi bhṛityebhyo vētānām pārītoshikam
   Tatprāptipatraṁ grīniyāddyādvaṇanapatraṇam.
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as forming part of the fighting forces. He refers to small and big fire arms; the former were about two and a half feet in length and were carried on their shoulders by soldiers; the latter were much bigger and were moved on carts and could be turned on a fulcrum. Šukra also gives details about the preparation of the gun-powder.

For reasons already explained we have to conclude that fire-arms were not known before c. 1300 A.D.; the above was one of the passages added to the book at the time of its latest redaction. We, therefore, do not include the artillery as a part of the army of the period under review.

In Bengal, the government during our period maintained naval forces in addition to the army. The records of the Pālas clearly show that they utilised the nautical aptitude of people in building up a regular fleet for fighting purposes. Contemporary records refer to this fleet as Naubala or Nauvātaka and to the admiral in command as the Naukādhya-ksha. The Khalimpur plate of Dharmapāla describes this royal fleet as “proceeding on the path of the Bhāgirathi”, and thus making it “seem as if a series of mountain tops had been sunk to build another causeway to Rāma’s bridge.” The force is here referred to as operating in the Gaṅgā and not in the sea. The reason probably was that the enemy was an Indian state in Bengal itself and not any external invader. The Sena records also refer to naval units of Bengal. In the Deopārā inscription of Vijayasena, the Bengal fleet is described as proceeding on a conquering expedition “up to the whole course of the Gaṅgā.” Their records, however, show a change in the nomenclature of admiral. The title Naukādhya-ksha of the Pāla period was replaced by the designation Nauvyāpṛitaka or Naubala-Vyāpṛitaka in the Sena period.

STRENGTH OF THE ARMY

The Šukranītī throws some light upon the relative strength of the different constituents of the army. Infantry was to be

four times as numerous as the cavalry, the bull and the camel corps were to be one-fifth and one-eighth the size of the cavalry; the elephant corps was to be one-fourth the size of the camel corps, and the chariot corps was to be half the size of the elephant corps; the artillery was to be twice the size of the chariot corps. That is to say if the infantry was 6,400 strong, the cavalry should 1,600, the bull, the camel and the elephant corps to be 320,200 and 50 respectively; the chariot corps was to be only 25 and the artillery 50. The reference to the artillery in this passage would raise doubts as to whether it gives a correct picture of the relative constituents of the army during our period. They may have also differed according to local circumstances; the elephant corps of the Pālas might have been stronger than that of the Pratihāras; the camel corps of the latter might have been more numerous than that of their contemporaries. We may perhaps conclude that the infantry in our period used to be four or five times the cavalry. The strength of the elephant and camel corps might have varied with their availability and necessity. The bull corps was probably intended for transport purposes. The small number of the chariots would confirm our conjecture that they were in use as ceremonial conveyances for higher officers in the army, rather than as a fighting arm.

Epigraphs of our period are silent about the actual strength of the fighting forces of the different dynasties. Muslim writers sometimes give us some information, but it is not always reliable. Al Masudi says that his contemporary Pratihāra king of Kanauj maintained four armies “according to the four quarters of the wind” and each of them numbered seven to nine lakhs. The Pratihāra empire was no doubt an extensive one including practically the whole of Northern India excluding Sindh, the Punjab, Kashmir and Bengal. But it is difficult to say whether it could have maintained an army of thirty six lakhs. Even the great Mauryas had not maintained so large a force. Probably each territorial army of the Pratihāras could be increased to seven or

1. Śākra, IV, Sect., VII, 19-20.
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eight lakhs, when a serious danger was apprehended in the area concerned. The total fighting force of the Gurjaras may perhaps have been a million and a quarter.

The Chandella army might have been relatively a smaller one, but here again our authorities do not agree. Both Nizamuddin Ahmad\(^1\) and Firishta\(^2\) state that the cavalry under the Chandella king Gaṇḍa was 36,000 strong at the time of the invasion of Mahmud in 1011 A.D. But as regards the strength of the infantry, both give different statements. According to Nizamuddin Ahmad there were one lakh forty-five thousand foot soldiers, while according to Firishta they were only forty-five thousand. The normal strength of the infantry is likely to have been 45,000 in the army of Gaṇḍa but it might have been strengthened to the number of 1,45,000 by the contingents of his feudatories, advanced to meet the invader\(^3\) as has been pointed out by Mahammad Nazim.\(^3\) The normal strength of the cavalry may also have been less than 36,000.

As regards the elephant force of the Pālas there is no unanimity among the writers. Sulaiman and Al Masudi observe that it consisted of fifty thousand elephants\(^4\) but Ibn-Khurdadba states that it was only five thousand strong.\(^5\) It is important to note that Al Masudi adds that the reports in these matters were exaggerated. It is not unlikely that the strength of the elephant force of the Pālas was 5,000 rather than 50,000 though this number also seems to be a little exaggerated. Even Chandragupta Maurya, whose empire included practically the whole of India, had an elephant force of 9,000. It may well be doubted whether the Pāla elephant corps was really 50,000 strong.

The available evidence thus gives us only scanty and inconclusive information regarding the strength of the fighting forces maintained by the different kingdoms. In this connection we should note that according to the views of Ṣukra,
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fifty per cent of the state income was to be spent on the army. This renders it very likely that the Chedis, the Chandellas, the Chaulukyas, the Chāhamānas, the Pratihāras, the Gāhadavālas, the Pālas and the Senas might have maintained fairly big armies costing a good deal to the exchequer. If the strength of the army of the Pratihāra empire was about a million and a quarter, the peace time strength of the armies of the smaller kingdoms into which it was eventually split, might well have been about a lakh.

RECRUITMENT OF THE ARMY

Śukra gives us interesting information about the composition, efficiency and recruitment of the army. We are told that the army consisted of permanent forces known as Maula-bala, which were hereditary in character. In times of need, the army was augmented from the battalions of the allies. Very often, fighting forces were borrowed from the feudatories also. This reminds us of the method of British Government, which allowed the feudatories to have their small forces, which could however be commandeered by the paramount power, when necessary. Sometimes soldiers from the army of a defeated enemy were also recruited. The army was usually supplied with weapons by the state itself. Sometimes soldiers themselves used to bring their weapons with them. We thus see that the armies of the different states of our period were far from homogeneous. Coherence and efficiency were therefore bound to be not very high, as is evident from the success scored by the Muslim invaders.

It may be noted that though Śukra refers to several varieties of the fighting forces of the army, like Kāmandaka, he regards the Maulabala among them as the best force. He advises the king to proceed against the enemy with an army mainly consisting of Maula-bala, as its members do not leave the king in the battlefield even at the point of death. The Muslim writers probably refer to Maula-bala, when they state that the troops in India are not paid by Indian kings, but maintain themselves without receiving any thing from them. It is very likely that the Maula-bala was paid by land
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assignments rather than by pay in cash.

In addition to the Maula-bala, which was naturally local in character, soldiers were recruited from outside the state also. From the Bhagalpur plate of Nārāyaṇapāla we learn that under the Pālas the army was not merely composed of the troops from Gauḍa but it had recruits from Mālavā, Khasa, Karnaṭa and Lāṭa countries. The Rājatarangini also informs us that the kings of Kashmir recruited mercenaries not only from Rajasthan, the Salt Range in the Punjab and distant Rājagriha in Magadha but also from the Yavanas and Turushkas. The Chachnāmā reveals that the king Dāhīor of Sindh had in his employ as many as 500 Arab troops under the leadership of Muhammad Allafi. Mercenary soldiers were known as bhrīta bala.

Both the literary and epigraphical evidence show that the recruitment was thrown open to all classes. Sukra clearly states at one place that the soldiers may be selected from among the Śudras, Vaiśyas and Kshatriyas and Mlecchas or from mixed castes, provided they are brave, well built, devoted to their master and scrupulous in obeying the orders. Even the Brāhmaṇas were admitted in the army. The Brāhmaṇa, who fights bravely in this world, says Sukra, gets fame; for the virtue of a Kshatriya is also derived from Brāhmaṇa.

The records of our period reveal the names of a number of Brāhmaṇas, who actually served as soldiers and commanders in the armies. Thus from the Mahoba inscription we learn that a Brāhmaṇa general named Gopāla under the Chandella king Kirtivarman vanquished the Chedi monarch Karna and reinstated his master on his ancestral throne. Madanapālaṣarman was another Brāhmaṇa general under the
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Chandella king Paramardideva. The Icchāwar plates, dated 1171 A.D., inform us that his father Thakkura Māheśvara was a Brāhmaṇa of the Kṛishnātreya Gotra, who studied the Sākhā of Chāndogya. Vaidyadeva, the Brāhmaṇa minister of the Pāla king Kumārapāladeva, had won two battles for his master; one in the southern part of Vaṅga and the other in the east.² Gauravamīśra, the Brāhmaṇa minister of Nārāyaṇapāla, is also stated to have shown bravery in the battlefield.³

The contemporary south Indian records also disclose the names of a number of Brāhmaṇa soldiers. Thus under the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛishṇa III, Brāhmaṇa Gaṇaramma is stated to have laid down his life in a valiant manner, while defending his village.⁴ The Kalas inscription of Govinda IV describes the glorious achievements of two Brāhmaṇa generals, namely Ravidāsa Dīkshita and Visottara Dīkshita, who are expressly described as Somajīyas and ornaments of the Brāhmaṇa race.⁵ Under the Gaṅga king Rāja-Rāja, his Brāhmaṇa general Māṇḍalika Vanapati is stated to have led an expedition against the Chola king Rājendra Chola, winning a victory⁶ over him. Kholeśvara, a Brāhmaṇa minister and general of the Yādava king Śinghaṇa, is said to have humbled the Gurjaras and Mālavas and destroyed the race of the heroic Ābhira king.⁷ Brāhmaṇa Kṛishnārāma, served as a commander-in-chief under the Chola kings Rājarāja the great and Rājendra Chola.⁸

These examples will show that the view of Śukra, who was in favour of recruitments from all classes including the Brāhmaṇas was followed in our age. In the Deccan even Jains figure among the generals.
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DISCIPLINE AND RULES

The soldiers in the regular state forces had to observe strict discipline. Military orders were communicated to them on every eighth day. They had to keep the arms, the weapons and the uniforms quite bright. They were not allowed to enter a village without a royal permit and were forbidden to harass the villagers. They were, however, permitted to camp near the village, but outside it. This clearly shows that soldiers, while on march, used to encamp on the outskirts of villages and towns and were not usually allowed to enter them except with the permission of the authorities.

PAY, GIFTS AND REWARDS

The soldiers other than those of the Maula-bala were regularly paid during our period. The Agni-Purāṇa states that a regular payment to troops is a factor of great importance in building up a strong army. Kāmandaka points out that a force, which is given its wages without delay, will fight with greater enthusiasm than a force, which is not properly paid.

The records of our period show that the generals and officers were sometimes given land grants probably in lieu of cash salaries. The Icchawar plates inform us that the Chandella king Paramarddideva granted the village of Nandini in the Nandāvana Vishaya to his general Madanapāla-Śarman. A rock inscription of the time of Bhojavarman states that the Chandella king Kīrtivarman appointed one Maheśvara as the Viśiṣa (commander?) of Kālanjara and endowed him with the grant of the village of Pipalāshikā.
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Similarly another officer named Vāśe or Vāśka on being appointed as the commander of the Chandella king Trailok- yavarman, received the revenues of the village Vaibhāri.¹ The system of making assignments to military chiefs was responsible for the rise of a military landed aristocracy. Members of the Maula-bala probably received the salaries in the form of land assignments. As far as ordinary soldiers were concerned, they were probably given salaries in cash. Śukra advises that full pay should be given to trained soldiers and half to soldiers under training².

Besides the regular pay, soldiers sometimes received special rewards. Śukra states that gifts should be given to soldiers according to importance of their achievements.³ The army, which is well rewarded by gifts and honours and also well supplied with war provisions leads to victory. Śukra points out how a well rewarded army remains loyal even to an unrighteous and low-born king.⁴ Kāmandaka also states that the king should give rewards to the soldiers after they succeed in the venture.

The epigraphical evidence shows that successful generals were sometimes rewarded with the assignments of land. The Charkhāri plate of the Chandella king Vīrā-Varmadeva mentions the grant of a village in the Dāhi Viśaya to one Rauta Ābhi in recognition of a special deed of valour performed by him in the battle of Sondhi⁵.

The contemporary South Indian records show that the practice of giving land grants to the officers in recognition of their valour prevailed there also; for instance, an inscription of the Eastern Chalukya king Amma I describes how the general Mahākāla more than once annihilated the enemy’s army and how the gratified king rewarded him

¹. E.I., I, 337.
². Saṁñikāh Śikṣhitā ye ke tesu pūrpa bhṛitiḥ smṛitā
   Vyūhābhyaśe niyuktā ye tesavardhāṁ bhṛitiśvahet.
   Śukra, IV, Sect., VII, 390.
³. Pratyagrekar漫长 krite yodhairdayāddhānam cha tān.
   Pāritoshyanchādhihikārāṁ kramato’rhaṁ niśpaḥ sādā,
   Śukra, IV, Sect, VII, 366.
⁵. E.I., XX, 192.
with the grant of the village Druṣṭuru in the Pennatavādi Viśaya. Another inscription of the same king refers to the gift of village Gonturu together with twelve hamlets to a general named Bhāṇḍanāditya, who had a glorious record of service to the state.

Besides the salaries and gifts of land, officers and troops in Kashmir were occasionally given special or additional allowances on the eve of an expedition. Such an allowance is not mentioned in the epigraphical records, probably because there was no occasion to refer to it. In stead of an allowance, Śukra recommends an increase of 24 per cent in the pay on the eve of an expedition. We may, therefore, well presume that the practice of sanctioning higher emoluments during an expedition was usually followed by the kings of our period.

The soldiers who displayed special pluck or courage in the course of a battle were duly honoured; they received special cash or land grants as stated in the Nīṭīvākyāmyṛita. Similar but higher honours and rewards were given to captains and generals also. Promotions usually followed a successful engagement.

PENSION TO SOLDIERS’ DEPENDENTS

The Government in our period considered it as its prime duty to support the dependents of the soldiers killed in the war. The Nīṭīvākyāmyṛita states that the king incurs a sin, if he does not maintain the relations of an officer who died in the service of the state. Epigraphical records also show that the dependents of the dead soldiers were actually supported by the state. Sometimes even land grants were made for their maintenance. Thus we learn from Gārrā plates that the Chandella king Trailokyavarman granted two villages for the maintenance of a person, whose father had been killed in the

1. E.I., I, 134.
2. S.I., I, 42-43.
4. Śukra, IV. Sect., VII, 351.
5. Nāk. Chap. 30
battle with Turks. It is expressly stated in the plates that
the grant was made by way of maintenance for the heirs of
one who laid down his life on the battle-field. This practice
prevailed in the Deccan also\(^1\) and we may well presume that
it was generally followed in our period. Pensions to the
dependents of ordinary soldiers might have been usually in
the form of cash payments rather than land assignments.

DRILL AND EXERCISE

The army had to go through daily exercises. "The un-
trained, inefficient, raw recruits" says Śukra\(^2\), "are like
bales of cotton". The king should, therefore, arrange for
daily military parades both in the morning and in the evening\(^3\),
and should promote strength and valour among the soldiers
by means of hunting and games\(^4\). Kāmandaka attaches great
importance to the daily exercise of troops. "By constant
exercises," says he, "one becomes adept in the use of chariots,
horses, elephants and boats and a past-master in archery."\(^5\)
He further states that even when the army is in camp, the
daily drill should not be discontinued.\(^6\)

Even earlier writers on polity have recognised the impor-
tance of drill and exercise of the army. Kautilya states that
one can infuse spirit and enthusiasm even in the timid by
means of discipline and training. The king should therefore
not only arrange for the daily exercises of soldiers but
should himself watch and encourage them.

1. *I.A.*, XII, 30.
2. Śakra, IV, Sect., VII, 180.
4. Śukra, IV, Sect., VII, 16.
5. Rathāsvanau-kunjarayānayogyo nitya-kriyāh syādditaṁśu pragābhaḥ
   Sumeṛhasāṁ karmāṇi dushkara'pi nityā kṛiyā kauśalamādadhātī.
   Kāmandaka, XV, 50
6. Nirvriksha-śhapa-pāśhāna-sthāṇu-valmiκanindravaiḥ
   Kārayetkārapaiśchitraiḥ sainyavāyahānamavaham.
   Kāmandaka, XVI, 18.
THE AMBULANCE CORPS

The ambulance arrangements for the army are not referred to in our inscriptions, but they are mentioned by Rājarāṅgini. The Arthaśāstra also refers to them. We may well presume that they were common in our period.

1. Rāja, VIII, 741.
2. A.S., BK. X. Chap. 9.
CHAPTER VI

TERRITORIAL DIVISIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

Let us now discuss the scheme of territorial divisions in vogue in Northern India during our period. It has to be observed at the outset that it was not at all uniform and it differed with different dynasties. Several kingdoms flourished in Northern India during our period of survey; out of these, some were fairly big, but others were very small. Under these circumstances we should naturally find a variety in the dimensions and nomenclature of the different territorial and administrative divisions in the various kingdoms. It may be noted that even in a unitary state like the Indian Republic, we have Tehsils in some states and Talukas in others; similarly there are Commissioner’s Divisions in some states and Boards of Revenues in others.

The biggest administrative division under the Pratihāras, the Pālas and the Senas was known as Bhukti. It was usually presided over by an officer called Uparika under the Pālas, as was the case under the Imperial Guptas. Under the Senas, he was given a more high sounding epithet, namely Brihaduparika. We do not know whether there were ordinary Uparikas working under him.

Bhukti usually comprised a number of Vishayas and thus corresponded to the size of a Commissioner’s Division in modern times. Thus under the Pratihāras, the Śrāvasti-Bhukti and the Kānyakubjabhukti in U.P. were divided into Mañḍalas and the latter into Vishayas. Under the Pālas and the Senas, the Śrīnagarā-Bhukti in Bihar included Patna and Gaya

1. I.A., XII, 143.
2. E.I., XXIII, 240.
4. The term Rājya, which denoted the province in Kashmir, was not in use in that sense in the rest of Northern India. The Kashmir valley was divided into three Rājyas Kramarājya, Mañḍavarājya and Lohārārājya (Rāj., II, 87).
5. E.I., XXI, 217.
districts. The Tirabhukti was obviously identical with modern Tirhut division in Bihar; it may probably have consisted of four districts, Saran, Champaran, Muzaffarpur and Darbhanga, as it does now. The Paunḍravardhana-bhukti in Bengal, comprised Dinajpur, Bogra and Rajashahi districts. The Kaṅkārāma-bhukti embraced a considerable portion of the valley of the Mor River and included parts of the Birbhum and Murshidabad districts. The exact dimension of the Vardhamāna-bhukti cannot be definitely ascertained. It embraced the valley of the Damodar river and is known to have included Uttarārādha and Danḍabhukti Maṇḍalas.

Under the Gāhaṇḍavālas, however, the biggest administrative division was called Deśa, which also corresponded to the modern commissioner's Division, and is thus identical with the Bhukti of the Pālas, the Senas and the Pratihāras. Thus Pāṭchāla is referred to as a deśa and may have included most of the modern Rohilkhand.

The next administrative term that we come across is Maṇḍala. It is referred to in the Pratihāra, the Paramāra the Chaulukya and the Sena records, but not in the same sense. In Bengal under the Senas, it is sometimes used to denote an area wider than a Vishaya but sometimes also to an area smaller than it. Thus in the Khalimpur plate of Dharmapāla, Vṛṣabhakṛaṇa Maṇḍala is used to denote an area wider than a Vishaya, as it included Mahantaprakāśa-Vishaya. The Bāṅgarḥ grant of Mahāpāla, on the other hand, refers to Gokulikā-maṇḍala as being comprised in the Koṭivarsha-Vishaya. Similarly the Manhali grant of Madanapāla and the Amāgacchi grant of Vigrahapāla IV refer to Halavarṭa-maṇḍala and Brāhmaṇigrāma-maṇḍala as included in the Koṭivarsha-Vishaya. The term Maṇḍala, when used to denote an area larger

1. E.I., XXIII, 290.
4. R.C. Majumdar, History of Bengal, p. 28.
5. R.C. Majumdar, History of Bengal, p. 28.
7. E.I., IV, 252.
8. E.I., XII, 328.
10. I.A., XV, 166-68.
than a Vishaya, may perhaps have been used to denote a sub-division of Bhuktī larger than Vishaya.

Under the Pratihāras, Māṇḍala was used to denote a territorial division larger than a Vishaya but smaller than a Bhuktī. Thus Kālañjara-māṇḍala was a division of Kānya-kubja-Bhuktī and included Udumbara Vishaya\(^1\) in it. Similarly Śrāvasti-māṇḍala was a division of Śrāvastī-Bhuktī and included Valayika-Vishaya\(^2\) in it.

Under the Paramāras and Chaulukyas, Māṇḍala was apparently used for a district.\(^3\)

In one of the Gāhaḍavaḷa records, we get a reference to the term Pathaka in between Deṣa or the Commissioner’s Division and Pattāḷa or Taluka.\(^4\) It may therefore be taken as corresponding to the modern district and ancient Vishaya.

Under the Pālas, Vishaya was used in the sense of a modern district, being a division of Bhuktī. Under the Senas, however, it is sometimes stated to be a division of Bhuktī and sometimes a division of Māṇḍala. Under Gāhaḍavaḷas and the Paramāras, Vishaya was used to denote a Taluka and not a district.

The exact dimension of a Vishaya cannot be definitely ascertained. We get the names of several administrative divisions in between the Vishaya and Grāma or village, whose natures and dimensions varied with different dynasties.

