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CHAPTER VI

POLITICAL STRUCTURE

(A) INTRODUCTORY

The prosperity or poverty of a country depends to a large extent on its polity and governance. Prosperity is the result of a fine and fair administration while the corrupt and dishonest administrative machinery causes poverty to the society. By means of the study of political structure one comes to know a number of the elements of polity and governance including the various forms of government and several methods of functioning by it, formulation of ends and limits of the state, and inter-state relation etc. In the following pages an attempt is made to arrange the data on this issue supplied by the author of the RS in a systematic order, supplementing them with the evidence from other relevant sources.

The science of government is known by several names like Rajaśāstra, Rajañitiśāstra, Nitiśāstra and Daṇḍanīti etc. Another name for this science is Nava which is mentioned by Vatsarāja (Samudra. p. 185; Kirāta. Verse 23) and many other authors of the classical works such as Bhāravi (Kirātarjunīya. II. 3, 12, 54). Giving two sorts of this science Kautilya states that 'Nava (good policy) and Aranava (bad policy) are

treated in *Dandaniti*. The author of the *RS* refers to both these types as *Nava* (see above) and *Durnaya* (*Pukti*, p. 39; IV. 24). It is obvious that the *Nava* (good policy) results into welfare while *Durnaya* (bad policy) produces loss. Kautilya says that a king understanding *Nava* and being endowed with *Atmāroṣas* and all the elements of the state may conquer the entire world, though originally he may have a small state.

Most of the law-writers on ancient Indian polity admit that a state is to be constituted by seven elements viz. *Śvēmi* (king), *Aṇātya* (ministers), *Janapada* or *Kātra* (territory of the state and its subjects), *Durga* (fortified city or capital), *Koṇa* (treasury), *Panda* (army) and *Mitra* (friends or allies). These seven elements are called *Sapta-āṅgas* or *saptā-prakṛtis*, and *Śukranīti* (I. 61-62) compares them with the organs of the body viz. the king is the head, the ministers are the eyes, allies the ears, treasury the mouth, army the mind, capital and *Kātra* are the hand and feet.

The epigraphic evidence of the Candella dynasty proves that the very concept of the state was accepted and applied by the rulers during the age of Vatsarāja. Thus a Candella inscription mentions that *Kirtivarman*, a Candella king, had

---

rendered more prosperous the seven constituent parts of the kingdom together with virtue. It will be proper for us to analyse all the political references of the Rṣ mainly under these seven heads.

(B) KING

King was the chief of the state administration and he was called nrpa (Karṇḍra. Verse 3; Tripura. IV. 19), nrpati (Kirāṭa. Verse. 3; Rukmi. I. 16), narapatī (Rukmi. II. 18; p. 59), naraśvara (Kirāṭa. Verse. 4; Rukmi. IV. 26), narendra (Karṇḍra. Verse. 32; Rukmi. I. 19; II. 22; III. 14), rāja (Kirāṭa. Verse. 6; p. 2; Rukmi. p. 59) mahārāja (Kirāṭa. p. 17; Karṇḍra. p. 23), bhūbhuj (Rukmi. I. 11), keśitibhuj (Rukmi. II. 14), evanibhuj (Rukmi. III. 12), keśitibhṛt (Kirāṭa. Verse. 48), evanina (Kirāṭa. Verse. 61), evanipūla (Hāṣya. II. 14) bhūpa (Samudra. III. 14), keśināṭha (Rukmi. II. 9), mahaṇāṭha (Rukmi. p. 59), keśināṭha (Rukmi. III. 13) and mahaṁahendrā (Rukmi. p. 63). All these synonyms of the king are very significant. They suggest the king to be regarded as the master and protector of all the human beings and the entire land of his territory and as a great god Mahendra on the earth. Benedictions are expected to be fulfilled in the concluding verses of Kirāṭarjunīya Vyṣyoga and Hāṣyangdāmanī Prahasana that the kings, being devoted to the justly expedients (of

administration), may sufficiently protect the earth.

Vatsarāja has referred to the two Candella kings - Paramardideva (Karṇāra. p. 23; Tripura. I. 4; Hāsya. p. 118; I. 4; p. 148; Samudra. I. 4; p. 150) and Trailokyavarmmadeva (Kīrāta. p. 1; Verse. 3) under whose patronage he had been flourished. The former is eulogised for his liberality, excellence, munificence and promotion of learning and literature (cf. Tripura. I. 4; Hāsya. I. 4; p. 119) and the latter for his bravery and valour who was to be pleased with his sword (= karavālalata) and not with any beautiful lady (= kāntā) (trailokyavarmanapatermanasi pramodavīśkaroti karavālalata na kāntā. Kīrāta. Verse. 3). However it is important to know that this is only one side of the picture. The other side was somewhat different. The inordinate desire for personal glory, superiority and worldly enjoyment of kings had reached to such an extent that the ancient ideal of saintly and disciplined king began to be set aside and hence a king shrugging his traditional duties was called kuṇvāmī (Tripura. IV. 18). They paid little attention to their moral duties and thus they lost the sympathy of their subjects. Madanavarman, a Candella king (12th century A.D.), is said to have neglected the administrative affairs so much that he had no time to attend the court regularly and was excessively indulged in luxury.

