CHAPTER - I
POLITY AND GOVERNMENT

Section (i) : Origin and Types of States

The Jain literature of our period, though vast and varied, offer but little information of spectacular nature regarding the administration and polity of contemporary India. As a matter of fact, we hardly notice any conspicuous difference between the political systems of the Gupta and post-Gupta periods. It may be said, that the system propounded by the Smriti and Nitisāstra writers was followed, but with certain modifications.

As we know, the Jain conception of the origin of the state is somewhat different from that of the Brahmans. Jinasena, the author of the Adipurāṇa (an 8th century work) records the tradition which mentions the existence of an idyllic state (bhagabhumi) wherein people had all their desires fulfilled by wish yielding trees (Kal/navṛkha). Gradually, with the change of time, the Kal/navṛkha began to disappear and discord appeared in the tranquil life of the world. Perplexed, people turned to an eminent person of their age to resolve their difficulties. According to the Jains, their had been born twelve such eminent persons called patriarchs (kulakara) in the transition era. When all the Kal/navṛkha entirely disappeared, it was Rshabhadeva, the first exponent of the Jaina faith, who introduced six occupations: martial, agricultural, literary, artistic, commercial and industrial. He also divided the people on earth into three classes viz. Kshatriya, Vaiśya and Sudra according to their professions. He also established law and order over the world. Rshabhadeva also planned and built villages and towns, arranging them into groups of eight hundred, four hundred and two hundred. He also created four great monarchies and placed
under them a thousand smaller kings and feudatories. He founded institutions of punishment which were light at first and later became more severe. Jinasena opined that for the preservation of man a coercive authority was necessary and absence of such controlling power results in Matsyanyaya (law of fish). Thus, a state of orderliness was gradually established. It was not the result of divine creation. It is on this moot point that the Jain theory of the origin of the state differs from the Brahmanical one. A story told in the Mahabharata depicts the god Narayana creating a son from his Tejas (Lustre) called Virajas, one of whose descendants, Prthu was crowned king and endowed with divine virtues. The above account of the Mahabharata clearly shows that the state was regarded as a divine institution. The Jainistic view, on the contrary, excludes the idea of divine creation and maintains that political and social institutions were the outcome of changed circumstances. Nor is there any indication that the government was instituted by any definite contract. From the statement of the Adipurana we find that the so-called modern factors — sovereignty, population and territory of the state were considered essential for the existence of the state in that remote age too.

Let us now turn our attention to the basic elements which constituted a state according to the ancient Indian authors and their Jain followers. These were seven in number and Somadeva (10th century) in his administrative manual, Nativakamrta has given an elaborate description of them. The seven important constituents are Vis. Svamin (king), Amatya (ministry), Janapada (territory), Durga (fort), Kosha (treasury), Bala (army), Mitra (allies). These constituents regarded as the limbs (Angas) of the body-politic by the Indian thinkers. During the early medieval period, almost every state, whether ruled by sovereign kings or feudal lords, exhibited these features...
In their political set-up, Mularaja, the founder of the Caulukyan empire and a well-known political figure of our period, not only possessed a ministry whom he consulted during his invasion of the Gahamana king, Vigrahara, but also a territorial state called Sarayatemadal and a fort named Kanthadurga. Needless to add, he maintained a large army and his coffers were full. The imperial Paramaras, Gahamanas and other sovereign states of this period, all embodied the above seven elements in their political system, without which it was not possible for them to function properly as a close-knit unit in their respective kingdoms.

Although monarchy was the most popular form of government of the post-Gupta times, yet the Jain texts of our period also refer to certain other types of states. Jinadesa, the author of the Mīthacūrṇi has enumerated seven kinds of states while warning Jaina monks from travelling into anarchical regions. These were (a) non-ruler states (anarāva anarāva or aralaka), (b) virarāja ruled states (virarāja), (c) kingless states (veraīa), (d) states in hostility (vīraddha-rāja), (e) Two-ruler states (doraīa), (f) republics (gana-rāja) and (g) Monarchies (raja).

Non-ruler states: Anarāva (anarāva) is defined often by scholars as a type of government where "law was to be taken as a ruler and that there should be no man-ruler". According to the Mīthacūrṇi, that state is called anarāva where coronation of the king and crown-prince had not taken place after the death of the former king. Another term for anarāva used frequently in Jain literature is aralaka. A statement of the Mahābhārata speaks disparagingly of the constitution of such aralaka states saying, "when the law would not rule, the citizens of this form of government took to monarchy". Thus, in a anarāva or aralaka state, it
was the existing law of the land which people obeyed in the absence of a proper ruler.

Yuvaraja - ruled states (Yuvarajia): Yuvarajaia was a state where sovereignty was vested in the hands of a crown-prince (Juvaraya). According to Jinadasa, that particular state was termed Yuvaraja where the crown-princes had not been formally coronated after the demise of the king and the former had not selected an heir apparent. Besides the territory bestowed upon the crown prince as Kumara-bhukti by the monarch may also be regarded as Yuvaraja-state. We have the example of prince Kunala and Samprati who were bestowed the responsibility of the city of Ujjayini as Kumara-bhukti, while emperor Asoka ruled at Pataliputra. Jayaswal is of the opinion, that in such cases, government was in all likelihood in the hands of a council of regency, the sovereign being immature.

Kingless states (vairajia): The term vairajia or vairalva may be rendered as the 'kingless constitution' denoting a democratic form of government. The Nisatha Gupti gives various definitions for the word such as states in mutual hostility, or states captured by enemy, or states which were kingless due to the death or abdication of the king, or a state where the king is forsaken by all his śvāras (śvēvasāra), that is the servants (śvēvas). The last definition is of some constitutional importance as the word śvāras (śvēvasāra) is specially explained as 'the servants' (śvēva-ītyarthah) which suggests that they were probably representatives of the people. The above definition to a considerable degree corroborates the passage of the Altareya Brahmana which states, "in this type of government the whole country or nation (janaṇadāh) took
throne, and struggling hard to appropriate the kingdom, violence being
the only means to decide the issue? Kautilya characterises *dvairāja* or the 'rule of the two' as "a constitution of rivalry and mutual conflict leading to final destruction". The author of the *Nisītha Cūrṇī* also speaks disfavourably of a *dērāja*.

**Republics (gana-rajā) :** In ancient India, *gana-rajā* implied a form of government where the sovereign power was vested in the hands of a *gana* or a group of people. The religious *ganas* or *sanghas* of the Jaina and Buddhist Orders were based on this concept of government. In the *Nisītha Cūrṇī* we find references to the *gana* of the Mallas and the Sārasvatīs. The *Abhirā-viśhaya* has also been mentioned which we know was a republic under the Guptas. However, it may be added that the republics during our period ceased to exist and monarchy was the most popular form of government.

**Monarchies (rajā) :** This particular type of government was most common in India in the early medieval period. The area ruled by a single king was known as *rajā* where the authority of the king was considered to be indispensable for the welfare of the state. Many of the great literati of this period, both Jaina and classical, refer to several illustrious contemporary monarchs from whom they received patronage and encouragement in their scholarly pursuits.

Section (ii) : The King

Kingship in India existed from the time of the composition of the earlier hymns of *Rgveda*. We learn of kings such as Divodāsa, Sudās, Purukutsa and others who ruled over comparatively small kingdoms. With
the gradual dissemination of the Indo-Aryans all over the sub-continent, larger states like Kuru, Panchala, Kosala, Matsya, Videha, Vidarbha etc., slowly emerged. By the time of the composition of the epics and Puranas, practically the entire Uttarapatha was Aryanised and most of the states came under the monarchical system. During the Buddhist period a few republican states made their struggling appearance, but with passage of time, these too, were absorbed by powerful monarchies.

Our Smriti and Nitiśāstra writers have laid down certain norms for the guidance of kings and only in very rare cases, were these rules flouted. We should remember that the kings of our period (600 A.D. - 1000 A.D.) enjoyed unlimited power like their Gupta predecessors, but only a few dared to misuse it. The modern saying "power corrupts, and absolute corrupts absolutely" perhaps does not pertain to the kings of the early medieval period as the rulers by and large were not tyrannical. Fortunately for us, a celebrated Jain writer of this time viz. Somadeva, has left for posterity an invaluable political treatise called Nitiśākārṇa which gives an authentic picture of the political system prevailing in India in his time.

The King of our period is considered to be the pivot of government and the nucleus of all state activities. Somadeva remarks, "without him not a single prakṛti (constituent) can function properly, however, well it may be equipped". Our author also openly declares that "the king indeed has no equal and should be regarded as god. He bows his head only to his gurus" evidently meaning parents. In the Nitiśāka Gūrti, the words of a king are quoted as "although not the Lord of the
Such utterances easily indicate that the kings' complete sovereignty over the state was recognised. Kshatriyas alone were regarded as eligible for kingship. Yuan Chwang also remarks: "The sovereignty for many successive generations had been exercised only by the Kshatriya, rebellion and regicide have occasionally arisen, other castes, assuming the distinction, but in practice non-Kshatriyas also sometimes assumed power. The Parâśas of this time invariably refer to the Śūdra kings who were ruling over certain parts of the country during this Kali age.

A true king is one who is the repository of all the merits. According to Somadeva, an ideal king should be a man of religious temperament with good family traditions, endowed with a pure character, dignity and valour. His living should be based on righteous means. He should be free to wield his power of wrath and mercy and should be able to display the superiority of himself over others. Besides these, a few more added qualifications are sought by Jinadāsa, author of the Māñjñā Tuṇḍī. He opines that a real king should be of pure heritage (upbhava - kula - viśuddha), should belong to high Kshatriya family (udita-kulavijñāna-gabhūta), and be properly coronated either by the previous king or by the subjects (muddhābhisita).

