CHAPTER IV

RELIGION AND THE STATE: KUMĀRAPĀLA'S CONVERSION TO JAINISM

Here we will examine the evidences having a bearing upon Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism to see whether they are tenable. According to all accounts Hemacandra persuaded the Caulukya king to embrace Śvetāmbara Jainism after discarding Śaivism, the religion followed by all of his ancestors. As we saw in the introductory chapter, Hemacandra wrote on a variety of topics including history of the Caulukyas. Naturally the conversion of Kumārapāla to Jainism would have been of the greatest significance for all Jaina acaryas including Hemacandra. He was the spiritual preceptor as well as the ‘court poet’ of the Caulukya king and therefore nearest to Kumārapāla among all the authors. Thus his account of the event is of greatest value among the Jaina sources. His description becomes all the more significant when one considers the nature of prabandha literature.

It will not be far too wrong to assert that particularly the later Jaina authors used the biography of Kumārapāla for nothing but sectarian propaganda by selecting some aspect thereof and blowing it out of all proportions and by outright distortion both by commission and omission of facts about Kumārapāla.

1 I have deliberately used this word for Jinamandana says that Kumārapāla threw all the Hindu idols out of his palace. see Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., pp. 123-24
Romila Thapar means the same while discussing Merutunga’s account of the miracle performed by Hemacandra and the consequent conversion of Kumārapāla. She says that the miracle of Śiva manifesting himself to Kumārapāla at the request of a Jaina acārya becomes the central concern of the Jaina sources. This was viewed as the most significant happening in support of Jainism and therefore an act of much importance in the confrontation between Jainism and Śaivism and “this might also explain the frequency of biographies of Kumārapāla among the Jaina texts.” But even Hemacandra, aptly called the Kalikālasarvajñā, must not be taken at face value. Apart from pointing out the inconsistencies of the Jaina texts, whether written by a single person or being the description of the same event by different authors, we shall juxtapose it with the Brahmanical and particularly the epigraphic sources.

At the start of the MRP Kumārapāla remembers Hemacandra with gratitude. Then he promulgates ordinances to enforce Jaina tenets of thought related with the 12 vows of a śrāvaka, besides observing himself. He performs the tīrthayātras to various Jaina holy places. These were put forward by Kṛpāsundarī as the condition of her marriage to the king. In the last scene of this drama, Kumārapāla overcomes the king of delusion (moharāja), who is symbolic of mithyātva, with the help of the Yogāśāstra—the steel armer and the Vīṃśatīṭarāgastuti—the divine pills, given by Hemacandra which symbolizes samyaktva. Thereafter he marries Kṛpāsundarī before a statue of Arhat, symbolic of his conversion to Jainism.²

---

² Thapar, R., Somanath, New Delhi, 2004 p. 116
³ MRP, act v, p. 111
Somaprabha describes Kumārapāla’s longing to know the true religion (dharmasvarūpa jñāsā). Once he called an assembly of his learned men and asked their advice about the best religion to be followed which could make one’s life most happy. Being Brahmans these learned men naturally extolled the merits of Vedic religion consisting of sacrifices and ceremonial rituals. Knowing that sacrifices involved slaughter of animals, the king was not convinced of the merits of this faith. He was unsatisfied and this increased his longing to know the true faith. Once his Jaina minister Bahada told him about Hemacandra. The minister advised the monarch that if he is desirous of knowing this, he should approach Hemacandra with devotion. Accepting this advice, Kumārapāla began to listen to the sermons of the monk. Hemacandra first began by teaching the king about the evil effects of vices like gambling, drinking, adultery etc. by means of parables and legends. Then he preached about the nature of true faith (samyaktva) and false religion (mithyātva). Then the monk persuaded the Caulukya king to ban these vices throughout his kingdom by royal decrees. In this way Kumārapāla became more and more devoted to Jainism and took a number of measures such as building of Jinacaityas and going to tirthayātras to show this commitment to the Jaina doctrines. All these steps were taken by the Caulukya monarch to show his gradually increasing devotion to Jainism, as a result of Hemacandra’s instructions. Then Hemacandra gave the details of the 12 vows of a śrāvaka. The monk put before the king examples of some famous Jainas of ancient times and of his contemporary Chaddana, the richest Jaina living in the Caulukya capital. Kumārapāla accepted the initiation of

4 KPP, pp. 5-6
these dvadasa-anuvratani from Hemacandra with devotion and became fully converted to Jainism.\(^5\)

According to Prabhūcandra and Pradyumnasuri after his coronation Kumārapāla decided to suppress Anorāja, the arrogant king of Sapādalakṣa (Eastern Rājapūtanā). He accordingly prepared for the war and proceeded with all his commanders and troops. After some days he reached the fort of Ajayameru i.e. modern Ajmer. He besieged it but could not conquer it despite all endeavours. When the monsoons set in he returned to Anhilvad without having carried his purposes into effect. At the beginning of the cold season he again set forth, but had to return again at the end of the summer without having achieved the fall of Ajmer. Eleven years passed in this way. Then he asked his minister Vāgabhata, the son of Udayana, whether there were no deity, Yakṣa or Asura, who could help him to achieve victory. Vāgabhata advised him to worship the image of Ajitasvamin of Anhilvad which had been consecrated by Hemacandra. Kumārapāla consented and offered Ajitasvamin presents of very costly goods as required by the Jaina sect. at the same time he promised that in case he conquered his enemy through Ajita’s grace, the latter should alone be “his god, mother, guru and father.” Thereafter he again proceeded against Anno for the twelfth time. The battle took place in the vicinity of mount Arbuda. Anorāja was totally beaten and Kumārapāla made a triumphal entry into Anhilvad. Without forgetting his promise he worshipped in the temple of Ajitanātha. Soon afterwards, Kumārapāla proclaimed to his minister that he wanted to be instructed in the Jaina tenets and asked Vāgabhata to find a teacher for him. The Jaina minister

\(^5\) KPP, p. 396
proposed that Hemacandra be invited to fulfil the king’s wish. Hemacandra preached before Kumārapāla with the result that the Caulukya king was moved to take the vows of layman, to renounce eating flesh and all other forbidden foods, and to study the doctrine of the Jainas.\(^6\)

Merutunga says that once Kumārapāla asked his spiritual preceptor how could he immortalize for ever the memory of his rule. Then Hemacandra advised the king either to pay off everyone’s debts, as was done by Vikramāditya, or to have a new stone temple built in the place of the dilapated wooden temple of Śiva-Somanatha in Devapattana. Kumārapāla preferred the latter and deputed at once an officer to begin the work. When it was reported that the foundation stone had been laid, Hemacandra proposed to the king that he should take a vow to ensure the happy conclusion of the project, and to that end either to observe complete chastity or to renounce indulgence in spirituous drinks and flesh eating until the flag was unfurled on the pinnacle of the temple. Kumārapāla swore before a Śiva-linga to abstain from the prohibited drinks and foods for the required length of time. After two years the temple was completed and the king wanted now to be freed from his vow. Hemacandra prevailed upon him to hold the vow still longer, until he had worshipped the god in the new temple. Immediately a pilgrimage to Somatha was undertaken, and on the advice of the envious Brahmanas, Hemacandra too was invited. The Jaina monk took a roundabout route so as to visit the shrines of Śatruñjaya and Gimar. At the gate of Devapattana he met the king and participated in the ceremonious entry-procession together with the king and the Ganda Brhaspati, the

\(^6\) \textit{PRC}, XXII, verses 417-595
temple priest of Somanatha. Dressed in a costly attire Hemacandra entered the temple led by Brhaspati, praised its brilliance, made the usual sacrificial offerings according to the instructions of the Śivapurāṇa and threw himself prostrate before the Linga. When Hemacandra finished his prayers, Kumārapāla worshipped the god according to the instructions of Brhaspati and distributed rich presents. Then he ordered his retinue to retire and visited with Hemacandra the sanctum (garbhagrha) of the Holiest of the Holy. There he asked Hemacandra to explain before the deity truthfully the way to salvation. Hemacandra meditated for a moment. Then he proposed to appeal to the god who was verily present there that he might manifest himself and show the way to moksa. Hemacandra sank into the deepest meditation in order to attain the desired end. He instructed the king to bring immediately incense-offering and aloe-wood. As both of them thus were so busy and the hall was filled with smoke-clouds, all of sudden there appeared a bright light and the beaming form of an ascetic was visible on the water-basin around the linga. Kumārapāla touched the apparition from its feet upto its head and having convinced himself that it was of divine origin, requested it for advice. Then Lord Śiva told him that Hemacandra would surely lead him to deliverance- etada upadiṣṭa eva-asamdigdho muktimārgah. Then the apparition disappeared. Kumārapāla then requested Hemacandra in all humility for instruction. The latter at once made him take a vow that he would never touch during all his lifetime either meat or spirituous drinks. After a short time Kumārapāla returned to Anhilvad. He was won over more and more to the Jaina faith through Hemacandra’s instructions in the āgamas as well as through his works, the TSPC, the Yogaśāstra and the Vīṇasativītārāgastotra. Kumārapāla

7 PC, p. 85
also received the epithet of Paramarhata, ‘the eager worshipper of the Arhata’. After discussing the account of conversion given in the PC Majumdar has said with some impatience, “There is no reason for believing these and other stories of the later chroniclers, which give conflicting versions and are full of impossibilities.”