6. cf. Jinamandana's Kumārapālāprabandha quoted by C.D. Dalal

Introduction to the MS. p. VII. fn. 3.
Paramarddideva also led a luxurious life and he is said to have killed one cook daily at the time of serving and consequently got the epithet of \textit{korakälānala}. In the RS there is a general complaint against kings who were under the influence of evil characters, interested in the false communications, ignorant, unable to listen to the true words (Tripura. III. 1) and who had lost the discrimination of wholesomeness and un-wholesomeness due to being haughty (\textit{garvamayikānihitāhitānihetāhinā}) (Tripura. p. 98). Sarvatāpa, a king of Tripuri, is said to be blind in arrogance and vile (Tripura. p. 100) and he does not have faith even in his guru and reliable officials (Tripura. p. 112). As a result his guru Šukrācārya also does not pay proper attention to him (Tripura. p. 100). Similarly Bali, the king of demons, also, being grasped by stubbornness, disobey the advice of his guru Šukrācārya (Samudra. p. 182).

Further, it is to be noticed that in medieval age the emphasis on military achievements had considerably affected the ancient ideals of kingship. As early as C. 900 A.D. Medhātithi had stated in his commentary on Manusmṛti (VII. 1) that the highest end of royalty for a king was to fulfill the desire of conquest and establishing the sole political

\footnote{Frabandhacerintāmani quoted by C.D. Lalai, Introduction to the RS. p. VIII.fn. 1.}
supremacy. That this idea had been increased at the expense of moral duties of a king is indicated in a stanza of the *RgVeda* (Kirāta. Verse. 48) whereas Arjuna sneers at Duryodhana that he (= Duryodhana) may make his State stronger by killing his rival (= Arjuna) along with the help of several associates and large army i.e. through a wrong way which is out of the morality of a king.

A few contexts of the *RgVeda* reveal the king's astounding political feature of internecine which made them weak and incapable for facing the foreign foe. Thus, Himalaya flouts Indra, 'If he (= Indra) would have not made us handicapped by means of cutting our feathers, we would have been able to crush the enemies on the occasion of encounter between gods and demons (Tripura. I. 35). Further the description of mutual contention amongst gods (*devānāmiyamitaratārakalaha vallī pallavita*. Tripura. p. 89) and the fire's destruction by sun, Ocean's withering by forest-fire (= *dāvānala*) and Garuda's destruction by snakes (Tripura. III. 15) may also be indicating of the same feature. It may be pointed out here that the historians have taken the internecine tendency of the kings of that time as one of the principal causes of the downfall of Hindu rule.

At last a descriptive list of the functionaries may be added here by whom a king was to be helped in many ways in his

harem and kingdom.

(i) **Sauvidalla** :-

We read about Dīpaka who was working as a Sauvidalla or superintendent of the harem of Revati the consort of Balarāma. He is described to be loyal to his lord (Rukmi, pp. 46-47). The nature of the post suggests that he must be aged, honest and modest and belonging to a noble family.

(ii) **Dūtas** :-

Priyādvada and Sandhānaka, the two dūtas or envoys of Kṛṣṇa and Śiśupāla respectively, have been referred to in Rukminītharana Thāmga. Particularly Priyādvada has been described as eloquent and competent to handle the situation as time and place demanded. Thus, when he came back from Kaundina-pura along with the scurrilous letters sent by Rukmi and Śiśupāla to Kṛṣṇa, he made so facial change that was automatically suggesting about some wrong happening. Thereafter when he was asked by Akrūra to tell something, he said politely - 'If I tell the exact thing who will give me another tongue' and then he offers the letters (Rukmi, p. 41). After discharging duty the dūtas were to be paid due reward (Rukmi, p. 53).

(iii) **Cara** :-

The system of espionage, which was largely applied in earlier ages, had suffered a considerable decline in the age
of Vatsarśja. The Sukranīti, which reflects to some extent the atmosphere of the same age, mentions the inefficiency of the spy system. Sphuṭākṣara, a spy in the Rṣ (Tripura. p. 103), complains against the kings who were unable to listen to the true words (of the spies) (Tripura. III. 1). We come to know that the king Sarvatāra, under whom Sphuṭākṣara was serving as a spy, had thrust away him because of not digesting his true task (Tripura. p. 98). The chief characteristics of the spy depicted in the Rṣ were plain-speaking and ultimate benevolence to his lord (Tripura. p. 99). He was a hereditary employee (= kramāyāta) (Tripura. p. 99).