The Pāla and the Sena records usually refer to Vīthī after Vishaya or Māṇḍala. Thus from the Naihati grant we learn that Svalpadakshinā Vīthī was a sub-division of Uttararādha-māṇḍala.\(^5\) In the Śaktipur copper plate of Lakshamaṇasena, the largest division is no doubt Kaṅkāgrāma-bhuktī, but it is difficult to say, which of the two other sub-divisions, the Madhugirimaṇḍala or the Dakshinā-vīthī was the larger one.\(^6\) If we assume that the names of the different units are given in this record in an ascending scale in regard to their jurisdiction, then it is clear that the Madhugiri-māṇḍala was smaller than Dakshināvīthī.

---

The Nālandā grant\(^1\) of Dharmapāla shows that a Vishaya was a division bigger than a Viṣṭhi, as in that record the Jambubadī-viṣṭhi is stated to be included in the Gayā-Viṣṭha. Similarly the Kumudāśutra-viṣṭhi was included in the Gayā-Viṣṭha in the Nālandā grant of Devapāla.\(^2\)

Besides Vīṣṭhi, there were many other sub-divisions in Bengal between Vishaya and village known as Khāṭikā, Vṛitti and Chaturikā. The exact dimensions of the subdivisions, however, cannot be definitely ascertained. The Govindapur grant of Lakṣhaṇasena refers to Valadda-Chaturikā as situated in the Pashchima-Khāṭikā of the Vardhamāna-bhukti, from which it will appear that a Khāṭikā was a larger area than Chaturikā.\(^3\)

As regards the relation between Vṛitti and Chaturikā, the Madhiānagar grant of Lakṣhaṇasena refers to Khaṇḍa-Vṛitti in Varendri in Puṇḍra-vardhana-Bhukti, without showing any relation of it to other units prevalent at that time.\(^4\) The Sahitya Parishad grant refers to Madhukshirikā-vṛitti placed under Nānya (Maṇḍala ?), which again was situated in Vāṅga.\(^5\) This grant, however, shows that a Vṛitti was larger than a Chaturikā, the latter containing a number of Pāṭakas.

Under the Gāhaḍavālas, the terms Pattalā and Vishaya seem to have denoted a division of the dimension of the modern Tāluka. As both these terms do not figure simultaneously in one and the same inscription, one may probably be taken as the variant of the other. Under the Chedis also, the Taluka was denoted by the term Pattalā.\(^6\)

The Pattalā was divided into Paraganās under the Paramāras. They are sometimes denoted by the term Pathaka and sometimes by the term Pratijāgaraṇaka. As both these terms do not figure in one and the same record, one may be taken to be a variant of the other. Under the Pratihāras also, Paraganā is denoted by the term Pathaka.

---

The Pathaka was sometimes divided into two parts. Thus Daśapur Pathaka under the Pratihāras, had two divisions, namely eastern and western Pāthakas. Under the Paramāras also, Nāgadraha and Ujjayini were both divided into Eastern and Western Pathakas. This reminds us of the present division of eastern and western Khandesh or of Northern and Southern Satara district in Maharashtra State.

The Pratijāgaraṇaṇa or the Paraganā consisted of a number of groups of villages. Thus under the Paramāras, Nyāyapadraka group contained 17, Makhāla 42, Varakheṭaka 63, Bhaillāsvami 126, Muktāpalī 84, Bṛ migliari 64, Voḍasira 48, Tinispada 12, and Savasisole 16. Under the Chaulukyas, Mahulagāmva group contained 42 villages and that of Dhadhārika 12. Under the Chandellas, Khaṭauḍa group contained villages, Haṭa 18 and Tānla 12. Under the Chāhamānas, Tānukīpa, Gaḍaḷaḍika and Khattapāḍa were the headquarters of 12 villages. These units seem to have been known after the name of the important towns or villages situated in them. Sukra refers to officers over 10 and 100 villages, and Mānasollāsa to officers over 10, 20 and 100 villages. In actual practice this decimal system seems not to have been followed and there were groups of all kinds of odd number of villages like 12, 16, 17, 18, 42, 63, 64, etc.

The village was the lowest unit of administration. It however consisted of several Pāṭakas or small settlements under the Gāhaḍavālas. Thus Kailāśa-grāma had 8 Pāṭakas

1. E.I., XVI, 182.
3. E.I., XVIII, p. 322.
7. E.I., XIX, 71.
12. Ibid., XVIII, 80-85.
16. Sukra, IV, 3. 76.
17. E.I., IV, 131-133.
and Godanti-grāma had two Pāṭakas.¹ Similarly Kusupatagrama and Bhādapa Nāndapa Grāma had also several Pāṭakas.² The term Pāṭaka may probably correspond to the term Vadi current in Maharashṭra, denoting small settlements on the periphery of a village.

PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION

Big provinces like the Uttarāpatha or Ujjayini under the Mauryas, the Antarvedi between the Yamunā and the Narmadā under the Guptas and Vanavāsi under the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas were non-existent during our period in northern India. Pratihāras had a fairly big empire stretching over a great part of northern India, but it had provinces in the modern sense of the term like Kathiawar, Mālwā and Jejakabhukti. These were under governors, and their charges were known as Maṇḍalas. Under the Chaulukyas, Saurashtra and Narmadātaṭa had the status of Maṇḍalas. The Governors of these Maṇḍalas often belonged to the military cadres. Thus Vīsaladeva, who later became Mahāmaṇḍaleśvāra over Narmadātaṭa was a Daṇḍanāyaka in the reign of Kumārapāla. Governors were often transferred. Thus, Sālaksha was earlier a Governor of Saurashtra and was later transferred to Lāṭa in the same capacity.

The title Maṇḍaleśvāra given to provincial governors would show that there was a tendency of their becoming feudatory rulers. Provincial governors were executive and revenue officers in charge of the revenue collection and were responsible for maintaining law and order. They were the immediate controlling authorities over the Bhūkti and Vishāya officers and were appointed by the king himself.

BHUKTI ADMINISTRATION

The next biggest administrative unit of our age was a Bhūkti; its governor was known as an Uparika in the Gupt period; this title continued to be in vogue in Bengal in our

¹ I.A., XVIII, 134-36.
² E.I., XXVI, 272.
age. He must have had under him an adhikarana or office, which dealt with the various branches of the Bhukti administration. Officers in charge of the Manḍalas, Vishayas and the Paṭakas worked under his general supervision. Although our records are silent on the point, we cannot be far wrong in assuming that the governor of the Bhukti was in charge of collecting state revenues. Śukra points out that officers of a status equal to that of a Śāmanta were to collect the royal revenue. A little later he observes that Śāmanta was a title of an officer over 100 villages. We may, therefore, well presume that the revenue collection was one of the main duties of the heads of the Bhukti, district and lower administrations.

Although our records throw no direct light upon the functions of the officer of Bhukti, it is not unlikely that he had to maintain law and order, supervise over the administration of justice and to carry on the works of public utility. Probably he had a small fighting force under him to help him in the work of maintaining law and order. He was also expected to submit a periodical report to the central government relating to the work done by him or the condition of his division.

MANDALA ADMINISTRATION

Manḍala was in charge of an officer called Maṇḍalesvara. In Gujarat under the Chaulukyas he was assisted by officers known as Daṇḍanāyakas, who were subordinate to him. In one of the inscriptions of Ajayapāla, we find a Mahāmaṇḍalesvara ordering a Daṇḍanāyaka. Besides discharging police and military duties, Daṇḍanāyakas were often in charge of tax collection. Daṇḍanāyakas were in course of time often promoted to the position of a Maṇḍalesvara. Thus Vijayaka, who was first merely a Daṇḍanāyaka of Nādula later became a Mahāmaṇḍalesvara ruling over Narmadāṭaṭa.

1. Śukra; I, 181.
2. Śukra; I, 191.
3. Śukrā; II, 294-5.
5. Bali Inscription, P.R.A.S.W.C., 1907-8, p. 55.
DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

We do not derive much information about the district administration from our records. It was presided over by an officer, who was given the designation of Vishayapati or Vishayika in Bengal. His designation under other dynasties, where he governed over a Maṇḍala, is not known. He may have received his orders usually from the officer in charge of Bhukti. His functions were similar to those of the head of a Bhukti; but were confined to his smaller charge.

Under the Guptas, the Vishayapati enjoyed the right of selling the waste land under his jurisdiction, on behalf of the central government. Whether the same practice prevailed during our period also, we do not know, for our records are silent on this point.

The district officers were often recruited from the military cadre. The Daṇḍanāyakas, who figure very frequently in the Chaulukya, Sena and Pāla records, were probably military officers of the status of colonels and were often in charge of the administration of the Vishayas as also of the Maṇḍalas. Thus under the Chaulukya king Ajayapāladeva in 1137 A.D., Daṇḍanāyaka Vaijalladeva was ruling over the entire Narmadātātaṇaṁḍala.3

The district officer, like the Bhukti governor, was probably assisted in his work by police and C.I.D. officers such as Daṇḍapāśikas and Chauroddharaṇikas, whose duties were to apprehend criminals and to send them to the law courts for trial. Chāṭas and Bhaṭas, also worked under their supervision.3

It is difficult to say whether there existed judicial courts in the districts, for the records of our period do not refer to them. During the Gupta period, we find that there were the courts of justice in the districts, administered by specially appointed officers with the assistance of jurors trained in law. The same was probably the case during our period also, as

2. A.S.I.W.C., 1907-8, 55.
   For Chāṭas and Bhaṭas see p. 299.
is indicated by the seals of Dharmādhikāriṇḍa and Dharmāśāsanādhikaraṇa found at Nālandā.

During the Gupta period, we find that the Central Government could not sell the waste land owned by it before securing the concurrence of the district councils. Nay, there are even some copper plates, which, while making the grants of the waste land, actually bear the seal of the district administration as a proof of its approval.\(^1\) Whether such powers were enjoyed by the district administration during our period is not revealed by our inscriptions.

Whether the district officers during our period were guided by any non-official council, as was the case under the Guptas, cannot be stated due to want of evidence. The contemporary Deccan records show that the Vishayapati was not the only governing authority. There was also a non-official district council, the members of which were known as Vishayamahattaras. Unfortunately the records do not give us any information about the existence and functioning of any district councils. The districts were divided into Talukas, Vithis, Pratijāgaranakas, and the latter into groups of villages as already indicated. But we do not get any details about their administration. They probably had a revenue officer to supervise and direct the revenue and executive functions.

**TOWN ADMINISTRATION**

The inscriptions of our period do not give us detailed information about the town administration. It was probably carried on by an officer appointed by the central government. Unfortunately due to the absence of epigraphical evidence, it is difficult to say by what name the head of the town administration was known; in the contemporary Deccan, under the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Śilāhāras, he was designated as Purapati or Nagarapati. In Kāśmir the term Nagarādhipa was in use\(^2\). Probably a similar term was also current in northern India.\(^3\)

---

2. *Raj.*, VI, 70.
3. The Siyadon inscription refers to an officer called Mahara, perhaps meaning the chief. But the record being fragmentary does not
The Purapati or Nagarapati was the most important officer of the town. Unfortunately satisfactory epigraphical evidence being not available, it is difficult to say what were the qualifications expected in him. Very often he was a military officer; Lūṇḍapāśaka, who was in charge of the town of Udaipur under the Chaulukya king Ajayapāladeva, was a Daṇḍanāyaka. Whether more importance was given to the military ability than to the administrative experience we do not know. Probably both were given due consideration. The contemporary Deccan records also show that very often the governor of the town was selected from among the military captains. Thus Rudrapayya, who was once a bodyguard of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛiṣṇa III, was acting later as a prefect of the town of Saravatura in Kārnāṭaka. Mahādeva and Pāṭaladeva, who were the Daṇḍanāyakas of the Chaulukya king Jagadeka-malla, were also appointed as the joint prefects of Bāḍāmi in 1140. Sometimes the heads of the town had literary predilections, the twelve officers in charge of Teridal in Southern Maratha country are all described as promoting the everlasting six systems of Philosophy. All this evidence clearly shows that the Purapati was sometimes selected for military ability, sometimes for administrative experience and sometimes for their learning, both in the Deccan and in Northern India.

When a place like Gwalior happened to be both a town and a fort, we come across slightly different administrative arrangement. The Gwalior inscription of the Pratihara king Bhoja refers to Allā as Koṭṭapāla, the commander of the fort, appointed by the emperor and to Tattaka as Balādhikṛita, the commander of the forces. It also refers to a committee consisting of two Śreshṭhis (guild presidents) and one Sārthavāha (caravan-leader) apparently selected or elected. In such cases, the commander of the fort and commander of the

enable us to state whether he was the Governor of the town or whether he was one of the officers. (E.I., I, 173-9).

Territorial Divisions and Administration

army were obviously in charge of military administration, whereas the civil administration was perhaps entrusted to a committee probably presided over by Purapati. This inscription does not refer to Purapati or Nagarapati. Can it be that the Koṭṭapāla himself might have exercised Purapati's powers and may have presided over the above committee? His duty was to maintain the internal peace and to collect the royal revenue.

The city affairs were managed by the Purapati with the help of a non-official committee, which was called by different names in the different parts of the country. At Ghalop in Rajasthan, it was called Chaukaḍikā, while under the Chandellas and Chaulukyas it was known as Paṇchakula. In the Gupta age, the term Paṇchamaṇḍalī seems to have been common. The town committees existed in the Deccan of our period also; we find one functioning at Guṇapura.

The inscriptions being silent, it is difficult to state as to who were eligible to become the members of the town committee. Whether the members were selected by the government or whether there was an election is not revealed by our records. It appears very probable that the people of the town themselves selected elderly and experienced persons of good and noble character as the members of the town committee. Functional considerations may have often governed their choice. One Bhinmal inscription of Kṛishṇa-pāṇḍa Paramāra, dated 1067 A.D., informs us, how the committee consisted of persons of different castes and professions, one being a Sauvarṇika or a goldsmith, one being a Śresṭhi or a prominent merchant and so on.

2. E.I., I, 179.
4. There is no direct evidence for the statement, but it is rendered very probable by the circumstance that the members of the village council were described as grāmamahattaras or grāmamahattamas. Mahattara indicated either a person of high status or an elderly person (Apte's Dictionary) but in ancient times high status was not usually associated with young age.
5. B.G., I, 473.
mittee at Guṇapura consisted of one Brāhmaṇa, one merchant and two bankers.¹

Sometimes the town was divided into several wards, each of which used to send its own representatives to the committee. Thus the Nādol stone inscription of the king Rājya-pāla informs us that the town of Ghalop was divided into eight wards, known as Wāḍas, each of which used to send two representatives.² The Pañchakula thus did not consist of five members only, as may be suggested by the term pañcha, but of a large number of representatives sent by different wards. The term Pañcha in words like pañchakula or pauchamandali had no exact numerical significance; the modern pañchanaṁā has only two witnesses. The strength of the town committee was 16 at Ghalop and 30 at Uttaramerur. It seems to have varied according to the size of the towns.

How the members of the wards were elected or selected cannot be stated with certainty for want of evidence. It is, however, certain that some kind of election or selection took place for constituting the town committee, since these members were non-officials. It may be that lots also were drawn from among the eligibles, as was done in the Tamil country during our period of survey. The election by lots no doubt now looks odd, but it was not unknown to ancient Greek democracy also.

It was the duty of the town committee to maintain peace and order in the town and to apprehend the law-breakers. The Nādol stone inscription informs us that if a theft took place in any ward, it was the duty of the committee to apprehend the thief, no doubt with the cooperation of the representatives of wards. The Central Government of the day also used to help it in tracing the lost articles by supplying it with money, weapons and watchmen.

The Town Committee also looked after routine adminis-

¹ The earlier practice, as indicated by the Dāmodarpur plates, often favoured functional representation; bankers, traders and writers were represented at Pañdavardhana by the most senior members of their guilds or professions. E.I., XII, 130.

² E.I., XI, 39.
trative work such as the collection of taxes,\textsuperscript{1} the maintenance of records and the correspondence with the Central Government. It also supervised the markets through the officer called Kauptika.\textsuperscript{2} It probably carried out the different works of public utility such as repairing and constructing roads and maintaining gardens, temples and educational institutions, as was the case in the contemporary South India.

Whether the Town Committee was divided into sub-committees for the convenience of work, is not revealed by our records. In the Mauryan period, we find that the town committee of big cities like Pātaliputra was divided into sub-committees, each being entrusted with a particular function. A similar state of affairs prevailed at Uttaramerur in south India during our period. We have, however, no evidence as to whether it prevailed in Northern India during our age.

The Town Committee had its own executive, which used to carry on the business of the town administration. It was called Vāra in Rajasthan and central India under the Chāhamānas and Pratihāras.\textsuperscript{3} Under the Chāhamānas, the executive was changed annually, for the Bhinmal inscription of 1067 A.D. clearly refers to one Jogachandra as the member of the executive for the current year.\textsuperscript{4} In the Siyādoni inscription, however, we find one Aśvānarasindhu functioning as a member of the committee once in 967 and then again in 969 A.D.\textsuperscript{5} It appears that the members of the executive committee were elected for more than one year at Siyādoni, unless we assume that Aśvānarasindhu was being annually 're-elected'.

The strength of the executive committee varied according to the needs of the situation. If the town was a big one, its executive committee would naturally have consisted of a larger number of members; while in case of small towns, there would have been only a few members in the executive. The

1. \textit{E.I.}, I. 188.
2. \textit{E.I.}, U, 188.
5. \textit{E.I.}, 173-79,
Gwalior inscription of the Pratihāra king Bhoja informs us that there were three members of the executive committee at Gwalior.\(^1\) The Bhinmal inscription of 1067 A.D. on the other hand informs us that the executive consisted of 4 members.\(^2\) At Siyādoni however, there were only two members in the executive.\(^3\)

The Vārikas, or the members of the executive committee, carried on their work in an office known as Sthāna in Rājapūtānā, where all important charters were deposited and a careful record of important documents was kept. The Pehoā inscription clearly informs us how the horse dealers at Pehoā, after having executed a deed of voluntary cess from buyers and sellers, passed a formal resolution and deposited its copy in the office (Sthāna) of the town-committee in order to enable it to collect the dues in future according to the agreed scheme.\(^4\)

The executive of the town committee used to have its own Karanika or writer, whose post was probably permanent. Unfortunately due to the absence of epigraphical evidence, we are not in a position to state whether he was appointed by the Government or by the committee. It appears very probable that he was a local resident and was appointed to the post with the approval of the members of the town committee. His duty was to maintain the office records in the proper order. He was, if necessary, assisted in his work by some assistants, though they are not referred to in our records.

Besides the secretary, there was also another officer called Kauptika, whose duty was to collect the market dues, which formed one of the important sources of income of the town administration.

Let us now briefly survey the different sources of revenue of the town committee. The tax on shops and houses was one source of the town revenue. The second source was the octroi duties collected within the jurisdiction of the town. Probably the town committee also received a portion of the

4. *E.I.,* I, 188.
fines. The central government often helped the committee with funds in carrying out the different works of public utility, if they were of considerable magnitude.

VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION

Village has been the most stable unit of administration from early times. As usual, village administration was presided over by the village headman. He was called by different names under the different dynasties. In Bengal under the Pālas, the headman was known as Grāmapati, while under the Paramāras, he was designated as Paṭṭakila. Under the Gāhaḍavālas in U.P. the title of the village headman was Mahattaka.

The post of village headman was usually hereditary. The Paramāra records often refer to hereditary Paṭṭakilas. One of them shows that Janha and his father Cahila were both Paṭṭakilas. It is however not unlikely that if the succession of the son was not approved by the government, it might be appointing a collateral in his place.

There were some villages assigned to scholars, some to pious Brāhmaṇas, some to military captains and some to high government officers. Unfortunately we do not know whether these donees were only entitled to the enjoyment of the income of the villages or whether they supervised over their administration also. In the South, however, the donees were only entitled to enjoy the income. This clearly indicates that the assignment of villages to Brāhmaṇas and military captains did not interfere with the normal scheme of administration and the headman continued to function in all villages, whether alienated or unalienated.

Normally there was one headman for each village in Northern India during our period. Such was not, however, the case in the Deccan. Under the Raṭṭas of Saundatti and the later Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi, we find a village being

2. I.A., XIX, 349.
governed by several headmen. The five Raṭṭa records of Saundatti inform us that there were twelve headmen in each of the three villages, namely Sugandhavati, Elerava and Hasudi, while the village of Hirayakummi had six.\(^1\) One of the records of the Chālukya king Vikramāditya VI shows that the village Teridal had twelve headmen.\(^2\) It is difficult to say whether in reality there were so many headmen in one village. It is very likely that under the Chālukyas and the Raṭṭas, there might be a custom of allowing the senior representatives of the main branches of the original headman's family to officiate simultaneously. Even today we find in Mahārāṣṭra two headmen representing the two main branches of the original stock functioning in several villages, one in charge of the revenue work and the other of the police duties. It is very likely that the same principle might have been followed there during our period of survey also.

The village headman was the most important officer of the village administration. He was in custody of the village records. A number of epigraphs show, how even the king used to consult formally the village headman at the time of granting a piece of land in the village. Thus from one of the Gāhaḍavāla grants of 1109, we learn that Govinda-

chandra consulted the village headman called Śri Gāṅgeya, when he made a grant of one Seerā of land measuring four ploughs.\(^3\) The Kāmāuli grant of the same ruler informs us that, while granting the village of Usithā in the Jiāvatipattala in the Pāṇchāla-deśa to the Brāhmaṇa Vīthākeyadikshita, Govindachandra took the 'consent' (sammati) of not only the Purohitā, the queen and other members of the ministry but also of the Mahattaka Vālhaṇa.\(^4\) From the Basāhi grant, we learn that the views of the same Mahattaka Vālhaṇa were ascertained by the king Govindachandra, when he granted the village of Vasabhi to the Brāhmaṇa Ālheka.\(^5\) All this evidence clearly indicates that under the Gāhaḍavāla ruler,

2. I.A. XIV, 14.
4. E.I., II, 359-61; See p. no. 3.
5. I.A., XIV, 103-4.
the views of the village headman were ascertained, when the king proposed to make any land grant. The village headman was a custodian of records and had an accurate information about the revenue of the village and of the ownership of the different pieces of land situated in it. It was therefore but natural that he should have been consulted at the time of land grant. The consultation was probably to ascertain whether there were any administrative difficulties; it does not suggest that the consent of the headman was a sine-qua-non for the grant of a village or a piece of land by a king.