As the kingpin of the administration was the monarch himself, it was therefore necessary that he should be exceedingly knowledgeable and versatile. Somadeva therefore lays great stress on the perfect education of the king. According to him, anarchy was preferable to the rule of an illiterate and ignorant potentate. Kautilya, the renowned author of the Arthasastra also emphasizes the necessity of a proper education when he
declares,42a "in view of maintaining efficient discipline he (the king) shall ever and invariably keep company with aged professors of sciences, in whom alone discipline has its firm root". In the same section we are told by Kautilya45 that even "during the rest of the day and night, he shall not only receive new lessons and revise old lessons, but also hear over and over again what has not been clearly understood". This account on the king's education is also to be found in the Rājāvansa44 where we are told that all the four princes received due education in their youth under the able tutelage of Vasistha. However, the most detailed and interesting account of the education of a prince is given in the early 7th century work of Bāna viz. the well known Kādambī. We learn from this work45 that the prince Candrapīda was sent to a school (vidvāṃśīra), specially built for him near the capital along with his friends (kulaputras i.e. belonging to noble families) at the tender age of six. This particular vidvāṃśīra was in the charge of several acarvas (teachers), versed in different branches of learning. The following subjects, according to Bāna, were taught in that institution - grammar, dharmāstiya, kāśṭhā, vāyavasā, (physical exercise) war-science,46 (it included training in following weapons - cēna, cakka, cārma, kroṣana, sakti, tonara, rarena, cādē and other war-implements) chariot, elephant and horse-riding, music47 (the musical instruments included vīna, venu, suraja, kārava-balīa, dardura, rute etc.), nyāsaśāstra, gāndaṃvya, bāstisikha, science concerning horses, puruṣālaśāstra, citrāvaka, vayravacchika, patakonvāra, lekhavakara, dvītīkāla, sandhaśāstra, salipurāṇa, arhacarita, ratnaraśikha, dārukāraṇa, dantavāpāra, vāstravāṇa, āvurya, menṭremprayoga, vishāṣṭhaśheśa, suṣrūccepādheśa, tareṇa, laṅchana, ārohana, ratitentre, Indrājīla, kathā, hatake, ākhāvīka, kāvya, Mahābhārata, Purāṇa, itihāsa,
Ramayana, sarvalipi, language, sīlpa, chandes etc. It is interesting to note that according to Bana, none except the royal parents of Candrapāda were allowed to visit him during his ten-years residence in that school. The school building had only one gate, which discouraged any sort of trespassing. Needless to say, the prince underwent an extremely rigorous training under the tutelage of a select band of teachers. The famous Jain saint, Jinasena I, in his Adipurāṇa informs us that not only the sons of Rasabha were educated in different subjects, but also his daughters, received special training in grammar and līlāśāstra. The Adipurāṇa further enlightens us that king Rasabha taught his sons various śāstras, a number of which like Bhāratasāstra, music, sandhīvaraśāstra, citrakāla, vṛtra, karmāṇī (in Bana's work we get the expression ratītantra), purnahalakshana, śāryavya, śaṅkavya, ratnapārīkṣa etc. also occur in the Kadambari. This reminds us of the sixty-four Arts of Vatsyāyana's Kamasūtra and the seventy-two Arts of the Jain canonical texts.

Like his eminent predecessor, Jinasena I, the author of the Nītiyākṣavarte also outlines the kind of education that was essential for a potent king. Somadeva considers that a king should be instructed in four branches of learning consisting of the knowledge of self (ānvikshā), śreyā or the knowledge of the four Vedas, sīkṣā, kalpa, vājāna, mīrakte, chandes, āvadhisā and itiḥāsa, Purāṇa, Mahāmya, Bhāva and dharmaśāstra etc., vārtā the science of agriculture, cattle-breeding and commerce and dandanīti or the principles of politics. Stressing the importance of these four vīdās, Somadeva elaborates that a person who studies ānvikshā can rationally examine all practicable and impracticable matters, does not despair in crisis and is not spoilt by good fortune.
was a contemporary of Haribhadra (8th century) asks kings not to indulge in the following vices (vatasana) - women, dice, wine, hunting, rude speech, severe punishment and misappropriation of the royal funds. Somadeva in his Nitiyakamrta strongly censures a king who is too much attached to women. He cites several instances of kings who were killed by their queens. Dice-playing was another veritable source of danger. In the Mahabharata we have well-known examples of Yudhishthira and Nala. All the great Brahmanical authorities like Kautilya, Manu, and Kananda have mentioned this particular vice. Wine, women, gambling and hunting are the four principal vices which according to Manu are to be strictly avoided. The same authority asserts that gamblers are open rogues and the king should not show any leniency towards them. Elsewhere also we get a similar statement. As regards wine-drinking, our law-givers are less liberal than our poets and dramatists. It is, however, doubtful whether the kings of pre-Muslim India ever forsook liquor. Kautilya believes that drinking is a more heinous practice than addiction to women. Rude speech has also been condemned by all law-givers. Somadeva clearly states that rude speech was worse than an injury caused by a weapon. The author of the Nisatha Gauri comments that rude speech was dangerous as it created dissatisfaction amongst the intelligentia and could bring destruction to a state. Jinadasa also asks kings to refrain from giving severe punishment (atiuggaderha). Misappropriation of funds has also been strongly disapproved by both Jinadasa and Somadeva. In Kashmirian history, told in the Rajatarangini, we are confronted with the example of king Jayapida (8th century) in the later part of his reign, who was ruined because he had plundered the wealth of his subjects. Another glaring example
is that of King Harsha (11th century) who was much worse than Jayapida in this respect.\textsuperscript{78}

Somadeva, while giving a detailed explanation of these vices (\textit{vyasana}) asserts, "A single \textit{vyasana} is enough to destroy a powerful king who may be possessing four kinds of armies, needless to say if all of them are combined".\textsuperscript{79}

The king, undoubtedly occupied the highest position in the body-politic of the state. He was the supreme head of all military, judicial, political and administrative activity in the kingdom. Dhanapala, the celebrated Jain author of the \textit{Tilakamaniari} gives us a realistic account of the daily routine followed by a king. Let us remember that although this work was apparently written in the first quarter of the 11th century, its author wrote his earlier work \textit{Paivalacch\textregistered} in Vikrama 1029 corresponding to 972 A.D., when Manyakheta was sacked by the Malava army.\textsuperscript{80} He was not only honoured by Bhoja but also by Munja, who died before 995 A.D. Thus, his evidence may be said to pertain to our period. From his description, it appears, that the first few hours of the day was spent by the king in personal purification and devotion to gods and religious teachers. Then he granted interviews to all important persons and officials like religious Brahmans, ministers, feudatories, kinsmen and other citizens. Here the king dealt with important and secret business of his kingdom, and also held talks with foreign ambassadors and gave donations to the needy people. After this, he generally visited the temples of the city and inspected the departments of public works. At mid-day, he returned to his palace and after distributing food and alms to mendicants, he took his bath with meticulous care and then his meal, which was
specially prepared for him. Then he retired to the picture galleries (deuta-valabhika) for enjoyment and relaxation. There he enjoyed music and poetic discussions. In the afternoon, he attended the general court (aathanamandapa) where he transacted the business of state, interviewed foreign potentates and met the general public. Sometimes, purely as a part of royal duty, he attended wrestling matches, elephant fights and other such pastimes. Thus, he passed the day in this manner and retired to bed in the late evening.

The Prabandhacintamani informs us that king Bhoja often met the general public and on such occasions his durbar was open to all and sundry. There was a danamandapa (translated as 'Pavilion of distribution' by Tawney) from which he used to distribute wealth to the poor.

There are indications in the Jain works of our period which show that the kings of early medieval India were seldom autocratic rulers. They had great respect for the sentiment of their subjects. A story recorded in the Kuvalayanala shows that a king did not hesitate to send his son to the execution ground for committing adultery with the daughter-in-law of a merchant. Such deference for a subject's feelings is also proved by the earlier stories of Asamanjas narrated in the Mahabharata, and that of Sita's banishment by Rama in the last book of the Ramayana. Another anecdote of the Kuvalayanala reveals how a king with the assistance of the crown-prince did his best to protect his subjects from the depredation by robbers. Such examples can easily be multiplied. They clearly prove that the early medieval kings of India like the famous monarchs of the epico-puranic period,
did not leave any stone unturned to alleviate the sufferings of their subjects. In fact, we come across the expression *durbalānam balaṁ rūjā* in the *Kuvalavamāla* itself.  

Not only was the king mindful of his people's welfare and conscious of his duties towards them, it was also necessary for him to obtain the counsel of his ministers in matters of administration. Somadeva says that it is impolitic for a king to neglect the counsel of his ministers. Such a king will soon find himself overwhelmed by foes. His obstinacy will plunge him into ruin. The next check on royal despotism was in the form of the feudal nobility and prominent persons of the state, who aided by the people could defy a tyrannical monarch through armed rebellion.  

Somadeva in his *Nītīvākṛṣṭa* states that realization of *trīyarga* i.e. *Dharma, Artha* and *Kāma* was the ideal of a state. A king was advised to follow these moderately so as not to injure the interests of each other.  