(iv) Pratihārī and dauvārika:

The porter and portress have been referred to as dauvārika (Tripura. p. 103) and pratihārī (Rukmi. pp. 50-51) respectively. To guide the way for royal personages in the harem, to offer seats for them and to call the wanted persons, etc. were the expected duties of these people.

(v) Bhṛtyas:

The other state servants were generally called bhṛtyas and they seem to be learned and skilful. For instance, we may take the two characters - Viparīta and Alīka, of Tripuradāna Dīma. The former was chief among all the servants (= bhṛtya-

Ministers have been one of the most important parts of the political life in India since a remote period. According to Mahābhārata the king is as dependent upon ministers as animals are upon clouds, Brāhmaṇas on Vedas and women upon their husbands. In the Rg the ministers have been referred to as āmayya (Karpura. p. 23; Hāveya. pp. 118, 148; Tripura. p. 106), Saciva (Kirata. p. 4; Tripura. pp. 99, 112; Samudra. I. 21) and mantrin (Rukmi. pp. 47, 49, 52; II. 9; Samudra. p. 161). The words maṇtriśiromani (Rukmi. p. 52) and Saćivottama (Samudra. I. 21) suggest a ministry consisting of several ministers led by a prime minister or chief minister. It appears that the ancient tradition of seven or eight ministers in a state was still continued in the regime of Candellas. The

11. Manu. VII. 54.
principal profession of ministers was to counsel with the king in administrative affairs and their counsel was called mantra (Samudra. p. 161); for the use of the verbal form mantravate see Rukmi. p. 49) and mantraṅgākti (Rukmi. ii. 9).

It is significant to note that in earlier ages we find an appreciable synthesis between the king and the ministers, but from the 6th century onwards we come across a number of the cases of rift between them. In Daśakumāra-carita (6th century A.D.), Kādambari (7th century A.D.) and Śīupālavadha (8th century A.D.) there are several instances of the kings neglecting the advice of their ministers. Further, in the 11th century A.D. we come to know about Mahipāla, a king of Bengal, who is said to have courted his ruin by neglecting the advice of his wise ministers. Kalhana (12th century A.D.) had stated that the ideal of synthesis between king and ministers without any possibility of disharmony and

16. Śīupālavadha of Magha. II. 28.
ill-feeling had become rare in the Kali age, and haughty kings he had given several instances of self-willed, capricious and haughty kings dispensing with their ministers. More or less a similar feature is found in the ES also. Thus, Balarāma regards the mantrasakti of ministers as eradicator of the sprout of Kaṭradharma (Rukmi. II. 9). Further Sarvastāpa, the king of Tripuri, disregards the advice of his minister Viśadgāya (Tripuri. p. 112).

However, from the above conditions a question may arise in our mind whether the ministers' advice was underservingly neglected or whether the ministers were not capable and efficient to give proper advice. In reply to this problem we may point out that it would not be correct to blame only the kings. Ministers also must have been lacking in certain affairs. It is likely that the tradition of hereditary succession to the ministerial posts strictly followed by the rulers of early medieval period in general and by the Candelas in particular must have checked the deserving candidates from being appointed on the ministerial posts. Some other sources testify this by furnishing us with several instances.

18. RT. V. 453-57.
19. RT. VIII. 2459-64.
of unworthy ministers. The ministers of the Rṣṇi like Uddhava etc., are shown more particular about omens etc., on the occasion of war (Rukmi. p. 49) which cannot be said to be rational and perhaps that was the reason why Balarāma had rejected their advice of calling some astrologers on the same occasion.

In the context of ministers mention may be made of Furohita (this word literally means, "Kept in front (like a shield)", and conventionally "a sacrificial priest"). But according to our ancient law writers he is not simply a priest. Some authorities include him among ministers and chief officials while others consider him as distinct from ministers. It appears that in the age of Vatsarāja the latter idea was followed. For, in the records of Candellas, Grahadvālas and Senas Furohita and ministers are mentioned as two different

20. RT. VIII. 7; Prabandhacintāmani of Merutunga. p. 190 (Trans. by Tawny).
21. Manu. VII. 78; YS. I. 313; See also HDS. Vol. III. pp. 117-18.
22. Śukraniti. II. 71-72.
23. Viṭāladesvarā on YS. I. 312.
25. EL. Vol. IX. p. 305.
functionaries. At times, however, the same person might have worked as Purohita as well as minister and this becomes clear from the statement of Viśadāsāya that he is appointed on the posts of Śacīya and Purohita (Śacīya paurohitve ca niyukto'-ami. Tripura. p. 99).