Jinamandana agrees with Merutunga. But he felt the inner contradiction which the story of the PC as well as that of the PRC contained and therefore interwove a new story at the beginning of his account, points out Buhler. He says “The story is to show that Hemacandra went to the court very soon after Kumārapāla’s coronation. This story, however, betrays quite clearly that the author had the knowledge of the older accounts and that he had changed them deliberately [our italics].” Actually the PC says that Hemacandra was introduced to Kumārapāla by Udayana. And as we saw it has described the meeting of Kumārapāla with Udayana and Hemacandra at Cambay when he was a fugitive and thus contradicts itself. So Jinamandana inserts the story that after his coronation Kumārapāla forgot Hemacandra altogether. After coming to Anhilvāḍ, he asked Udayana whether the king still remembered him. As the reply was in the negative, he requested Udayana to warn the king against visiting the palace of his queen on a certain day. He also permitted the minister to disclose his name if the king insisted on knowing the name of the warner. Udayana warned Kumārapāla who acted accordingly. On the said day the palace of the queen caught fire from lightning and was burnt to ashes. When he asked the name of the warner he was told that it was Hemacandra. Kumārapāla at once summoned the monk and promptly begged to be excused in all

---

8 Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., p. 120

9 Buhler, G., op. cit., p. 31
humility for his forgetfulness and promised him to rule entirely according to his counsel.
In the rest Jinamāṇḍana wholly and literally follows Merutunga. He “lengthens the
account of Kumārapāla’s conversion very much by many quotations which he attributes
to Hemacandra [our italics].

Now let us see what Hemacandra himself says about the conversion of Kumarapala. In
the *Mahāvīravariṇī* he puts these words in the mouth of Mahāvīr in terms of a prophecy:

45-46. when, O Abhaya, 1669 years would have passed after my nirvana [i.e. in V.S.1199], then
there will live in that city [Anhillapattana] the long armed king Kumārapāla, the moon of the
Caulukya lineage, a powerful lord of all.

53. Once this prince will see the teacher Hemacandra, who has arisen from the race of
Municandra in the Vajraśākhā.

54. Delighted at the sight of him, as the peacock is delighted at the appearance of the clouds, this
good man will hasten to do honour daily to that monk.

55. This king will go with his minister of the Jaina faith to honor that suri whilst the latter is
preaching in the temple of the Jina about the sacred law.

56. There he will, though ignorant of the truth, pray to the god, and honor that teacher with a
naturally pure heart.

57. After he has heard with delight the noble sermon about the law from his lips, he will take the
minor vows (*anuvratāni*) and will then strive after the vow of perfection (*samyaktva*).
58. After enlightenment has come to him, he will fully learn the life of the faithful (prāptabodho bhavitā śrāvakācārāparāgaḥ), and resting in the audience-chamber will ever delight himself with the speeches about the sacred law.\textsuperscript{11}

Buhler was of the opinion that the MRP preserved the exact date of this event where the conversion of Kumārapāla is allegorically mentioned as his marriage with Kṛpāsundarī. Hemacandra is mentioned as the priest who ordained the marriage tie before Arahat. The text of this drama was not available to Buhler.\textsuperscript{12} Therefore his assertion is based on Jinamāṇḍana, but fully knowing the nature of his text Buhler is cautious. He says “According to the quotation of Jinamāṇḍana from the Moharājaparājaya, this marriage took place in V.S. 1216, Marga sudi 2. If, as may well be well supposed, this date really occurred in the drama, then it must be taken as authentic, for the Moharājaparājaya was written, a few years after the death of Kumarapala, between V.S.1229 and 1232 [our italics].”\textsuperscript{13} Jinamāṇḍana says kṛpāsundaryah saṁvat 1216 mārgasudidvitiyādine pāṇim jagrāha srikumārapālamahipālah srimadardhaddevatāsamaksam.\textsuperscript{14}

Now the MRP nowhere mentions the date of Kumārapāla’s conversion. Thus according to Buhler the date of conversion given by Jinamāṇḍana i.e. V.S. 1216 must not be taken

\textsuperscript{11} TSPC, XII. Translation by Buhler. He also gives the text of Mahāvīravacarita, sarga XII. verses 45-96 on pp.87-89 of his monograph in a rather long footnote.

\textsuperscript{12} Buhler, G., op. cit., General editor’s preface p. x

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 35

\textsuperscript{14} Quoted by the editor of the MRP on p. ix fn. 1
as authentic. This is confirmed if we consider the nature of the *Kumārapālacaritra*. As pointed out by Buhler, it is a loose compilation from the *PRC*, the *PC*, the *PK* and several other similar works.\(^{15}\) We have already seen how Jinamandana deliberately inserts his own stories and attributes his own ideas as quotations from Hemacandra. In the colophon he says: \textit{iti...srijinamandanopādhyaśaṁhit śrikumārapālaprabandho drṣṭaśrutāmsareṇa yojitah.}\(^{16}\) Therefore in all probability Jinamandana deliberately put V.S. 1216 as the date of conversion and for authenticity attributed it to the *MRP*. He choose this date because by this time all the wars of Kumārapāla were over and this fact was well known to Jinamandana. So his motive was to represent Kumārapāla as an ideal Jaina king and in this incarnation he must not indulge in bloodshed. It is obvious that for the Jaina authors the most significant date was Kumārapāla’s conversion to Jainism as far as his biography is concerned. No other chronicle has given the date, authors like Somaprabhasuri and Yasahpāla who belonged to the circle of Hemacandra and who must have been alive and old enough to note the significance of V.S. 1216 for Jainism, are silent. Even Merutunga, as someone more reliable among Jaina authors and who is meticulous with his dates, has not given any. According to him the conversion took place after Kumārapāla visited Somanātha with Hemacandra and Ganda Brhaspati. The Veraval epigraph dated V.S. 1225 says that the repairing work of this Saiva temple was finished by then. The *PC* is explicit that up to this date Kumārapāla was a Saiva king. As we saw Merutunga was familiar with all of Hemacandra’s works and doubtlessly with many similar works concerned with Hemacandra and Kumārapāla. Presumably none of

\(^{15}\) *MRP*, pp. 2-3

\(^{16}\) Ibid, p. 62 fn.4
them mentioned the date of conversion. It was left for the unscrupulous propagandist Jinamandana to invent in A.D. 1435-36 that Kumarapāla was converted to Jainism in A.D. 1160. Thus irrespective of the fact of conversion, its date as given by Jinamandana can not be accepted without reservations, in fact it is purely fictitious.

As we shall see below in some detail many things of Mahāvīra's prophecy are factually incorrect, not a few impossible and on the whole it appears that Hemacandra is expressing a wish (note the future tense of the narration) rather than noting some empirical facts. The TSPC is meant for the Jaina audience only and indeed among them it occupies a virtual canonical status. In view of the intimacy between Kumarapala and the Jaina elites Hemacandra probably wrote this as an expectation from a grateful and hence friendly king. This prophecy certainly gives legitimacy to the Caulukya king among the Jaina community. The only certain thing about this prophecy is that it was made after V.S. 1199. At least theoretically interpolation can not be ruled out. Thus this passage might be interpreted to mean that instead of recording the fact of Kumarapāla's conversion it expresses something which the author wished to happen. This interpretation is supported by what Hemacandra says in the second verse at the end of his own commentary(vṛtti) on the Yogāsāstra. He wrote this vṛtti 'owing to the request which the illustrious Caulukya king made to me.' Hemacandra says:

_Samprūpi yogaśāstrāttadvivrteścāpi yanmayā sukṛtam_  
_Tena Jinabodhilabhapraṇayī bhavyojano bhavatā._
"Through the merit which I attained by the Yogasatra and its exposition, may the good man be *induced* to win for himself the enlightenment of the Jina [our italics]."\(^{17}\) This commentary is contemporary with the *Mahāvīra-caritra* of the *TSPC*.\(^{18}\) As emphasize above, the crucial word is *Jinabodhi-bhapraṇayī*. Here Hemacandra expresses his desire that the Caulukya king may be inclined to acquire the 'teachings' of the Jina. It must be noted that *Jinabodhi* here means the doctrine of the Jainas which Kumārapāla may be *induced* to acquire. Now one should see how far it will be from the truth to interpret this verse as a proof of Kumarapala's conversion to Jainism. Hemacandra makes no mention of Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism in the *DKV*. This omission is significant for two things. As we have argued elsewhere\(^{19}\), unlike the *TSPC* which was written for the Jaina *sangha*, the *DKV* is meant for a wider audience. Secondly, the voluminous *TSPC* was written earlier than the last five *sargas* of the *DKV* which deals with the life of Kumārapāla.\(^{20}\)

Thus it can be suggested that there was no 'formal' conversion of Kumarapala to Jainism on the basis of the above discussion. This is supported by the silence of Somesvara, the *Gurjareśvarapurohitā*. Majumdar attributes this to his sectarian feelings and says "The descendents of the Caulukya chaplains, the Brahmin Somesvara, totally

\(^{17}\) Buhler, G., op. cit., p.39. Buhler has given the text in fn. 80 which appears on pp. 93-94 of his book.

\(^{18}\) Ibid, pp. 40, 48.

\(^{19}\) M.Phil. Diss., pp. 62ff.

\(^{20}\) Buhler, G., op. cit., p. 48
suppresses the fact of Kumarapala's conversion.\textsuperscript{21} This is unlikely because Someśvara was "a frank partisan of the brothers Vastupala and Tejahpala....[and ] his main intention in writing the book [the KK] was to eulogise Vastupala."\textsuperscript{22} Thus 'total' suppression of Kumarapala's conversion' was not something which would have sounded like music to the ears of the author's patron.