One of the foremost duties of a king is his executive functions. The *Niśīthā Cūrṇi* tells us that the important officials of the state and members of the personal staff were appointed by the king himself; he fixed their salaries and could also give increment in recognition of meritorious services. The king was the Lord of the treasury and the coffer of an able monarch was supposed to be always full. The king was authorised to levy taxes, he could also excuse or allow the same to be paid later. The chief duty of the king was to protect the people from both external and internal dangers and to see that law and order prevailed in society.
Somadeva says, "He is a king who takes the place of Indra towards the well-disposed and the place of Yama against the ill-disposed. For, the king's duty is to punish the wicked and protect the learned and well-behaved, not shaving his head or wearing matted hair. Moreover, the author of the Nātivākyamṛta feels that to ensure life and order, he (the king) should wield his danda neither sternly nor tenderly but impartially. Jinadāśa, on the other hand, comments that a king unable to discharge the function of protecting the state and its people, deserved to be condemned. He further quotes the famous dictum - "How can king be a king who does not protect the state (ko rāvā yo na rakkhati)." Somadeva appears to agree whole-heartedly with his predecessor when he states, "the king should adopt all possible measures to protect the world, that alone is counted as the basis of kingship. The king however, not only protected the state from external and internal hazards but also from natural calamities. We learn from the Puratana-prabandha-sangraha that Visaladeva the Vāghelā king, averted a famine by timely help.

Besides his role of protector of the nation, the king had other arduous duties to perform. Though assisted by a commander-in-chief (mahabaladākrtī), the king was the ultimate head of the army. He often led his armies to the battle-field in person. This act of personally leading his troops has been compared by Somadeva with the Aṣvamedha sacrifice.

The king was also the supreme authority on all judicial matters, and his judgement could not be overruled. The laws of the country were framed by the king according to the customs of the land. Any person defying these laws was liable to severe punishment.
There are several instances in the Niaitha Cūrnī, a 7th century text, which show the king confiscating the property of the people, banishing them or even putting them to death for trivial offences. In this connexion a passage of the Buddhist text Milinda-panha written in the early centuries of the Christian era, is quite illustrative. According to this passage, even for a minor offence against the king, the offender could be killed along with his entire family. From these statements, it is apparent, that kings enjoyed great power, but, as we have already seen, there were certain restrictions imposed by our lawgivers and political theorists, to prevent them from becoming tyrannical.

Apart from the above functions, the king was also responsible for the social, cultural and moral well-being of his subjects. Quite often we find kings giving donations to Brahmans, organizing religious debates, administering judgements on such debates, arranging various festivals and also participating in social functions. Patronage of arts, education etc. was also an integral part of a king’s daily life. Many of these early medieval kings like Paramāra Mūnja, Bhoja etc., were renowned for the honour they conferred on men of letters. Dhanapāla, the poet of the work, Tilakamāñjari, speaking of himself, says, that he was honoured by king Mūnja with the title of Sarasvati. In addition to Dhanapāla, Amitagati, the author of the Suhasita-ratna-sandoha and other works, Padmapāta, the writer of the Nava-Sahasāṅka-carita, Dhanenjaya, the composer of Dasarūpaka, his brother Dhanika, the author of Dasarūpāvaloka, Halāyuḍha, the commentator on Pingala’s work on metrics, were among the jewels that adorned the court of Vakpati Mūnja. Mūnja, himself, was no mean literary figure and several Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Apabhramśa verses ascribed to him are
preserved in the Prabandha-intamani and the Puratan-prabandha-sangracha. His very epithet 'vakoati' is significant and indicates his love for the Goddess of Learning.

Another sacred duty of the king was to ensure proper maintenance of the āramas and provide the monks and recluses with necessary requirements. The author of the Nisitha Curni, echoing the sentiments of Kalidāsa asserts, "the hermits are to be protected by the king (raya-rakkhiyani ya tevedhanāni) and also believes that any physical injury to the hermits could bring disgrace to the king. This concern for the welfare of cenobites formed a part of the king's religious duties. Though not the head of a religion or Church, the king exercised a great influence in religious matters. The preachers of various religious sect always tried to influence the king with their own tenets in order to convert him to their faith. There existed a strong conviction that "the subjects follow the king in every matter including religion". Somadeva, however, lays great stress on the king's religious duties. Not only should he apply himself to the study of svadharmasa and travi but also protect the svadharma of his subjects whereby he can realize trivarga. Svadharma is the particular duty of each individual, in every group. In this respect, the 10th-century author of the Nitiyaksmritsa also enumerates samasa-dharma, i.e. the duties common to all castes such as kindness, truthfulness, obtaining from other's property etc. By protecting the svadharma and samasa-dharma of his subjects, the king receives one-sixth of the religious merit of his people. Barring a few exceptions, the kings of this age were not sectarian
or hostile towards religions other than their own. The monarchs of the early medieval period usually professed one of the contemporary religious systems and their religious seal is apparent from the large sums of money that were spent in the erection of temples dedicated to their favourite deities and saints.

Thus, we may conclude that the duties and functions of the king were as varied as his powers, and that a high moral and spiritual standard was required of him. Occasional references to unworthy and inimical sovereigns (duttharaya, ravadatta, vasaninarimda)\textsuperscript{115} show that not all kings lived up to the ideal set for them.

Before a new king was installed on the throne certain rituals and celebrations were performed. Abhisheka or anointing was the first among them. Jinadāsa, in the Nisitha Cūṛa comments that the coronation of a king or emperor was styled mahabhishēka while that of the crown-prince or feudatory was known as abhisheka.\textsuperscript{116}

The Jains, though they have little faith in the Vedic rituals, advocate a simple ceremony of anointing. Water from the Ganga, Sindhu and other rivers (sacred to the Brāhmaṇas) mixed with camphor, sandal and the essence of different kinds of flowers was poured on the head of the monarch by other kings, feudatories, ministers, merchants, princes and other respectable citizens. The members of the eighteen guilds performed the anointing of the king's feet only. The ascetics of all the religious sects also called on the king at the time of his coronation.\textsuperscript{117} So, the Mūrabhishāktas only were regarded as true kings. On this
auspicious occasion, the capital was astir with songs, music and dance. The king possessed certain royal insignia like chhatra (royal umbrella), cânara (a pair of flywhisks) and simhâsana (throne) which indicated his regal power.

In the early medieval period, kings assumed high sounding titles. As early as the Mauryan times, even mighty emperors like Asoka were content with the title râja, but, it seems, gradually from the Kusâna period the appellation 'king of kings' (raja-râja) grew popular. The Gupta monarchs as evident from their epigraphs and coins assumed the popular title of mahârajâdhirâja. In the Bhaṭṭagīpta, written in the early 6th century A.D. Dravyavardhana, the king of Avanti is given the same title. The epigraphs of our period show kings investing themselves with titles such as paramabhâttâraka, paramesâvara, mahârajâdhirâja and many other epithets connected with their religious belief. The Caulukya kings for example, assumed such titles as Dvâpati-varalabhâpasâda, siddharâja, paramesâvara, tribhuvanâganda, mahârajâdhirâja, paramabhâttâraka, Parvati-prâvaralabhâpasâda, etc.

For the Jain emperor Kumbhrâpala we have some special titles in the Jain epigraphs and colophons; for example, asprâvaka, Jinasanaprabhâvaka and paramârâvaka etc. The contemporary Paramâra and Kalacuri kings also assumed various titles. For example, Paramâra Manjâ had the title Sarasvatî. The Jain works of our period also confer flamboyant titles on the kings. In the Kuvalayâsâla, king Drâhavardhana is given the titles of mahârajâdhirâja and paramesâvara which remind us of the titles of the famous king Harshavardhana. A peculiar epithet mahârajâdhirâja is attributed to one Vijaya-sena in the Kuvalayâsâla. From the Jain manuscripts of the medieval period we
learn of many such lofty titles of kings. These designations, however, not only bestowed upon the king a divine prestige and right to rule over the people, but also surrounded his person and position with an aura of invincibility and magnificence that would awe any ordinary mortal.

The evidence of Yuan Chwang, as mentioned earlier, clearly shows that in the seventh century not only Kshatriyas but also Brāhmaṇas, Vaiśyas and even Sudra kings reigned in different parts of this sub-continent. This pattern apparently remained unchanged even in the later period.

That kingship was hereditary is known not only from contemporary inscriptions but also from the Jain works of our time. However, it should not be supposed that the eldest son always succeeded his father. Somadeva emphatically states that no prince should be installed as heir-apparent, howsoever well-born he may be, unless he is qualified for the great trust. During our period this dictum was followed to a large extent. We know from the Harshacarita that because of his exemplary qualities Harsha was able to achieve the distinction of wearing the crown of Thanesvar; similarly the Paramāra king Mūṇja, appointed his nephew Bhōja as his successor owing to the latter's good qualities. Likewise, the Gaulukya Durlabhaharāja installed his nephew Bhīma I on the throne, who, in turn, bestowed the crown on his second son Karna.

As regards succession, Somadeva gives the following order of inheritance - son, brother, step-brother, paternal uncle,
daughter's son (dauhitra) and in the absence of all of them a qualified outsider could succeed the king. Very often, heirless kings were advised by their ministers to beget sons through monks.

Another way of selecting an heir to a vacant throne was by 'Divine-will'. In this form of succession a royal horse or elephant was invested with all the auspicious articles required for the coronation and was left by the officials to roam about the city to select a suitable person. In the story of the robber Muladeva told in the Niṣṭhā Cūrtī we have a beautiful example of such practice. Jinādāsa tells us that when the robber Muladeva was being taken round the city before his execution, the royal horse and an elephant which had been released, as the king had died issue-less, upon meeting the prisoner behaved strangely. The horse neighed and turned its back towards him, whilst the elephant trumpeted and sprinkled sacred water over his body and placed him on its back. He was then publicly proclaimed as their sovereign by the royal bards and ministers. Many such instances are found in the Jain and other ancient texts.