Purohita was supposed to be a highly respected official. According to Kautilya, the king is required to honour his advice as a pupil honours his teacher, a son his father, or a servant his master. We find that Sarvatēpa, the king of Tripūrī, honours every advice of his Purohita Viśadāsāya (Tripura. pp. 101-4) except one (Tripura. pp. 112-13). It may be added here that the Purohita was expected to be endowed with high merit. According to the ancient authorities he was to be well-versed, in addition to various other subjects, in rites of propitiation and magical formulas contained in the Atharvaveda. Viśadāsāya, the Purohita of the Rṣi, must have acquired the expected knowledge. That is why Sarvatēpa had asked him to produce some kind of magic as a result of which Brāhma, Viśnū and Maheśa, being hopeless due to the suspicion of gods' complete destruction, may leave themselves the city of Indra (Tripura. p. 98). The magic accordingly employed by Viśadāsāya deserves to be quoted here in full. 'A flag,

27 Arthaśāstra of Kautilya. I.9.16 (U.V. Shastri edn.).
illusively made of Indra's skin and scattered with his many (= thousand) eyes, fettered strongly on Yama's danda with Varuna's pāśa, and embellished with the feather of Kārttikeya's peacock, was inserted at the tree of plenty' (Tripura. III. 5) and thereafter on the other side the illusive uproar of a large army was produced there (Tripura. p. 100).

(D) TERRITORY OF THE STATE

According to Agni Purāṇa (239.1-2) rāṣṭra or territory of the state is the most important among all elements of the state. Kāmandaka remarks that all elements of the state spring from the territory of the state, therefore, the king should develop his territory with all his efforts. A reader of the RV may form some idea regarding the general trend about the territory of the state. The utmost duty was to maintain the safety of the territory and if someone was unable to do it, he was highly disdainable (cf. dhigdhīciyaścirajāvitām vadasauraiḥ svargo hahā! grhyate. Tripura. II. 14). The author has referred to two types of realm -

1) Saurājya (acquired and governed fairly) (Rukmi. p. 68), and
2) Vīmārgārjita-rājya (acquired through improper means)
(Kirāta. Verse. 48).

Medhāstithi has remarked in his commentary on Manusmṛti

(IX. 294) that the kingdom has no fear of ruin if justice is properly administered. Vatsarāja has expected this ideal to be followed by kings (nvāyopāya-vraccā avanimavani-pāla-vantu praman-tāh. Kirāta. Verse. 61). But on the other hand the motive of enlarging the realm justly or unjustly by all means seems to have been a common feature of the Vatsarāja's age. The instances of extorting the Pāṇḍava's kingdom by Duryodhana or Kuравas through ill means (Kirāta. Verses 19, 54; p. 18) and of making illusive efforts by demons to occupy the city (territory) of Indra (Tripura. pp. 98, 100) may lead us to the same conclusion. One more reference to this fact may be added according to which the author has indicated that one, desirous of governing the entire earth, should serve the bow (vadystān caturamburāsā prāikhāmurvīṁ bubhukṣurbhavāḥsteccāno'ya mundāhvas-

(E) FORT OR FORTIFIED PLACE

The ancient authorities have largely stressed upon the necessity and importance of the fort-construction and it was one of the most important elements of early medieval age. The fort of Kālañjara referred to by Vatsarāja (Kirāta. p. 1; Kar-
pura. p. 23; Rukmi. p. 37) has been a central figure of the history of Candellas. More details are proposed to be given in a subsequent chapter on Fine Arts.
The treasury (= kośa) has been considered as one of the most important pillars of a state. According to Kātuṭīlyā all undertakings depend upon kośa, therefore, a king must pay his first attention to treasury. Gautama and Vignudharmottara Purāṇa also mention that kośa is the basis of other six elements of the state and the root of the tree of state. Vatsarāja has referred to the treasury as kośa (Kirāta. Verse. 54) and nidhāna (Hāsya. I. 17) the officer-in-charge of which was called kośādhvaksā (Rukmi. p. 53) and all the transactions in his office were conducted with his consent. In Hāsyacudāmaṇi Prahasana the author has made a mention of digging a treasure (Hāsya. I. 17) which suggests that there might be a tradition of keeping the treasure under-ground. Some other instances of depositing the personal property under ground (Karpūra. p. 35; Hāsya. I. 20) also strengthen this inference. The history of Candellas reveals a prosperous position of treasury. The construction of beautiful temples at Khajurāho, massive tanks and


32. kośām rājyavataramālaṃ ........ Vignudharmottara Purāṇa. II. 61. 17.
water reservoirs at different places of Bundelakhand, several forts at Kālañjara, Mahoba, Ajayagarh and other places indicates the large amount of wealth which was existing in the treasury during the Candella period. One more fact in this connection may be added that in 1233 A.D. the fifth share of the booty of Kālañjara, which was the perquisite of Sultan Iltutmish, amounted to twenty five lacs of coins.