We have decided not to discuss the rather late account of the Dhrmārṇya- Māhātmya of the Skanda Purāṇa and 19\textsuperscript{th} century oral traditions which are nothing but their authors' attempt to outwit their rivals, particularly the former is so loose an account that we should hesitate in ascribing it to the incident of Kumarapala's conversion.\textsuperscript{23}

At the end we must examine the epigraphic sources. The Jalor inscription says that this temple (Jīna caitya) on the Kāñcanagiri fort of Jalor was ordered to be built (kārīta) by prabhuhemāsuri-prabodhita-gurjaradharādhisvar-paramārha-caullakya-mahārāja-
dhirāja-sīkumārapāladeva and consigned forever (ācandrārka) to the care of Devācārya, the lord of debaters from the Vṛhadgaccha-vṛhadgacchāvādindra in V.S. 1221.\textsuperscript{24} It further states that Samarāsimha, the ruler of Jalor (etad-deśādhipacahamānākulatilakamahārājaśīramaraminadhava) ordered for some repair work in V.S. 1242.\textsuperscript{25} By the order of srimadrājakula a toraṇa and golden flagstaff was installed

\textsuperscript{21} Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., p. 124
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid, p. 413
\textsuperscript{23} For details see M.Phil Diss. pp.53 ff
\textsuperscript{24} EI, XI, p.55 Lines 1-3of the epigraph
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., line3.
by Purṇadeva, disciple of Devācārya in V.S. 1256. Lastly in V.S. 1268 Rāmacandra, the disciple of Purṇadeva made some further additions to this temple, apparently on his own.

Here Kumārapāla is called ‘foremost among the worshippers of the Arhat’ (paramārhat) who was ‘enlightened by Hemacandra’ (hemaśuriprabodhīta). Two things should be noted. This epithet of Kumarapala is not contemporary, it was given in A.D. 1185, at the earliest, to which the inscription belongs. Secondly it was issued from a prominent Jaina center of Jalor.

A usual epithet of Kumārapāla occurring in many inscriptions, including post V.S. 1216 ones as well, is Umāpati-varalabdha-prasādāt or Pārvatipati-varalabdha-praudhapratāpa. The most significant epigraph in this regard is the Veraval inscription of Brhaspati noted above. It is dated Vallabhi samvat 850 which corresponds to V.S.1225 or May or June 1169 A.D. Here Kumārapāla is called Māheśvaranpā-agraṇīh or ‘the leader of the kings of Śaiva faith’. It is of some significance that most of Kumarapāla’s epigraphs begin with an invocation to Śiva, not a single inscription has been found in which any Jaina divinity is invoked.

---

26 This epigraph belongs to Cahamana Samarasimha of Jalor and is dated V.S. 1242 according to the editor D.R.Bhandarkar. vide p. 54 of EJ,XI. See also DHNI,II p. 983 fn.1

27 For two examples, see Vadnagar prasasti dated V.S. 120 at EJ, I, p. 293 ; Udayapur inscription dated V.S. 1220 in IA,XVIII, p.341

28 Buhler, G., op. cit., p. 86 fn. 64

29 Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., p. 121
In his *Abhidhanacintāmaṇī* Hemacandra calls Kumārapāla paramārhat and Majumdar thinks on the basis of this and the *Mahāvīracarita* that “there is no doubt that Kumārapāla became a Jaina...the evidence therefore is conclusive that Kumārapāla adopted the Jaina faith.”\(^{30}\)

We have already discussed the *Mahāvīracarita* of the TSPC, in the case of the *Abhidhanacintāmaṇī* the probability of interpolation is indeed great. A manuscript copyist, let us say a śvetāmbara monk of Gujarat who knew the close relations between the Caulukya king and Hemacandra, might preface the name of Kumārapāla with the word *Paramārha* very much deliberately. Somesvara gives a more important evidence. He says that Kumārapāla’s body was cremated and his ashes immersed in the holy water of the sangama at Prayaga and oblations were offered for his departed soul at Gaya by the Brahmana purohita of his son and successor Ajayapāla, as we saw above. The Surathotsava of Somesvara says:

*Kumārapālasya culukyabhartaṅgāṃi Gaṅgāsalile nidhāya
Śrīsarvadevena Gayā-prayāga-viprah pradānena krtah kṛtārthah.\(^{31}\)

This shows that Kumārapāla was not converted to Jainism till his death, at least. Thus the weight of the evidence indicates that there was no conversion of Kumārapāla to Jainism, despite his close connections with the Jaina elites.

\(^{30}\) Ibid., p.124

\(^{31}\) Canto XV, *sloka* 29. Quoted by Majumdar on p. 454 fn. 119 of his monograph.
Kumarapala as the Instrument of Enforced Proselytization of the Non-believers

As we saw above, the contradictory nature of evidence makes it difficult to arrive at any definite conclusion with reference to Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism. The emphatic 'yes' of the Jaina sources is contradicted by the 'no' of the Brahmanical sources and the ambivalence of the epigraphic sources. For a study of kingcraft, an alternative approach will be to sidestep the issue of conversion, and focus upon the question 'what differences the conversion might have made in the practices of statecraft by Kumārapāla.' To clarify this point, it is important to know what religion/sect a king follows in his personal life. For example, he may be a Śaiva, a Vaiṣṇava, a Jaina-śvetambara or digambara, or a Baudhā. The personal religion of many a king has been a subject of some controversy. To give some examples, whether Candragupta was a Jaina and his grandson Aśoka a Baudhā, whether Amoghavāraśa I was a Jaina. Was Viśṇuvardhana converted to Vaiṣṇavism from Jainism? In our case, whether Kumārapāla was converted from from Saivism to Jainism. But what is more important from the perspective of kingcraft, is to delimit the influence of the personal religion of a particular king upon his practices of statecraft. To put it more precisely, what differences a particular religion made to the way in which a king was related to his realm. Then a comparative study of the monarchs following the prominent faiths will tell whether we can talk of a Śaiva, a Jaina and a Baudhā kingcraft as distinct from a Śaiva, Jaina or Baudhā king. So far, no study of this kind is available to us. Moreover, this comparative study of the practices of kingship should be juxtaposed with the normative discourses of statecraft as envisaged by these three prominent traditions. A historical
perspective along this line will be helpful in answering the significant question of the preponderant dominance of the Brahmanical ideology of kingship over its two main rivals.

We have already examined the ideologies of kingship of these traditions in a previous chapter. Here we shall describe the practices of kingcraft by Kumārapāla as a Jaina king as represented by the Jaina authors.

Hemacandra says:

49. He will make people like unto himself, firm in the fulfillment of the law, even as a wise teacher trains a good pupil.

50. Granting protection to those who seek it, and like as a brother to the wives of other men, he will esteem the sacred law above riches and as life.

59. He will keep everyday to the vows, particularly to those relating to rice, vegetables, fruits and other foods, and will generally practice chastity.

60. This wise man will not only avoid courtesans, but will admonish his lawful wives to practice chastity.

61. According to the instructions of that monk [Hemacandra], he, who knows the general principles of the faith, the doctrine of that which has soul and of that which has no soul and so forth, will, like a teacher, procure enlightenment for others too.

62. Even the Brahmanas of the Pāṇdhuraṅga sect and others, who hate the Arhat, will, at his command, become equal to those who are born in the faith.

63. This man, learned in the law, will, after having taken the vow of a believer, not take his meals without having worshipped in the Jaina temples and without having bowed before the teachers.

64. He will not take the property of men who have died without leaving sons. That is the result of right insight, for those without insight are never satisfied.
65. He himself will give up hunting, which even the Pandus and others did not give up; and all other people will give it up at his command.

66. As he has prohibited the harming of living creatures, there can be no thought of injury and other things like that: even a man of the lowest birth will not kill even bugs, lice and the like (insects).

67. After he has forbidden hunting, game of all kinds will chew the cud in the forest, undisturbed as cows in the cow-shed.

68. He, who equals Indra in might, will always insist upon the care of all living beings, whether they live in water, on land or in air.

69. Even the creatures who eat meat from their birth will, as a result of his command, forget the very mention of meat like an evil dream.

71. So thoroughly will he stop the preparation of spirituos drinks throughout the world, that even the potter will no longer make liquor jugs.

72. The drunkards, who are impoverished because of their passion for intoxicants, will prosper again, after they have given up drink at his command.

73. He will destroy the very name of the game of dice, which Nala and other princes had not given up, like the name of a personal foe.

74. So long as his glorious reign lasts, there will be no pigeon race and no cock-fights.

75. In almost every village, he, whose wealth is immense, will adorn the earth with temples of Jina.

76. On the whole earth, as far as the ocean, he will cause the statues of Arhat to be born in procession on cars, in every village, in every town.

77. After he had continually given money away, and redeemed every one's debts, he will introduce his era on the earth.

78. Once he will hear, on the occasion of a story related through the mouth of his teacher, about that Jina statue buried in the dust, which the seer Kapil consecrated.
79. Then he will form the desire: I shall dig up the sandy place, and shall have the all-consecrated statue brought here.

80. When the king is conscious of such great enthusiasm, and also learns of other auspicious signs, then he will be convinced that the statue will reach his hands.

81. Then, after obtaining the permission of his teacher, he will give the order to his officials to dig up that place of Vitabhaya.

82. Then as a result of the purity of the king, who is faithful in his devotion to the Arhat, the goddess, who keeps a watch over the holy doctrine will appear.