Usually the wish of a departing king was respected and this is proved by the Allahabad Prāsasti of Samudragupta, according to which, Samudragupta was especially selected by his father to succeed him, a decision which made a few princes of equal birth (tulvatula) unhappy but not the members of the court (sabhya) who applauded the decision of the dying king (in this case Candragupta I) with deep sighs of happiness. Govinda III, the redoubtable Raṣṭrakūṭa king, although not the eldest son, succeeded his father to the throne. Sometimes, however, the dying king's wishes were not
honoured as in the instance of Kumārapāla. Also we know that, at
times, extraordinary circumstances resulted in the people themselves
choosing their leader. Here, we may cite the example of Gopāla I
(8th century) king of Bengal and founder of the Pala dynasty, who was
selected by the people because of the prevailing matsvanvā
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in the kingdom. As we have noted earlier, this particular
expression matsvanvā occurs in the Adhinurana of Jinasena I,
a contemporary Jain work. In case the heir-apparent was a minor,
we find the queen mother officiated as regent.

Kings are sometimes depicted, by a few Jain works
of our period, as abdicating in favour of the heir-apparent and
spending their lives in religious pursuits. The Prabhāvakāranka
states that king Āmas, successor of Yaśovarman of Kanauj, renounced
his crown in favour of his son, Dunduka, and spent his life in pious
activities. Similarly, the Dvārakā-kavva relates that king
Durlabhārāja relinquished the throne to his nephew Bhima and adopted
a devout life. Likewise, Bhima I is known to have abdicated in
favour of his second son Karna.

Princes, i.e. the king's sons, were variously called
rajaspatra, kumāra, prasakumāra, maharajakumāra in Jain literature
and inscriptions. The crown prince or jñavarāja after completing
his studies was usually given charge of an office to gain
experience in administration. There are instances in Jain colophons
and inscriptions which show princes sharing in the administration
with their father. Younger princes were normally granted certain
portions of the state for their maintenance.
Section (iii): Personal Officers of the King

The Nisitha Carpi and the Tilakamaniari, two well-known works of our period, draw a vivid picture of the royal palace and give a list of officers connected with the upkeep and management. Rajakula signifying the palace and its surroundings was the centre of state-politics. The palace (bhavana, pāgaia) was provided with every conceivable amenities for comfort, was surrounded by walls and moats (prākara, parikha) and was guarded by royal guards (arākkhiva - purisā). It was decorated with gardens and parks, and its floor was studded with precious stones and jewels. Skilled architects (vaddhakiravana) were employed to plan the royal palace in such a manner that the temperature did not vary throughout the year. According to the Tilakamaniari, the charge of the palace was entrusted to an experienced officer known as saudhapāla, but the entrance and exit of the palace was guarded by the dyārapāla.

The most important part of the royal household was the Harem. The chief queen was known as rājamahisī (rannomahisī) or mahādevī. Probably she also underwent some sort of coronation ceremony along with the king. The remark of Prabhavatidevi, the chief queen of Prabhakaravardhana in the Harshacarita is significant. She says, "Upon this head have the subservient wives of countless feudatories poured coronation water from golden ewers. This forehead, in winning the honourable fillet of chief queen, has enjoyed a thing scarce accessible to desire". According to the Nisitha-Carpi, the royal harem (oroha, amteura) was divided into three...
In the first resided the old ladies unfit for sexual relationship; the second was for the young wives in full bloom of their youth, while, the third was occupied by the daughters of the royal family who had not yet reached maturity.

Section (iv) : Council of Ministers

The Council of Ministers variously styled as *parisha* or *mantri mandala* formed an important limb of the body politic in the early medieval period. All the law-givers contend that "even an intelligent king cannot know everything, the king, therefore, should enlist the help of competent ministers". Somadeva, emphasizes the importance of the royal council by stating that, "every enterprise of the king should be preceded by deliberation with councillors" and "with the help of the council of ministers the king can achieve all the wishful objects".

Regarding the size of the ministry the earliest work to shed any light is the *Rahasya* according to which Dasaratha had eight ministers. The *Mahabharata* also recommends eight ministers; Kautilya, as apparent from a passage of his *Arthasastra* advocates a smaller ministry of three or four members, although elsewhere, he says, that the question of the size of the ministry should be left to the discretion of the king. Thus, Kautilya's statements suggest that in earlier times there existed both small and big cabinets. Manu, as quoted by Kautilya, recommends a ministry of twelve, although in the present *Manusambha* the number given is seven or eight. The *Sukra niti* advocates a
ministry of ten members. In this connection a passage of the 1st-century Buddhist work *Milindapañha* is quite relevant. According to it, among hundreds of officials of a monarch only six are genuinely important. They are senāpati, prime minister, chief justice, chief treasurer, umbrellas-bearer, and chief body-guard. This passage probably shows that all these persons were members of the king's cabinet. The exclusion of purohita is quite significant. However, in the later period, purohita came to be included in the cabinet.

A somewhat late Jain work via. the *Hamādra-Nabākavya* of Nayacakendra informs us that the ministry of Hamādra consisted of eight ministers. The well-known Jain political thinker of our period, Somadeva, in his *Nītivākyamrta* is also not sure as to the exact size of the cabinet and gives three different figures - 3, 5 and 7. Another Jain writer of this period via. Jinādāsa in the *Nisitha Cūrṇi* shares Somadeva's penchant for a small ministry by restricting the members of the king's council to 3 and 7. Jinādāsa states that the king enjoyed the rights of kingship along with the crown-prince (yuvarāja), the commander-in-chief (senāpati), the prime minister (āmatya), the purohita, the satthā and the satthavya. In this context we must refer to the observation of Medhatithi, (5th century A.D.) the celebrated commentator of Manu, that a very large ministry is undesirable. This view is also strongly supported by Somadeva, who considers that too many ministers are more of a hindrance than help to the monarch.

The councils of this period generally consisted of the king and his prime minister and other councillors like purohita, sāndhyāpupprakāśā, senāpati, mahaśatthvālīka, and yuvarāja.
Some of these persons are also included in the list of people mentioned in the Nārāyaṇa Gīta as being the senior most authorities in the state. These were the king (rāja), the crown prince (ruvarāja), prime minister (ārāca), satthi and purohita. Elsewhere in the same work, two other officials viz. senāpati (commander-in-chief) and satthavaha (chief caravan-leader) are also included in the list. Somadeva, however, discourages the inclusion of senāpati or military personnel in the council. He says, "Military authorities should not be authorities in political councils! for war-mongering leaders have a natural hankering after war".

As to the choice of ministers, all the earlier authorities are unanimous on the point that they should be of noble birth. Kautilya quotes the view of some writers like Viṣalaksha, Parāśara, Piśama, Kannapadanta, Vātavyādi and Bahundantiputra. Kautilya agrees with the last-mentioned teacher when he says that a king shall employ as ministers such as are born of high family and possessed wisdom (prajña), purity of purpose, bravery and loyal feelings, in as much as ministerial appointments shall purely depend on qualifications. Similar statements can be found everywhere in the Śanti and Anuśasanaparvan of the Mahābhārata. It is interesting to note that Kautilya never says that Brahmanas alone should be employed as ministers. However, in most cases only Brahmanas were appointed as ministers. We know from literature that even kings with Buddhistic learnings like Ajātaśatru had Brahmana ministers. Candragupta Maurya's ministry boasted the redoubtable Cāṇakya. The Nandas, who were Sudras, also employed Brahmanas as their maṇtrins. In the Gupta period we definitely know that Brahmanas served as ministers under
the kings of this imperial dynasty. The Karamdanda inscription dated G.E. 117 (436 A.D.) of the time of Kumaragupta I informs us that kumaravatya,izarasvamin, a Brahmana of the anayasigotra was the mantrip of Candragupta II. His son kumaravatya Prthivisena, in his turn was the mantrip of Kumaragupta himself. On the other hand, Somadeva, in his Nitiyavamsa tells us, that persons belonging to the three higher castes viz., Brahmaṇas, Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas were eligible to become ministers. Let us not forget that these three castes were called dvijas in ancient India. That non-Brahmanas were sometimes elevated to this enviable position, in this period, is proved by the history of the Gujarati king, Vanarāja, (8th century A.D.) who appointed one Jamba, a merchant (vaṇija) by caste as his prime minister (mahamatya). This interesting information is provided by the well-known historical poem Prabandhacintamanī of Mṛṅgūṇiga. The descendants of Jamba also held high posts during the rule of later kings of Gujarat like Siddharāja and Kumarapala. The son Vaishya Udayana called Vaśbhaṭadeva was the prime minister of Kumarapala. In other parts of India, however, we find Brahmaṇa ministers. The Buddhist Pala kings of Bengal were served by hereditary Brahmaṇa ministers as we learn from one of the Badal Pillar inscriptions. King Munja (second half of the 10th century A.D.) had Brahmaṇa Rudrācītīya as his minister.

In his Yasastilakacanọ, Somadeva cautions against appointing low-born persons as ministers. One of the reasons cited by him for the minister's corruption is that the man belonged to an oilman's family. It is therefore apparent that even Jain law-givers were aware of the importance of birth. This noted writer further
asserts that a minister should also be a native (svadesajam) of the country he served, as a foreigner cannot be trusted on vital matters. Moreover, according to Somadeva, a minister must be endowed with the following virtues. He should be free from carnal desire (avvasanin), reliable and courageous. He must also possess theoretical and practical knowledge (adhitakhile vyavaharatram), and be able to comprehend military problems (astrajam).