DUTIES OF THE HEADMAN

The most important duty of the village headman was to preserve law and order in the village; for this purpose he used to have a local militia under him. During our period, the rebellions of feudatories were frequent. Sometimes the peace of villages was also disturbed by the rivalries of adjacent villages. The headman, on such occasions, had to discharge the duties of a military captain and often to lay down his life, while defending the homes of the fellow villagers. Unfortunately the North Indian inscriptions of our period do not give us any specific instance of a village headman giving his life, while fighting for the protection of his village. Śukra, however, says that the headman should protect the villagers from thieves and dacoits,¹ suggesting thereby that it was the duty of the headman to preserve law and order and apprehend bad characters and robbers. He must have discharged this duty with the help of village police or militia.

In the contemporary Deccan records we come across a number of instances of the village headmen fighting and dying for their villages. A number of inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings Kuśa, Kuśa II, Kuśa III and Karkka II inform us, how in the skirmishes caused by the cattle-lifting propensity, number of village headmen gave up their lives.²

¹. Ādharashkebhyaśchorebhhyo hyadhikāriganāt tathā. Prajā-samṛakhanae dakəho, grāmapo mātripiṭīvat. Śukra. II, 171.
². E.C., VIII, Sora No. 234.
In Northern India, during our period of survey, as observed already, there were constant wars going on between the different dynasties; the villagers therefore could not have enjoyed complete peace. They had to be self-reliant in defence and to be expert in the use of arms, as owing to communications being slow, it was not possible for the central government to help them by providing military or police aid at the nick of time, when there were sudden raids of bandits and robbers.

The next duty of the village headman was to collect the village revenues and to pay them into the royal treasury. This is evident from a number of inscriptions, which, while referring to village and land grants, generally mention the name of the village headman. Even in the extreme south in the Tamil country, where village councils had become permanent bodies, meeting regularly and functioning methodically, we find the village headman collecting the village revenues.

When the government wanted to make any extra demand from the villagers, it was the village headman, who used to carry on negotiations on behalf of the villagers. According to Šukra,³ he was to protect the village against the government officers. This would suggest that it was his duty to resist unfair demands.

We do not know whether the headman was assisted in his work of the collection by other officers also, for our inscriptions do not throw any light on this point. As far as the small village is concerned, it is very likely that the headman himself would have collected the revenues, but in case of big villages, it is not improbable that he would have been assisted in his work by other village officers.

Settlement of village disputes was also another important duty of the village headman. Being the village magistrate, he had the right of trying petty criminal cases. Civil cases were probably settled by the village Pañchāyat, meeting under the chairmanship of the headman.

Besides the settlement of village disputes, the headman had to look after the works of public utility. He had also to entertain and make arrangements for the boarding and lodg-

³ Šukra, II, 171.
ing of the officers of the central government, when they paid their visits to the villages.

The headman was remunerated for his services in various ways. It is difficult to say whether in Northern India, he was given rent-free land for his services; the records so far discovered are usually silent on this point. In the Deccan, however, the headman used to have his own rent-free land. One of the records of the Raṭṭas of Saundatti clearly states, how Govinda of Kadole alienated 200 mattars of cultivable land, which was enjoyed by him as his rent-free land. This record clearly shows that the headman not only enjoyed rent-free land but had also the right of alienating it. Whether all the headmen of the Deccan during our period enjoyed this right, we do not know.

The headman was entitled to a number of petty dues in kind, which consisted of articles like Gūrya, Ghee, betel leaves, etc. These were described as Maulika-arhaṇas or requisites of hereditary officers in Kalachūri records. Our inscriptions further refer to Bhogakara, which probably represented petty taxes in kind on fruits, vegetables, etc., paid by the villagers as a government tax. It is important to note that as the king could exact these taxes only when on tour, they were usually assigned in practice to the village headman, most probably as a part of his pay.

The village headman was not usually a Brāhmaṇa by caste, as is evident from the nature of his duties and also from the evidence of a number of inscriptions. It is no doubt true that Śukra states that a grāmaṇa should be a Brāhmaṇa; perhaps it may have been the case in some places. The duties of the headman are more appropriate for a Kṣatriya than for a Brāhmaṇa. The six copper plates of the Gāhaḍavāla king Jayachandra record grants to a Kṣatřiya hereditary Rauta Mahāmahattaka. Sometimes he was selected even from lower castes. One of the Paramāra records informs us that in 1186 A.D. in the Banwāsa state in Rajasthan, the Paṭṭakila Jahça belonged to the Tailika family. His post was also hereditary,

2. I.A., IV, 276.
for his father Chāhil is also described as Paṭṭakila in this record.  

The village headman exercised great influence over the villagers. His influence with the government also was as great as that with the people, for as already shown, he was often consulted at the time of making village or land grants. There is no doubt that he was responsible for his work to the central government; but still he remained a man of the people. Śukra observes that he was like father and mother to the villagers taking full care for their economic prosperity and happiness, and protecting them against government officials.

VILLAGE OFFICE

The village headman must have carried on the administrative business in a suitable office building in the village, where all the records relating to the rights to and transfers of the village lands as well as the documents connected with the government dues were carefully kept.

VILLAGE ACCOUNTANT

It is important to note that our records nowhere refer to the village accountant. The contemporary South Indian records show that under the Cholas, the accountant was an important officer of the village administration, whose duty was to keep an account of the land and other taxes, noting the amount paid by each villager. Why he does not figure in the records of Northern India of our period, we do not know. Whether his post had disappeared, or whether his omission is accidental cannot be stated with certainty. Śukra, whose work sums up the general condition of our age, however, refers to the village accountant and calls him by the name Lekhaka; it is therefore very likely that he would have been a member of the village administration. He was to be skilled

2. Prajāsamrakshanā daksahā grāmāpo mātrīpitrīvat.

Śukra, II, 171.
in account keeping.\(^1\) Like modern village accountants, he also used to keep accounts of the income and the expenditure of the village and received the Government revenue in cash or kind, after making proper entries in the registers.

Besides village headman and the village accountant, there were also some other officers, who are referred to by Sukra but do not figure in the inscriptions. One of them was Sāhasādhipati, whose position was probably similar to that of the modern magistrate. Other officers were Bhāgahāra or the revenue collector, Śulkagrāha or the toll collector and Prathīhāra or the gate-keeper. It is very probable that these separate posts existed only in the big villages or towns; in the normal village, however, the headman himself would have discharged the functions of these different posts.

The Prathīhāra and Pāla records refer to some other officers namely, Yuktas, Niyuktas, Āyuktas and Viniyuktakas. The precise nature of the functions of these officers is still uncertain, but it is not unlikely that they would have belonged to the village administration. If so, may it not be that the duties of these officers corresponded to those of Bhāgahāra, Śulkagrāha and Prathīhāra mentioned by Sukra? Probably they also existed only in bigger villages.

**THE VILLAGE COUNCIL**

The village headman carried on the village government with the help of a village council, known as Pañchakula in Rajasthan under the Chāhamānas. What its name was under other dynasties is not known. It was an important body in the village administration; for we find that even royal grants made for the works of public utility were often made in its presence. Thus when princes Lākhaṇapāla and Abhayapāla made a grant of one karaka of barley from the village Bhādiyannva, conjointly with the queen Mahābaladevi, it was made in the presence of the Pañchakula.\(^2\) The grant of 40 drama\(\)s by Vibhāka was also made in the presence of the

Pañchakula. The Bhinmal stone inscription of 1249 A.D. also records a grant of 50 drammas to the treasury of the God Jayasvāmī in the presence of the Pañchakula. The grant made by Kāyastha Subhaṭa for the worship and services of the Tīrthaṅkara Mahāvīra was made in the presence of the village Pañchakula. Even small donations intended for providing for the offerings of Naivedya were often made in the presence of Pañchakula. All this evidence clearly indicates that the Pañchakula was an important body of the village administration under the Chāhamānas.

The Gāhaḍavāla records, however, do not refer to a Pañchakula. They only mention the village elders or Mahattaras. The non-reference may be accidental. It is also likely that the members of the Pañchakula were also known as Mahattaras. The president of the village council was usually the headman.

It is somewhat strange that the Pañchakula or the village council should not figure in the records of the Pratihāras, the Paramāras, the Chedis, the Chandellas, the Pālas and the Senas. This silence is rather difficult to explain. It is hardly likely that the village council was unknown to the administration of these dynasties.

Let us now see who were eligible to become the members of the village council. It appears that there was no caste restriction and people from all the castes could become its members. One Chāhamāna inscription, dated 1153 A.D., informs us that in Nādula kingdom, the village administration was carried on by one Bhan (Bhaṇḍāri), one Rā (Rauta), one Vanika and one Vipradha. They were probably members of the village council and obviously belonged to different castes.

Village revenues were usually collected in kind; the Bhaṇḍāri, whose duty was to collect it, played an important

---
1. B.G., I, 474, No. 7.
2. B.G., I, 1 p. 475.
part in the village administration and would have been included in the council.

We have no information as to how the village councils were constituted. Our records nowhere refer to any election or selection of the members of the village councils nor to their qualifications. The contemporary South Indian records from Tamil country give us detailed rules in this connection; candidates were required to have certain property and educational qualifications along with a blameless character.

In Northern India also, probably the same would have been the case. Equal importance was probably given both to the moral, educational and property qualifications, while selecting the members of the village council. Whether there was any age restriction for the candidates seeking the membership of the council in Northern India during our period, as was the case in the Tamil country, is not revealed by our records. Nor do we know whether a person once ‘selected’ as the member of the council could again stand for ‘selection’.

Whether elected or selected there is clear evidence to show that the village council under the Chāhamānas was constituted periodically. In one of the Bhinmal Inscriptions, we find the members of the local community making a religious grant and observing that though they have made the donations, all the members of the future council will enjoy its merit.1 This instance not only indicates that the village council was constituted periodically, but it also shows that the grant made by the earlier bodies could be modified or cancelled by the later committees. It appears that, it was open for the subsequent Pañchakulas or village councils, as for later kings, to stop, to continue or to vary the grant.

The contemporary records from Tamil country show that there were a number of sub-committees of the village or the town council, each being in charge of a particular department like the adjudication, tanks, temples and roads. Apparently such was not the case in northern India, for the work in connection with temples, well construction and other works of public utility, is seen to be in charge of special committees known as Goshṭhis. Our records do not suggest that these

1. B.G., I.I, 480.
Goshṭhis were sub-committees of the town or village committee. It is also doubtful whether they were connected with them. Thus one of the Chāhamāna inscriptions informs us that Valapaḍeṇa, who was a feudatory of Jaitrasimha, levied a cess from ploughs and oil mills for the management of a well in 1215 A.D. at a village in Jodhapur state, the management of which was entrusted to a Pratipālikā Goshṭhi.\(^1\) The Bhadunḍa inscription of the Paramāra king Pūrṇapāla, dated 1145 A.D. refers to the construction of step-well in the village of Bhāmipadra and the work done by the Goshṭhikas in its charge. The Pehoa inscription of the Pratihāra king Bhoja refers to the Goshṭhikas of horse dealers, who were entrusted with the collection of agreed cesses and contributions for the upkeep of a local temple and its worship expenses.\(^2\) The Āhar inscription refers to a Goshṭhi managing the Kanakadevi temple and looking after the investment of its funds.\(^3\) The management of a Jain temple was also carried on by the members of a Goshṭhi.\(^4\) The Pārśvanātha temple at jalor was also administered by a Goshṭhi, the members of which are stated to have been in charge of the collection of the rent of a building for Pāñchamī-bali ceremony.\(^5\) Another inscription informs us that the members of a Goshṭhi acted as witnesses at the time of a grant made by a Jain śreshṭhi for a maṇḍapa.\(^6\)

The above evidence tends to show that there were non-official committees of respectable members formed for the purpose of organising and managing works of public utility and arranging for the needs of temples and other centres of religion and culture. How they were constituted, we do not know. It is possible that the members of these committees acted like trustees in modern days.

---

2. E.I., I, 188.
3. E.I., XIX, 45.
Territorial Divisions & Administration

It is difficult to say whether the village council under the Chāhamānas discharged the functions of trustees and bankers as was the case in the Tamil country during our period; nor can we say whether it looked after the management of schools and poor houses (sattras). Our inscriptions are all silent on these points. It is probable that the village councils in Northern India did not enjoy considerable powers like those of the Chola councils.

ADJUDICATION

Both the literary and epigraphical evidence shows that the settlement of village disputes was one of the most important functions of the village council. Somadeva informs us how king's court did not entertain any case at first instance and how the village council used to try them first. If, however, the parties felt dissatisfied with the decision of the village council, then alone they could appeal to the king's court.\(^1\) Śukra expresses the same view.\(^2\) Our records also indicate the same; for village grants usually assign to the donees not only the right to receive the land revenue, but also the fines and other sums due from the villagers in connection with their disputes and crimes. If all the cases were tried directly by the king's court or at the headquarter of district, the donees of our copper plate grants, residing in distant villages, could have hardly found it convenient to collect the fines imposed by the royal courts in towns and cities. It was because the lighter criminal cases were usually tried at the village itself, that the assignment of fines to the grantees of village grants was found practicable. The village councils could not try all the criminal cases. There were, however, usually no limitations on their civil jurisdiction.

PROCEDURE OF THE VILLAGE COUNCIL

Unfortunately the records of our period give us no clue about the preceding of the meetings of the village council. It is, however, not unlikely that the village headman would have presided over the meetings, which were probably held

---

1. Grāme pure vā vṛitto vyavaḥārastasya vivāde tādā rājanāmupeyāt. 
2. Śukra, IV, 5, 74.
in the village office. The other officer, who used to be present at the meetings was probably the accountant, who used to keep the records of the proceedings in the village office.

**SOURCES OF REVENUE**

The tax on shops and houses, the fines imposed by the local courts, extra taxes for special works, voluntary cesses levied for important works¹ were the main sources of the income of the village councils. The state was entitled to free service for one or two days in the month from the skilled and unskilled labourers; this right was usually transferred to the village communities, which found it very useful for digging wells, constructing dams and similar works. Probably a percentage of the land revenue was also assigned to the village communities.

¹ *E.I. I*, 159-62 refers to voluntary cesses agreed to by horse dealers, gardeners etc.
CHAPTER VII

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

Ancient Indian political thinkers regard the treasury as a very important limb of the body politic. The *Mahābhārata* advises the king to protect his Kośa (treasury) with great care and effort, since it is the very root of the state. Writers like Manu, Yājñavalkya and Kautilya also express the same view. They all declare that the kingdom can never prosper without an overflowing treasury. The king should therefore pay first attention to Kośa.

The same is the view of the writers of our period. The *Agni-Purāṇa* emphasises the importance of a full treasury, for, it says that without treasury, the realization of one’s objectives can never be ensured. The *Vishnudharmottara* points out how the treasury is the very root of sovereignty. The same is the view of Kāmandaka, who naturally insists that proper attention should be given to the treasury department. According to Somadeva, it is the treasury which is the breath of the king’s existence, and not the air he breathes. In fact it is the treasury and not the person of the king, who is the sovereign. The king, whose treasury is full is always victorious; otherwise even his security is in danger. In short a kingdom can never be safe, if its treasury is not prosperous. Śukra states “The treasury is the root of the army, and the

army is root of the treasury. The king should therefore personally look into the income and expenditure everyday." The Rājatarāṇīghī informs us how the king Kalasha of Kashmir watched the income and expenditure and had a clerk by his side to take down his instructions. All this evidence clearly indicates that ancient Indian political thinkers regard the treasury and ample reserve funds as the most essential for the welfare of the state. They have clearly declared that any deterioration in this connection would lead to the most serious national calamity.

PRINCIPLES OF TAXATION

The principal sources of state income during our period were the different kinds of taxes and fines, income from government properties and tributes from the feudatories. Among these the income from taxes was the most important one. We shall therefore discuss at the outset the general principles of taxation, as evolved by our political writers.

From very ancient times, great emphasis was laid by our political writers on the necessity of the taxation being reasonable and equitable. Both the Mahābhārata and the Manusmṛiti point out that excessive taxation will lead the king to ruin and hatred. Sukra, while expressing the same view, states that the best king is he, who following the practice of a garland maker (who takes flowers without rooting out the plants), protects his subjects, makes the enemies tributaries, and increases the treasure by their wealth. In short, it is only by moderate and timely collection of taxes that people will become attached and loyal to the king, thus ensuring a continuous payment of taxation.

Kāmandaka advises the king to recover taxes at proper time and proper place. The Śāntiparva also advises the

1. Śukra, IV, 2 14.
4. Mālākāraṣya vrityaiva svaprajārakṣapena cha
   Śatruḥ hi karadikṛitya tattādhanah kośavardhānam. 
   Śukra, IV, 2, 18.
5. Kāmandaka, IV, 03-04.
king to levy taxes at the proper time and place, which may be convenient to the subjects.¹

In the case of trade and industry, the king should levy taxes on net profits and not on gross earnings. The king, says Śukra, should not realise duty from the seller, when he receives what is less than or just equal to the cost. Under such circumstances the duty should be realised from the buyer.² In case of peasants also, the king should levy taxes upon them after ascertaining the amount of profits.³

An article should be taxed only once and not twice. The duty, says Śukra, should not be realised more than once by the king under one excuse or the other.⁴

Articles of very small value should not be taxed.⁵

The criterion of equitable taxation was that the state on the one side and the agriculturist and the trader on the other should both feel that they have got a fair and reasonable return for their labours. The king, says Śukra, should receive the rent from the peasant in such a way that he may not be destroyed.⁶ He should behave like a weaver of garland, who plucks only full blown flowers from the tree and leaves the remaining untouched, as also the trees. He should not follow the example of a coal manufacturer, who entirely consumes the wood once for all.⁷

The last principle of taxation was that the king should impose extra taxes only in times of crisis. Śukra says that it is only at the time of national calamity that the king should receive from the people special grants and contributions.⁸

---

1. Māhā, Śānti-parva, XXXVIII, 12.
2. Lābhām dhritāh harc-śulkam kṛetritāscha sadānripaḥ. Śukra, IV, 2, 111.
6. Śukra, IV, 2, 112.
7. Mālakārīva grahyo bhāgonāṁ gāragkaravat. Śukra, IV, 2, 113.
normal times, however, the king is not permitted to increase the land revenue, nor is he allowed to levy extra duties or to make a levy upon the property of temples and other holy establishments. In short, extra taxation was regarded as only an exceptional remedy to be adopted, when there was no other alternative. Somadeva also permits the state to tax the temples, Brāhmaṇas and the wealth collected for sacrifices only in case of emergency to tide over great difficulties.\(^1\) We thus see that our political writers have laid down excellent principles of taxation, which are generally sound and reasonable.

Ancient Indian political thinkers have also laid down equitable and sound principles for remissions in taxation. According to Śukra, people who undertake new industries or bring waste lands under cultivation, or who for the growth of irrigation, construct new canals or dig tanks or wells, should not be taxed until they realise profit equal to twice the expenditure.\(^2\) It is interesting to note that this recommendation of Śukra is similar to but more specific than that of Kautilya, who also recommends five years remission in taxation in case of new construction, four years remission in case of repairs, three years remission in case of improving and extending water works, and two years remission to those who mortgage or purchase uncultivated land. Śukra further lays down that family necessities like milk, vegetables, cloth, etc., apparently when produced in the house itself, were not to be taxed.\(^3\)

Let us now tackle the problem whether Brāhmaṇas were exempted from taxation or not. Śukra\(^4\) and Somadeva\(^5\) no doubt state that a king should not tax Brāhmaṇas and temples except in times of stress. This no doubt suggests that in normal times they were not taxed. It is, however, doubtful whether the exemption was applicable to all the Brāhmaṇas, for most of the Smṛitis exempt only Śrōtriyas from taxation.\(^6\) Other Brāhmaṇas following the professions of trade and industry were not exempted from taxes. The epigraphical evidence

\(^1\) Neel., 82.
\(^2\) Śukra, IV, 2, 115.
\(^3\) Śukra, IV, 2, 127.
\(^4\) Śukra, IV, 2, 2, 9.
\(^5\) Neel., XXI, 14.
\(^6\) e.g. Manus., VII, 133.
also shows that the claim of the Brāhmaṇa class as a whole for remission from taxation was generally not recognised by the state. The donces of the Brāhmaṇadeya villages may perhaps have been exempted from taxes. But we are not sure even on this point; for the contemporary South Indian records inform us that when lands or villages were granted to the Brāhmaṇas or temples, they were usually required to pay a quit rent. Such might have been the case in the North also during our period of survey, though we have no specific epigraphical evidence to prove it. If Devadāya grants in South India were not exempted from taxation, ordinary Brāhmaṇas, who were following a number of non-Brahmanical professions, could hardly have received a better treatment. There is no doubt that the Mount Abu inscription of Tejapāla of 1230 A.D. reveals that the king Somasimha of the Paramāra dynasty remitted the tax upon the Brāhmaṇas,¹ but this statement should not be taken as literally true, for it is made in the course of that king’s eulogy. It is further to be noted that the inscription does not make it clear whether all the Brāhmaṇas or only a section of them was exempted from taxation. The utmost we can say is that occasionally a king like Somasimha took this unusual step.

**SOURCES OF REVENUE**

Let us now see what were the sources of revenue of the different governments of the period under consideration. Śrautṣṭis give us a regular list of taxes in this connection. The inscriptions do not do so; but the statements made in them about the immunities of the villages alienated in favour of Brāhmaṇas and temples help us to a great extent in having the knowledge of the principal sources of income. Accounts of the Muslim traders are also useful to some extent in this connection.