Many varieties of coins such as dināra, niska, dramma, ṛpaka and kārsūpāna etc. are found in the history of northern India. Some of the Candella rulers viz. Kirtivarman, Madanavarman, Paramarddideva and Trailokyavarman are told to have issued several gold coins. Rājatarāṇī (IV. 017; V. 71, 84, 85, 89, 108, 116; VIII. 3335) and KS (Kerpura, p. 29) reveal that dināra was the most common coin of that age.

(G) ARM

Army is also a significant part of the government.

34. Sharma, Dasharath, Rājasthāna Through the Ages. p. 497.
Particularly in the early medieval period when there was a great threat from the neighbouring rulers and foreign invaders both, the importance of the army was realized by the kings more seriously than ever before for their security.

Vatsarāja refers to the army as bala (Vṛīta. Verses. 24, 25; Rukmi. p. 66; Tripura. p. 76; II. 15), Sainya (Rukmi. IV. 19), Prātanā (Vṛīta. Verse 44), vāhini (Vṛīta. pp. 11, 12, 13; Tripura. p. 99), anika (Tripura. I. 22; II. 3), anikini (Vṛīta. pp. 13, 15), Varṇāthinī (Tripura. p. 95), Camū (Tripura. II. 13) and aksarmāni (Vṛīta. Verse 48; Tripura. p. 106). It may be noticed here that all these are known as technical terms in ancient literature. Thus, Mahābhārata (udvagāvāra. 155. 24-26) describes that an army called senā consists of 500 elephants, 500 chariots, 1500 cavalry and 2500 foot-soldiers, 10 senas make one prtanā, 10 prtanās are equal to one vāhini, 10 vāhinīs are equal to one dhvajini, 10 dhvā- jīnis are equal to one Camū and 10 Camūs are equal to an aksauhini which, according to Vaijāvantī kośa, is equal to 10 anikinis. However, Vatsarāja does not seem to have made any technical distinction in using these terms. He does not ascribe the above-given particular sense to the various synonyms of army as he has called the same army of Kirātās prtanā (Vṛīta. Verse 44), vāhini (Vṛīta. pp. 11, 13) and anikini (Vṛīta. pp. 13,

15) and the same army of demons vāhini (Tripura. p. 99), anika (Tripura. I. 22; II. 3), camu (Tripura. II. 13) and aksauhini (Tripura. p. 106).

In ancient India an army used to be composed of four parts - infantry, cavalry, elephants and chariots, which is casually indicated in the RS (Tripura. II. 10). However, one must be aware of the fact that chariots were largely used, of course, in ancient India; but from eighth century A.D. onwards they disappeared in the warfare as is established by several scholars. Therefore, the references to chariots available in the later literature should be taken as merely conventional.

The chief commander of an army is called vāhinīśa (Kūkmi. pp. 11, 12), vāhinīśītha (Kūkmi. p. 13), nāyaka (Kūkmi. IV. 19) and sēnāśī (Tripura. p. 86). That he was followed by a very large number of army-men is testified by the internal as well as external evidences. Thus, the troop in KīrātārjunaVyāyoga is said to be uncountable (= gananā-bāhyā) (Kīrāta. p. 15). Vidyādhara, a Candella king, is recorded to have had a very vast army in 1022 A.D. and thus

our author Vatsarāja who was a contemporary of Candella kings might be acquainted with big armies.

However, a careful observer of the conditions of Vatsarāja's age must keep himself aware of a military fact that the size of standing armies used to be small. For, the kings depended largely on feudal and hired contingents. Sulaiman wrote in 9th century A.D. that the Indian kings had no standing armies. It may be corroborated by some more evidences, Mānasollāsa also mentions that the hired soldiers were reviewed by the king every day and were paid wages daily, monthly, quarterly, every four or six months according to terms of the contract.

The armies of Vatsarāja's age seem to be very heterogeneous to be commanded and mobilised briskly. Due to the pride of their personal valour and heroic chivalry the soldiers were not capable to form an independent strategy and to take a united action. We may notice an undesirable contention in the troop of gods on account of the same phenomena (cf. Trinura. pp. 81, 86, 89). There was prevailing a large number of weapons for military equipment during that age. In the contemporary literary

40. Ṣ. II. 568-70. p. 80.
works the number of these weapons goes to the extent of thirty six. The following are met with in the RS.

Sword: -

Sword has been referred to as Karavāla (Kirēta. Verse 3), sādi (Rukmi. II. 2; Tripura. I. 27), kṛṇāna (Karṇa. Verse 29; Rukmi. I. 13; IV. 2); Khadga (Rukmi. I. 17, 21; IV. 3, 6, 14; p. 43) and dhārā (Samudra. II. 9). It was supposed to be the chief among all weapons (= Sastrāsya pradhānam) (Tripura. I. 27), the destroyer of the families of enemies (= ripukulānta-kara) (Karṇa. Verse. 29) and to be worshipped by Kṣatriyas (= kṣatārādhyā) (Rukmi. IV. 3).