The purohita or royal priest was mainly responsible for the religious, moral and cultural well-being of the state, and was instrumental in warding off natural and super-natural calamities (aagna) by performing sacrifices and rituals. While describing the qualities of the purohita, Somadeva seems to follow his illustrious predecessor Kautilya. He states that the purohita should be a person whose family and character are highly spoken of, who is well-educated in the Vedas and the six Angas, is skillful in interpreting portents, providential or accidental, is well versed in the science of government and who is obedient and can prevent calamities of all kinds. Another work the Thanamgaa defines purohita as santikarmakarin i.e. one who performed rites for the peace of the nation. The Vivadasava, tells us, that a sacrifice was performed by Mahesaradatta, the priest of king Jayaratha, to avert his misfortune. Alteker, however, has expressed the opinion that by this time the position of the priest deteriorated and he has pointed out that "the post-Gupta inscriptions usually distinguish him from ministers showing that he was no longer a member of the ministry". Nonetheless, that the purohita still exercised a profound influence on the state and the king, in this period, is evident from the testimony of several contemporary Jain writers.
The exact term generally used to denote the prime minister in the early medieval period was mahamatya. As we have already mentioned, the prime minister of Vanaraja (8th century A.D.), the king of Gujarat, was mahamatya Jamba. In other Caurukyan records also the prime minister is called mahamatya, but sometimes a mahamatya acted as a local governor. The Nigitha Gun, a 7th century work, uses the term mahamati (Prakrit) to denote a prime minister. Another term for prime minister used in this period is mahapradhana, which is found in the Paramara epigraphs. The position of the prime minister in this period was very important. We know from the Jain inscriptions and from a number of Jain colophons that he was in-charge of the management of state affairs (samastya vyapanar paripanthayati or gikaranadina samastya vyapanar kurvati). He was also authorised to transact the royal seal and signet. Such a powerful dignitary was the prime minister that he could even make or unmake the king. We find that Visaladeva Vaghela was installed on the throne by Vastupala and Tejahpala, according to Vasantavilasa had been appointed by Viradhavala Vaghela as the gikaranadhinathas (in-charge of gikarana 'central secretariat'). The name of Tejahpala was also mentioned in the grants of feudatory lords, a fact which openly reveals the power wielded by this energetic minister of the Vaghela king. In this context we may refer to some other eminent prime ministers of contemporary monarchs, such as Umapatidhara, the prime minister of Lakshamanaasena, the famous Sena ruler of Bengal, Rudraditya of Paramara Munja, Vidyadhara of Jayacandra Gahadvala, Vagbhat of Kumaraapala etc. The king always
consulted him on all vital matters. Besides the prime minister, there were other ministers who managed the different departments of state.

It has been pointed out that in ancient India terms like amatva, saciva, mantrin etc. were used indiscriminately to denote a minister. The Jain poet Dhanapala, in his Tilakasenjari, uses the term buddhi-sacivasa to designate a minister. This particular word, it is extremely significant to note, is found in Madhatithi's commentary on the Manusambhita. The Prabandhacintasamā on the other hand, supplies a very novel term for a minister viz. rājavṛddha. We also come across a few other terms such as kārva-sacivasa, amatvavrddha, amatvavargya from the Jain literature of this period. It is very interesting to note that in the Amarakosa, it is stated that all amatvas other than mantrins are called karwasacivas i.e. ministers for action or execution. In all likelihood, karwasacivas and kārva-sacivas were synonymous. In the Mahābhārata, we also find the terms amaccas, sacives, and maniti interchangeably used which according to Madhu Sen simply denoted the other ministers of the state. These ministers usually headed different departments. Somadeva says that income, expenditure, royal safety and maintenance of order were the chief concern of these ministers. These ministers also looked after the affairs of the provinces and sometimes were called ministers of these provinces.

Apart from the purāhita and mahamatva the two other important councillors of the king were the senapati and the sendhaviyagabika. Their appointment naturally demanded the existence of certain special qualities in the prospective candidate. Somadeva rightly stresses on some basic qualifications. Regarding the senapati, he says, that an aspirant should be born of a high family, be pure in
character, endowed with genius, devotion, truthfulness, purity and valour; influential, possessing a large family, knowing how to use his policies and devices, trained in all sorts of vehicles, weapons, battles, alphabets and languages. He should know his position as well as the position of enemies, possess a giant and healthy body, be loved by all officers, be faithful to his master and to the interest of the country and be able to bear all sorts of troubles and exertions, undaunted by men either of his own acquaintance or his enemies.\textsuperscript{212} The \textit{senapati} or war-minister, also, according to Jinadasa was an influential member of the king's cabinet who was consulted on all important matters of the state.\textsuperscript{213} In this particular text, he is variously called \textit{senapati},\textsuperscript{214} \textit{senadhira} and \textit{mahabalachikrt}.\textsuperscript{215} In the inscriptions of the Guptas\textsuperscript{216} and the Maitrakas,\textsuperscript{217} \textit{mahabalachikrt} is a common nomenclature of the commander-in-chief. Somadeva, however, as we have noted earlier, did not favour the inclusion of the \textit{senapati} in the royal council.

Regarding the \textit{sandhyavigrahika}, (ambassador) another notable functionary, Somadeva says knowledge of grammar and logic, an influential position, expressiveness, fluency in speech, genius, discretionary power, knowledge of most of the languages and alphabets, knowledge of time, place and varnasrama, intelligence in rapid reading and writing, were the essential qualities of an ambassador.\textsuperscript{218} On behalf of the king, it was the \textit{sandhyavigrahika} who signed treaties and conducted foreign negotiations.\textsuperscript{219}

We have already noted that Jinadasa, the celebrated author of the \textit{Nisitha Curni} includes two other personages in the king's council viz. the \textit{satthi}\textsuperscript{220} and \textit{satthavaha}.\textsuperscript{221} The \textit{satthi} was a
prominent citizen being the head (mahattara) of the eighteen professional guilds and was invested with a golden patte by the king which was inscribed with the image of the goddess Sri. Sattra was the chief caravan leader, who took caravans abroad with the permission of the monarch. Needless to say, that these two representatives of the business community acquired a high social and political status because of their economic prosperity and assistance to the state. Thus, it is but logical that they should form an integral part of the king's advisory body. Moreover, it is quite clear from the extensive Jain and other literature of the early medieval period that the business communities gradually assumed an important role in the political life and administration of this age.

An extremely striking feature of this period was the office of the councillors was generally hereditary. Vimala, the dandanatha of Caulukya Bhima I, had his long heritage from the time of Vanaraja. Also, the ministers of Kumārapala were the sons of former ministers. Somesvara, the purohita of Bhima II, claimed his parentage in the service of the Caulukyas.

Section (v) : Provincial and Village Administration.

The Jain works and epigraphs of our period throw considerable light on provincial, town and village administration. Inscriptions of the Gupta period show that the provinces or states were ruled by governors, who sometimes assumed the title of mahārāja or even Gopāla. We have the title of uparikamahārājas, who were two, provincial governors. The districts were under vishayapatis.
who sometimes held the titles kumārāvatya or avuktaka. In the later period, the governors of provinces were known as mahāvandesvara or mandaesvara. The governors were also known as dandaāvaka or dandeśati as Vimala, who constructed the Jain Abu temple in V.S. 1080, was a governor under Bhīma I, the Cauñukya emperor. The provincial governors exercised wide powers and had their own council of ministers as we learn from the Jain romance the Tilakeśanjāri of Dhānpála, who flourished between 960 and 1020 A.D. Afterwards, governors like Lavana-prasāda, Vīradhavala and also Vastupāla, who were under Cauñukya emperors, practically behaved like independent kings. We have, for example, separate inscriptions of Vīradhavala and Vastupāla. In any case, there is reason to believe that in the post-Gupta and the early medieval period, provincial governors wielded considerable power. It should further be remembered that after 600 A.D., there were very few big empires, barring the empires of the Gurjara Pratiharas and the Rašṭrakutas, and naturally the sovereign kings had to depend heavily on their provincial governors.

The district administration was carried out by the sāmantes or vishavanatīs. The term sāmante is pretty old as it occurs in texts like the Mahābhārata and Manusmṛti. The early Jain work, namely the Paumacarīva of Vimala throws considerable light on the sāmantes, who had to help their overlords with their forces and they were also consulted by their sovereigns on important occasions. Sometimes, they also acted as āutas (messengers). The Sukraniti mentions even anusāmantes (sub-feudal lords). The Nīcītha Gūmptī has the words visarākṣīya and
desarakkhiva for district-administrator. Even it mentions a new
term called desakutta. In the Gupta inscriptions, we have the
term vishavapatl, for the district-administrator. The vishavapatlas
collected government revenues and other cesses and maintained peace
and order within his jurisdiction. It has been observed that the
term vishavapatl was synonymous with ralasthaniya of the inscriptions.

The cities were administered in the early medieval
period by an official called puradhvaksha. The Samaratkasahas mentions one such city-administrator. We have in the same work of
Haribhadra, the name of another city-official called nagararakhaka. Among other city-officials we get such names as talara, paramakshika, rajapursha, karanika etc. The Kuvalayamala mentions city-officials
like navarambha, puramchalla etc.