The principal sources of revenue may be classified under the following five heads:

Regular taxes, (kara and sulka).²

Occasional taxes.

¹ Muktiṣa viprakarān—E.I., VIII, 208-19.
² Śukra, II, 384.
Income from state properties (ākara of Šukra).

Tributes from feudatories.

Fines (daṇḍa of Šukra).

Of these items, the fourth one will be considered in the ninth chapter, where the position of the feudatories will be reviewed; the remaining will be considered here.

Let us now discuss the different sources of revenue one by one.

Regular Taxes: The close study of the inscriptions reveals that the following were the usual taxes levied in our period:

- Bhāga-kara
- Bhaga-kara
- Sulka
- Vishi
- Udāniya and
- Uparikara.

Among these taxes, the first four are referred to by the Śrīśītis and also by the books on polity; the last two appear only in inscriptions.

Bhāga-kara:—Agriculture being the main avocation of the people, the land tax was naturally an important source of the state income. The Śrīśītis invariably call it as Bhāga-kara, i.e., a tax consisting of a portion (of the produce of land). Its incidence varied from 16 to 25 per cent according to the quality of the land. It was usually collected in kind, as the term bhāga-kara clearly suggests. That the term bhāga denotes a royal share of land produce is also evident from Sanskrit literature, where the king is very often described as subsisting on pashṭhāṅga-bhāga, i.e., the sixth part of the produce of the land. It is therefore certain that bhāga-kara of the inscriptions is nothing else but the land tax.

Bhaga-kara:—It represents petty taxes payable in the form of daily presents in kind such as fruits, flowers, vegetables, fodder, betel leaves, etc. As these taxes were paid in kind, they were generally assigned to the local officers of the villages, most probably as part of their pay. They were, however, utilised in providing for the provisions for the visit of the king.

and officers when they happened to come there on the inspection tour.

Let us now consider the meaning of the terms Udrañga and Uparikara. Unfortunately we are not still in a position to determine the meaning of these terms, for they are not referred to in modern Sanskrit dictionaries. Some Sanskrit Kośas, however, refer to the term Udrañga. According to Trikhanḍaśeshakośa, udrañga is the name of the celestial city of Hariśchandra.1 But this meaning can hardly be considered in connection with the present enquiry. The Śāvatra-Kośa refers to a word Uddhāra, which is taken by some scholars as a synonym of udrañga meaning a tax levied on the permanent tenants.2 But as the word uddhāra means a special share in property given to the eldest son, it cannot be taken in connection with taxation.

Can we identify udrañga with drañga? The Rājatarangini mentions the term drañga in the sense of a frontier town.1 It is therefore possible that the term sodrañgah may mean 'along with the octroi duties'. But against this view, it can be argued that if the term was used in the sense of octroi duties, it would not have been sodrañgah but sadrañgah. It is, however, important to note that our records refer to several variations of the fiscal terms, but none of them ever mentions sadrañgah as an alternative form of sodrañgah. The form of the term sodrañgah is constant in all the records of the different dynasties of our period of survey.

Let us now discuss the different interpretations of the terms udrañga and uparikara offered by different scholars. According to Fleet, udrañga means a tax on permanent tenants and uparikara a tax levied on cultivators, who have no proprietary rights in the soil.3 This view is however untenable, for it is very unlikely that the government would have made any distinction between the taxes paid by the permanent tenants and temporary cultivators. Further there is no evidence to show that the government was imposing any extra or special taxation on such tenants, who had no proprietary rights in the soil.

According to Dr. Ghoshal, the term uparikara means 'an irregular tax, which bore harshly on cultivators'. In other words it was a tax on land, which had to be paid over and above (—upari) the normal land tax. It thus appears to be identical with Bhogakara as both the terms denote additional taxes.

Dr. Altekar takes the term sodraŋgaḥ and soparikaraḥ as identical with the terms sabhāga-bhogakaraḥ. This view is supported by the fact that in none of our records the terms sodraŋgaḥ and soparikaraḥ appear along with the expression sabhāga-bhoga-karaḥ. Where the expression sabhāga-bhoga is used, the terms sodraŋgaḥ and soparikaraḥ do not figure and where sodraŋgaḥ and soparikaraḥ appear, the expression sabhāga-bhoga-karaḥ is not used. Further it is important to note that there is hardly any record, where neither set of taxes is mentioned. It is therefore probable that the terms bhāga and bhoga are synonymous with the terms udraŋga and uparikara and stand for taxes that were almost universally levied in connection with land.

The incidence of the land tax is not revealed by our epigraphical records. Several records from Bengal give us the amount of the tax collection from some villages, but as we do not know the gross produce of these villages, we cannot determine the incidence of the tax. Śukra in one place states that in the ideal state, the farmer should have as his net income an amount double the expenditure incurred including the state tax. This ideal was rarely realised, for elsewhere he allows 16%, taxation on poor land, 25% on ordinary dry land, 33% on well-irrigated land and 50% on river-irrigated fields. It is true that the state was recommended to return 5% of the tax to the farmer; but this does not conceal the onerous nature of the above scale of the land tax. The high percentage of the land tax was probably due to the high expenditure on the military establishment.

Was the land tax collected directly from the farmer or had the zemindari system come into existence is a question,

3. Śukra, IV, 2, 113.
4. Śukra, IV, 2, 116-1 f.
5. Śukra, IV, 2, 11 f.
which is difficult to answer. Alienation of villages, of which we get several instances, do not attest to the existence of the zemindari system; for the grantees usually got the right of receiving the state’s dues and had nothing to pay to the state. The general instructions about the collection of the land tax given in Šukra² suggest that the tax was collected by the king through his officers. A little later, Sukra, however, states that a king may settle the amount of land revenue and collect it from one individual in advance. This obviously is the beginning of the zemindari system.

One is, however, inclined to think that the earlier account referring to the direct collection of the tax by the state represents the reality in our period and the later verses refer to innovations that were coming into vogue towards its close and had become common in the 13th and 14th centuries.

Land tax was collected both in kind and in cash.³ The very term bhāga-kara denotes that it was paid as a part of what was actually produced in the field. The jātakas describe how royal officers went to the farms at the time of harvest and collected the tax in kind.⁴ The same was the case under the Mauryas also, for Kauṭilya lays down a fine of 53 pānas for an unauthorised removal of corn from fields. Šukra refers to the officer called Koshṭāgārādhyaksha, who was in charge of state granaries at different centres, where the corn collected in tax was stored. It was his duty to dispose of the corn before it started deteriorating on account of time or insects.

The records of the Senas indicate that in Bengal land tax was very often collected in cash. The Barrackpur grant of Vijayasena records the gift of four pājakas of land yielding 200 Kapardaka-purāṇas.⁵ The Govindapur grant, in which the village Viddasasasan was donated, informs us that the village granted yielded annually 900 purāṇas at the rate of 15 purāṇas to a Droṇa⁶. The grant of village Velahisti in the

1. Šukra, IV, 4, 113.
2. Šukra, IV, 4, 124-6.
4. II, p. 578.
5. E.I., XV, 278.
Tārāpandighi inscription yielded an income of 150 Kapardaka-purāṇas annually.1 The Madhiānagar grant records a gift of Dāpaniyapaṭaka yielding 100 purāṇas and 68 Kapardakas.2 The village of Pinjakāṣṭhī divided into two parts in the Madanapāda grant gave to the donee an income of 500 (Purāṇas).3 In the Naihati grant of Ballālasena, one village yielding an income of 500 Kapardaka-purāṇas was gifted away.4 The Saktipur grant of Lakṣmaṇapādēna records that Kṣetrapāṭaka yielded an income of 500 Kapardaka-purāṇas.5 The Sahitya Parishad grant refers to an income of 500 Purāṇas.6 Under the Pratihārās also the land tax was sometimes collected in cash. From one of the inscriptions of Mahipāla I, we learn that he assigned 500 drāmmas for a temple out of the revenues of a certain village. It appears that cash collection was, however, not very common in all parts of Northern India, for the records of other dynasties under consideration do not refer to it.

Pratihārās had issued fairly copious silver currency in drāmmas under Bhoja I and one can understand the collection of the land tax in cash under Mahipāla I. Purāṇas used by the Senas have so far not come to light. Can it be that the Sena records refer to the Vigraha-pāla-Drammas, which continued to be minted even after the death of that king? Or can it be that Drāmma was merely a coin of account and that the records convert the tax in kind into tax in cash and give the amount in Purāṇas? Further discoveries alone can solve this riddle.

It is difficult to say whether land tax in kind was collected in more than one instalment, for our records do not throw any light on this point. The Begumara plates of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krīṣṇa II inform us that it was collected in three instalments, one in Bhādrapada, one in Kārtika and one in Māγha. The same would have been the case in the North also during our period of survey. If the land

1. E.I., XII, 6-10.
4. E.I., XIV, 156.
5. E.I., XXI, 211.
tax is to be levied in kind as part of the field produce, it has to be collected as often as the crop is reaped.

Ownership of Land

Let us now discuss the question of the ownership of land, which falls under different categories, namely, the arable, barren, marshy and forest land. It may be noted at the outset that as far as ownership in forests, marshy and waste lands is concerned, there is overwhelming evidence to show that it was vested in the state. But as regards the arable land, there is a divergence of opinion. Early Anglo-Indian administrators were inclined to the view that the state was the owner of all the arable land. They were interested in advocating this view, because they were of the opinion that what the British government took from the tenants was not land tax but land rent.

Indian scholars, on the other hand, are generally seen advocating the view that the land was not the state property at any time and that its ownership was vested in private individuals. So what the government obtained was a land tax and not land rent.

There is no doubt that in the pre-historic times, the ownership of land was vested in the whole community and that no one could alienate it without the consent of the village residents. But later on, gradually the right of ownership of the person, who tilled the land, came to be recognised. This is quite clear from the Smriti and Niti works of early and medieval periods. Kauṭilya also differentiates between the crown lands and the private lands. His law of sale recognises private property in the land. According to Pūrva-mīmāṃsā in the Viśvajit sacrifice, a king has to give every thing of which he is the owner, but not the land, because he does not own it; the commentator Ṣabarāsvāmī points out that the ownership of the fields belongs to different private individuals. Nārada states “A householder’s house and his field are con-

1. A Ś., II, Chap. 23.
sidered as the two fundamentals of his existence, therefore let not the king upset either of them; for that is the root of the householders.\textsuperscript{1} The same is the view of many other writers like Kātyāyana,\textsuperscript{2} Nilakaṇṭha\textsuperscript{3} and Śabara.\textsuperscript{4} All this evidence clearly indicates that the ownership of arable land was vested in the peasant proprietor and not in the state.

To turn to our period, it may be noted that when our records contain grants of villages to temples and Bṛāhmaṇas, they usually refer to the transfer of the land tax and other specified dues to the donee.

The state no doubt often possessed some lands in different localities, the ownership of which had become vested in it by purchase, forfeiture, escheat, etc.; but they were not very extensive. For, when the ownership in fields is granted, our records usually refer to the alienation of small pieces of land by kings. Thus the Patan grant of the Chaulukya king Bhima II informs us that the king granted four ploughs of land in Kāḍāgrāma to Bṛāhmaṇa Āśādhara.\textsuperscript{5} The Augasī grant records a gift of ten ploughs of land to a Bṛāhmaṇa made by the Chandella king Madanavarman.\textsuperscript{6} In the Mahoba grant, the king Paramārddī is stated to have granted a piece of land measuring 60 square vāḍhas, cultivable by five ploughs in the village Dhanaura to Bṛāhmaṇa Rāmaśarman.\textsuperscript{7} The Paramāra king Bhojadeva granted 100 nivartanas of land at Vaṭapad德拉aka to the Bṛāhmaṇa Bhallā.\textsuperscript{8} The Chāhamāṇa queen Āṇaladevi granted one plough of land to the Tirthaṅkara Mahāvīra.\textsuperscript{9} Depālapur grant of Bhojadeva

\begin{enumerate}
\item Grīḥakāshetre cha dve drīṣṭe vāṃśhetā kuṭumbinām.
\hspace{1cm} Taṃśatī nākshipradrāja te hi mule kuṭumbinām. \textit{Nārada XI, 42.}
\item Quoted in \textit{Viramitrodaya Rājaśīti}, p. 271.
\item \textit{Pūṇeśvaraṃyaśākha}, svaṭvāgama chapter.
\item VI. 7, 3.
\item I.A., XI, 71-73.
\item I.A., XVI. 202.
\item E.I., XVI. 9-15.
\item E.I. XI, 181-83.
\item E.I., IX, 47.
\end{enumerate}
informs us that he granted 34 Aṃśās of level land furnished with four ploughs at Kirikaika in the western Pathaka of Ujjaini to the Brāhmaṇa Vacchāla.\(^1\) The Chaulukya king Bhīma I granted three ploughs of land at a village named Varaṇavādā to the Brāhmaṇa Janaka.\(^2\) The Barrackpur grant informs us that the Sena king Vijayasena granted four Pāṭakas of land measured by Samatajīva-nāla to the Brāhmaṇa Udayakarṇadevaśarman.\(^3\) The Bombay grant of the Paramāra king Naravarman informs us that he and his wife Mahādevī granted some pieces of land to the Brāhmaṇa Āśādhara.\(^4\) All this evidence clearly indicates that when full ownership in land was transferred to the donee, not the entire land in the village but certain small pieces situated in it acquired by the state, by forfeiture, escheat, etc., were usually transferred.

It is further worth noting that when the state wanted to give considerable landed property, usually some fields scattered here and there were given and not a continuous and big piece of land. Thus the two Paramāra inscriptions state that the king Māṇḍalika granted to the temples of Māṇḍalesvarī some lands as well as a garden behind Nagnataḍāga and to the temple of Varuṇeśvarī, some rice fields along with some other pieces of land in the villages of Nattapāṭaka, Pāṇacha and Māṇḍaladraha.\(^5\) Now if the state had the right over all the arable land, Māṇḍalika would not have given to the temple pieces of land scattered here and there. The contemporary South Indian inscription from Mūlguṇḍa, in which the king Karṇa is stated to have given detached pieces of cultivable land situated in different corners of the village, clearly show that the state was not the proprietor of the entire land of the realm.\(^6\)

---

2. \*E.I.*, XXI, 172.
5. \*E.I.*, XXI, 49.

Such was the case in the earlier period also. The Kadamba king Viśnu-Vaṁśa is said to have granted the village of Katallaka along with a specified plot of 100 Niseraras situated in it. In another Kadamba grant issued by the king Mrigeśvaravarman, bailing from Karṇṭaka the village Kadākalani is given to a Brāhmaṇa along with a plot of land for building a house in it.
That the grant of the village did not mean the transfer to the donee of the ownership in all the arable land situated within its boundaries is made further clear by some records where, along with the village granted, some land situated in that village itself is also given to the donee. Thus in one of the grants of the Gāhadavāla king Govindachandra, the village of Lelispāda along with the field named Tiyāyi situated in it was granted to the donee.¹ One of the Kāḍī plates of the Chaukulya king Bhīma II also informs us that a village was given along with twenty ploughs of land situated in it.² In the contemporary Deccan also we come across similar instances. Amoghavarsha I of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty is stated to have donated the village of Taleyar and also a flower garden 530 × 150 cubits in dimension, situated in the same village.³

It is true that we also come across some cases where when the whole village is granted, an exception is made in the case of some plots of land situated in it. Thus from the Charkkhārī plate of the Chandella king Paramarddideva, we learn that he granted the village of Gaganda with the exception of 5 ploughs of land gifted to Buddha.⁴ The Bānagarh grant of Mahīpāla records the donation of the village of Kurala with the exception of Chūta-pallikā situated in it.⁵

It is possible to argue from these cases that these grants are making exceptions in the case of particular plots of land because the ownership in all other plots of arable land was being conveyed to the donees. Such a conclusion would, however, not be a correct one in view of the other and overwhelming evidence that we have cited to prove individual ownership of land. It is likely that when small pieces of land were being granted to temples, they were exempted from the land tax or had to pay a quit rent only. The specific exception made in the above grants probably refers to such fields and would indicate that the new donee was

5. *E.I.*, XII, 328.
not entitled to any land tax or the full land tax from the plots of land previously given to temples or Brāhmaṇas. They do not show that he became the owner of the remaining arable land.

It is thus clear that during our period ownership in the arable land was not vested in the state. On the other hand, it belonged to private proprietors, who could not be dispossessed by the state at its own will as long as they paid regular land tax. If there was a default in this connection for two or three years, then this land was forfeited to the state. This, however, was a well-recognised limitation over individual ownership of land.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTY

We have finished the discussion about the problems connected with the land tax; we shall now have a glance at other taxes levied under the different governments during our period of survey. Among them the customs, octroi and excise duties were very important. The officer called Saulkika, who used to collect the octroi duties from the traders and industrialists at the gate of a town or a village, figures in almost all the inscriptions of the Pālas of Bengal. He is also included in the list of officers of the Paramāra administration. His absence in the records of other dynasties is of no particular significance, because they often mention the octroi duties.

Duties were collected sometimes at the boundary of the state, sometimes on the road and sometimes at the entrance of a town or village.

The expression sanirgama-pravesa, occurring in Chandella, Chedi and Sena records, probably refers to the excise and octroi duties, levied on merchants by the state.

Śukra, while giving us an interesting and convincing

I.A., XV, 306.
I.A., XIX, 71.
Śukra, IV, 2. 18.
E.I., IV, 157.
I.A., XVII, 224.
E.I., XXI, 95.
explanation for the justification of these taxes, says that the king should levy duties on the merchants in order to maintain and protect the roads, which they use for the transport of their commodities.\(^1\) It may be noted here that the state had to spend then as now a large amount of money for the upkeep and protection of the roads; it is therefore very likely that the income derived from the customs and excise duties would have been partly spent for this purpose. The epigraphical evidence also shows that there was a road tax. The Gāhaḍavāla records refer to a tax called pravaṇikara,\(^2\) and the Ghedi records mention a tax called pravaṇivāda.\(^3\) It is very likely that both these taxes were identical. Pravaṇi\(^4\) literally means a place, where four roads meet. And hence it may be an octroi duty imposed upon merchants at the important stages of roads.

It is difficult to say how the customs officer used to discharge his functions, and at what rate he levied the duties on different articles; for our inscriptions do not throw any light upon these problems. In the earlier period, under the Vākāṭakas, we find that the state used to demand the best article brought to the market by a merchant as a part of its tax upon him. Whether such was the case in our period also we do not know. It appears that in the normal course of events, a tax of a certain percentage, varying from 5 to 20, was levied on different kinds of goods.

Octroi and excise duties were collected both in kind and in cash. There is no doubt that the Śrīpitis state that these duties were usually collected in kind, but the inscriptions of our period show that cash collections were also not unknown. The taxes on articles like ghee, milk, flowers, butter, vegetables were usually collected in kind. The reason for this is not difficult to understand. It is doubtful whether any government of our period issued currency in copper in copious quantity. Nor does the work appear to have

---

1. Mārga-sahskāra-rakṣhārtham mārgagebhyo haret phalam.


been undertaken by any private agency or corporation. Economic transactions, including payment of octroi duties, had therefore to be made in kind or on barter basis.

It is further to be noted that the taxes collected in kind were often assigned to the local officers. This is but natural. For in ancient India, when communications were very slow, it was difficult for the king to send his officers daily to the villages to collect these dues. Even if this had been organised, some of the articles like vegetables would have been rendered useless before they reached the central depot at the head quarters of a Pathaka or Vishaya.

Let us now survey the information given by our epigraphs about the octroi and customs duties. Some of these taxes were imposed by kings no doubt for temple service; but the fact that they could do so for the temple shows that they must have been levying similar imposts for the state also.

Under the Pratiharas, a tax of fifty leaves was levied upon every Chollikā. Under the Paramāras, a tax equal to one māṇaka was levied on every bharaka of cocoanuts and fruits. Merchants who used to trade in grains had to pay one bharaka on twenty packs of loaded grain. The traders of barley used to pay a tax equal to a vāpa on each māṭaka of barley. People, who used to carry away the loads of cattle fodder were required to pay one Vṛīsha-Vimśopaka on each load.

Duty was also levied on the cloth industry. In Rajputana under the Chāhāmānas, the cloth merchants had to pay one rūpaka as a tax on each bharaka of thread and cotton. In Mālwa, under the Paramāra rule, the cloth merchants were taxed one and half rūpakas on each Koṭikā of cotton fabric.

The precise meaning and implication of the terms māṇaka, bharaka, chollikā, vāpa and koṭikā is not known. The
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Sanskrit and Prakrit dictionaries explain some of these terms as merely a measure without giving its precise quantity. The exact incidence of taxation on the above—mentioned articles, therefore, cannot be ascertained. As has been stated already, it may have varied from 5 to 20 percent.

Excise duty was levied on oil. From one of the Pratihāra records we learn that a tax of two pallikās was imposed on every Ghaṭakakūpaka of clarified oil.¹ In Mālwa, the oilmen used to pay one pāṇaka on each karsha of oil and one pallikā on every ghaṭaka of oil.² Under the Chāhamānas in Rajasthan a tax of two pallikās of oil was imposed on each oil mill.³ Another inscription from the same province mentions a tax of two pallikās from four pailas of oil paid by the oilmen from every ghāṇaka⁴ or oil mill. Unfortunately dictionaries do not give the exact significance of the terms ghaṭaka, kūpaka, and pallikā. It is possible that ghaṭaka denotes a ghaḍā or a pot; but what was its exact quantum, we do not know.

We shall now discuss the excise duty that was levied on articles like butter, sugar, candied sugar and jaggery. It is important to note here that the incidence on these articles varied from place to place. Under the Pratihāra dynasty, we find the butter merchants paying a tax of two pallikās on every ghaṭaka-kūpaka of clarified butter;⁵ but under the Paramāras, only half of the above tax was imposed on every ghaṭaka of butter.⁶ Traders of sugar had to pay one dramma on each pailā of sugar in Mālwa;⁷ while in Rajasthan, a tax of one sarṇika was levied on each bharaka of candied sugar and jaggery.⁸ It is very likely that similar cess was levied upon the above—mentioned article under other dynasties under review.