Bow and arrow: -

Although bow and arrow had lost their popularity as war weapons in medieval period and they were not used to that extent as in ancient ages. Vatsaraṇja is, however, well acquainted with them. In the RS they are often referred to. Generally

three things are mentioned in connection with this weapon viz. bow, arrow and quiver. Bow is referred to as bānasana (Kirāta. p. 18), sarasana (Rukmi. II. 6), ghanuḥ (Kirāta. Verse. 6), kodanda (Kirāta. Verses. 17, 31, pp. 3, 12, 19), pāpa (Kirāta. Verse. 18, p. 18; Rukmi. IV. 4; p. 72; Tripura. p. 85), dārśaka (Rukmi. p. 69), kārmuka (Tripura. p. 16a 105), and tvāra (Kirāta. Verse52). Arrow is called ṣara (Kirāta. Verses 8, 14, 44; pp. 4, 5, 12, 13, 15), prsatka (Kirāta. vers. 12, 52), ṣatu (Kirāta. p. 4; Rukmi. IV. 22, p. 72), nāraka (Kirāta. p. 4; Verse 34; Rukmi. IV. 18), gāyaka (Kirāta. Βεμ. 20, 43), bāna (Kirāta. pp. 10, 11, 12, 15, 16; Verse 41), pratī (Kirāta. pp. 10, 11; Verse 35; Rukmi. p. 67), mārgana (Kirāta. p. 12; Tripura. I. 29) and viśikha (Kirāta. p. 13); and the quiver isudhi (Kirāta. Verse. 17) and nīśanga (Kirāta. p. 10, Verse. 33).

The archery was to be learnt as a vidyā (science). Thus, Arjuna is said to be an expert in the science of archery (= kodandavidvāvidardha) (Kirāta. p. 3). The G further suggests that if somebody wanted to rule over the entire earth, he should use the bow (Kirāta. Verse. 18).

Spear is known as śūla (Kirāta. Verse. 2; Tripura. I. 20) and trisūla (trident) is a special variety of it (Rukmi. II. 12; Tripura. I. 8). Generally it consists of wooden or bamboo
pole pointed with a blade of steel and is supposed to be a convenient weapon for mounted soldiers.

**Club**

Club is called gadā (Tripura. II. 4; Kirāta. p. 19) and muśala (Rukmi. II. 11; p. 72) is a slightly different variety of it. It is one of the most ancient weapons used in India. Generally it is a weapon of foot-soldiers and is the best suited war-instrument for close combat. Fighting with club was also to be learnt as a vidyā and thus Duryodhana is said to be unrestrained in the science of club (= gadāvidyāyām uddhuraḥ) (Kirāta. p. 19).

**Battle-axe**

The battle-axe referred to as naraśu (Tripura. I. 20) and kuthārī (Kirāta. Verse. 28) is generally known to be a long tapering stick, attached to a crescent-shaped blade towards the upper end.

Some other weapons mentioned in the RS are cakra (Rukmi. III. 12; Tripura. I. 8, 37), vairā (Kirāta. Verse. 2; Tripura. p. 79; I. 12, 19) and hala (plough) (Rukmi. p. 68). Moreover some fire arms are also referred to as dahanāstra, Agneyāstra (Tripura. p. 104), rāvakāstra (Tripura. III. 18) and Agneyabāna (Tripura. p. 106). The history of military science also proves the prevalence of fire-arms in ancient and early medieval
In the context of weapons mention may be made of armour also which is casually referred to as kavaca (Tripura. I. 29; Samudra. I. 22) and kaṅkata (Tripura. III. 19) in the RS.

General ethics of fighting:

In the RS we find some traces of a higher ideology of warfare. Although the kuṭa-yuddha or war by intrigues and tactics was commonly practised in ancient ages, in the dramas of Vatsarṣja it gets a little scope and all the tactics based on cheating are rather neglected in favour of the feelings of personal chivalry and old religious beliefs. A study of the RS reveals that in the following conditions the attack was prohibited:

i) If the enemy is with averted face (= parāmukha) (Rukmi. p. 67);

ii) If it is a night time (Rukmi. pp. 45, 48).

iii) If the enemy is not inviolable (= durddharsa) (Tripura. p. 114).

iv) If the opponent is a child (Tripura. pp. 105; III. 21).

v) If the opponent is handicapped (Tripura. III. 17).

On the other hand the opponents of heroes in the RS are shown applying kuṭa-yuddha when they found their enemies in a far superior position for an open fight (= prakatayuddha).