The Jain works of our period, give us a very good
idea about villages of India in those days. The Adipurana of
Jinasena I, composed in the early 9th century explains in the
16th chapter the terms grama, pura, rajasthan, kheța, kharvata,
pattana, madanaka, drona maha, samvaha etc. He mentions two types
of grames or villages, the first with a population comprising
one hundred families (kula or grha) called nikanta or j阅读va
(inferior type of village) and the second with a population of
five hundred families called susamrada (prosperous). Kautilya also
in his Arthasastra gives these two extremes, namely, the smallest
with a population of one hundred kulas and the largest with five
hundred kulas or families. Therefore, there is little doubt that
the Indian villages did not undergo any fundamental change so far.
as the distribution of population is concerned from the Mauryan period to that of the Gurjara Pratiharas. That some of the villages in ancient India were quite populous is proved by the testimony of Arrighi, the historian of Alexander, according to whom, the population of some villages varied between 5000 and 10000. Jinasena also gives us the interesting information that the majority of the population of the villages are either Sudras or agriculturalists (keshaka). Kautilya also says the same thing. However, the members of the higher castes also lived in quite large numbers in villages. This is also amply borne out by the evidence of the epigraphs. Hundreds of inscriptions of this period, found from all over India, show that Brahmans, Vaiśyas and other castes also used to live in villages and the grāmās, of this period, enjoyed rare prosperity.

The pārās, according to Jinasena, should be surrounded by parikā (moat) and must have gopura, aṭṭalaṅka, and different types of building (bhavana). It should be surrounded by rampart (vaprāpaṅkamandita) and should have gardens and lakes. The gardens were meant for the beautification of the towns and the lakes were used for various purposes. It should be situated at a proper place. The sloping of the town should be towards north-east to enable water to flow in that direction. The khetas (a type of small town) are those types of towns which are surrounded by the river and mountain and the kharvataḥ by mountains only. According to Kautilya, the kharvatikas (the same as Jinasena's kharvata) are towns in the midst of two hundred villages. This is
also, the opinion of Jinasena. Both Jinasena and Kautilya opine that dronamukha is a town which has four hundred villages as its dependencies and the capital city should be twice a size of a dronamukha, which may be termed as a town of middle size. For the capital or the metropolitan city Kautilya uses the word sthaniva and Jinasena rajadhani. The word rajadhani though not found in the Arthasastra occurs in the earlier Books of the Pali canon and also the Mahabharata. There is little doubt that Kautilya's sthaniva and Jinasena's rajadhani carry the same meaning. Another term found in the Adipurana of Jinasena is madamba, which is the name of a type of town described as the centre of five hundred villages. In the later Jain commentary of the Vyavaharasutra by Malayagiri (a contemporary of Hemacandra) a madamba is explained as consisting of eighteen thousand villages, an obvious exaggeration. The sangraha according to Jinasena consisted of ten villages. It is the same as sangrahana of the Arthasastra.

We have noted earlier some aspects of the town and provincial administration revealed in the Jain works of our period. Let us now turn to what the Jain and other contemporary writers of this period have to say regarding the administration of the villages.

From the Vedic period, the village administration was generally under an official called grama. It has been conjectured that he was probably a royal nominee in early times and the post was hereditary. From the evidence of the later Vedic
texts like the Taittiriya Samhita and the Brihavani Samhita, it appears that Gramani probably belonged to the Vaisya caste. The Amarakosha understands by this term both the leader of the village (gramadhipa) and a barber (nāpita). Therefore, there is little doubt that Gramani was in the Gupta period, the most important village official, connected with the day-to-day administration of the village, which is the smallest administrative unit of ancient and medieval India.

It appears that, with the passage of time, the term Gramani was replaced by such terms as bhōja (bhōjak) or mayēhara (mahattara). The term Bhōjak appears in the early Jain Kādambe records of the 5th century. As pointed out by J. C. Jain, the expression Bhōjak or gamabhōjak occurs in the 5th century Pali commentaries and also Jain canonical texts and commentaries. Along with Bhōjak, we have also, in the Jain works, the expression gauvād, which is equivalent to grāmakuta or grāmakūta. It should be remembered that there are several epigraphic references, dating from at least 8th century, to the term grāmakuta. It has further been opined by Fleet that the Kānareśa word gauvād or gauvāde has ultimately come from gauvāde. Another similar term was gauvagha, which we find in the Desīnāmāla written by the great Jain savant Hemacandra. J. C. Jain, quoting from the Harinārāmakṣaṇa, says that the gābha or grāmasabba was the centre of the village.

Let us now discuss the very interesting term paṇcakula, which is not even mentioned in the famous dictionary of Monier-Williams. However the term actually occurs in several epigraphs and a few literary texts, including some Jain works. The earliest reference to it is found in Bana's Harshacarita.
However the meaning of that term, as used in that work of Bana, is obscure. The Samarakacakaha of Haribhadra however uses it in the actual sense and it is also mentioned in an contemporary epigraph (i.e. of the 6th century). As noted by A. K. Majumdar, the pancakula occurs several times in the Siyadoni inscriptions of the Gurjara Pratihara kings, dated in the early 10th century. It is of great interest to note that the technical administrative term pancakula also occurs in the 10th century Jain text called the Brhatkathakosa, written by Digambara Harishena. The term pancakula obviously reminds us of achtakulechikara of Gupta epigraphs and atthakulaka of Buddhaghoṣa. The term rācendrangalā, found in the Sanchi stone inscription of Chandragupta II, dated Gupta year 95, corresponding to 412 A.D., is the nearest equivalent of the term pancakula. The is absolutely no doubt that pancakula is the same as modern pancaśīvāt.

Several other administrative officers like Talāre, which according to Hemacandra is the same as nagara-rakṣaka, Hindirāke, Śūra-Thakura, which according to the Jain Abhavatilaka, Čani is the same as graśmavātī etc., are mentioned in the Jain works. Numerous other administrative officers are mentioned in non-Jain epigraphic records of our period.

Section (vi) : The Judiciary.

From quite early times, judiciary was regarded as an important part of the royal administration. This is evident both from Manu and Kautilya. The kings in ancient India were
expected to be conversant with different types of laws. The author of the *Arthasastra*, particularly lays great stress on the correct and unbiased application of legal procedures. Both Fa-hien and Yuan Chwang have spoken about crimes and punishments in ancient India. It is clear from the account of both these travellers that crimes were rarely committed in ancient India and the criminals had to undergo light or heavy punishments, according to the nature of crime. Yuan Chwang particularly, writing in the 7th century A.D., mentions the absence of capital punishment. According to him, even for persons, plotting against the king, the highest punishment is only imprisonment for life. The earlier authors like Manu or Kautilya could not have dreamt of such light punishments. Even for a small offence against the sovereign, the Buddhist text the *Mādhavendra* recommends the most severe type of capital punishment, including the close relatives of the offender. Therefore it appears that afterwards the punishments of the offenders became less severe and more humane.

The Jain canonical texts throw a flood of light on the judicial system of those days. As noted by J. C. Jain, the term used for the law-suit is *vavahāra*. The king is regarded as the supreme judge and even for ordinary offences, people sometimes approached the highest authority. Sometimes even the Jain monks had to appear in the law courts. We have in the *Avagria Cūrni*, the story of Vaira's mother who complained against the Ṣāṅgha for stealing her child. In the Jain commentaries, we hear of monks complaining against the prostitutes for trying to
seduce them. The Viṣṇukṣaṇa, particularly contain references to various types of crimes and punishments. There is little doubt that most severe punishments were meted out to even ordinary thieves and robbers. A particular robber thief called Vijaya is mentioned both in the Navadhammakāhyā and the Vipākaṣṛuta, and the relevant passage of the Nava-dhammakāhyā shows that the prisoners were ill-treated in those days. The Vipākaṣṛuta contains a vivid description of the instruments of torture and also the torture of prisoners by those instruments. It also mentions a notorious jailor called Duryodhana. The same text tells us how a merchant's son was condemned to death by embracing a red-hot metal image of woman for making love with a prostitute, who was the king's favourite. Actually this punishment is also recommended by Manu. Therefore, it appears that the early Jain writers were unacquainted with the laws of the land. However, sometimes the Brahmanical laws were not followed. The same Vipākaṣṛuta (also called Vipākaṣṛuta) tells us how an influential Brahmana called Brhaspatidatta, the chief priest of Udayana, the famous king of Kausambi, was executed for making love with queen Padmavati, one of the wives of Udayana. It is well known that our Smrti texts do not recommend capital punishment for Brāhmaṇas and, therefore, it appears that in actual practice, even the members of this particular caste could not avoid the gallows. Another similar example will be found in the drama Mrčchakaṭikā, where the Brahmana Cāruḍatta was ordered to be executed for killing the prostitute Vasantasena (who was actually not killed).

The Nīsittha Cūma gives the important information
that there were several types of courts. At first the case was tried by the village officer (called gramakita or gramamahattara), then by bhujika (a superior officer), then by mahabaladhdikrta and lastly by the king himself. The karanapati, mentioned in this 7th century text, acted as chief justice on behalf of the king. Several karanikas, meaning judges or magistrates, worked under him. These karanikas, may be compared with the adhikarana, mentioned in the Nrochakatika. It is further apparent from that play that the king himself directly appointed him and could replace him by another judge. There is evidence to show that motivated judges, who deliberately gave bad judgements, could even be put to death by the sovereign. A story in the Kethasarita-gucara informs us how a judge (in this case a puradhyaksha) was killed by a king because of bad and motivated judgement.

That the poor people could not afford to get justice in the court, is clear not only from the Nrochakatika (where Sakara boasts that his opponent Carudatta, being poor, will not be able to defend himself), but also from the Nisitha Curni. We are told by Jinadasa that the poor people were turned out by the servants (dutagas) of the court. That there was corruption in the courts is also clear from a sentence, uttered by Devasoma in another 7th century work, namely the Mattavilasaprahasana of Pallava Mahendravarman.