¹ E.I., XIX, 5-10.
² E.I., XIV, 309.
³ E.I., IX, 24-36.
⁴ E.I., XI, 41-42.
⁵ E.I., IX, 5-10.
⁶ E.I., XIV, 309.
⁷ E.I., XIV, 309.
⁸ E.I., XIV, 309.
Apart from the above duties, tax was also imposed upon goods in transit. What was its exact rate we do not know. A Paramāra record refers to a contribution of one Vināstapaka per bull that passed on the road.\(^1\) This was no doubt given to defray the expenses in connection with a Śiva temple, but it suggests a regular tax paid to the state also per pack-animal.

Apart from octroi and excise duties, the traders had to bear another burden of tax called the shop tax. It is important to note here that the early Smṛitis rarely refer to this tax; but it is expressly referred to by Śukra as payabhūṣika, a tax upon the site of a plot in the market.\(^2\) Our epigraphical records, however, do not refer to shop tax paid to the state; they mention contributions by shopkeepers for charitable and religious purposes,\(^3\) which probably presuppose a regular tax paid to the state also. But whether this was a shop tax or a general tax on merchants, we do not know.

The rate of shop tax varied under the different dynasties. One of the Pratihāra records informs us that the shop-keepers used to pay two Vināstapakas as a shop tax.\(^4\) Under the Paramāras a tax of one dramma was imposed on every shop of braziers.\(^5\) It is very likely that the shop-keepers dealing in other commodities also had to pay similar tax under different governments.

Cattle breeding was an important profession in ancient India; it had also to bear its own share of taxation. The exact rate of the tax, however, is not known. According to Manu, cattle breeders should pay 2\% tax, on the herd.\(^6\) This obviously means that the tax was levied on the corpus of the herd. Sukra, on the other hand, imposes a duty of 6\% to 12\%, which probably refers to the increase in the herd effected during the year.\(^7\) The inscriptions of our
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1. E.I., XXI, 51.
2. Śukra, IV, 2, 129.
3. E.I., XIV, 309.
4. E.I., III, No. 36.
5. E.I., XIV, 309.
6. VII, 130.
7. Śukra, IV, Manu, 2, 239-40.
period, however, refer to a third method of taxation at a
certain cash rate per head, per cow, horse, bull, etc. The
Bayānā inscription of Chitralekhā refers to a temple tax on
the sale of articles. We are told there that a tax of one
drama per horse was levied for the God Vishnū by the
queen.1 This was probably the normal tax imposed on the
sale of horses. The Gāhaḍavāla records also invariable
mention Gokara,2 which was levied on cows. Unfortunately,
its exact incidence cannot be determined, as the records are
silent upon the point.

Trade in wine was usually under state control. The
Arthaśāstra informs us that it was manufactured partly in state
and partly in private distilleries; the wine prepared by the
latter had to pay an excise duty of 5%.3 Under the
Paramāras, four rāpakaś were levied as tax on each sumvāka
of wine.4 Unfortunately inscriptions give us no clue to the
quantity of the measure sumvāka and hence the incidence of
the tax cannot be determined.

Excise duty was levied on salt under the Pratihāras,5 the
Gāhaḍavālas,6 the Chedis7 and the Chandellas.8 Sometimes
the state used to give licences to the manufacturers to work
on salt wells. When such was the case, the latter had to
pay one māṇaka as a tax on each mūṭaka of the salt under
the Paramāras. The exact significance of the term mūṭaka,
however, cannot be determined and hence it is difficult to
say what was the actual rate of this tax. It is interesting to
note that when villages were granted to the donees, they
were also invested with the right over the excise duty on
salt that could be produced from the salt water wells in
the villages.

Most of the records of the dynasties under survey refer to
a tax on mines. In ancient India, all the mines were regarded
as state property, but as the government itself was often

1. E.I., XXII, 120.
2. E.I., XIII, 217.
6. I.A., XVIII, 57.
7. E.I., XXI, 95.
8. I.A., XVI, 205.
unable to work them, they were sometimes entrusted to private individuals. When such was the case, the lessee had to pay a fairly heavy excise duty. According to Śukra, it was to be 50% in the case of gold and diamond; 33% in the case of silver and copper and 16% to 25% in the case of other metals. The proportion mentioned above was probably levied not on the gross but on the net value. The Smṛitis on the other hand refer to a tax of 2% on gold, but it was most probably a customs duty rather than an excise duty. Salt and iron mines and stone quarries were also state properties, as shown by the expressions salohalavagākaraḥ and sapāthāpakkani occurring in several Chedi, Chandella and Pratḥāra records.

All this evidence clearly indicates that customs and excise duties were collected both in kind and cash. Unfortunately we are not able to determine the exact incidence of taxation, as our records are generally silent on the point. We have seen above how they do not supply data in terms, which can be fully understood. Most of the Smṛiti writers lay down that the excise duty should be 16% in cash on articles like fish, meat, honey, medicines, fruits, pottery, fuel, etc. It is very likely that the taxation may have varied in practice with different articles, but the average may have been in the vicinity of 16%. The Arthaśāstra, on the other hand, levies a light duty on articles like medicines, fuel, leather goods and earthen pots and a little higher duty on wine, silken pieces, etc., varying from 6% to 10%. Śukra, however, recommends a duty varying from 3% to 6%.

**VISHTI**

The institution of compulsory or forced labour is very old in India. It is referred to in most of the Smṛitis and is also mentioned in several north Indian inscriptions of the dyna-
stics under consideration, which assign the right to exact it to the grantee of the village gifted away. The writers on polity of our period also lay down a rule that every citizen, whether he may be rich or poor, should pay something to the state by way of taxation in return for the protection received. The rich could afford to pay in cash or kind but not so the extreme poor; they were therefore required to pay their tax in labour.

Each labourer was expected to work for a certain number of days in the year for the state. Sukra recommends that the artists and artisans should work one day in the fortnight for the state. This liability is two times the liability imposed by Manu, who asks the king to take free labour from artisans for one day in the month. This tax, being not a regular one, was generally imposed upon labourers when kings or their officers were on tours in villages or when public works in the villages like the excavation of tanks, wells, etc. were carried out or when the government granary was to be cleansed or taxes paid in kind had to be weighed or measured. The Gāḍāvāla records refer to a tax called Skandhaka, the meaning of which is rather obscure. Skandhaka may mean one who carries load on shoulders or the load carried on shoulders. It may therefore refer to the liability of the labourers to carry the luggages of the touring officers upon their shoulders.

**MISCELLANEOUS TAXES**

Let us now discuss the miscellaneous taxes imposed by the different dynasties. Under this head may be first mentioned a tax on houses. That the house tax was a common demand of the state would appear probable from the circumstance that very often we find the people agreeing to pay a contribution per house to the temple treasury for the temple expenses. Thus one of the Paramāra inscriptions informs us that a tax of one dramma was imposed by the king Māṇḍalika on every house for meeting temple expenses. The

1. **Śāstra, IV, 2, 24**.
2. **E.I., III, 266**.
3. **E.I., XIV, 309**.
same inscription also reveals that at the time of Chaitra festivals a tax of one *drama* was levied on the house of every trader for the same purpose.\(^1\) If the king in this way could impose upon the people a house contribution for temple expenditure, it follows that he could do the same for general administration also. It may be noted here that Sukra also imposes a tax on house sites.\(^2\)

Besides the house tax, there was an irrigation tax or *jalakara*, which was levied under the Gāhādavālas. This must have been an important source of income. Sukra also says that the king should realise 1/3, 1/4 and 1/2 of the produce from places, which are irrigated by tanks, canals, wells and rivers respectively.\(^3\)

Inscriptions, however, refer to another method of taxation on irrigation. The Sevadi stone inscription of the Chāhamāna dynasty records a grant of one *Haraka* of barley from every one of the wells belonging to four villages for worship of Dharmanāthadeva in the temple of Semvipati.\(^4\) Under the Paramāras, a tax of one *haraka* of barley was imposed on one water wheel.\(^5\) This tax was probably in addition to the general land tax.

People indulging in gambling were also taxed. From one of the Paramāra records we learn that a tax of two *rāpakas* was levied on each gambling house in Mālwā.\(^6\)

Under the Chāhamānas, tax was imposed upon dancing girls also. What was its exact rate, we do not know. The Nadol stone inscription informs us that Bhanaṇa, a local chief, freed the dancing girls from Daśabandha, which was probably a kind of tax equal to one-tenth of their income.\(^7\)

Articles accidentally found were also usually taxed. The Pratihāra records refer to a tax called *mārgaṇaka*\(^8\) and the Chaulukya epigraphs refer to *abhinavamārgaṇaka*.\(^9\) Unfortunately the exact significance of these terms cannot be definitely

2. *Sukra* IV, 2, 129
8. *E.I.*, XIV, 182; *E.I.* III, 266.
ascertained. Mārgaṇaka literally means what is obtained by search. It may therefore possibly refer to the treasure-troves found under ground. It seems to be the same as navanidhāna, mentioned in Chaulukya records. Smṛitis recommend a levy of tax on treasure-troves and the state of our period must have followed the advice.

Dr. U.N. Ghoshal, however, holds that Mārgaṇaka was a tax of the nature of a benevolence levied upon the villages and that abhinavamārgaṇaka indicated an additional levy made, when the original imposition had become permanent. In the absence of any authority for this interpretation, it is difficult to accept it.

Along with the tax mārgaṇaka, the Pratihāra records refer to another tax called Khalaka or khalabhihikahā, which was probably a cess imposed upon a threshing floor. It may therefore stand for the demand for a portion of a crop over and above the usual grain share, that was collected from the grain heaped upon the threshing floor. It is also not unlikely that khalabhihikahā may be the customary dues claimed by the village artisans for their services in the year to the village residents. This custom still prevails in Western India.

OCCASIONAL TAXES

In ancient India, the visits of the inspecting and detective staff were regarded to some extent as visitation. The expenses connected with their stay had to be borne by villagers. In the Deccan during our period we find that under the Yādavas, a special kind of tax was levied at the time of the halt or departure of the royal officers, so that they may be provided with free boarding and lodging. In the earlier period, under the Vākāṭakas, the villagers had to supply fodder to the horses of the visiting royal officers and supply labour, bulls and carts necessary for their transport. The records of our period are no doubt silent about such impositions; but this silence is probably accidental. The villagers

2. E.I., III. 266.
and citizens of our period also had probably to pay an additional impost, when officers of the central government used to come for inspection. The Gāḍāvāla records\(^1\) refer to Paṭṭakiladāya, Vishayikadāya, Akshapaṭalikaprasaṭha, Pratihariprasaṭha and Aḍhuprasaṭha. Unfortunately we do not know what is meant by Aḍhuprasaṭha, for Sanskrit dictionaries do not give us the meaning of this term; but the remaining four terms may probably indicate the dues given to the government officers called Pratiharī, Akshapaṭalika, Vishayika and Paṭṭakila, at the time of their visits to the villages. These dues were probably paid in kind. It is very likely that some corn measuring one prasṭha was supplied to Pratiharī and Akshapaṭalika. As regards the dues given to Vishayika and Paṭṭakila, it is difficult to say what they actually used to be.

Chāṭa-bhaṭa-praveṣa-daṇḍa is mentioned in several records. \(^\downarrow\) It obviously refers to a tax or impost levied at the visit of chāṭas and bhaṭas. Who these persons were is however not quite certain. Bhaṭa obviously refers to soldiers, and the entire expression is usually taken to refer to the levies imposed at the entry of regular and irregular soldiers. There is however no clear authority for taking the term chāṭa as denoting irregular soldiers. It is not impossible that chāṭa may be a corruption of Chhāṭa and that the latter may stand for chhatra. If so, the term chhatra may by implication lākṣaṇā stand for umbrella-bearer and may refer to attendants in general, who did umbrella-bearing and other menial work. Chāṭas may therefore be standing for peons and other menials, who attended the government officers, when they visited the villages for inspection. A third interpretation is also possible for the term chāṭa. On the authority of Tājñavalkya I, 355 Pañchatantra, I,390 and Mrishchhakāṭika 78,13, St. Petersburg Dictionary suggests that chāṭa may stand for a cheat. Chāṭabhaṭa-praveṣadāṇḍa may therefore stand for:

(i) a tax levied upon villagers to meet the expenses connected with the visits of soldiers and officers with their peons and attendants.

\(^1\) E.I., XXIX, Part I, p. 5.
(2) a tax levied upon the villagers for meeting the expenses of soldiers quartered on the village and a fine imposed upon it for giving shelter to cheats and bad characters.

(3) a tax levied at the entry of regular and irregular troops.

The first interpretation seems to be probable. In contemporary south India, the villagers had to supply police and military officers with boiled rice, milk, vegetable, grass, fuel and other necessaries and luxuries of life.¹ In northern India also the same may have been the case. Chāpabhata-pravēśa-dāṇḍa therefore probably indicates the additional imposts levied to supply provisions for soldiers and peons and other attendants, when they had to stay in villages probably in connection with the visits of touring officers.

In India, it is a custom to offer a present to a person on occasions of festivity like the birth of a son or the marriage of any member of his family. This custom was followed by the subjects with reference to their king in ancient times and continued even in the 20th century. The Kumāragadiāṇaka² tax mentioned in the Gāhaḍavāla records was due to this practice. Gadiāṇaka is well-known to be a weight equal to 41 guṇjas, or 70 grains; probably it denotes the gold coin current under the Gāhaḍavālas. It is therefore very likely that the subjects used to pay one gold coin to the king on the occasion of the birth of prince. This was undoubtedly a heavy demand and may have been paid only by the rich.

EMERGENCY TAXES

As already stated or discussed Hindu political writers have given the right to the king to levy extra taxes at the time of national emergency or foreign invasion. This is also evident from inscriptions. The Gāhaḍavāla records refer to a tax called Turushka-dāṇḍa,³ which was levied in their kingdom. The meaning of this term is very obscure. It may mean a tax collected by the Hindu Government for the

¹. I.E. XI, 6.
². E.I., IV, 105.
³. E.I., XXIII, 217.
payment of a tribute to Muslim invaders; or it may be a sort of poll tax imposed on Moslems. But more probably it refers to a special tax to meet the cost of extra military forces and preparations to meet the danger of the Moslem invasions. So it was a measure of emergency taxation.

INCOME FROM STATE PROPERTY

Let us now consider the different sources of revenue other than taxation. These are not directly mentioned in our records; but the privileges and exemptions, given to the donees of the copper plate grants, help us to a great extent in getting some indirect idea in this connection. A close study of the records reveals that the donees were usually given the right to work salt and iron mines, appropriate buried treasures and use village pastures. This clearly indicates that normally the state claimed ownership over all the mines, treasure troves and the waste lands. The same was probably the case with forests also.

Waste, fallow, and pasture lands were not regarded as private property and were naturally owned by the state. The expressions Svamātrīṅyātīgōcharaparyantah, sagartosharah, sasthalah and sagochara occurring in many of our records transfer to the donees the right to utilise fallow lands, pastures and waste lands. These were used for grazing cattle; and when the villages were granted to the donee, the latter used to impose a fee on them. Sometimes the expression svakāśhīḥatřinodakopetaḥ is also used, which means that all the trees, whether valuable or not, grass, fuel, etc. growing on the waste lands included in the boundaries of the village were granted to the donees.

It is interesting to note that in the Gupta period, though the state claimed ownership over the above mentioned lands,

3. *E.I.*, XXVI, 9; *I.A.*, XVII, 244; *E.I.*, XXI, 95; *I.A.*, XV, 305.
6 *I.A.*, VI, 191-2.
it did not enjoy the right of alienating them. It had to take
the consent of the village councils at the time of their
disposals. The same was the case in South also during our
period. The waste and fallow lands were administered by
the village assemblies. They are often seen selling or
mortgaging common land at the time of national calamities
such as famines, floods, etc. There is no evidence so far
forthcoming to show that village committees exercised similar
right over waste lands in northern India.

Marshy land was also regarded as state property. The
expression śānūpajangalaḥ\(^{1}\) occurring in the Prathāra and
Chedi records, transfers to the donee the right to utilise
marshy land, which was often converted into a tank in the
rainy season and could be used for fishery.

The state claimed its ownership over mountains, hills
and vales. Trees growing in these places were claimed
by the state as its own property. The expressions
sanimnaunata\(^{2}\) and saparvata\(^{3}\) occurring in the Chandella and
Prathāra records authorise the donee to utilise the land
consisting of mountains, pits and hills. The donee was also
entitled to utilise temporarily abandoned land (ūśaravāha-
pratibaddha).\(^{4}\)

Rivers were an important source of state income. As
pointed out already, cultivators, who used to irrigate their
lands by the water of the river, had to pay 50% as land
tax. Toll duties were also collected from the people on
water ways, which yielded considerable income to the state.
The expression sajalaḥ\(^{5}\) occurring in the Gāhaḍavāla records
is difficult to explain. Probably it refers to watersheets like
those of tanks and rivers. It is interesting to note that as
eyrly as the period of the Arhatāstra we find the state claiming
its ownership over fish, aquatic animals and green vegetables
from irrigation works and tanks in so far as these formed
articles of merchandise. The expression sajalaḥ would
suggest that the same was the case in our period.

1. I.A., XVIII, 34-5; E.I., XXI, 95.
3. E.I., XXI, 95.
5. E.I., XIV, 193.
Ownership over the treasure-troves was also vested in the state. The records of our period frequently refer to treasure-troves. In ancient India there were no banks and hence people were mostly in the habit of burying their treasures. The donees of our copper plate grants are usually seen enjoying the right over treasure—troves that were discovered in the villages or lands granted. The expression used in this connection is *nidhinikshepasahitaḥ* meaning "along with the right to treasures and buried wealth". The state claimed its ownership over treasure troves either because it claimed to be the heir of heirless property or because it regarded them as similar in nature to the mineral yields, both being recovered from the bowels of the earth. Most of the Smṛiti writers state that the king was entitled to a fairly large share of the treasure—troves except when the discoverer was a Brāhmaṇa. They clearly lay down that the property discovered by a Brāhmaṇa should be regarded as his property. The king should not take even a single penny from it. If the property was discovered by a man other than a Brāhmaṇa, the king could claim his right over half of it; the remaining half was given to the finder.

Forests were also regarded as the Government property. From the *Arthasastra* we learn that the king used to reserve a portion of forests for breeding elephants and another for his game. The remaining area was utilised for fuel and timber. Most of the records of our age, while granting the villages, use the expression *savananidhāṇa* or *saṃrikṣhamālākulaḥ*, which refers to the transfer to the donee of the state’s right in the forest lands situated within the boundaries of village.

The records of the Gādaṇḍavāla rulers declare their proprietary rights in mango and Madhūka trees. The grants of the Sena dynasty invest the donee with the proprietary right in the coconut and betel-nut trees. The Chandella kings claimed ownership in plants like sugarcane, cotton and jute. It is difficult to say whether the state ever claimed ownership in these plants growing in private fields. Can it be that expressions *tāmramadhūka*, *sakarpāsa* and *sagwākandāri-

---

kelā refer to the state’s right in these plants growing on waste land and pastures?

Under the Chandellas the donee was invested with the right over mandira and prākāra. It is difficult to state what is meant by the term samandira-prākāra. Possibly it refers to some state-buildings, the ownership over which was sometimes transferred to the donee. In this connection it is interesting to note that Sukra includes rent as one of the state revenues. Very probably this rent might have accrued from state buildings.

The Chandella government also claimed its ownership in the birds flying in the sky, fish swimming in water and games roaming in the forest. The expression used in this connection is samyigavihaṅgama-jalacharam. This would probably indicate that the state used to impose a tax upon hunters and fisherman, the proceeds of which were often assigned to donees.

FINES

As in modern times, fines formed one of the items of state income in ancient India also. The expression dnoḍadāyādi occurring in the Chandella records and Sadandaḍaśāparādha occurring in the Pratihāra, the Chedi, the Pāla and the Sena records transfer to the donees the right to receive the fines imposed upon criminals. In villages and towns not assigned to the alienees, these fines when imposed by popular courts, formed a part of the village income. In alienated villages, however, they were often assigned to the donor.

The fines imposed by the state courts, however, went to the central treasury. The officer called daśāparādhaṅka, who figures in many of our records, was put in charge of collecting the fines imposed on persons found guilty of any of the ten traditional offences. In the Chedi records also we find

1. E.I., XXI, 216.
a reference to the fines imposed upon fraudulent people. The officer who collected these fines was probably known as *Dauhasādhasādhanika*. The Gāhaḍavāla records also refer to a term *Kūṭaka*, the exact significance of which is still uncertain. But as it is mentioned along with *databandha*, it may be taken as a fine imposed upon fraudulent people.

**APUTRIKĀ-DHANA OR HEIRLESS PROPERTY**

The state also claimed its right over heirless property. The donees of the copper plate grants are often seen invested with this right at the time of the gift of villages. It is important to note that in ancient India, for a long time, widows were not regarded as heirs to their husbands' property; and hence at the time of their husbands' deaths, the property was escheated to the state which gave only a maintenance to the widow. When, however, the right of the widow's inheritance was recognised, the state tried to compensate its loss by imposing a tax on the property of the widow, which was naturally known as *aputrikā-dhana*.

**EXPENDITURE**

Let us now discuss the topic of state expenditure and see how far it was well-regulated. It has to be observed at the outset that neither the epigraphical records of our period nor any literary works on polity except the *Śukraniti* give us any information in detail about the various items of state expenditure. Kauṭilya, no doubt, deals with this topic, but the information which he supplies does not exactly bear on the entire state expenditure. He enumerates 14 items of expenditure, but as Dr. Altekar has pointed out, the information is neither systematic nor exhaustive. Kauṭilya deals mostly with the royal household, but does not inform us the exact percentage of the state income that was spent on it. The judiciary and the civil administration are not mentioned by him in the list of the items of state expenditure. The salaries of

2. *I.A.*, XII, 103-4.
the different ministers and officers of the ideal state are no doubt mentioned by him but it is difficult to state how far the emoluments received by different officers were reasonable, as he does not refer to the exact income of his ideal state. We thus see that the information, which Kautilya gives us about the state expenditure, is not sufficient for our purpose. Most of the subsequent writers do not at all enlighten us on this point.