42. cf. HDS. Vol. III. p. 213.
(Rukmi. p. 71). This may lead us to a serious weakness of the Indian kings of that age. K.M. Munshi has rightly remarked that the Indian kings were fighting with their enemies according to certain humane rules prescribed in their Dharmaśāstra treatises while the way of fighting of foreign invaders was without any norms. No code or canon could circumscribe their destructive zeal of burning, looting and indulging in matchless massacre at the point of weapon.

Some other general trends are reflected as follows:—

the fighting was expected between warriors possessing equal weapons (Kīrāta. p. 19; Rukmi. p. 70). It was not deemed proper to fight with an enemy who was stronger (Samudra. p. 181). The brave persons did not retreat from the battlefield (Rukmi. pp. 66, 67). To become long-lived fleeing from a battlefield was worthy to be condemned (Rukmi. IV. 3). The kettle-drum (= dundubhi) was to be beaten for signalling the start of a battle (Rukmi. p. 43). As a matter of fact the war-music has been a significant feature of the battle during ancient and medieval ages. It had the power to create a military atmosphere in which every soldier was prepared to risk his life in the battlefield. This idea is indicated in a passage describing that it was impossible for Kṛṣṇa to sit silent after hearing

---

43. Munshi, K.M., Foreword to The Struggle for Empire. pp. XI-XII.
the sound of a kettle-drum of war as for a lion to delay after listening the scream of an elephant (Rukmi. p. 68).

Vatsarāja's age was of intense faith in omens and supernatural agencies which were considered to be a major factor leading to success in warfare also. In Rukminīharana Ihāmrāga we meet with Uddhava asking to call some astrologers for suggesting the auspicious moment for march (Rukmi. p. 49). It may be just imagined that in a state where the time for beginning an expedition was to be dictated by the astrological forecasts and not by diplomatic and strategic considerations how the determined foreign invaders could be resisted effectively.

A verse of the BS (Kirāta. Verse 57) indicates an ancient military rite called nīrājanavidhi which used to be performed before starting for an expedition in medieval age also. In this ritual lamps were to be waved before the soldiers etc. In the age of Vatsarāja this rite was so important that Bhoja had remarked in the 11th century that the kings who did not perform the nīrāja ceremony were likely to be doomed.

A reference to serve the injured in battle (Tripura.

p. 108) may lead us to infer the existence of a commissariat department. Every organized army needs a separate department to look after the supply of foodstuffs, medical assistance and other essential commodities. According to Mitiprajakaśikā (VI. 33 ff.) an army was to be followed by civil officials and good physicians etc. In Candellas' records we read of a veterinary surgeon called aśavāidyā. He must be accompanying the army with a rich stock of medicines and big staff of attendants. Some other contemporary sources also bear witness to the same department. The Prabandhacintāmani refers to the commissariat department in the army of Pratihāra Cāhamāna. Another reference to the department of medical services in Kāśmīra army is furnished by Kalhana.

(II) FRIENDS OR ALLIES

The seventh and last constituent part of the state was mitrās or friendly rulers of other states. However, we find this element in a very poor position during medieval age. After the fall of Pratihāra empire, all the kings were ambitious of becoming the supreme power in north-western and central India at the expense of others. There was hardly any

46. ASI. Vol. XXI. p. 51.
48. RT. VIII. 740-41.
king relying on friendly relations of another. Although there are a few instances of alliance, they seem to have been due to fear or tributaries of the mighty rulers which were broken to pieces after some time.

As a matter of fact in that age of foreign invasions there was an ample need for resolving the mutual differences and strengthening the friendly relations with other indigenous rulers. Had it been occurred, it would have brought some fruitful result to the nation. Luckily, we have some specific instances of Candella rulers boldly forwarding to this significant political idea. In this regard mention may be made of three Candella kings - Dhaṅgadeva, Candadeva and Vidyādhara. The first two helped the Śhī kings Jayapāla and Anandapāla of Lahore forming a confederation of the other kings of Ujjain, Gwalior, Kanauj, Delhi and Ajmer while Māhmūd attacked Bhatinda. Vidyādhara also had promised aid to Trilocanapāla, the son of Anandapāla, for the recovery of his lost kingdom. A survey of the Åś reveals that the author might be highly influenced by these remarkable activities of the

49. cf. HCG, pp. 144-45.
51. HCG, p. 64; GJ, pp. 76-77.
Candella rulers and through the combination of sixteen and twelve heroes of Tripuradāha Dīma and Samudramathana Samavarkāra respectively he was discharging his duty of awakening the nation by means of motivating the contemporary kings to be confederated under one competent ruler (= Paramarddiveva) for the successful encounter with invaders.