83. As a result of the extremely great merit of king Kumārapāla, the statue will soon come to light, when the place is excavated.

84. The, too, the grant of villages, which king Udayana had made to this statue, will come to light.

85. The king's officials will place this old statue in a car, as if it were a new one, after having done honor to it as is prescribed.

86. Whilst, on the way, divine services of various kinds is being held, whilst concerts are being given day and night without interruption.

87. Whilst the women of the villages clap their hands loudly and rejoice, whilst the five-toned drums sound joyously.

88. Whilst the fans rise and fall on either side, the officials will convey this holy statue to the boundary of Pattana.

89. Accompanied by the lady of his palace and his servants, surrounded by the four columns of his host, the king will go to meet it with the whole community.

90. Dismounting from his chariot himself and mounting the state elephant, the prince will escort the image into the city.

91. After Kumārapāla has erected it in the pleasure-house near his palace, he will pay homage to it, as prescribed, morning noon and night.
92. After he has read the grant made to the statue, he will confirm that which was given by Udayana.

93. That temple built solely of gold, O crown prince, as its splendour appears to be incredible, will arouse the wonder of the whole world.

94. After the statue has been erected within it, the prince will increase in might, wealth and highest happiness.

Hemacandra says that Kumārapāla was shocked to see a goat ready to be sacrificed for the goddess Durga and prohibited the oblation of animals in the sacrifices. The brahmanas who killed animals had to use corn as the sacrificial offering. The DKV describes the decree of non-slaughter of animals (amāryā-ghoṣaṇā) by Kumārapāla which was enforced strictly throughout his kingdom. Also in Pālidesā (modern Pali) in Rajaputana one had to submit to that ordinance, and the ascetics of that region, who used to wear antelope skin, found it hard to procure the same. As we saw the Pandurangas who were Saivites, and other Brahmanas had to live like garbhasravakas. He forbade hunting even for the royal family. The inhabitants of Pāncaladēsa, the tribes of middle Kathiavad according to Buhler, who were great offenders, had to bow to the same order. A further result of the amāryā ghoṣaṇā was that the butchers had to give up their trade and received in compensation a lump sum of their three year's income.

32 TSPC, XII. Translation is by Buhler, given on pp.41-43 of his book.

33 DKV, XX.22-23

34 Buhler, G., op. cit., p. 43-44

35 DKV, XX.5-37; IA, pp. 268-69
Merutunga describes in his yukāvihāraprabandha how a simple minded merchant, in the land of Sapādalakṣa, who had crushed a louse, was dragged to Anhilvad by the officer in charge for enforcing the amāryā-ghoṣanā. As a punishment he had to build at the cost of whole of his fortune. It was merciful in comparison with the punishment which, according to the PRC, was incurred by Lakṣa, the bearer of the betel-bowl of Kelhana, the ruler of Nado1. When it was known that Lakṣa had placed a dish of raw meat before the lokaloka caitya in the Caulukya capital, he was sentenced to death!36

The MRP describes the practices of Kumārapāla undertaken to show his devotion to the Jaina tenets of thought. Unlike Hemacandra and like Merutunga and the KPP these measures were the causes, not consequences of his becoming a Jaina King. All the same, these represent an ideal Jaina king living in an equally ideal kingdom. Yasāhpāla says that Kumārapāla gave up flesh eating and hunting. He ordered royal officer (dandapāsānika) Dharmakṛṣṇa to take hold of the following vices-gambling, flesh-eating, drinking and slaughter of animals. Theft and adultery have already been expelled from the city. Concubinage may, however, be overlooked as it is immaterial if it goes or stays. After hearing about their 12 years’ punishment, the saptavyasanāni pleaded their cause and told Kumarapala how the ancient kings and even Vanaraja, the maternal uncle of Mularāja I, were addicted to these vices. They pleaded for their stay on account of the large revenue to the kingdom. Kumārapāla paid no heed to their pleadings and ordered their banishment from the kingdom.37 He built Tribhuvanavihāra and 32 other Jaina

36 Buhler, G., op. cit., p. 44
37 MRP, act IV; pp. xiii-xiv of editor’s introduction
temples for the atonement of the sin of flesh eating to which he was much addicted before his conversion.\textsuperscript{38} Gambling was very popular among the masses and not less so among the rulers. Many kings and their kinsmen delighted so much in \textit{dy	ext{"u}takrid\text{"a}} that even if someone died in their house-father, mother, wife or son, they went on gambling without any grief.\textsuperscript{39} He built at Tharapadra the temple called Kumaravih\text{"a}ra, where the MRP was enacted on the occasion of a Jaina festival. This place has been identified with modern Tharad in the Palanpur agency by the editor of this drama.\textsuperscript{40} Yashp\text{"a}la describes Kum\text{"a}rap\text{"a}la’s pilgrimage to Satrunjaya and Girnar, two of the most holy places of the JAINAS. Kum\text{"a}rap\text{"a}la banned the escheat of property by the state in cases of death without an heir. In this situation, the state officials took possession of the house, a \textit{pa\text{"n}cakula} was appointed for executing the confiscation. The dead body could be removed only after everything was taken away by the state.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{38}\textit{MRP}, p. 106

\textsuperscript{39}Ibid, act IV, p. 80. It says that gambling was most popular and on festive occasions people enjoyed a great deal of it. Five kinds of it are mentioned, among these \textit{andhaya} was daily resorted to by kings and \textit{nalaya} was played by merchants (\textit{va\text{"n}iyaputta}) with plenty of gold. The following rulers were famous gamblers: son of the king of Mev\text{"a}d, brother of the king of Sorat\text{"h}, king of Candravati, nephew of the king of Nadol, bhaginija of the king of Dh\text{"a}r\text{"a}, maternal uncle of the lord of Sakambhari, step brother of the king of Kon\text{"a}kana, sister’s son of the king of Marwar and 11 uncles of the Caulukya king.

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid., editor’s introduction, p.xiii

\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., pp. x-xi
According to Somaprabha Suri Kumārapāla took the following measures to show his devotion to Jainism:

*Abhayadāna* to Jivas: He gave up meat eating and sent orders to every village and towns to show mercy towards living beings.\(^{42}\)

*Dyūtaparityāgaḥ*: After giving up gambling himself, Kumarapala sent royal decrees throughout his kingdom prohibiting this.\(^{43}\)

Practice of chastity: As a result of Hemacandra’s instructions he gave up the enjoyment of prostitutes and wives of others (*vesyaparadaragamana*).

*Madyapānavarjanam*: As a mark of devotion towards Jaina tenets Kumarapala gave up drinking of wines.

Construction of *Jīnalaya*: He built the grand Kumaravihara at Patana under the supervision of Bahada, son of Udayana and two Jaina merchants, and surrounding it 24 temples for the 24 Tirthankaras. Surrounding another grander temple built for Neminātha, Kumārapāla made 72 smaller temples for the Tirthankaras. In Patana he made 24 other temples, among these Tribhuvanavihara was named after his father. Outside his capital, Kumārapala built innumerable temples. Somaprabha says that he built temples on every step.\(^{44}\) Kumārapāla personally visited these temples and worshipped the images of Tirthankaras therein. He celebrated annually in the Kumāravihāra, Jaina festivals such as the eight day long *aṣṭāhnikī* with great pomp and enthusiasm. In the evening of the last day of the festival, a large chariot drawn by

\(^{42}\) *KPP*, pp. 40-42, 475

\(^{43}\) *KPP*, p. 185

\(^{44}\) Ibid., pp. 136-43, 475-76
elephants and containing the image of Parśvanātha, used to go in procession through the
town to the royal palace, accompanied by state officials and leading citizens. The king
personally worshipped the image amidst dances and prayers by the populace, the chariot
rested for the night in the palace and departed next morning to a grand pavilion erected
outside the palace-gate, attended by Kumārapāla. Thereafter this chariot passed through
many streets of Patan, then returned to its own place. Apart from personally celebrating
the greatness of the Jaina faith, he also issued orders to his subordinate rulers to
celebrate it in a similar manner. These princes built Vihāras in their own cities.45

Kumārapāla's Tīrthayātṛās: Accompanied by a large army symbolizing royal power and
a large Jaina congregation, Kumārapāla went to Saurashtra and halted at Girinagara
situated at the foothill of mount Raivat (Girnar). Owing to physical weakness he could
not ascend the hill, therefore he ordered the ministers to perform the worship. Then the
whole party of pilgrims proceeded to visit the temple of Rṣabhanātha on the Śatruṅjaya
hill. The maintenance of this sacred place was under minister Bahada by the order of the
Caulukya king. After his return to Pattana, Kumārapāla was aggrieved that he could not
ascend the hill to worship the Tirthankara, therefore he ordered for the construction of a
flight of steps to ascend the hill.46

Charitable works: After his Tīrthayātṛā, Kumārapāla built an alms-house (sartrāgāra)
for giving food and clothing to helpless and decrepit Jaina devotees. In its vicinity he

45 KPP, Editors introduction, p. xii
46 Ibid, pp. 174-80
also built a monastery (poṣadhasāla) for enabling enable the devotees to pass their time while observing their religious vows.47

The *Panḍanamaskāra mantra*: Kumārapāla always recited with great devotion the well-known Jaina salutation to the Jinas, Siddhas, Ācāryas, Upādhyāyas and the Sūdhūs, collectively known as the *Panḍapermesṭhins*. He had so great a faith in its efficacy that he used to say that what he could not acquire by means of his army, he achieved that through the mere recital of this great mantra. Through its recital his enemies remained subdued to even a Bania officer like Āmbaḍa. Not only internal revolts and foreign invasions but even famines did not affect his kingdom through the recital of this mantra.48