The Nrochakatika shows that two officials, namely the Sreshthin and the Kavastha directly helped the judge (Adhikaranika) in judicial matters. The Sreshthin was probably
the chief merchant of the town and the Kavastha was the chief among the Lekhakas or accountants. In the Damodarpur copper plates of the Gupta period, we get a new expression, namely Prathama-kavastha, who evidently was a high-ranking administrative official and the evidence of the Mrochakatika proves that he was also associated with judiciary. Another point, which should be noted in this connexion is this that, even subordinate judges (like that one in the Mrochakatika) could pass death-sentences, without referring the matter to the king.

Haribhadra's Samāracakāhā (first half of the 8th century) also throws some light on the judicial system prevailing in the early medieval period. Here also, we are told, some officials or any minister investigated serious judicial matters, in the preliminary stage, and those were afterwards referred to the king for his final judgement. Sometimes even influential persons of the town could judge a minor case. For serious offences, women and rebels were generally expelled from the kingdom, and not executed. As we have already seen, the punishments became less stringent in the later period and this is evident from both Tuan Chwang and Haribhadra.

The Brhatkathakosā of Harishena shows that even Pancakulas could act as judges. The Tilakamanjari of Dhanapala refers to a type of judicial officers called Dharmasthavas, whose main duty was to see that no injustice was done.

Somadeva in his famous Nitivāmartha gives a rare picture of the judicial system of the 10th century. However, most of his recommendations follow those found in Kautilya. He
repeatedly says that a king should be just, and judge every
case without any prejudice or pre-conceived notions. He
uses such terms as sabhya and sabhapati to denote a
member of the jury and magistrate. It further appears from
this text that legal matters became immensely complicated by
the 10th century, and even common people often resorted to
dishonest practice by producing false legal documents
(kutalokha). He further says that every attempt should
be made to settle a case in the village or town, and in case
of complications, the matter is referred to the king and
there is no higher legal authority than the king. Somadeva
recommends death penalty for those who ignore the orders of
the king. When on the witness box, a Brahmana must first
touch hiranya and vairavita, a Kshatriya should touch sastra,
ratna, bhumi, vahana etc., a Vaiśya should take oath by touching
ear, baby, kakini (small coin) and hiranya; and a Sudra should
take oath after touching corn or milk or valmika. The persons
belonging to various other professions should touch an object
of their trade.

It appears therefore from the Jain works of our period,
that kings in the early medieval India, like the sovereigns
of the Gupta or the pre-Gupta periods, were guided by law books
and tried to be just and unbiased in judicial matters. However,
the punishments surely became less harsh in this period, mainly
as a result of the spread of theistic religions and also Jainism
and Buddhism.
Section (vii) : Military Organization.

Not much is known about the military organization of the Vedic period, although we have both the words sena and senāni. The latter term means a royal general and in the Aitareya Brahmana, we come across the more regular word senapati. From the Vedic texts, it is apparent, that even a much lesser king used to maintain a regular army. That the soldiers were regular paid, is clear from a crucial passage of the Mahabhārata, where the word yetana has been used. We are told in the relevant passage of that epic that unless soldiers are regularly paid, they will not fight properly against the enemy. Kautilya regards army as one of seven elements of state. He thus defines a good army "coming down directly from father or grandfather, ever strong, obedient, happy in keeping their sons and wives well-contented, not averse to making a long sojourn, ever and everywhere invincible, endowed with the power of endurance, trained in fighting various kinds of battles, skilful in handling various forms of weapons, ready to share in the weal or woe of the king, and consequently not falling foul with him and purely composed of soldiers of Kshatriya caste, is the best army".

It is interesting to note that according to Kautilya, senapati or the leader of the army was one of the highest paid officers of the kings. Along with the sacrificial priest, Mantri, Purushottama, crown-prince, the queen-mother and
the chief queen, he was paid a salary of 48,000 nanag, a year. This proves that from very early times, the commander of the army held a very high position in the king's administration. His pre-eminent position among the royal officers is also directly proved by a passage of the Buddhist Milinda-panha, where, we are told, that among the hundreds of officers of the king, only six are important, and the name of the commander of the army gets the pride of place in this list.

From the very early times there were four main divisions of the army, namely chariots (ratha, Prakrit raha), elephants (gava or gaia), cavalry (hava) and infantry (pavatta or padatika). This is also proved by the testimony of Alexander's historians, who refer to all these four types among the soldiers of Porus. In course of time, however, chariots became somewhat obsolete and was replaced by camels and the navy also started playing an important part in war, as we learn from Kalidasa. The importance of the navy, as noted by Saltenor, is also recognized in the spurious Gayā copper plate of Samudragupta and the well-known Deo-Baranark inscription of Jivitagupta. The Khalimpur copper plate of Dharmapala also refers to the naval power of that great Pala king. It therefore appears that in the period, under review, navy became an important wing of the king's army. The earlier Jain canonical works refer to chariot, elephants, cavalry and infantry as the four wings of the army and we have descriptions of war involving
chariots, which prove that they played an important part in the wars of pre-Christian times.

The elephants played an important part in battles not only in very early times, but also during Alexander's invasion and also the time of Harsha and even afterwards. In the Ahole inscription of the Jain poet Rāvīkṛtī, we are also told about Harsha's elephant-corps (gajandarāñka). We learn from the Nīśatā Cūrṇī that the elephant-trainers were known as samabrāh. The elephants were equipped with armours, cruppers, bells, neck-ornament, head-piece, flags, garlands etc. The Samaśācakāśa also refers to the importance of elephants and the head of the elephant corps was known as mahaṃhastinaka. The Nīśatā Cūrṇī mentions the fact that the elephants should be trained thoroughly. We learn from the eye-witness account of Yuan Chwang that the war-elephant was covered with coat-of-mail and his tusks were provided with sharp barbs. We are further told that the commander-in-chief (senaratī) himself rode on the elephant and had a soldier, on each side, to manage the elephant. However, we learn from Somadeva, the author of the Nītivākṣyānta that an untrained elephant is a great menace for the army-asikṣhitā hastiṇām kavalamartha-prāṇaparāhāh. However, he also recognises the fact that the elephant is the most important wing of the army—bealau hastiṇām pradhānaparāhāh.

The cavalry also was recognised as a very important wing of the army and there is reason to believe that Porus lost
to Alexander because he was weak in cavalry. In the later period, Indian kings recognised the importance of cavalry, and horses were imported from all conceivable places. The Adipurna of Jinasena mentions the elephants of Kamboja, Singhu, Aretta (a part of Punjab), Bahlika, Gandhara, etc. Haribhadra in his Avagaka-tika refers to the training of horses and the Nityakyaṃṭa of Somadeva recognises the great importance of cavalry. Bhoja in his Yuktikalpataryu refers to the horses from Tajakistan and Tushara countries as the best, and Sindhu horses as inferior.

The foot-soldiers were equipped with all sorts of weapons. Yuan Chwang has paid a glowing tribute to the trained foot-soldiers of India, who according to him were "choice men of valour". We further learn from him that the Indian soldiers bore a large shield and carried a long spear and they generally used sword, bow and arrow and were perfect experts in all the implements of war.

A great number of weapons have been mentioned in the Samaśiccakāha like knife, khadga, bow, arrow, gūla, trisūla, pāresi, sakti, asi, okra, gade etc. Some thirty-six types of weapons have been mentioned by Somadeva in his Yāgastilakaccaṇḍa. However most of the weapons, mentioned in the Jain works of our period, were known from much earlier times.

Several types of military officers like baladākīrtta, mahabaladākīrtta, mahādandaśāyaṇa, mahāsārāpati etc., are
mentioned in the Gupta inscriptions. Harsha's, minister of peace and war was known as mahasapajdhiva. Some other officers like Anwarati, Bhatarvarati, Sampura etc were also known.

The Yasastilakacampu gives a vivid description of the army of various regions and janapadas like Dakshinātya, Dramila (Tamil country), Uttarapatha, Tirabhakti (north Bihar and some adjoining places of Nepal), Ganda and Gurjara (Gujarat). These descriptions show that even in the 10th century the soldiers of various regions of India were not only well-equipped, but also known for their courage and determination.

The importance of forts from the point of view of defence, has been recognised in the Sanaicakaha. Kautiliya also refers to the importance of forts and it is recognised by him as one of the seven limbs of the state.

Section (viii): System of Espionage.

The system of espion age is as old as the epico-Purantic period. In the Uttarkanda of the Ramayana we have the story of the spy reporting to Rama regarding the gossips of the people of Ayodhya in connection with Sītā's stay in Lanka. The Mahabharata refers to the spies sent by Duryodhana in search of the Pandavas. The exact expression used in this connexion is bahiscara, who apparently were distinguished from the internal spies, employed by the king.
The Manuasastra also lays stress on the importance of the spies and the relevant expression there is ċāračakshus.

Therefore, to Manu, the spy was the eye of the king (mahāpati) and a similar expression is to be found in the Kaṇandakīya Nītīśāra. 385. Kautilya not only refers to spies, but his Arthaśāstra 384 devotes several sections on the system of espionage, prevalent in his time. The author of the Arthaśāstra uses a special term to denote a spy, namely gūḍhapuruṣa, and it appears from his work that the persons, employed as gūḍhapuruṣas, were active both inside and outside the kingdom.

There is little doubt and as evident from the Arthaśāstra, the system of espionage had reached a developed stage by the time of Kautilya.