The RŚ of Vatsarāja further stresses upon the importance of allies at several places. Thus, in Kirātārjunīya Vyāyoga it is reflected that Arjuna can attain every success when Vāsudeva (Kṛṣṇa) is his friend (Kirāta, p. 3). Furthermore in the same play Siddhādeśa says that there is no fear to Pāṇḍavas from Kauravas when Indra is on the side of Pāṇḍavas (Kirāta. Verse 24). In Tripuradāha Dīma also Nārada thinks that the victory of gods is beyond any doubt when Dharma is on their side (Tripura, p. 86). Balabhadra, in Rukminīharana Thāmrga, gives a call to the kings related to Rukmi in order to become united with him through matrimonial relations (Rukmi, IV. 5).

In the context of allies we may mention the tradition of Sāmantas or feudatory kings. V.S. Agrawal points out that the institution of Sāmantas seems to have come into existence many centuries before Bāna. Afterwards the medieval literature is found to be full of references to Sāmantas as an active

52. cf. Samudra, I. 4.
institution. According to him the medieval polity may be said to be based on Sāṃanta system. Generally when an ambitious king won another ruler, the former included the latter's territory into his own, or the latter was reduced to the position of a subordinate ruler (= Sāṃanta) who obeyed the former and paid him regular tribute.

In Rukminīharana Thāmarga the feudatory system is indicated when a bandī (bard) of the prince Rukmi says that the other kings may enjoy the royal usufruct on the earth provided they conceal their 'deva' epithet (before the supreme prince Rukmi), otherwise they will be killed by the arrow of Rukmi (Rukmi. I. l1). Obviously it is a challenge to the other kings to be either vassals of the prince Rukmi or to be the victims of the arrows of Rukmi. It becomes more clear when Krishna accepts this challenge and says punningly that he will make dāna (1 - tribute or share; 2 - splitting) in the battlefield by wealth in the form of sword (Rukmi. I. l3).

(I) JUSTICE AND POLITICAL IDEAS

To administer justice impartially and to punish the guilty, these two have been among the principal functions of the state from a remote date. Vijñāneśvara (11th-12th century A.D.) mentions in his commentary on Yājñavalkya Smṛti (II. l) 53.

---

that the highest duty of a king is to protect the subjects which can not be discharged without eradicating and punishing the wicked. Therefore, a king has to administer justice. This idea is faithfully followed by the author of the Rg. In Kirātārjunīya Vyāyoga Vatsarāja has expected the kings to be inclined to the (four) expedients being applied justiciably (Kirāta. Verse, 61). Further it is stated in Rukminiharana Thāmrga that no body would hesitate to punish the wicked properly (duryātrocitadandapātanavidhau kastau dolāvate. Rukmi. II. 5). Elsewhere (Hāsya. I. 13) the king is said to be the protector of the people through bearing the royal staff (as a symbol of judicial authority and punishment). A passage from Kārṇḍaśārīta Bhaṇḍa informs us that if somebody was guilty of being a thief, he was to be imprisoned and no other remedy was there for that (Kārṇḍa. p. 29). He was to be arrested immediately by the policemen (Kārṇḍa. p. 34). If there was some doubt or uncertainty about the offence of an accused, an ordeal was to be conducted which was called dvīvaśuddhi (Hāsya. I. 13).

Being a minister of Candella dynasty Vatsarāja must have been well-versed in politics. He has casually expressed some general political ideas in his Rg. Thus, he has given a general suggestion that one should not be careless with an enemy even if he is of the size of an atom (nanu raramānumātāraṇi vairinī apramattena bhavītavyam. Tripura. p. 88). As the God
is of inconceivable character and no one can check the destiny, so one should perform whatever is ought to be done in accordance with one's discretion (Tripura. IV. 5). To take rest becomes an ornament only for those persons who have successfully accomplished their task through efforts (chalitodyamakhadānāh viśṝma mandanāyate. Samudra. I. 30). The author also advises indirectly a king that the bitter remarks of the intoxicated and proud persons should not be minded and the proper remedy for those persons is to merely sneer at them (Kukmi. II. 5).

CONCLUSION:

The above account of political ideas can be concluded with following observations. The kings who were the axis of the states are shown in is to have departed from the ancient ideal of noble kingship. They are dominated by several ill-characteristics. Ministers are also passing through a tragic state. A great rift is noticed between the king and ministers. The thirst of enlarging the territory of state by all means - whether proper or improper - is of common occurrence amongst rulers. The increasing conditions of unsafety due to various invasions compel the administrators to construct the fortified places at a large scale. Treasury is rich through which the kings can afford various constructive works of public utility and cultural significance. The armies are said to be comprised mostly of feudatories and hired soldiers. They are
lacking the glory of unity and discipline to some extent. The kings do not realize the necessity of improving friendly relations with other rulers which ultimately leads them to internecine.