Kumārapāla’s Dinacarya: Somaprabha represents Kumārapāla as a Jaina layman who steadfastly observes the twelve vows of a śrāvaka. Leaving his bed early in the morning he recited the sacred panḍanamaskāra mantra and meditated on the gods and the gurus. After taking bath Kumarapala worshipped the Jaina images in the temple in the palace, then he went to the Kumaravihara, mounted on elephant and accompanied by ministers. After performing the eightfold worship there, he used to go to Hemacandra. Having worshipped him and listened to his sermons, Kumārapāla returned to his palace on midday. Then he gave foods and alms to mendicants, and after sending food offerings to the Jaina idols in his temple, he took his meal. Then he attended the assembly of learned men and discussed with them philosophical and religious issues. Among these poet Siddhapāla was the prominent person who always pleased the king by narrating a

47 *KPP*, p. 219

number of stories and other episodes. In the fourth prahara of the day i.e. after 3 p.m., Kumārapāla took his seat in the royal court and attended to the business of the state, heared appeals from the and passed judgements on these. Sometimes he watched the wrestling matches, elephant fights and such other pastimes. Thereafter he took the evening meals before sunset. Kumārapāla ate only once on the eighth and fourteenth day of every fortnight, inother words he observed the prescribed fasts on the Jaina holy days like a devoted śrāvaka. After dinner he worshipped the household deities and in the end, after attending the musical concerts and recitations by the Čāraṇas, Kumārapāla retired for rest with a mind filled with renunciation. 49

Merutunga says that after giving up alcohol and meat etc. himself Kumārapāla banned these in his kingdom. He then promulgated an edict prohibiting the killing of animals for fourteen years in the eighteen provinces subject to him. He built 1440 Jaina temples. In Vāgbhatpur near Śatruṇjaya a temple of Pārśvanātha called Tribhuvanavihāra was built in honor of his father. He built 32 ‘atonement’ temples for expiating the sin of meat eating during his early years. Then he took the 12 vows of a layman. When the third one, prohibiting stealing was explained to him, Kumārapāla at once decided to abolish the old custom of confiscating the property of those subjects who had died without leaving an heir. 50

Thus the representation of Kumārapāla is in excellent agreement with the Jaina ideology of kingship as elaborated in chapter 1. Now this identity of logos and praxis can only be suspect, to say the least. Howsoever it may turn out to be in reality, according to the

49 KPP, pp.422-23

50 PC, p. 87
Jaina ideology of kingship, the fourfold Jaina samgha is envisaged as the ideal community. Here, monks are the interpreters of the laws of social conduct, as contained in the canonical texts. And these laws are encompassed by the twelve vows of a jaina layman. The whole state apparatus is geared towards the salvation of this essentially Jaina community. The king is the enforcer of the Jinasasana, who coerces every subject inhabiting his realm, including the non-believers, to conform to the dictates of the Jaina faith, by royal decrees. Besides his executive functions, the king is also a good preacher to his subjects, but himself a disciple of the monks. What is important here is to note that the Jaina king is nothing but the instrument of proselytization in the hands of the Jaina monks used to attain salvation for the whole community of the Jainas, consisting of the monks and the nuns on the one hand, and the layman whether by birth (garbhāsrāvakas) or forced to become like them. As noted above, Cort rightly terms the Jaina king as nothing more than the sanghapati, a leader of the Jaina community on the ‘Jaina path of purification’.

Before proceeding to discuss the actualities of statecraft, let us note the situation in other traditions. The dharmaśāstras envisage the king as the ‘upholder’ of the social order based on the varṇāśramadharma. Unlike his Jaina counterpart, a Brahmanical king is denied any legislative power and as noted above he can not prescribe rules of conduct in the domain of acara. His jurisdiction is confined to military and fiscal laws. Therefore he can not be an instrument of proselytization. In fact, the dharmaśāstras explicitly say, as noted above, that he should respect the customs of heretics even if they are in contravention to the sastric injunctions. Thus Jainism was envisaged by the svetambara
monks as the state-religion and Kumārapāla as the instrument of its enforcement. Buhler means the same when he says:

Kumarapala strove after making Gujarat, in certain respects, a model Jaina state. He renounced not only for himself the enjoyments and pleasures prohibited by the Jaina doctrine but he induced also his subjects to impose upon themselves the same privations.51

Jainism compares favorably with its sramanic counterpart Buddhism in this regard. As we saw the Cakkavattirāja conquers 'the whole earth to its very ocean boundary' and subjugates 'all the rival kings in the region of the east, south, west and north'. All the defeated kings of the four quarters come to the Buddhist 'king of kings invincible' and request "Do thou, O mighty king, be a Teacher to us!" Then the Cakkavattiraja preaches them Bauddha ethics such as 'Ye shall slay no living things, Ye shall not take that which has not been given, Ye shall speak no lie, etc.52 Cakkavattirāja Mahā-Sudassana is said to have lived for eight and forty thousand years "as a layman, the noble life in the palace of dhamma."53 Thus besides living as a layman the Buddhist Cakkavatti orders the kings of the whole earth to follow the Buddhist tenets of thought. So we can say that the Bauddhist kings are the enforcer of the commandments of the Buddha, and hence proselytizers like the Jaina kings. Before examining what the Jaina kings might have done as the enforcer, let us have a very brief look at how far the monks as the

51 Buhler, G., op. cit., p. 43
52 T.W.Rhys Davids, tr., Buddhist Suttas, SBE, XI, OUP, 1881; 1968 reprint by MLBD, Delhi, pp. 252ff.
53 Ibid., p. 285
interpreter, and the śrāvakas as the follower of the laws are following the rules of conduct prescribed in the Jaina canons.

Haribhadra suri (700-770 A.D.) of Chittor, one of the most famous svetamabara monks, has given a vivid picture of what the Jaina monks were actually doing. At the outset it must be pointed out that we do not know the proportion of these Sadhus called Caityavāsins to the total. But it was substantial enough to arouse the reforming vidhicaitya movement. It was spread wherever monks were found, and in all probability existed since the very beginning of Jaina monasticism. Moreover, we must not assume that those who are not castigated as the Caityavasins were living in strict conformity with the monastic rules of discipline, divergence must be expected here too, but to a lesser degree. Haribhadra has this to say about those who have taken the vow of sarvavirati:

[They were] living in caityas and maṭhas, building Jina temples, putting to personal use money collected for religious purposes, wearing scented and coloured clothes, singing in the presence of women, paying court to the rich, using tāmbula, lavaṅg and flowers, taking rich food, selling images of Jina, practicing astrology, reading omens, quarrelling with each other to have disciples, putting off religious discussion by telling people that abstruse matters could not be discussed with them—in short, doing practically everything which a Jaina sadhu should not do[our italics].54 What is interesting is to note that these temple-dwelling monks were doing their best to put up a successful fight against the vidhicaityins and they publicly defended their practices. Jineśvara Suri, whose followers formed the kharatara gaccha, defeated the Caityavasins in a religious discussion held at

54 Sharma, D., op. cit., pp.249-50
the court of Durlabharaja Caulukya.\textsuperscript{55} Jinavallabhasuri (d. V.S.1167) founded the reformed temples (\textit{vidhicaityas}) at various places in Rajasthana and elsewhere. Every \textit{vidhicaitya} bore the inscription "here are followed no rights of those who go against the sutras. Women do not get admission here at night. It is no property of the sādhūs. None takes bath at night. There is no insistence on the privileges of castes and sub-castes. The worshippers are given no betel leaves. Such are the rules of a \textit{vidhicaitya}."\textsuperscript{56} His disciple Jinadattasuri alias Dadaji and his pupils made this movement popular in Malava and Sind besides Rajasthana and part of Gujarat. He laid the following rules of discipline for the fourfold Jainasangha to show respect to the hierarchy of monks:

When the chief monk (\textit{yugapradhānācārya}) entered a city he was to be received by the \textit{caturvidhasaṃgha} with the \textit{pañcamahāsābda}, \textit{nichāvara} and the \textit{maṅgalakalaśa}. When the lecture for the day was over, female followers of the \textit{ācārya} were to sing songs when a second-rank \textit{ācārya} entered a town, he was received by the \textit{caturvidhasaṃgha}, conch was sounded and women sang. But no \textit{pañcaśābda} and \textit{nichāvara} for him. No spreading of silken clothes when he entered a house.\textsuperscript{57}

What interests us here is that these are the normative rules of conduct for the puritans, in actual practices divergence is the rule. A monk who was above in the hierarchy and presumably more detached from the world, was to be given greater creature comforts.

The rules of monastic discipline known as the \textit{yatyācara} is fundamentally different from the ethics of the householder called \textit{śrāvakācāra}. Williams tells that all treatises on lay

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{55} Sharma, D., op. cit., p. 252
  \item \textsuperscript{56} Ibid., pp. 251-52 and 253 fn. 15
  \item \textsuperscript{57} Ibid., p. 255 fn. 32
\end{itemize}
conduct written during the early medieval period were authored by monks, except the sugara-dharmamrita (1240 A.D.) of Asadhara. After making an exhaustive study of all the significant texts dealing with lay ethics he says "The sravakacara are not the only, nor indeed the best, source of information on the lay life. Clearly their authors...have not portrayed society as it existed but rather as they would have wished to see it. ...Like the Hindu dharmasastras these treatises present a one sided view but in them it is the idealized figure of the mini and not of the Brahmana that occupies the centre of the stage."\textsuperscript{58}

Thus the sravakas are not following the twelve vows, and this includes the Jaina king who can be termed a sravakaraja. Moreover, the blame for this divergence from the normative conduct should lie with the Jaina king, the enforcer of the Jinaśāsana.