Śukra,¹ the principal writer for our period, however, gives us detailed and definite information about the percentage of state income devoted to the different items. He divides the state expenditure into the following six items and makes the following allotment.

- *Bala* or Fighting forces $50\%$
- *Prakṛiti* or high officials $8 \frac{1}{3}\%$
- *Dāna* or Charity $8 \frac{1}{3}\%$
- *Adhikāriṇah* or Civil Administration $8 \frac{1}{3}\%$
- *Ātmabhaja* or Privy purse $8 \frac{1}{3}\%$
- *Kosha* or Reserve fund $16 \frac{2}{3}\%$

Let us now see how far the above budget of state expenditure is satisfactory. There is no doubt that the percentage of income spent on the fighting forces was very high. But we should, however, not forget that during our period constant wars were going on between the different dynasties for the supremacy of power. Each state therefore probably felt it necessary to maintain a big force, which required a large amount of state expenditure for its proper maintenance. There is, therefore, nothing improbable in the military expenditure of the normal state having amounted to half of its revenues.

The Privy purse at $8\frac{1}{3}\%$ of the state income also seems to be reasonable. It is, however, not unlikely that the kings during our period would have taken a little more than what was permitted by Śukra. The Union Government of India allowed 10% of the revenue as the maximum privy purse, when the states were integrated in the Indian Union.

¹. Śukra, 1, 316-17.
The high officials ‘prakṛitaḥ’ and the civil administration (adhisthānāḥ) claimed 16 1/3% of the state revenue. This seems to be rather a high percentage, but very probably it included the pays of the central, provincial and local officers.

The banking of the modern type was unknown in ancient India and a prudent state was expected to have a reserve fund in cash equal to twenty times its annual revenue.¹ Hence it is that 15 2/3% of the annual revenue was transferred to the reserve fund.

The item of Dāna or charity, which was allotted 8 1/3% included not only religious gifts but grants for schools, colleges, hospitals and canals. This item thus partly helped the nation-building activities.

CHAPTER VIII

JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION

The administration of justice is regarded as one of the most important functions of the state in modern times. Such was not, however, the case in the ancient period, both in India and elsewhere. A number of offences like murder, theft, etc., are referred to in the Vedic literature, but the king is not described as a judge deciding either civil or criminal cases. Nor do we get any reference to the king’s court. The assemblies of tribes and clans known as Sabhā and Samiti used to settle disputes; it appears that the king had very little to do with the administration of justice.

When, however, the powers of the king increased, administration of justice became one of his important functions as will be clear from the duties of the king in the early Smṛti period. Śukra, the principal writer for our period, says that the king should punish the wicked by administering justice, for otherwise the good will suffer and the wicked prosper. Somadeva also expresses the same view, when he states that the king should always punish the sinners and criminals and all those, who are obstacles to the happiness of his people.

The king as the head of the judicial administration is required to be impartial in deciding the cases, in accordance with the sacred law and local customs; the latter were as important as the former. The king, says Śukra, who does not follow the local customs, becomes the cause of hatred among the subjects; he should therefore maintain and enforce the customs current in society.

1. Dusṭanigrhaṇam kuryād vyavahārānuñcārṣaṇātīḥ.
Śukra, IV, 5, 1.

2. Rājyaṃ maryāḍāṃ vātikrāman sadyaḥ phaleṣa daṇḍenopahantavyaḥ,
Nahi durvṛitisāḥ daṇḍādānyo’sti vinayopāyaḥ,
Nak.

3. Jāti-jānapadān dharmān śrīcādharmaṁstathaiva cha,
samikṣaya kuladharmānāha svadharmāṁ pratipālayet.
Deśajātikulānām cha ye dharmāḥ prāk pravartitaḥ,
Tathaiva te pālaniyah prajā prakshubhyate’nyathā.
Śukra, IV, 5, 47-48
The Niti writers of our period further advise the king to try the cases with the help of Sabhyas or jurors, and not only by himself. Sukra states that if the king will act unrighteously, the enemies will soon overpower him. He should, therefore decide the cases without being influenced by any passion, greed or anger; evidence was to be carefully studied in the light of logic and inference.

Prādvivāka or the chief justice is the next important member of the judicial administration. He presided over the high court of the realm and deputised for the king in his absence. Somadeva calls him Sabhāpati. In the epigraphs of the Chedis he is described as Mahādharmaśāhyakṣa. He was to be well grounded in the substantive law, the law of procedure and the sacred and customary law. Like the king, he was also required to decide cases impartially and according to the law with the help of the Sabhyas. Sukra imposes upon him a fine of a thousand, if he decides a case contrary to law.

Sabhyas or jurors also played an important part in the judicial administration. Both the king and the chief justice are advised by Sukra to decide cases along with three, five or seven jurors. Somadeva also is of the same opinion, though he does not give the number of jurors. Great care was taken in the selection of the jurors. The court says

5. E.I., XXI, 217.
Somadeva, will be like a desolate forest, if it will not consist of learned jurors.¹

The jurors were to be truthful, virtuous and well-grounded in the Vedas and Dharmasastras.² They were further required to be strong enough to bear the strain of the judicial administration.³ At the time of the trial of a case, they had to give their own frank opinion, even if it was in opposition to that of the king.⁴ Sukra condemns a juror, who keeps silence in the court and calls him a sinner, if he does not speak out truthfully.⁵ The juror was even deprived of his office, if he decided the case through greed or fear without studying it carefully.⁶

It is important to note that almost all the Smritis recommend that the Sabhyas should be Brähmanaś. The reason is not far to seek; the study of the Dharmasāstra was usually cultivated in the Brähmanical circles, and a thorough knowledge of the sacred law was necessary for the proper discharge of the duties and functions of the juror. This recommendation of the Smritis, however, does not seem to have been followed in all cases in actual practice. It may be pointed out here that even the Dharmasāstra writers themselves recommend that the cases should be tried with the help of the jurors selected from the castes, or the professions of the parties themselves. Sukra, who sums up the practice of our age, also states that the Sabhyas should be selected from all the castes.⁷ He further points out that the foresters are to be tried with the help of foresters, merchants with the

help of merchants, soldiers with the help of soldiers, making it clear that jurors were selected from all the castes.

It appears that pleaders emerged in society during our period. They are not mentioned by Nārada; his commentator Asahāya, however, refers to them. Śukra (IV, 5, 110) refers to Tajña-Pratinidhi, who was to plead on behalf of minors, women and old men. It would appear that if a party did not belong to any of these categories, the Pratinidhi or pleader could not be appointed. In some cases, however, parties regarded as incapable of defending their own cases, were allowed to have the Pratinidhi. The statements made by these Tajña-Pratinidhis were regarded as binding on their clients.

The clerical staff of the court consisted of an accountant and a Lekhaka. The former probably collected the court fees, and the latter recorded the statements of the parties. The Lekhaka writing incorrect statements was punished as severely as a thief.

Let us now survey the fundamental principles followed by the Hindu jurisprudence. The first and the most important among them was that the trial should be held in public and no case should be heard in secret either by the king or by the chief justice or by the Sabhyas.

Both the king and chief justice should try the case with the help of jurors. Smṛitis, whether early or late, are particular on this point.

Judgment was to be in accordance with the rules of Dharmaśāstras. ‘Even the king is a sinner’, says Śukra, ‘if he decides the case in an arbitrary manner; he should therefore administer justice in accordance with the spirit of Dharmaśāstra’.

1. Anyaduktai likhedanyadyo'rthipratyarthināh vachāḥ
   Chauravat trāsatvedrājā lekhakaṁ drāgatandritaḥ.

2. Naikāḥ padechchha kāryāṇi vādinaṁ śiṁuṇyād vachāḥ.
   Rahasi cha nṛpaṁ prajñāḥ sabhyāśchaiva kadāchana.

3. Sabhyādibhirvinirupiktaṁ vidhritam prativedāṇa
   Drishtvā rājā tu jayine pradadyājjayapratrakam.

4. Svatantarāḥ sādhayāmparthe nājāpi śyāchcha kilbishi.
   Dharmaśāstraśvirodhena hyarthasastraṁ vichārayet.

Śukra. IV, 5, 63.
Śukra. IV, 5, 6.
Śukra. IV, 5, 285.
Śukra. IV, 5, 274.
Cases should be tried as soon as possible; for if they will be delayed, there will arise great difficulties, which will lead to miscarriage of justice. Law’s delays are also condemned by the Śrītaṅga.

Evidence was to be recorded in the presence of both the parties. Śukra advises the king not to record any evidence, if one party is absent.²

Cases should not be decided as far as possible with only one kind of evidence, i.e., oral, documentary or circumstantial. Effort was to be made to have all available evidence.³

Cases were normally tried in the order of priority; but the gravity or importance of a case often led to its being taken up earlier.⁴

Amendment in the plaint was possible before the statement of the opponent was filed; but after the filing of the statement, no amendment was permitted.⁵

Retrial could be possible only after depositing a double stamp duty⁶ (daṇḍa). Stamps did not exist in our period but the word stamp duty has been used here for the sake of convenience.

The judges were to act with ideal decency; during the pendency of a suit, they were not to have any private talk or communications with the parties.⁷

POPULAR COURTS

The epigraphic records of our period do not at all refer to the popular courts, which were a special feature of ancient

1. Na Kālaharanāṁ kārīyaṁ rājñā śādhanadārīānte
   Mahāṁ dośho bhūvayet Kālāśāharmāyūpattilaśaṁ.
   Śukra, IV, 5, 167.

2. Arthipratyarthipratyakshaṁ śādhanāṁ pradānayeyet
   Apratyakshaṁ tayornalva grāhīyāt śādanaṁ mripah,
   Śukra, IV, 5, 168.

3. Kevalena cha bhogena lekṣenāpi cha sākshibhīḥ
   Kārīyaṁ na cintayeyāmā lokadeśādāśādāriṁ.
   Śukra, IV, 5, 211-12

   Śukra, IV, 5, 156.

5. Saśayyātva tu yat kārīyaṁ tyajedanyad vadeśasau.
   Anyapakshāreyādā vūdi āhāḥ daṇḍasyaṁ sa smṛtaḥ.
   Śukra, IV, 5, 196

6. Dviguṇaṁ daṇḍanāduḥṣiṇaṁ punastat kārīyaṁuddharet.
   Śukra, IV, 5, 167.

7. Na kālaharanāṁ kārīyaṁ rājñā sākshiprabhāshane.
   Śukra, IV, 5, 1-93
Indian polity for a long time. The Niti writers, on the other hand, reveal the existence of such popular courts known as Kula, Sreni, and Gana during our period. Sukra clearly states at one place that the Srenis should consider points passed over by the Kulás; the Ganas were to review the cases decided by the Srenis and lastly the king and his officers were to be the higher courts of appeal.1 The Kula, Sreni and Gana were thus the three types of popular courts, each succeeding one being more important than the preceding one. When and where these three failed to administer proper justice, the king or his officers were to interfere.

Unfortunately Sukra does not explain the nature of the above three types of popular courts. But on the evidence of the Mitaksharã composed towards the end of our period, we can say that Kula court consisted of a group of relations, near or distant. It is important to note that in ancient India joint families were the order of the day and they were usually very large. When therefore a disagreement or dispute used to take place between two members of a family, it was usually settled by its elders. If they failed to bring about any compromise, the Sreni or the guild court used to intervene. It is important to note that Srenis or guilds became a prominent feature of commercial life in ancient India from c. 500 B.C. They were well organised and had their own executive committees of four or five members. It is therefore not unlikely that these executive committees would have been entrusted with the work of the settlement of disputes among the members of the guild. The nature of Gana court is difficult to ascertain. Probably it was identical with the Pûga court of Yaññavalkya, which consisted of persons of different castes and professions, but residing in the same place.2 It was obviously the popular Pañcháyat court.

1. Vîchâryya srenibhih kâryyam kulairyoâvichâritam,
Ganaâchá šrenyavijñatah ganajâjatah niyuktakåh.
Kulâlbhîyâdhikåh sahâyâstebhîyo'dhyaksho'dhikåh kritåh,
Sarvâbhåmadhikåh råjå dharmâdharmaniyojåkåh.

Sukra, IV, 5, 30-31.

2. Nîpenâdhikrîtåh pûgåh šrenayo'tha kulâjî cha
pûrvyåh purvamågru jöeyam vyavahâravidhaunglaam.
Bhinnajåtûnåh bhînna-vrittiyâm ekasûna-nîvâsinåm samâlah pûgåh

Yâjñ, II, 29-30.
Ample evidence exists to show that the village Panchāyat court continued to function efficiently even under the Muslim rule in the Deccan. We find the Muslim emperor Ibrahim Adil Shah of Bijapur refusing to entertain the appeal of Bapaji Musalman for the retrial of his case in the royal court. During the medieval period, we come across several Maratha kings, refusing to entertain any case at the first instance. Thus when the dispute about the Patilki-watan of Ravet in Poona Pargana was taken to Shahaji, the father of Shivaji, he ordered that the Panchāyat of the place concerned should decide the case.¹ Shivaji also, while declining to entertain the case of one Ramaji Krishna, makes an interesting statement, which is very important. He said to the plaintiff “If you so wish, I shall send your case to your own village Panchāyat if that will meet your desire, or I shall refer it to the district Panchāyat, if that course recommends itself to you. Let me know what you like.”² It is interesting to note here that though Shivaji puts before the plaintiff a number of alternatives, he nowhere refers to the possibility of the trial of the case by himself or by any of his officers. Shivaji’s son Rajaram also followed the same practice. When a very important dispute involving the Watan right to more than twenty villages was referred to him, he immediately directed the local Panchāyat to decide it.

While there thus exists ample evidence to show that the Village Panchāyats and guild courts were actually functioning even under the Muslim rule in Maharashtra, we have no contemporary epigraphical evidence to show that they were actually functioning as suggested by Šukra. We have, however, to remember in this connection that these popular courts are first mentioned by Yājñavalkya and then by Nārada, Brīhaspati, Somadeva and Šukra. These writers covered a period of about a thousand years, c. 250 to 1250 A.D., and they could not have mechanically referred to the popular courts if they were not actually functioning. A reference in the Jñānestvāri³ shows that cases were tried actually by the village chāvadī in the Deccan in c. 1300 A.D.

---

2. A.S. Altekar, Village Communities, p. 46.
It is important to note that Somadeva, who flourished in the 10th century, observes that the royal courts could be approached only after a case was decided by the town or the village court.¹ The village court, he refers to, must obviously have been the Gaṇa court of the Nārada and Śukra. Had it not been functioning, Somadeva could hardly have laid down that the royal courts should come in the picture only after a case was decided by the village court. It is also very unlikely that they could suddenly have sprung into existence in Western India under the Muslim rule as shown by the papers of Maratha history. We must therefore conclude that they were a reality in the body politic during our period though not mentioned by contemporary epigraphs. The silence of the latter was probably due to there being no occasion to mention them.

We thus see that the village Panchāyats played an important part throughout the long course of Indian history. They flourished in India, not due to anarchy as was propounded by Sir Henry Maine, but because the Central Government was itself refusing to entertain any suits at the first instance and was deliberately referring all of them back to the village Panchāyats. The village Panchāyats thus reduced the burden of the Central Government, helped the cause of justice and encouraged the principle of self-government.

¹ Nāk., XXVII. 22.
CHAPTER IX

FEUDATORIES

✓ Feudatory states existed in India since very early times; they are not a new feature in Indian polity introduced by Lord Wellesley. From the very beginning of the historic period of Indian history, we find that a big empire was not directly administered by the emperor, however powerful he might have been. Some parts of the empire used to be under the direct control of the Central Government, while others were put in charge of chiefs, who had recognised the suzerain's authority and were willing to act according to his orders. This arrangement is but natural. India is a vast country and the means of communications were very poor in ancient time. Owing to this circumstance, the political writers of ancient India were generally in favour of continuing the existence of feudatory chiefs. It is important to note that even when an enemy or a king was defeated and conquered, the conqueror, according to Manu, was expected not to annex the kingdom of the vanquished king, but to crown him or any other member of his family, provided he agreed to behave in a loyal way.¹

This principle of non-annexation was followed in India nearly by all the dynasties, as it permitted local culture, trading and political institutions to develop more or less unhindered. Even the Arab writer Sulaiman, who flourished during our period, observes, "When a king subdues a neighbouring state in India, he places over it a man belonging to the family of the fallen prince, who carries on the government in the name of the conqueror."² It is due to this principle that we find a number of feudatory states existing during our period of survey, as they did in the earlier period. The records of the Pālas, the Pratihāras,

¹. Šthāpayattāra tadvamāyāraṁ kuryāccha samayakriyām. Manu, VII, 22
². Elliot and Dowson; History of India, Vol. I, p. 7.
the Senas, the Chandellas, the Chauhukyas, the Chāhāmānas, the Paramāras and the Chedis clearly indicate that the rulers of the above houses had many feudatories under them. Some of them belonged to ancient royal families ruling for a long time, and others were kings of more recent origin. We propose to discuss the relations between the emperor and the feudatories in this chapter; epigraphical evidence and the data in works of writers on polity will both be of help to us.

As may be expected, the feudatories were of different grades. Śukra refers to two of them, the Śāmanta and the Māṇḍalika. Contemporary inscriptions also refer to both these classes. Perhaps Mahāmaṇḍalaśvaras constituted a third and higher class. Our epigraphs refer to feudatories and their sub-feudatories. Thus Rāṇaka Śāṅkarasimha was a subordinate of the king Vāpanadeva, who in his turn was a feudatory of the Chaulukya emperor Jayasimha in 1146 A.D. Yaśovarman, who was a feudatory of the Paramāra king Bhojadeva, had his own sub-feudatory chief Rāṇaka Āmam. It is interesting to note that a similar practice prevailed in the South also during our period. The Rāṭṭas of Saundatti, who were the feudatories, first of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and then of the latter Chālukyas, had their own sub-feudatories. Govinda III, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, had under him a feudatory called Karkka ruling over Southern Gujārāta in 813 A.D., who had in turn a sub-feudatory named Śrī Buddhavarsha of Salukika family, who was governing Siharika 12. The feudatories could thus create their own sub-feudatories probably with the previous permission of the emperor.

It is important to note that during our period of survey, royal officers, ministers and provincial governors began to

1. According to Śukra I, 282-83, the income of the śāmanta was to be between one and three lakhs of silver karshas and that of the māṇḍalika between three and ten lakhs of the same coin. Karsha as a silver coin weighing 100 Raṭṭis was not in vogue in the Hindu period and we may therefore doubt whether the information holds good of our age.
2. I.A., X, 159
3. E.I., XIX, 73-7
5. E.I., III, p. 53.
assume feudatory titles and hence sometimes it becomes difficult to state whether a particular Mahāmanḍalēśvara was really a feudatory king or whether he was a provincial governor with feudatory titles. This confusion becomes more confused, when we find the defeated feudatory chiefs being appointed to important posts of administration. Śukra, however, gives a valuable clue for the solution of this riddle. He observes that a Šāmanta is a feudatory ruler over 100 villages, while nrisāmanta is an officer in charge of the same number of villages.¹ This Niti writer thus differentiates the two by giving them separate nomenclature; our inscriptions, however, do not do so.

Sometimes the feudatories were appointed to high posts in the Central Government. Thus the Vāghclā chief Viradhavala, the feudatory of the Chaulukya king Kumārapāla, and Ratnapāla, the feudatory of the king Bhīma II of the same dynasty were both in charge of Samastamudrācyāpāra (E.I. VIII, 219-22; I.A., XVIII, 112). Māṇḍalike Malayāsimha was a minister of Chandella king Trailokyavarman (E.I. XXV p. 2). Sometimes, they were even entrusted with the supervision of the entire kingdom of the overlord. The Ratnapur inscription of the Kalachūri year 915 informs us, how the Chedi king Prithvīdeva obtained great mental happiness after entrusting the government of Talahāri māṇḍala to his feudatory Brahmadeva (E.I., XXVI, 257). All this evidence clearly indicates that the feudatory chiefs, when loyal, were well-treated by their overlords and were often appointed to high posts.

The status and titles of the feudatories naturally differed according to their grades. The Jain writer Raviśopyaścāra informs us that ‘important feudatories were entitled to the use of five musical instruments (Paṇchamahāśabda) namely Śrīniga, Śaṅkha, Bheri, Ayaghaṇṭā and Tamaṭa.² They were also allowed the use of a feudal throne, fly whisk, palanquin and elephants. They bore high sounding titles like Mahāmanḍalēśvara, Mahāśāmanta, and Mahāmāṇḍalika.

¹ Śukra, I, 190.
² I.A., XII, 96; In Kashmir, however, the term Paṇchamahāśabda denoted the five officers (1) Mahāpratihārapida (2) Mahāsandhi-vigrāhika (3) Mahāśivāśāla (4) Mahābhārdgāra and Mahāśadhanabhāga. Rāja; IV, 140-49.
Sometimes we find the feudatories even assuming the imperial title *Mahārājādhirāja*. It is difficult to understand the reason, which led the feudatories to assume the imperial title. In some cases, it is probably that the decline in the power of the central authority would have given them an opportunity to declare their independence and to assume the imperial titles. Thus during the decline of the Pratihāra empire, a number of its feudatories quietly assumed the imperial title *Mahārājādhirāja Paramēśvara*. The Rājor inscription shows that when Vijayapāladeva was unable to look after the administration, his feudatory Mathandevā declared himself as an independent ruler by assuming the imperial title *Mahārājādhirāja Paramēśvara*. Similarly when the power of the Chaulukyas was altogether weakened, the Vāghelā family, tracing descent from a sister of Kumārapāla, reaped a rich harvest out of this opportunity and leapt into prominence. Lavaṇa-prasāda, and his Vāghelā minister (the feudatory of Bholā Bhima) and his son Viradhavala carved out a principality round Dholka and thus established themselves in an almost independent position in Southern Gujarat. In the Mount Abu inscription of 1287 A.D., they are called merely Rāgaka and Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara but in 1288 A.D., they assumed the imperial epithet *Mahārājādhirāja*. During the decline of the Pratihāra rule Dhūrmaṭa assumed the imperial title *Mahārājādhirāja* in c. 966 A.D. and Nishkalaṅka in 1025 A.D. The position of these feudatories was perhaps similar to that of the provincial governors like the Vaziers of Oudh during the last days of Moghul rule, as observed by Dr. R.C. Majumdar.