We further learn from the Arthaśāstra that both males and females were employed as spies in the guise of a fraudulent disciple (kapātikā-cātra), a recluse (mṛgākṣita), a householder (grha-patikā), a merchant (vaidehaka), as a ascetic, practising austerities (tāpasa), a classmate or a colleague (satri), a fire-brand (tikṣaṇa), a poisoner (rasada) and a mendicant woman (bhikṣukī). The Kaṇandakīya Nītīśāra, which very closely follows the Arthaśāstra has a full chapter on the system of espionage. As we have already said, it calls the spy (cāra) the eye of the king (narendra). We further learn from this text that the spies could be disguised as children, agriculturalists, forest-dwellers, beggars, teachers (adhvānaka) etc.
The Jain texts from the earliest times throw much light on the system of espionage. In this connexion, we come across terms like suãaka, anusãaka, pratisãaka and sarvasãaka. This word suãaka actually means an informer and occurs in the early Sanskrit literature. These officers were mainly employed by the chief-minister. The suãkas were asked to report on the internal secrets of the harem and the anusãkas were employed to find out the foreign spies in the kingdom. The pratisãakas, according to J.C. Ja, sat on the city gate, apparently doing some menial work and the sarvasãkas, who were probably high officers, worked through their assistants.

The Paumacarivam of Vimala, written in the early Christian period, also refers to the activities of the spies, who are called by the term Cariva purusa (Sanskrit caraparna). In the place of this work, we are told, that king Janaka ordered his Cariva purusa to find out his lost son. The non-Aryan king Ravana also had his Cariva purusa, who communicated to him, the news of Lakshmana's recovery from his serious injury. Elsewhere, in this work, we get simply the word cariva (Sanskrit cara). These spies had transmitted to Satrughna the loop-holes of his enemy Madhu, the non-Aryan ruler of Mathura. Thus we see that the system of espionage was quite developed in the early Christian period. Even the classical writers refers to the 'scouts' employed by Porus to keep watch on the movements of Greek army, led by
Alexander. These scouts or 'sentinels' were evidently spies, in the service of king Porus.

The seventh-century text, the Nisitha Curna mentions both sucakas and jadagas (Sanskrit cara). In one place, this text identifies the cara with sucakas; sometimes even Jain monks were suspected to be spies. We have already seen that Kautilya has mentioned karasas or bhikshus, who were entrusted with the job of espionage. The eighth-century work, the Samarucakas mentions the spies as cara, who gave secret reports to the king about the law and order situation of the state. However, the most beautiful account regarding a spy has been given by Somadeva in his celebrated Yasastilakacamt, where we come across a spy called Sankhanaka, who is represented not only as an exceptionally intelligent man with a keen sense of humour, but also as a great judge of human character. We further learn from Somadeva that this spy, although a poor man, was quite honest and served the king well. Even the ministers could not escape from his close observation. He used to give detailed reports about various officers to the king. He quotes a verse to the effect that when a king does not employ spies, nor exercise his own judgement, his kingdom is at the mercy of his ministers, just as the milk belonging to a blind man becomes the prey of cats. Elsewhere we are told that, let those kings, who have the curiosity to visualise what is in the mind of everyone, have
spies only for eyes. Those who are not aware of the situation of themselves and others, through the movements of spies, are deprived of both wealth and life by the action of their officials and foes. It is further clear from Somadeva's work that there were several officials in the Criminal Intelligence department of king Yasodhara. While Sankhasa is called gudhapurusaha, another higher officer is called Varichhaka, which according to Hanci is another name of spy. Yet another term, namely jangha-rakshanka occurring in this work, has been explained as parasurasaha by the commentator Srutasagara. There is little doubt that spies played an important part in the administration of a kingdom even in Somadeva's time, who in his Nitivakramakam has mentioned no less than thirty-four types of spies. However, it is better to regard these thirty-four types, as thirty-four types of disguises, undertaken by spies, most of which have been mentioned by Kautilya. These thirty-four types are chatra, karatika, udasthita, arhanati, vaidhika, taraka, kirata, karnapatika, abhimanyaka, samhika, pataccara, vata, vidushaka, pithamanda, pertaka, gavya, vadaka, vasantana, ganaka, sekunika, bhishak, sindrajalika, namatiika, yude, arulika, saivahaka, tikshna, krura, rasase, lade, nake, badhira and anhe. It is apparent from this list that the spies, employed by the kings, wandered all over the kingdom under the garb of the above-mentioned professional groups. Therefore, it has to be admitted that espionage continued to be an integral part of the royal administration almost up to the end of the Hindu period.
Section (ix) : Other Important Officials.

The Jain texts and epigraphs of our period mention many other officials, who were directly or indirectly connected either with the central or district administration. Let us remember that most of the kings, of our period (600-1000 A.D.), ruled over much smaller kingdoms, compared to those ruled by the Mauryas, Kushānas or the Guptas and therefore, the stress is here more on provincial or district administration. We have already mentioned quite a large number of officials connected with espionage, provincial and village administration and judicial system. But quite a few have not been mentioned and we propose to discuss some of these officers here in this section.

In ancient and medieval times, the kings had to maintain their harems very carefully as it was a source of danger, not only for him, but also for his other loyal officers. In the Jain commentaries particularly the following harem officials are mentioned namely kaṇḍukīn, varisadhara, mabhattara, dandadhara, dandarakhīva and dovarīya. The first mentioned official is equivalent to English Chamberlain and had free access to both the kings and queens of the harem. He is generally represented in the Sanskrit literature, as an old and clever Brāhmaṇa and in practically every play, we find references to the kaṇḍukīn. The commentator of the Pararajasaṇīya states that he gave reports of the happenings in the harem to the king. In the Pararajasaṇīya also he is mentioned twice. The varisadhara...
was another official of the harem. We are told that his
testicles were removed by surgical operations since child-
hood. The mahattara was an executive officer and according
to J. C. Jain told stories to the ladies of the harem,
after their menstruation bath, and pacified their anger,
and reported the cause of the anger to the king. The Kama-
sutra mentions the lady counterparts of both kaṇcukīn and
mahattara, namely kaṇcukīva and mahattarika. Obviously both those
lady-officers acted as special officers of the harem. The
dandadhara, as the name indicates, carried a danda (staff)
in his hand, and kept a watch over the harem. The
dandārakkhiva, with the permission, of the king, took a
man or woman into the harem. The Dvarāriva acted as a door-
keeper and accordingly to a Jaṭaka story, prevented the
Candālas and other low-caste people from peeping into the
palace, through the windows. Another official of the harem
is mentioned in Dhanapala's Tilakamaniari, namely Gayāpala.
He was in all probability, an officer-in-charge of king's
bed-chamber. Sircar accepts this explanation of the term
Gayāpala, but A.K. Majumdar is of the opinion that
he was probably an officer under mahamandalesvara. The
Tilakamaniari also mentions some personal officers of the
king like Saudhapala, pratibhara or mahapratibhara,
ratnakosaṃbhu, vstradhāra, tambūla-vahaka etc. The
Saudhapala was in charge of the palace and its surroundings
and the pratibhāras took the interview-seekers to the king.
and the ratnakosadhvaksha had to examine the jewels and ornaments of the palace. A special officer called rajavallabha has been in the Upamitibhavaranacakatha of Siddharshi, written in the beginning of the 10th century. According to the Milinda Penha, the chatradhara (umbrella-bearer) and the angarakshaka (body-guard) were the two of the six most important royal officials of the king.

Several important officials are mentioned in the epigraphs and unpublished Jain manuscripts of the medieval period. The terms like mahaksharatalika and mahasandhivigrahika occur very frequently in the Jain and non-Jain epigraphs. The first term has generally been explained as the head of the aksharatika department (Accounts Office). Kautilya uses the term aksharatikadadhayavacha. The same authority has also explained his functions. Sometimes the mahaksharatalikas were the writers of the king's grants. Sometimes this officer belonged to the kṣaṭyā caste. The mahasandhivigrahikas, as the name indicates, was the minister of war and peace, but often they had to act as jūtakas in the kings' grants. They are also mentioned frequently in the Gupta epigraphs. The Kalvan plates of Yasovarman of the time of the Paramāra Bhoja I, which is a Jain record, shows sandhivigraha Jogeswara as the writer of the grant. The mahāmāhārūtika was the royal astrologer and he is also mentioned by Kautilya.

The two terms mahāmāhārūtika and...
dandanavaka also frequently occur in Jain and non-Jain epigraphs. The evidence of the Allahabad prasasti of Samudragupta shows that the composer of this prasasti, namely Harishena, held in the three important portfolios namely sāṅchivigrāhika, kumārāṇāṭya and mahadanda ṛṇaka simultaneously. As Fleit observes, the terms dandanātha, dandanāthaka, dandāchitra, dandaśa, dandāvara etc are all synonyms of dandanavaka. They are employed in epigraphs as military titles. A.K. Majumder with the help of epigraphs of the later period, shows that mahāmandalesvara was a superior title in comparison to dandanavaka. The Jain works and unpublished manuscripts often mention both mahāmandalesvara and ṛṇaka as equivalent titles and Lavanaprasāda was both a ṛṇaka and mahāmandalesvara (governor). However, the case of Vimala dandanavaka shows that a dandanavaka could also be a governor like mahāmandalesvara. Sometimes we also come across the title sarvasvarā. The Jain work Suktaṇṭa-sankirtana of Arisimha says Caulukya Bhima-II made Lavanaprasāda the sarvasvarā of his kingdom.

Various other officers are known from thousands of epigraphs and colophons of manuscripts, both Jain and non-Jain. However, in the limited space, at our disposal, it is not possible to discuss all of them. Further in the works of G.C. Chaudhury, A.K. Majumder, P. Bhatia, D. Sharma, J.C. Jain and others, we have plenty of information on them.
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