Needless to say, the Jaina sources give an idealized picture of Kumārapāla. With Williams we can say that they portray Kumārapāla as they wished him to see enforcing throughout his realm, not as what he was actually doing. Majumdar puts it beautifully "...a concerted attempt was made by the Chroniclers after his [Kumarapala's] death to prove that he was an out and out Jaina who has severed all connections with the Brahmanical religion."\textsuperscript{59} Ray meant the same "...there is reason to suspect these [Jaina] stories of the king's partiality to Jainism. ... It is evident that Kumarapala accepted some of the principles of Jainism. But it is doubtful whether he was really sincere in his acceptance of its tenets."\textsuperscript{60} The wishful element of representation indicates that the

\textsuperscript{58} Williams, R., op. cit., p. xii

\textsuperscript{59} Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., p. 123

\textsuperscript{60} DHNI, II, p. 997
reality was different, and this is evident from the internal contradiction of the Jaina authors. We take two examples from Hemacandra. In the TSPC, he says "This wise man will not only avoid courtesans, but will admonish his lawful wives to practice chastity." And the KVC or Prakrit Dyatasaya in its description of Kumārapāla's court says that a haetera used to sit by the side of the king. As noted above, Hemacandra says "So long as his glorious reign lasts, there will be no pigeon race and no cock-fights." Somaprabha while describing Kumārapāla's dinacarya says that he attended wrestling tournaments, elephant fights and such other mundane shows.

As we saw in the previous chapter, on the basis of juxtaposition and critical evaluation of the sources, we find three measures of royal policy which can be attributed to Kumarapala and on which is based the claim of him being called a Jaina king. It must be pointed out at the outset that these are practices of kingcraft having a bearing on the question of how the king was related to his realm.

1. The decree of non-slaughter of animals. Two inscriptions issued by the subordinate princes refer to it as the amāri ruḍhi (amārya-ghoṣana). We do not have any inscription of Kumarapala declaring the non-slaughter of animals. But on the basis of these two by his subordinate rulers we can assume that he might have decreed something similar. The first inscription is undated and was issued by Girijādevī, the queen of Mahārāja Puṇāpāksadeva, a subordinate of Kumārapāla ruling over Ratnapura which is identified

61 KVC, canto VI, verse 38
62 KPP, p. 423
63 Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., p. 122
with modern Ratanpur in the Jasavantapura district of southern Marwar. It was addressed to all the sthanpatis, Brahmanas, Acaryas, Mahajanás and Tamboliwas of the

Bhandarkar makes him the feudatory of Rāyapañā vide EI, XI, p. 44. Again the position of the latter vis-à-vis the Caulukyas is controversial. The discussion by Ray at DHNI, II, pp. 1110 ff fails to clarify the situation. Sharma is probably right to assert that Rāyapala was an independent ruler from whom we have 8 inscriptions bearing dates from V.S. 1189-1202, all found around Nadol indicating his rule over this territory (vide DHNI, II, p. 1112). According to Sharma Rayapala’s independent position is indicated by the fact that he nowhere mentions the name of Jayasiṁha Caulukya and by his titles such as mahārāja-dhiraja parmeśvara. Moreover, Rayapala’s rule did not extend as far as modern Ratanpura. See p.149fn. 17 of his book. Thus muni Jīnavijaya was right to include Punapaksadeva’s present epigraph among those which were issued by the ‘feudatories’ of Kumārapāla. See MRP, Appendix III, p.17 In the present epigraph Punapāksadeva proudly mentions that he was given a seat at the court of Rayapala (mahārājabhūpāla śrīrayapuladevāt-mahāsanaprāpta). The case of Rāyapāl as well as his predecessors and successors is interesting for understanding the political processes in early medieval India. The Caulukyas benefited from the intra-lineage rivalry of the Cahamanas of Nadol by supporting a rival member of the same family in gaining the throne and keeping the grateful maharajas under their subordination. However these latter were free to change allegiance after the death, and sometimes even during the lifetime, of their benefactors as and when the balance of power shifted in their favour. Though the lack of adequate data increases our difficulty, a patient approach should be rewarding. Besides, Rayapala’s
Ratnapura town. Hereby they were informed that on the amāvasyā day Girijādevī ordered them all, after considering this world as essenceless and prāṇināmabhayadāna as the mahādaṇa, not to kill any living being (amāridāna), on the 11th and 14th of both fortnight and on the amāvasyā of every month. This order was applicable to the Priests, ministers and all the thākurās who were dependent upon Punapākṣa (asmadiyā bhuvi bhoktā mahāmātyāḥ sanḍhivigrāhakratitasvapurohitaprabhrtisamastuḥthākurānām) and all other subjects. On the holy day of amāvasyā the potters were forbidden to work (bhāndaprajālanam ca paurvikaih kumbhakāraisa no kāryam). Anyone who infringed this order by killing a living being was to be fined 4 drammas. This edict was issued on the behest of Putiga and Saliga, sons of suśravaka Subhamkara of the prāgyātvamśā, who were residents of Nadol (nadulapurānivāsi). It was signed by Punapākṣa and witnessed by thākura Jasapāla.

The second edict of non-slaughter of animals (amāri-rūḍhi) was issued by Ālhana Cāhamāna, a subordinate of Kumārapāla with whom we are familiar, on the sīvarātri day and is dated V.S.1209.65 He issued injunctions, considering prāṇināmabhayadāna as the mahādaṇa, to the mahājanas, tāmbulikas and other subjects, forbidding slaughter of somewhat different administrative arrangements has drawn the attention of historians.

According to Chattopadhyaya, his case infringed the monopoly of the state over legitimate use of force (vide his article ‘Autonomous Spaces…’ pp.141-42 referred to above) and Sharma has praised his ‘administrative talent’ at p. 150 of his monograph. In any case, his Nadol inscription dated V.S. 1198 which lies at the root of the above debate is complex enough to invite an article in itself.

65 EI, XI, pp. 143-46; BPSI, pp. 172ff; MRP Appendix III, pp. 17-18
living beings on the 8th, 11th, and the 14th of both the fortnights of every months in the three towns mentioned below over which he was ruling at this time. The sanction behind this law of non-injury was capital punishment, and anyone who killed or caused others to kill was to be killed (व्यापदनियाः)! The Brahmana priests, ministers and others were also ordered to respect the edict. And amongst them who commits the sin of taking life should be fined 5 drammas, but if the offender was attached to the king, he should be fined 1 dramma only. Then comes the sign manual of the issuer, maharaja sri Alhanadeva, followed by the approval of princes (mahārājaputra) Kelhāna and Gajasimaha. The edict was written by thakkura Khelāditya, the mahasamdhivigrahika. Like the previous edict, this order was made on the behest of Pūtiga and Sāliga.

With reference to the differential punishment, it is to be noted that it was applied with greatest severity to the merchants and betel sellers, who were and still are Jainas according to Bhandarkar. Priests and amatyas (ministers) were to be fined, but the most privileged were the members of the ruling family. Bhandarkar has identified the three towns of Kirātakūpa, Lāthṛada and Śivā with modern Kiradu (the find spot of this edict), modern Radhada in the Mallani province of Marwar, and modern Sheo district’s headquarter respectively. 66

Neither of these two rulers was a Jaina. Ālhana Cahamāna of Nadol was a Śaiva like his Śākambhari brethren. 67 Supposing they were Jainas, can this royal declaration be termed exclusively Jaina? Dumont says “vegetarianism and non-violence seem likely to have been imitated by the Brahmans from the great heresies as prestigious ideals.” He points

---

66 EI, XI, p. 44

67 Sharma, D., op. cit., p. 259
out further that vegetarianism began in the sects of the renouncers such as the Buddhists and the jainas and in course of time it became a higher ideal than the Brahmanical value of sacrifice.\(^{68}\) Thus we cannot assert with certainty that ahimsa travelled from Jainism to Brahmanism. It originated in the various groups of the renouncers among which some must have been of the Brahmanas. If we believe Jacobi, then asceticism was adopted by the ‘great heresies’ from the Brahmanas.\(^{69}\) The Kiradu inscription indicates that many Brahmanas of these towns were non-vegetarians, as Bhandarkar emphatically points out.\(^{70}\) But their modern descendents are, unlike their meat eating Rajaputa patrons, vegetarians and ‘staunchest advocates of ahimsa’, but one should feel hesitant though it might actually be the case, in attributing this “to the influence of Jainism” as Sharma has done.\(^{71}\) Incidentally, it is relatively little known that even the Jaina monks ate meat at one point of time in certain specified circumstances such as illness.\(^{72}\)

Even if it came from Jainism, and this is certainly doubtful, ahimsa became popular among Brahmanism and Buddhism at a very early point of time, and thereafter it can longer be termed exclusively Jaina. We cannot disagree with Williams when he says: The differences which separate Jainism from Hinduism and Buddhism...are largely differences of emphasis for all have built from common material. Ahimsa, for example, is preponderant in,

---


69 *Jaina Suttas*, II, pp. xxv-vi. It is significant though it may not be relevant that the Upaniṣadas represent a turn from *yajña to dhyāna*.