Feudatory chiefs had usually to entertain an officer from the imperial court, whose position was similar to that of the Political Agent or Resident under the British administration. He exercised general power of supervision and control over the feudatories and used to give full information to the king about the happenings in the feudatory states. He had a large number of spies under him to detect whether the

2. E.I., I, 173.
3. R.C. Majumdar, History of Bengal, P. 275.
feudatory kings were contemplating sedition or revolt against the imperial power.

The 'Political Agent' considerably restricted the powers of the feudatory chiefs. We sometimes find him countersigning the grants of the feudatories on behalf of the king. Thus according to the Unā charter, Dhiika, who was probably such an officer under Mahendrapāla, gave his approval to a grant made by Mahāsāmanta Avanivarman II.1 It was Tantrapāla Mādhava, who allowed Indrarāja, the Chāhamāna feudatory, to make an endowment for the upkeep of a temple.2 It is thus clear that the 'Political Agent' occupied an important place of honour and power in the feudatory states. He was received, as merchant Sulaiman observes, "with profound respect that was naturally expected to be shown to the representative of the paramount power."

It will be convenient here to describe the relations between the imperial power and its feudatories. There is clear evidence to show that the paramount power did not exercise the same kind of control over all the feudatories. General obedience to the imperial power was expected in every case. All feudatories were also required to pay a regular tribute. This was sometimes sent directly to the capital, as was done by the feudatories of South Kośala in the case of their suzerain Jājalladeva I (E.I. I p. 53). Sometimes, however, it was collected by the emperor during his tour of inspection, as we find in the case of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III, who is stated to have collected the tributes from his feudatories during his tour in the South.3 Feudatories were expected to be present at the imperial court not only on ceremonial occasions,4 but also at periodical intervals

1. E.I., IX, I.
2. E.I., XV, 182-8. These examples are no doubt few, but we cannot ignore their evidence. Usually the sanction of the emperor himself was taken and so there was no necessity of getting the permission of the Political Agent.
4. Mandalādhipati Chanda of Aṅga was present at Madanapāla's coronation and spread out the rich material for this ceremony (Rāmacarita, III.16 commentary). In Kashmir, vassals used to attend the coronation (Rt. VIII. 3303)
for offering personal homage to the king. They had apparently no right of issuing their own coins.

It is difficult to state whether the emperor had the right of interfering in the matter of the succession of feudatories, as the records of our period do not throw any satisfactory light upon the point. We do not know whether the permission of the sovereign was necessary at the time of succession, nor can we say with certainty whether the hereditary principle of crowning the eldest son was invariably followed. It may be noted that during the British rule, in the case of feudatory states, when a new prince was to be crowned the permission of the paramount power was required. The same probably would have been the case with the feudatories of our period also.

Under the Gupta administration, however, kings who had been reduced to the feudatory status after conquest, were apparently granted imperial charters, regranting them their territories under such conditions as were agreed or imposed. This claim is made in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta, but we have so far discovered no such charters. It is very likely that the imperial overlord would be present in person at the time of crowning the new feudatory prince, as we find in the case of a Valabhi ruler Droṇasimha, who was a Gupta feudatory, whose installation was performed by the paramount master in person, the sole lord of the circumference of the territory of the whole earth.¹

Very often, the feudatory chiefs in India had to participate with their forces in the military campaigns of their feudal lords. Thus Ḥarsarāja Guhila, who was a feudatory of the Pratihāra king Bhoja, is said to have assisted the emperor in one of his Northern campaigns.² Kakka, a feudatory of the king Nāgabhaṭṭa, also claims to have fought with the army of his overlord against the Gauḍas in battle at Muddagiri.³ Guṇāmbodhideva, another feudatory of Bhoja, had taken a prominent part in the campaign of the former

¹. Majumdar and Altekar; The Age of the Vākāṣṭhas, p. 187.
². E.I., XII, 15.
against the Pālas. The Kāhlā plates inform us, how Guṇāmbodhideva took away the fortune of the Gauḍās in his successful expedition,¹ Guhila, a chief of the Kalachūrī family, accompanied his suzerain Mahendrapāla in his expedition against Magadha and Bengal with his cavalry recruited from the sea-coast.² Kalachūrī prince Soḍhadeva is also known to have participated in the Bengal campaign of Bhoja.³ Śaṅkaragana, a feudatory of Nāgabhaṭṭa, is also said to have fought against the ruler of Bengal on his emperor’s behalf. The Guhila king Bhaṭṭa, who was a feudatory of Mahipāla, is said to have defeated the armies of the kings of the south at the behest of his overlord.⁴ Balavarman, a feudatory of Mahendrapāla I, is stated to have ‘freed the earth from the Hūṇa race’ by slaying Jājappa and other kings.⁵ The same practice was followed in the Gāhaḍavāla and other dynasties also. Kumārapāla and Vatsarāja accompanied the Gāhaḍavāla ruler Govindachandra, their feudal lord, in his military campaign.⁶ Māṇḍalika, the feudatory of the Paramāra king Jayasimha, helped him in vanquishing the opposing force led by general Kaṅha.⁷ Yaśodhavala, the Paramāra feudatory of Kumārapāla, assisted him in his campaign against Mallikārjuna, the ruler of Koṅkana.⁸ He also offered his services to Kumārapāla in his war against the Mālwa king.⁹ Dhārāvarsha, a son of the feudatory chief Yaśodhavala, also followed the army of Kumārapāla in its march against Koṅkana.¹⁰ Prahlādanadeva, a son of Dhārāvarsha, also went to help the Gurjara king Ajayapāladeva, when the latter was attacked by Śāmantasimha of Mewar.¹¹ Lakshmanarāja, the Chedi

2. E.I., XII, 15 Verse—23.
3. Ibid.,
4. Ibid., IX, 12, 16.
6. E.I., IV, 120–33.
7. E.I., XXI, 47.
8. E.I., VIII, 216.
10. E.I., VIII, 216.
ruler, is also stated to have been accompanied in his march against the western region by the infantry of the tributary chiefs, whose names are unfortunately not mentioned in the records.

The contemporary south Indian records also show, how the feudatories had to supply a certain number of troops to their feudal lords and how they used to participate in the imperial campaigns. Thus Narasimha Chālukya, who was a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III, is stated to have taken a prominent part in the latter’s campaign against the Pratihāra king Mahīpāla.¹ The Chālukyas of Veṅgi, the feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, had to support the latter in their wars against the Gaṅgas.² It may be noted that the practice of taking military help from the feudatories was followed in India also under the British rule. In both the World Wars, states like Bikaner, Gwalior, Mysore and Hyderabad had sent their forces to help the British in France, Northern Africa and Mesopotamia.

Whether the practice of allowing feudatories to maintain their own forces to be used by the emperor when necessary is a sound one, may well be doubted. Several instances, however, show that it was the root-cause of the weakness of Indian Polity, for very often, when an emperor was in great difficulties, the feudatory chiefs used to dictate their own terms, while giving him the military support. Thus Rāmapāla of Bengal had to pay a heavy price for getting the support of his feudatories to win the throne. Even when a strong emperor could keep the feudatories under control, the very presence of the latter was an influence, which disturbed the unity of administration. Feudatories were frequently intriguing against the emperor either covertly or openly.

The measure of internal autonomy, that was enjoyed by different feudatories, was not uniform in all the dynasties. It differed according to their power and prestige and also according to the circumstances. The bigger feudatories of course must have had enjoyed a large amount of internal autonomy. Subject to the payment of a certain amount of

1. A.S. Altekar, Rāṣṭrakūṭas, 265.
tribute, they had full right over their revenues. They could
even make land grants without taking the permission of the
imperial power. Sometimes, they do not even refer to their
suzerain in their records. Thus Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Vaijal-
ladeva, who was a feudatory of the king Ajayapāladeva in
1173 A.D. and was ruling in Narmadātaṇa-maṇḍala refers to a
number of political officers such as Daṇḍanāyaka, Desaṭṭhakkura,
Adhiṭṭhānaka, Karapapuruṣa, Shayyāpāla, etc., while making a land
grant. It is, however, interesting to note that he is silent
about the emperor’s permission. Nor does the charter con-
tain the signature of the emperor; it is signed by the feudatory
alone. Similarly Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Mahārājakula Somasim-
hadeva, the lord of Chandrāvati and the feudatory of the
Chaulukya king Bhīmaṇadeva, while granting the village
of Davaṇi for the worship of Nemūṭha, did not take
the permission of his sovereign. Māṇḍalika, feudatory of
Jayasimha, also enjoyed full powers over the revenues of his
fief, for he is also stated to have made a land grant to the
Maṇḍalēśvara, without taking the permission of his imperial
over-lord. Dhārāvarsha, feudatory of the Chaulukya king
Kumārapāla, granted one haḷavāḥ of land at the village
of Sāvadā to the merchant named Ampā without taking con-
sent of his imperial overlord. Our epigraphs supply several
other similar instances.

2. E.I., VIII, 204-07.
3. E.I., XXI, 47.
5(a) E.I., XIX, 80, for such a grant by Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Prīhlvādeva,
a feudatory of a Tripurī king.

(b) J.A., VI, 203-04, for such a grant by Sāmantaśīra, a feudatory of
the king Vīnāladeva.

(c) J.A., XVII, 230-34, for a grant by Mahārāṇaka Kumārapāla, a
feudatory of the king Trailokyavarman.

(d) J.A., XVII, 224-27, for a grant by Kirtivarman, a feudatory of the
king Jayasimha.

(e) A.S.I.W.C., for a grant by Rājyadeva, a feudatory of the king
Naravarman.

(f) J.A., XVI, 292-96, for a grant by Udayavarmanadeva, a feudatory of
the king Jayavarmanadeva.

(j) E.I., III, 266-67, for a grant by Mathanadeva, a feudatory of the
king Vijayapāla.

(h) E.I. XIX, 178, for a grant by Mahāmaṇḍalika Siyaka, a feudatory
of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Pṛishṇa III.
Feudatories

The bigger feudatories could create their own sub-feudatories and also could appoint their own officers to control them. They even could compel the sub-feudatories to take their permission at the time of issuing charters. Thus the sub-feudatory Rānā Śaṅkarasimha had to take permission of mahāmanḍalesvara Vāpanadeva, when he wanted to alienate three ploughs of land to meet the expenses of a temple. There is, however, an exceptional case, which refers to a sub-feudatory chief making a grant without taking consent of his feudal lord. The Kālavān plates of Yaśovarman inform us that Rānaka Āmma, who, in his turn was a feudatory of Bhojadeva, granted certain pieces of land at Mahishābaddhika in the holy Tirtha of Kālakesvara without taking the consent of his feudal lord. It is very likely that the plates would have been issued during the last days of the reign of Yaśovarman, when he was unable to control his kingdom, and his sub-feudatory gained power. It is also not unlikely that the non-mention of the consent of Yaśovarman might have been due to the negligence of the drafter of the grant.

Some of the feudatories of the Paramāras and the chedis though ruling over only 4 villages are seen referring to their Sandhivigrahikas and Mahāmāyas in their records. So bigger feudatories must have had a full-fledged ministry and all the paraphernalia of a royal court, if the smaller ones were having their foreign ministers and chief ministers.

It is clear that the control, which the emperor exercised over big feudatories was not strict. This is also evident from a letter of Akkam, the Lohān śief of Brāhmaṇabāda, to Chacha, who had called upon him to recognise his sovereignty—"I have never shown you opposition or quarrelled with you. Your letter of friendship was received, and I was much exalted by it. Our friendship shall remain and no animosity shall arise. I will comply with your orders. You are at liberty to reside at any place within the territory of Brāhmaṇabāda. If you have resolved to go in any other direction,

1. I.A., X, 159, Vāpanadeva was himself a feudatory of Jayasimha.
2. E.I., XIX, 71-73.
3. E.I., XIX, 10.
there is no body to prevent or molest you. I possess such power and influence and can render you aid."

The powers of small feudatories were limited. They had no full right over their fiefs. They were only allowed to enjoy their income. They could not alienate or sell villages and lands in their fiefs. Thus when Gāṅgeyadeva, who was a feudatory of the king Jayavarman, was making a grant, he had to supplicate the permission of his overlord.¹ Dharaṇīvarāha, a feudatory of the king Mahīpāla, had to secure the consent of his overlord, before making a grant.² Rāṇaka Lavaṇaprajñā, a feudatory of Madanapāla, had to take the permission of Govindachandra, while granting the village Rāmaitha in the Sigurodha pattalā to Brāhmaṇa Guṇachandra.³ Vatsarāja, a feudatory of Govindachandra, had to take his sovereign's permission, while granting the village of Ambavara to Brāhmaṇa Dalhuśarman.⁴ The Pipliānagar plate of Mahakumara Harishchandra, the feudatory of the king Jayavarmadeva, not only bears his own signature, but also that of Rāmachandra, who was most probably his suzerain's representative.⁵ In the Pratihāra empire, even the feudatories in distant places like Kathiawar, had to take the imperial permission for such transactions; the officers of the Central Government had to sanction such alienations on behalf of their suzerain by authenticating the documents by their signatures. [Thus when Balavarman and Avanivarman II of Kathiawar wanted to grant the villages of Jayapur and Amvulaka, in the Saurāṣṭra mandala, they had to take permission of Dhiika, who was a representative of the Central Government, and is seen signing the grant on its behalf.⁶ The Chāhamāna records also show that their feudatories could make grants generally with the consent of the provincial representative of the suzerain.⁷]

It is interesting to note that the same practice prevailed

1. E.I., IX, 120-3.
2. L.A., XII, 195.
6. E.I., IX, 1.
7. E.I., XIV, 176-86.
in the south also during our period of survey. Thus when Budhavarsha, a Chaulukya feudatory of Govinda III desired to give a village to a Jain sage, he had to supplicate for the permission of his feudal lord.\(^1\) Virachola and Prithvipati II, feudatories of the Cholas, had to take imperial sanction, before they could alienate villages in charity.\(^2\) The early Kadambas also excercised a similar control over their feudatories.\(^3\) All this evidence clearly indicates that the practice of getting imperial permission usually prevailed in most of the contemporary dynasties, both in the South and the North, with reference to smaller feudatories.

The position of the third-rate feudatories was very precarious. All their activities were strictly controlled either by the emperor or by his representative. They were not the masters of their fiefs and had no full control over their revenues. There are a number of cases to show the emperor giving away in charity villages situated within their jurisdiction. Thus the Godapura plate records a grant made by Gāngeyadeva at the dictate of his emperor Jayavarman.\(^4\) The king Vijayachandra issued a charter in 1168 A.D., assigning two villages in the domain of his feudatory Śrī-Pratāpadhavala.\(^5\) The Chaulukya queen Saubhāgyadevi alienated the village of Ajhāri, which was in the domain of her feudatory Yaśodhavala.\(^6\) Naravarman granted on one occasion twenty ploughs of land from the village Kadambapadraka, which was under the jurisdiction of his feudatory Rājyaadeva, and on another occasion he gifted away six ploughs of land from the same village.\(^7\) The Gāhaḍavāla records also show that the Central Government could assign villages from the territories of its feudatories.

It would thus be seen that the smaller feudatories were not full masters of the entire revenues of their fiefs. It is also likely that their day-to-day administration was not
always free from imperial interference. The feudatories were subjected to a number of indignities, if they dared to rebel and were defeated in war. They were even deposed from the throne, if necessary. Thus the Ajhāri inscription of 1145 A.D. informs us that when Kumārapāla and Arnorūna came into conflict, Vikramasimha, the feudatory of Kumārapāla, turned treacherous to his lord. Kumārapāla defeated and dethroned Vikramasimha and put his nephew Yasodhavala on the throne. Sometimes the feudatories were compelled to do menial work. A verse in the Sanjān plates of Amoghavarsha I, which is incomplete and obscure, states that feudatories had to sweep the stables of horses (vīrajasamabhītenuryaya vāhyāliḥbhāmin) of his camp. Feudatories were also forced to surrender their forces, elephants and treasury as a punishment for their disloyalty. Sometimes they had also to send their young princes as companions to the heir-apparent, as was done in the case of Mādhavasena and his brother in the time of Harsha. Even their wives were sometimes put into prison, and the conqueror used to marry them forcibly as Chācha did in Sindh; this would indicate that the less cultured princes used to subject them to further indignities and humiliations. The feudatories had also to offer their daughters in marriage to the emperor, if the latter was inclined to accept them. Thus under the Guptas, the Śaka feudatories of Samudragupta are said to have offered their daughters in marriage to the emperor. The records of our period, however, do not give us any such instances, though they were probably not unknown to it.

On the other hand, when the Imperial Government became weak, the feudatories could not only rebel with impunity but also assume independent status. Thus when the last few rulers of the Pāla dynasty were unable to carry on the administration properly, a number of feudatories

1. Ajhāri Inscription of Yasovarman.
2. Nikṛtivikrita Gaṅgaśrikhali buddhanishṭaḥ (śrīnkalābaddha) bṛhitmyurantukā maṇḍoleśa (maṇḍaleśaḥ) svabhṛitya.
Vīrajasmīha tenuryasa (mahātena) vāhyāliḥbhāmin
Parivṛti (parivṛtimuṇu) visṛgyā Vengināthādgayopī.
E.f., XVIII, 246, V. 33.
For Bahlūli as stables, see Mānasallāra, Chap. III, p. 61-63.
asserted themselves and the authority of the Pālas was then confined to a portion of their kingdom, where they maintained a precarious hold for a short period, hemmed in the East by the Senas and in the West by the Gāhaḍavālas. The same was the case with the Chedis of Tripuri, for we learn that when the king Gayakarṇa was unable to exercise effective control, the Ratnapur branch of the Kalachhūris asserted its independence in South Kośala. The feudatories of the Pratihāras and Chaulukyas did the same during the decline of the power of their overlords. Even if the feudatories did not declare themselves independent, they practically exercised full sovereign authority. Thus the chiefs, who rallied to the cause of Rāmapāla, were all practically independent even though the Rāmacarita calls them Sāmantas. The charter issued by Vaijalladeva, a feudatory of the king Ajayapāladeva, is drawn up exactly in the style of independent kings.  

It is further important to note that even when the emperor was a strong one, the feudatories were generally inclined to try to become independent by overthrowing the imperial yoke. Thus during the later years of Jayasimha’s reign, his feudatory the Chāhamāna Āśarāja revolted against him and became independent. Under such circumstances, it was but natural for the kings not to get regular tributes from their feudatories.

The communications being what they were, kingdoms of considerable size could normally become possible in ancient India only by recognising local kings as feudatories, and inducing them to co-operate in the common venture of building up a strong state, which could, owing to its increased resources, secure a better and all-round progress of the country. This, for instance, happened under the Guptas, Harshavardhana and the Pratihāras. The feudatories, however, introduced an element of instability in the imperial state; when there was no strong and tactful emperor at the centre, they would either fight among themselves or intrigue for overthrowing the imperial power. This stood in the way of the development of a strong centralised state in the country, so necessary for its defence from external foes. Possibly times were not favourable for such a development as a permanent feature of Hindu polity.

1. I.A., XVIII, 80-85.
CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

We have finished our survey and discussion of the different aspects of the administrative system during our period. It is hoped that the reader will find the account to be more vivid and comprehensive than that of most of the earlier periods of the Ancient Indian History. As regards the Mauryan period, we have valuable contemporary literary evidence, namely the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya, throwing a flood of light upon the Mauryan administration; but how far its picture is realistic and how far idealistic we do not know, for Aśokan inscriptions are not quite sufficient to check it. In the case of the Indo-Greek, the Scythian and the Kushana periods, the information that we get about their administration is admittedly fragmentary. As regards the Gupta Age, we have a large number of inscriptions of the Guptas as well as of their contemporaries, but the information supplied by them about the administrative structure is not quite copious. Further, we do not have the advantage of comparing the data supplied by the inscriptions with that supplied by any contemporary Niti works.

During our period of survey, the epigraphical evidence is happily ample and it can be correlated with the data in the contemporary Niti works, among which the Śukraniti of Śukra is the most important.1 This work gives us a very vivid and comprehensive account of the administrative machinery. It is due to this reason that it has become possible to present a fairly detailed, comprehensive and realistic picture of the administration and political institutions of the period.

As regards the efficiency of the different governments of our period, it can well be claimed that they were usually able to maintain law and order and to develop the resources

---

1. It is probable that the work assumed its present form in c. 1400 A.D., but we have shown already how its data are substantially true of our period.
of the country by encouraging trade, industry and agriculture. The immense wealth consisting of pearls, gold and silver, carried away by Mahmud of Ghazna clearly indicates how prosperous the economic condition was during our period. Literature also prospered, especially in the branches of politics, Dharmaśāstra, poetics, astrology, chemistry and philosophy.