70 *El*, XI, p. 44 see also Sharma, D., p.257 fn 44

71 Sharma, D., op. cit., pp. 257-58

72 Schubring, W., op. cit., p. 273, Jain, J.C., op. cit., pp. 127-28
but not peculiar to, Jainism: it is extolled even in such 'Hindu' texts as the Manusmrti (which Hemacandra stigmatizes as a \textit{himsāśāstra}) but it is the central position and pervading character of ahimsa that separate the Jaina ethic sharply from 'Hinduism' as well as from Islam and Christianity.\textsuperscript{73}

We saw how an edict forbidding the slaughter of animals is in accordance with the \textit{sastric} injunctions. Vigrahārāja IV of \textit{Śakambhari}, a Śaiva king, "prohibited the slaughter of animals on certain days in a month throughout his extensive dominions."\textsuperscript{74} The Mughal emperor Akbar ordered some regionally and temporarily limited prohibitions under the influence of Jainism.\textsuperscript{75} Thus we should say that a decree of non-slaughter of animals (\textit{amāryā-ghosanā}) by a ruler is neither an exclusive trait of a Jaina king nor it can be attributed to the sole influence of Jainism.

2. Abolition of the confiscation law can be considered more Brahmanical than Jaina for it is not given in the Jaina canons but prescribed in the \textit{dharmaśāstras}, as we saw in chapter II above. Here we would like to add that this step might have been motivated by financing the war efforts. In the first tow decades of his rule Kumārapāla waged many wars with the neighboring kings. The chroniclers are not specific about the date of this decree, Somaprabha and Yasahpāla describe it as the pre-conversion policy. It is probable that Kumārapāla abolished the confiscation law both to oblige his wealthy

\textsuperscript{73} Williams, R., op. cit., p. xxii

\textsuperscript{74} Sharma, D., op. cit., pp. 256-57

\textsuperscript{75} Schubring, W., p. 57 for references see fn. 3 of this page.
supporters during the succession strife—mostly Jaina merchants and traders, as well as to give an incentive to this economically powerful group to facilitate the financing of large scale military mobilizations. Then he took this step within a few years of his coronation. Perhaps the MRP contains a veiled reference to this. It says that the merchants living in the Caulukya capital were very affluent and refers to many Jaina millionaires (kotisvaras). Significantly Yashpāla says that the royal decree abolishing the confiscation law came in the case of a Jaina millionaire. 76

3. Patronage to Jaina institutions such as the construction of Jinacaityas etc. Generally monarchs supported all prominent religious sects of his realm. Kumārapāla’s ancestors as well as the Cahamānas of Śakambhaṇi were Śaivas, but virtually all of them gave patronage to Jaina acaryas and built Jinacaityas. This is equally true about the Cahamānas of Nadol and Jalor who were the subordinates of Kumārapāla. It is rather well known to need any citation. 77 This ubiquitous trait of monarchy is explained as examples of religious tolerance of Indian kings. Certainly religious wars were absent in India and the harmonious co-existence of different and not so different sects is part of the cultural heritage of India, nevertheless it is a politically naïve explanation. Being of some methodological significance and not least because it is the central argument of this thesis, it will be discussed below in some detail.

76 MRP, act III. See also editor’s introduction pp. viii, x.

77 For details see Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., pp. 310-27; Sharma, D., pp. 256 ff. Because of its being a widespread phenomenon, it existed almost everywhere where monarchy was found, I have confined my example to the two dynasties of western India.
Except these all other measures of Kumārapāla, mainly those related to the saptavyasanāini, are nothing but the figment of imagination of the Jaina monks which was rooted in their longing to see the enforcement of the Jinasāsana by the state, if only they could find a suitable monarch. Why this was impossible in reality is the subject of the following section.

Compulsions of Statecraft and Sectarian Ideologies of Kingship

For a proper understanding of the practices of kingcraft some knowledge of the demographic composition of the subjects is necessary, particularly the numerical and economic strength of the various religious sects and their caste and occupational composition, and most important of all their customary laws.

The most dominant religious sect inhabiting Kumārapāla’s realm was the Śaivas divided into four schools Śaiva, Mahēśvara, Kāpālika and Pāṣupata. Like Gujarat these Śaiva sects ‘found greatest acceptance throughout the Cauhana dominions..”, in Śakambhari as well as in Nadol and Jalor. Among the saiva sects the most popular one was the Pāṣupata school, which believed in the 18 incarnations of Siva, among these the most prominent was Lakulīśa, the founder of the sect who flourished about 150 A. D. according to Bhandarkar. Sakti worship was equally popular in western India, and in her various forms like Śakambhari, Sankarā māti, Aghatēśvari and Bahughrī devī, and Vatayāksī she was the tutelary deity of many Cahanama kings and many temples

---

78 Sharma, D., op. cit., p. 259

79 Ibid., pp. 262-63
dedicated to these local manifestations of Durgā/Cāmūndā are found in Rajasthan and Gujarat. Doubtlessly the most prominent Śaiva centre was the temple of Somanātha in Kathiavad.

The most popular sect was also the most prominent in terms of patronage, and mass following was doubtlessly its reason. The Hansot plates of Bhratryadgīha II of Broach dated V.S. 813 shows that he was a paramamāheśvara. The Vaiśnavas were less prominent than the Śaivas among the Hindus. But the Cāhāmanas patronized Vaiśnava acaryas and built temples for them. Some of them prided themselves in being regarded as incarnations of Rāma. Besides these two main Hindu sects, worshippers of sun were another religious group, and the saura sect was patronized by Cāhāmanas of Śākambhārī, Nadol and Jalor. Bhinamala was a great centre of this sect, with the famous Jagatasvāmin temple.

Among the Jainas western India has been a stronghold of the svaṃbaras, but their Digambara brethren were also present in Gujarat and parts of Rajasthan forming the Caułukya dominion. Although the Jainas were in a minority but they were very powerful in economic terms. Weber has characterized them as "a specific merchant sect as exclusive or even more exclusive than the Jews were in the occident." They were mostly based in town, this residential preference was necessitated by their occupational following, but not altogether absent in the rural areas. Besides the Brahmanisation of

80 Sharma, D., op. cit., pp.262-64
81 Ibid, p.259
82 Ibid, pp. 258-59
83 Weber, M., The Religion of India, p. 193
local Goddesses, the Jainas adopted the popular sakti worship and made Sacchika, Ambikā and Cāmunḍā the tutelary goddesses of the gacchas whherever she was popular. After their Jainisation these goddesses became vegetarians, satisfied with sweets and flowers instead of sacrifices.84

Economically, a very powerful religious group was of the muslim merchants settled in the port towns of Veraval, Cambay and Broach and engaged in the Indian ocean based international maritime trade. Jain says "..Arab traders were staying in large numbers in almost all the important towns, marts and ports of western India ...and they enjoyed more or less exclusive control over the transshipment of oriental commodities."85

The Brahmānas formed the most important caste group for purposes of legitimacy for the Caulukya kings. Their power flowed from their social status based on their monopoly of the spiritual domain with the largest following base of the masses. They were also engaged in administration, agriculture and trade, but the Brahmansas engaged in these activities most probably formed the minority.

But the most powerful caste was of the Rajputas, their superior rights in land enabled them to dominate all other social groups. Although of different origins, all of them claimed ksatriya status. Their military strength was based on their landholdings, but we should not ignore their claim to be ksatriyas if we want to understand them as the warrior class in terms of occupation. We have seen that in contemporary society military exploits was commonly perceived as the occupational trait of the Rajaputas and Banias

84 Sharma, D., op. cit., p. 264

85 Jain, V. K., *Trade and Traders in Western India*, Delhi, 1991 p. 252
were thought to be incapable of it. Needless to say they were also engaged in most other professions which was not considered as 'too mean' for them. Like the Brahmanas numerical proportion cannot be ascertained but the followers of non-ksatriya occupations were probably not the majority.

The most troublesome aspect of the sectarian ideologies of kingship, Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jaina, from the perspective of the king, was their hostility towards the 'others'. The non-believers were either to be expelled or converted or oppressed by various official measures. The coexistence of the followers of all these three religions, and in the present case also Muslims in the port-cities, made it impossible to follow the ideology of kingship of any one of these sects. Lingat has put it most succinctly "The resources of politics are indispensable for him [the king] to preserve his kingdom from the excitements and catastrophes which an exclusive preoccupation with religious precepts could not fail to produce." Thus the following measures attributed to Kumārapāla by Hemacandra, not to talk of other Jaina authors, tell us nothing but the hostility of Jainism towards Brahmanism, rooted in their rivalry for the soul of the laity which included the rulers, the merchants as well as the peasants.

As noted above Hemacandra says in his TSPC "Even the Brahmanas of the Panduranga sect and others, who hate the Arhat, will, at his command, become equal to those who are born in the faith." Thus the Pāṇḍuṇaṅgas who were Saivites, and other Brahmanas had to live like garbhasravakas. In the DKV Hemacandra mentions that Kumārapāla was shocked to see a goat ready to be sacrificed for the goddess Durga and prohibited the oblation of animals in the sacrifices. The brahmanas who killed animals had to use corn as the sacrificial offering. It further describes the decree of non-slaughter of animals
(amāryā-ghoṣāṇī) by Kumārapāla which was enforced strictly throughout his kingdom. Also in Pallidesa (modern Pali) in Rajaputana one had to submit to that ordinance, and the ascetics of that region, who used to wear antelope skin, found it hard to procure the same. Intrusion by the state to this degree into the religious life of the people, a domain which was independent of state control from the very beginning and must have appeared as the most natural thing to the people, could not fail to produce disastrous consequences and was sure to bring civil strife and invasion from neighboring kings who were always in the lookout for such opportunities.