In the realm of politics, a number of books like the Nātivākyāmyita of Somadeva, the Rājadharmaśakarā of Kṛtyākalpātaru by Lakshmīdhara, the Bārhāspatya Arthāśāstra of Brīhaspati, the Yuktikālpataru of Bhoja, and the Mānasollāsa of Someśvara were written during this period. The Śukraniti sums up the administrative condition of the age, though in its present form, it is about a couple of centuries later. The Dharmaśāstra works like the Mitāksharā of Vījñāneśvara, the Dāyabhāga of Jīmūtavāhana, the Kalpataru of Lakshmīdhara, the Brāhmaṇapaśarvasva of Halāyudha, were composed in our period. It may be pointed out that the first two of these are still regarded as authoritative in the law courts. In the realm of poetics, important authors like Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Kuntala and Rājaśekghara flourished in our period. In the sphere of chemistry also, our age made a fairly good progress. The chemical knowledge of the Rasāñjana, composed in this period is, according to P.C. Ray, distinctly in advance of that of the same period in Europe. Astrology attracted considerable attention. In the earlier period this 'science' hardly existed; in our period, almost every king began to engage a court-astrologer to ensure the prosperity of his kingdom and the success of his army. Some important works on history like the Gaṇḍavaḥo, the Kumārapālacharita and the Rāmāpālacharita were composed during our period of survey. In the realm of philosophy also, great philosophers like Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja flourished during our period, though they belonged to South India. North India also had its own logicians and philosophers, among whom we may mention Vāchaspatimiśra, Udayana, Jayanta, Śāntarakshita, Jñānaśri, Ratnakara, and Hemachandra.¹ Achievements in the realm of education were also striking. Our age produced some universities like Nālandā.

¹. Rahula Sankrityayana, Pramāṇapustikāhādyam. pp. 618 and 628.
and Vikramasila of international fame and we find them receiving donations from kings like Balaputradeva from distant Suvarnadvipa. Art and architecture also flourished remarkably during this period. Temples at Khajuraho, Bhuvanesvara and Mt. Abu are remarkable for their architectural grandeur and sculptural beauty. The sculpture of Mathura was of such exquisite beauty that even Mahmud of Ghazna hesitated for sometime before ordering its destruction.

But on the debit side, we have to note that the ideal of India as one political unity could not yet be realised. India was divided into a number of states which were engaged in frequent feuds. An effort was no doubt made by the Pratiharas to unite most of the states in Northern India and to establish there a strong empire, but that also did not last long. It functioned efficiently only about a century and the failure of the Muslims of Sindh to penetrate further into Rajputana and Central India may rightly be ascribed to the great barrier imposed by the Pratihara empire. But when it collapsed, a number of small states came into existence and Mahmud of Ghazna found it easy to gain victory over the different states in India. It may be further pointed out that even after the retirement of Mahmud of Ghazna, the states in Northern India did not unite and merge into a strong unitary state. Such a phenomenon occurred after the invasion of Alexander the Great, but it did not recur after the onslaughts of Mahmud of Ghazna.

Another great defect of the Indian polity of our period was that India did not recognise the importance of establishing mutual contacts with the neighbouring countries. In the Mauryan period, Greek ambassadors were staying at Pataliputra and Indian cultural missions were sent to the neighbouring kingdoms for the propagation of religion. We have some evidence to show, how in the Gupta age, Samudragupta seems to have received some embassies from adjacent islands like Ceylon1 and probably from Java and Sumatra.

---
1. The evidence referred to above is the statement of the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta which states 'Daivaputra-Shahi-Shaladevahati-Saka-Murugadhi-Sahidhakthadhithecha saradadevadhibhibh......
   cesā-krita-bahu-virya-jrasa-dharmi-bhandhaya' (contd. on next page)
But during our period, no such ambassadors were sent or received. Had the Chāhamānas and the GāhADVAlas kept regular missions in Kabul and Lahore, they would have realised how weak the successors of Mahamud of Ghazna had become by c. 1100 A.D. and could have taken steps to eliminate the foreign power from the Punjab. The advance of the Turks from Central Asia was hardly known in the Indian capitals. The invasion of Mahamud of Ghor therefore came as a great surprise to the states of Northern India, which could not unite together to give a joint resistance to the invader.

It is possible to argue that this statement may be a mere courtly exaggeration, hence we have guardedly stated that 'Samudragupta seems to have received some embassies'. It may however, be pointed out that the statement refers to diplomatic contacts with the Kushānas and Sakas as also the rulers of Ceylon and other islands. The diplomatic relations with the Sakas and Kushānas are generally taken to be sober historic facts; to doubt them in connection with the rulers of Ceylon and other islands would therefore be hardly fair. We know from Chinese sources that the Śrīhalese monarch sent envoys to the Indian potentate and obtained from him permission to build a convent at Buddha Gaya 'for the benefit of pilgrims from Ceylon to that holy place' (Majumdar and Altekar, The Age of the Vāhānakas, p. 258).

If the embassy from Ceylon suggested by the Allahabad Pillar Inscription is thus very probable, there is no reason why we should distrust its statement, about other islands also doing the same.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Original Works in Sanskrit

Ṛgveda
Atharvaveda
Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa
Taistirīya-Brāhmaṇa
Baudhāyana-Dharmaśāstra
Mahābhārata
Manu-Smṛti
Nārada-Smṛti
Tāṅkaśvalya-Smṛti
Agni-Purāṇa
Matsya-Purāṇa
Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya
Bārhaspatya-Arthaśāstra
Kāṃnandaśiya-Nitiśāra
Śukraniti
Tuktikapataru
Mānasollāsa
Rājadharma-kānda of Kṛtyakalpataru
Kādambarī
Rājatarangini
Nītivākyāmṛita

Vaidika Yantralaya edition, 1907
Vaidika Yantralaya edition, 1907
Ānandāśrama Press edition. Edited by Haug, Bombay, 1863
Ānandāśrama Press edition
Anandāśrama Press edition, 1920
Chitraśāla Press edition, Poona, 1929-33
Nirṇayasāgara Press edition, 1909
Edited by Dr. Jolly, Calcutta, 1885
Nirṇaya-sāgara Press edition, 1918
Anandāśrama Press edition, Poona, 1900
Anandāśrama Press edition
Edited by Dr. Shamsastri, Mysore, 1923
Edited by Thomas, Brussels, 1916
Published by Khemarāja Śri Krishnadas
Edited by Jivananda Vidyasagara Bhattacharya, Calcutta, 1890
Edited by I.C. Sastri, Calcutta, 1917
Edited by G.K. Shrigondkar; Gaekwad’s Oriental Series, No. LXXXIV.
Edited by K.V. Rangasvami Aiyangar, Gaekwad’s Oriental Series No. XI.
Nirṇayasāgara Press edition, 1912
Translation by R.S. Pandit, Alahabad, 1934.
Grantharatnamālā edition.

Modern Books on Polity and History

Aiyangar, K.V.

Aiyangar, K.V. Rājadharmā, Madras, 1951.
Altekar, A.S. State and Government in Ancient
Altekar, A.S. Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Their Times, Poona,
Banerjee, P.N. 1934.
Banerjee, R.D. Public Administration in Ancient India,
Bendi Prasad The State in Ancient India, Allahaba-
Bendi Prasad bad, 1928.
Bhat, B.V. The Political Theory in Ancient India,
Bhat, B.V. Allahabad, 1927.
Banerjee, R.D. Shivajī Rājanīti, Rajawade
Banerjee, R.D. Samśodhana Mandala, 1941.
Bandyopadhyaya, N.C. The Pālas of Bengal, Calcutta, 1924.
Bandyopadhyaya, N.C. History of Orissa, Calcutta, 1931.
Chakravarty, P.C. Development of Hindu Polity and
Dikshitār, V.R.R. The art of War in Ancient India,
Dikshitār, V.R.R. Dacca, 1941.
Dikshitār, V.R.R. Hindu Administrative Institutions,
Dikshitār, V.R.R. Madras, 1929.
Gune, V.T. Mauryan Polity, Madras, 1932.
Gange, J.C. The Judicial System of the Marathas,
Ganguli, D.C. The Paramāras, Dacca, 1933.
Ghoshal, U.N. Hindu Revenue System, Calcutta,
Ghoshal, U.N. A History of Indian Political Theories,
Kane, P.V. History of Dharmāśāstra, Vol. III.
Keith, A.B. History of Sanskrit Literature, Oxford,
Jayaswal, K.P. 1928.
Jayaswal, K.P. Hindu Polity, Calcutta, 1924.
Law, N.N. Interstate Relations in Ancient India,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law, N.N.</td>
<td>Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity, Oxford, 1921.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majumdar, R.C.</td>
<td>Corporate Life in Ancient India, Calcutta, 1920.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majumdar, and Altekar</td>
<td>The Age of the Vākāṭakas, 1st ed. Lahore, 1946.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majumdar, and Pusalkar</td>
<td>The Age of Imperial Kanauj, Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, 1955.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāzim Muhammad</td>
<td>The Life and Times of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazena, Cambridge, 1931.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen, B.C.</td>
<td>Historical Aspects of Bengal Inscriptions, Calcutta, 1942.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarkar, B.K.</td>
<td>The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus, Calcutta, 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarkar, B.K.</td>
<td>The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology, The Sacred Books Series, Volume XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarkar, B.K.</td>
<td>The Śukranīti, Allahabad, 1914.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinha, B.P.</td>
<td>The Decline of the Kingdom of Magadha, Patna, 1954.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śastri, K.A.N.</td>
<td>The Cholas, Madras, 1935.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripathi, R.S.</td>
<td>History of Kanauj, Banaras, 1937.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, H.N.</td>
<td>The Sultans of Delhi, Their Coinage and Metrology, Oxford 1936.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT-INDEX

A
Abhinava-mārgaṇaka, 193-194
Adhikaraṇa, 151
Aḍhupraṣṭha, 195
Adjudication in village, 169
Agrahārika, 130
Aindri-sānti, 53
Ākarādhipati, 127
Akhapataḷikapraṣṭha, 195
Akharaśkṣita, 121
Amaradakṣīṇa proclamation, 75
Amāṭya, 111
Amoghaṇavarśa III, his election, 34
Aṅganiṅghika, 111
Aṅgarakṣhaka, 111
Antaḥpurayogyapurusha, 113
Anuṣatika, 115
Aputrikādhanā, 201
Ārāmadhipati, 125
Army, its strength, 134-137; recruitment, 137-139; discipline and rules, 140; pay, gift and reward, 140-141; pension to dependents of soldiers, 142; drill and exercise, 143; ambulance corps, 144
Āvasthika, 111
Āyutika, 116, 132

B
Bakulamahādevi, 41
Balādhyaksha, 114
Bārhaspatya-Arthaśāstra, its views on polity, 22-23
Bhāgakara, 176
Bhaṇaka, 187
Bhāṇḍāgārādhikṛita, 126
Bhaṭa, 121
Bhishak, 112
Bhogakara, 176
Bhukti, 145
Bṛhaduparika, 145

C
Cattle breeding, tax on, 189
Cavalry commander, 116
Central Secretariat, its power of supervision and control, 108-110
Chāṭa, 121
Chāṭabhaṭapraveśadanda, 195-196
Chaturikā, 148
Chaukāḍikā, 155
Chaurodharanika, 152
Chollikā, 187
Coronation, 51-58; comparison with Vedic and post-Vedic times, 51-58; comparison with the modern English coronation, 58

D
Dānādhyaksha, 130
Daṇḍadāyādi, 200
Daṇḍamahādevi, 141
Daṇḍanāyaka, 151
Daṇḍapāśikas, 121, 152
Daṇḍasakti, 121
Dāṇḍikā, 121
Dāṣāparāḍhika, 129
Dauhasādhasādhanika, 201
Deśa, 146
Dharmalekhi, 129
Dharmamahādevi, 41
Dharmapradhāna, 129
District administration, 152-153
Divinity of king, 47-50
Drāṅga, 177
Drāṅgika, 127
Dūtāpreshanika, 120
Dvyaśrayakāvya, 68

E

Ecclesiastical department, 129-130
Election of kings, 34-35
Epigraphical sources of information, 31-33
Expenditure of the state, 201-203

F

Feudatories, 212; grades of feudatories, 213; feudatories
appointed to high posts, 214; assumption of imperial titles
by, 215; status of feudatories 214; feudatories entertain-
ing Political Agent, 215; restriction by the Political
Agent, 216; relation between
the imperial power and
feudatories, 216-217; feu-
datories participating in the
wars of their feudal lords,
217-219; control of the
paramount power over them,
219-221; sub-feudatories,
221;
Finance department, 126
Fines, 200
Firishtah, 5
Foreign minister, 119
Fort Commander, 154

G

Gamāgamika, 120
Gambling tax, 193
Gaulmika, 114, 132
Gaurī, 41
Ghāṅaka, 188
Gokāra, 190
Gokulikā, 125
Gopāla, his election, 34
Goshti, 167-168
Grahaśānti, 54
Grāsabhūmi, 73

H

Harem, 113
Head man of the village, 159-161
Heredity among ministers, 86
Hiraṇyasāmudāyika, 125
House tax, 192

I

Incidence of land tax, 178
Income from state property, 197-200
Infantry commander, 115
Inspection officers, 108
Irrigation tax, 193

J

Jābatā, 8-9
Jalakara, 193
Judicial courts, 208-211
Jurisprudence principles, 207-208
Jyautishika, 112

K

Kāmandaka-nītiśāra; its date,
2-3; general nature, 12-13
Karanika, 124
Kauptika, 158
Khala, 121
King, qualities and qualifications, 45-47; divinity of the
king, 47-50; functions, 50-51; titles, 58-60; checks upon
the king, 61, 63-65; king
as a trustee, 19, 62; king as servant of the people, 63; his privy purse, 66; abdication and suicide, 67-69; head of the judicial administration, 204-5; Kingship, hereditary, 34-36; order of succession, 36-42; selection of suvarāja during lifetime of the king, 36-38; women’s right of succession, 40-42; training of the princes, 43-44; 
Koshādhyaksha, 126; 
Koshṭhāgarādhyaksha, 179; 
Koṭikā, 188; 
Koṭapāla, 118; 
Koyikara, 5; 
Ksetrapa, 124; 
Kula court, 209; 
Kumārāmātya, 81; 
Kūpaka, 188.

Land tax in cash, 179-180; 
Land tax in instalments, 180; 
Lekhaka, 207.

Mahābhogik, 125; 
Mahādauhasādhanaika, 121; 
Mahādharmanādhikaraṇika, 129; 
Mahādhamādhyaksha, 129; 
Mahāganastha, 117; 
Mahākaraṇika, 123; 
Mahākṣapaṭalika, 123; 
Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara, 151; 
Mahāmudrādhiḥkṛita, 120; 
Mahāmauhūrtika, 113; 
Mahāpiḷipaṭi, 117; 
Mahāpratīṭi, 124; 
Mahāpratīṭhāra, 111; 
Mahāpruḥhita, 112; 
Mahārāja gurū, 112; 
Mahāsādhanaika, Mahāvasā- 
dhanika, 116; 
Mahāsandhīvigrāhika, 121; 
Mahātaka, 129; 
Mahāvyūhapati, 117; 
Māṇaka, 187; 
Mānasollāsā of Someśvara; its date, 2; general features, 25-28; 
Maṇḍala, 146; 
Maṇḍala administration, 151; 
Maṇḍaleśvara, 150; 
Mantri, 97-99; 
Mārgaṇaka, 193; 
Maryādādhurya, 118; 
Maula-bala, 137; 
Military department, 114-119; 
Ministry, 78; Nīti writers on ministry, 78-80; epigraphs on ministry, 80; ministers under provincial government 80-81; influence of the ministry, 81-84; minister’s qualifications, 84-87; hereditary ministry, 87-88; strength of ministry, 90; views of Nīti writers on its strength, 91; functioning of the ministry, 101-105; consultation with the ministry, 102; routine working of the ministry, 102; transfer of minister from one department to another 102; minister in charge of two departments, 102; business of the council, 104-105; relation between the king and the ministers, 105; powers of the ministers, 105-106; 
Minority administration, 42-43; 
Mūtaka, 187.

Nagarapati, 153; his qualifications, 154; 
Naimittika, 112; 
Nākādhīyaksha, 119.
Nāyaka, 117
Nitivākyāmṛita of Somadeva, its general features, 21-22
Nṛṣāmanta, 214

O

Octroi duties, 186
Ownership of land, 181-83
Ownership of arable land, 184-85
Ownership in waste, fallow, pasture, marshy lands, over mountains, hills and vales, over treasure-troves, forests, trees, state buildings, and on rivers, 197-200.

P

Pallikā, pailā, 188
Paṅchakūla, 155
Paṅchamahāśabdas, 83
Paṅchāyatanā, worship, 11
Paṇḍita, 100, 130
Paṇyabhūṣulka, 189
Parighā, 15
Parīkā, 15
Paṭakas, 149
Pathaka, 147, 148
Pattala, 147
Paṭṭakila, 159
Paṭṭakiladāva, 195
Pattipāla, 114
Popular courts, 208-209
Prabhāvakacharita, 68
Pradhāna, 94-96
Prādvivāka, 99, 128, 205
Pramāṭrī, 124
Prāntapāla, 118
Pratihāra, 111
Pratijāgaranaṇaka, 149
Pratindidi, 94
Pravanikara, 186
Pravanivāda 186
Provincial administration, 150
Pūga Court 209
Purāṇas—as source of information, 29-31
Purohita, 92-94

R

Rājadharmaṇḍa of Kṛityakalpataaru, its date, 2 ; general nature, 23-25
Rājakīyabhoga, 73
Rājaniti of chitnis, 8
Rājasūya, 52
Rāyachintaka, 75
Raṇabhāṇḍāgarādhikaraṇa, 118
Ratnī, 52
Record office, 108
Remission on taxation, 174
Revenue department, 122 ; Revenue minister, 123
Road tax, 189
Rūpaka, 187

S

Sabhāgabhogakarṇa, 178
Sabhya, 205, Sabhys to be Brāhmaṇas, 206
Sachiva, 96-97
Sāhāni, 116
Sāhasrika, 116, 132
Sahāya or sainya forts, 15
Salt tax, 190
Sāmanta, 10, 214
Samastarājyaprakriyopeta, 75
Sambhārapa, 113
Sanirgamapraevaṇa, 185
Śarvadarśi, 94
Śatāṅka, 115, 132
Saudhāgehādhipa, 111
Śaukika, 127, 185
Śaunika, 128
Śayāypāla, 113
Secretariat, 107 ; qualifications of secretariat officials, 107 ; working of the secretariat 108 ; Secretariat looking after land-transactions, 109-110
Sellachakra, 116
Senāpati and Mahāsenāpati, 114
Shashṭhādhitīra, 125
Shivaji’s ministry, 8
Shop tax, 189
Silver coin weighing 100 rattiś, 4-5
Silver pala, 11
Sodraṅgaḥ, 117
Sources of revenue, 175, 175
State compared to the limbs of body, 18; state regarded as a living organism, 18
Sthāna, 158
Sugandhā, 41
Śukranītisāra, date, 3-11; officers, 7, 14; kinds of documents mentioned in it, 14-15; social organisation, 15; points of resemblance and difference between the Arthaśāstra and the Śukranīti, 15-17; income of different grades of rulers mentioned in Śukranīti, 5-6 discussion about gun and gun-powder, 5; State in Śukranīti, 17-18; 20-21; King in Śukranīti, 18-19; succession in Śukranīti, 19; ministers in Śukranīti, 19-20 Śukra on Zemindari system, 179
Sumantra, 100
Sūtrādhyaksha, 128
Suvarṇādhyaksha, 128
Svarāṭ, 5

T
Tantrapāla, 108
Tarīka or Tarapati, 127
Taxation, views of Nārada, Aparārka and Śukra, 61-62
Taxes in kind assigned to local officers, 187
Taxes on leaves, fruits, oil, load, cloth and cotton fabrics 187
Taxes on butter, sugar, candied sugar and jaggary, 188
Tax on cattle breeding, 189
Tax on dancing girls, 193
Tax on mines, 190
Temple tax, 189
Territorial divisions, 145-150
Town administration, 153-59; town committees, 155, town wards, 156; executive of town committee, 157; strength of the executive, 157-158; sources of revenue of town committee, 158-159
Treasury department, 125
Triḥuvanamahādevī, 41, 43
Turushkadanḍa, 196

U
Uddhāra, 177
Udraṅga, 177
Uparīka, 145, 150
Uparikara, 177, 178

V
Vaidya, 112
Vājapeya, 52
Vāpa, 187
Vāra, 157
Vetradhara, 111
Vijayanagar, 5; officers in Vijayanagar kingdom, 7; territorial divisions, 7
Village headman, 159-60; duties of the village headman, 161-162; village disputes, 162; village office, 164; village accountant, 164-65; village paṇchakula, 166-166; its subcommittees, 167-168; its procedure, 169,
sources of revenue, 170; Warden of the marches, 118
village pañchāyata, 210-211 Waste land, ownership of, 197
Vināyakaśānti, 54 Wine Tax, 190
Virāṭ, 3 Women as ruling monarchs, 41-42
Vishaya, 145 Y
Vishayikadāya, 195 Yuvtikalpataru of Bhoja, its
Vishayāmahattara, 153 general features, 28-29
Vishṭi, 191-192 Yuvarāja, 69, 71-75
vṛitti, 148

War minister, 96
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>should be</td>
<td>should not be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>sarvadā</td>
<td>sarvaād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>treasury</td>
<td>treasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>thna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>impotence</td>
<td>importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>shaṇḍha</td>
<td>shaṇḍa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>vāgraṇa</td>
<td>vāgra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>rājye</td>
<td>raje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>falling</td>
<td>failing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>covetousness</td>
<td>covetousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>looked</td>
<td>look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>considerably</td>
<td>considerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>principal</td>
<td>principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>waning</td>
<td>waving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>brakes</td>
<td>breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>enjoying</td>
<td>enjoining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>describes</td>
<td>describes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>pondering</td>
<td>pondering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>probably</td>
<td>probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>It is</td>
<td>It it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>dependants</td>
<td>dependents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>predilections</td>
<td>predilections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>records</td>
<td>recdrds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>councils</td>
<td>councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>fishermen</td>
<td>fisherman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>