Similarly the following measures of Kumārapāla are not what he actually did, but Hemacandra's attempt to show the superiority of Jainism over its main rival Hinduism. He says in the TSPC "He himself will give up hunting, which even the Pāṇḍus and others did not give up; and all other people will give it up at his command", "He will destroy the very name of the game of dice, which Nala and other princes had not given up, like the name of a personal foe" and his proselytizing spirit is evident "Even the Brahmanas of the Pāṇḍuraṅga sect and others, who hate the Arhat, will, at his command, become equal to those who are born in the faith."

We need not mention subsequent Jaina authors who were least concerned with the veracity of facts and used Kumārapāla's biography solely for sectarian propaganda. Thapar rightly says that these accounts 'primarily focus on superior power of Jainism.'

Jayasiṃha punished the Hindus who damaged Muslim property at Cambay, and built a mosque there for the Arab traders. None of the three traditions allowed their king to do such favorable things to the mlecchas.

86 Thapar, R., Somnatha, p. 115
The Politics of Patronage: Material Support for Legitimacy

Sharma says that largely due to the great influence of the Jaina acaryas of our period, Jainism had either the favour or the active and steady support of a number of Cauhana rulers and their ministers. They built Jinacaityas and viharas, patronized Jaina monks, granted villages and donations to the Jaina temples, and Vigrahāraja IV issued the decree of amāryā-ghośaṇā. Prthvirāja III decided the religious debates of the Jaina monks and granted a jayapatra to Jinapati suri in V.S.1239.88

The details given by Sharma make it amply clear that the Cahamānas of Śakambhari, and more important for us, those of Nādol and Jalor as well were Saivites who worshipped the sun-god and built temples for the saura sect and gave donations to them. Many prided themselves in being called avatāra of Rāma and patronized Vaiṣṇava acaryas, besides supporting the popular local cults of mother goddesses and making them their tutelary deities. In addition to patronizing all prominent and not so prominent Hindu sects and cults, they extended their support to Jaina institutions in a similar manner. "They honored Jaina teachers, granted lands to Jaina temples and took part in their religious ceremonies."89 This pattern of patronage to all religious sects is equally applicable to the Caułukyas.90

87 Sharma, D., op. cit., p.267
88 Ibid, pp. 256-57
89 Ibid., pp. 249 ff and 267
90 For details see Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., pp. 287 ff.
To understand the politics of patronage we must first understand the motive behind the support given by rulers to religious institutions and holy men. As we saw Saivism was the most popular and hence most significant religion of western India. It was divided into four schools which had their own monastic organization, the most important being that of Somanatha. Ganda Brhaspati was the monk who supervised the functioning of this Saiva centre. Similarly the Jainas were divided into many *ganas*, *gacchas* and *anvayas* each headed by a separate monk, the overall chief of the hierarchy of monks and sravakas.

The adherents of Jainism constitute the community (*samgha*). It comprises both monks and nuns as well as both male and female representatives of laymanship called *śrāvaka* and *śrāvikī*, hence the community is called *caturvidha Jaina samgha*. The monks are called *nirgrantha*, *bhikṣu*, *śramaṇa* and later *sādhu*, and the nuns are known as *bhikṣuni*, *nirgranthī* or *sadhvī*. Mahāvīra’s disciples were organized into groups and were called *gaṇadhāras*. Their successors have propagated the teaching by branches and schools called *gana*, *śākhā*, *gaccha*, *kula* and *anvaya*, the last two denoting a school having formed around an outstanding teacher and his followers, and two schools of this kind when combined constituted a *gana*. The religious life of the laity is tightly controlled by the monks and nuns. Both of the latter are under the command of superiors, in the first line under that of the *ācārya* and the *upādhyāya*, to whom we have to add *pravartini* for the nun. The canonical texts enumerated the superior in the following order — *āyariya*, *uvajjhāya*, *pavatti*, *thera*, *gani*, *ganahara*, the last two means the head of a *gana*. The

---

91 This section is based on Schubring, W., op. cit., pp. 247 ff
spiritual leaders in this sequence range on a descending line according to their rank. At the top we have the acārya who by his person embodies both the teacher and the master. Though he, too, directs the act of admitting and instructing pupils, which was the responsibility of a gas. The acārya accepted the confessions of the monk and imposed penance. He supervises the objects of and the alms given to the outfit. Whereas he instructs in the deeper meaning of the canons, the upadhyāya merely recites it. These monks and nuns wander among the laity to instruct them in the Jaina ethics, this traveling is stopped in the rainy season for four months, this stationary life is known as the pajosavana. For the eight months these monks and nuns are engaged in the proselytizing of the non-believing masses besides controlling the religious life of the faithful ones. The monastic life is controlled by the canons dealing with the disciplinary matters and enforced by the hierarchy of monks of a particular gaccha and its sākhās.

The following rules of conduct made by the famous svetambara monk Jinavallabhasuri illustrates how the caturvidha Jaina saTgha was related to the hierarchy of monks and nuns.

When the chief monk (yugapradhānacārya) entered a city he was to be received by the caturvidhasamgha with the pañcamahāsabda, nichāvara and the mangalakalaśa. When the lecture for the day was over, female followers of the acarya were to sing songs. When a second-rank acarya entered a town, he was received by the caturvidhasamgha, conch was sounded and women sang. But no pañcasabda and nichāvara for him. No spreading of silken clothes when he entered a house. An upādhyāya was received by layman and sādhus. No pañcasabda, no nichāvara and no singing when he entered a temple. But women sang at his lectures.
A vācanacārya was not received by sādhis and laywomen. No songs at the end of his lectures. Any senior sādhu present enjoyed the privilege of precedence over him.

In a caitya a conch was sounded in the traditional manner for the ācārya, upādhyāya and the vācanacārya. An ācārya received three blankets, an upādhyāya two, and a vācanacārya one for sitting.

When a mahattara entered a city she was received by laywomen only. A conch was not sounded. No layman came. No songs by laywoman. No maṅgalakalasa, no sounding of the conch and no nicchāvura for her. Karpur was put on her forehead. No blanket was put at her back, but she was given two blankets for sitting.

In the case of a pravartini, there was no karpuraksepa, and she was given only one blanket for sitting. The internal administration of these monastic institutions, Saiva or Jaina or any other was entirely in the hands of the ācāryas and these were more autonomous than most other ‘autonomous spaces’. We have given examples from the Jaina monasticism, we should presume that some similar arrangements existed for the Buddhists as well as the Saivas, for example, among the ‘Hindus’.

Weber has termed the fourfold Jainasamgha as ‘the community of monks as the nucleus, the laity as a community under the religious rule of the monks’ and put emphasis on ‘the strong organization and ties between the lay parish and the monks’.

---

92 Sharma, op. cit., p. 255 fn. 32

While discussing the position of the Jaina laity vis-à-vis the order of monks in the context of the dvādasāsrāvavakrāratas, he says perhaps a bit harshly:

They were treated as incompetent minors and held under disciplinary control by means of inspection trips of the clergy and guardians of morality. ....The competent monastic superior [acārya/suri] controlled the life of the laity, which for this purpose was divided into sanghas, .. ganas ...and gacchas.94

Now we can see that if a king patronized a famous ācārya he could assume the support of all his Jaina followers. The Jalor inscription says that this temple (jina caitya) on the Kancanagiri fort of Jalor was ordered to be built (karita) by Kumārapāla and consigned forever (acandrārka) to the care of Devācārya, the lord of debaters from the Vṛhadgaccha-vṛhadgacchiyavādīndra in V.S. 1221. It was an attempt by the Caulukya king to find Jaina support in the Cāhamāna dominion. Jalor was a stronghold of Jainism and this is evident from the inscriptions recording grants by the Cāhamāna rulers.95 Politically it should be interpreted in the context of the power struggle between Kumārapāla and Kirtipāla Cāhamāna who founded the Jalor branch of this lineage which was independent of the Caulukyas, as noted above. This temple remained in the hands of the disciples of Devācārya till V.S. 1268 and was supported by the Cāhamāna rulers of Jalor after Kumārapāla for the same political purposes.96

94 Weber, M., The Religion Of India , pp. 197-98

95 For the grants see DHNI, II, pp.1123 ff

96 EI, XI, p.55
In fact the śrāvakācāras explicitly advocated the policy of conformity to the order of the rulers. While discussing the ideal qualities of a layman (śrāvakaguṇa) Hemacandra says in his Yogasastra, a very influential work on lay discipline-avarnavādi na kvāpi rajadisu viseṣatah, it means that a layman should not denigrate other people, particularly the rulers etc. The Dharmabindu of Municandra, another important text on śrāvakācāra explains that the word rajadisu is intended to include ministers, court chaplains and other officials. It is dangerous to denigrate great ones as it may result in loss of life and possessions.97

Similarly the religious life of the ‘Hindus’ was under the influence of the Brahmana priests, the greatest force of legitimacy in early India. These holy men were patronized by the rulers to gain the support of the masses over whom they had immense spiritual power. They were given entire villages in grants. Ananadanagara was such a Brahmanical settlement not very far from the Caulukya capital. The Vadanagara prasasti refers to the rampart and a temple of Lasmi built by Kumārapāla in this village of the famous Nagara Brahmanas.98 As noted above Kumārapāla repaired the famous Somanataha shrine and patronized its chief Śaiva priest who was given a village in grant besides other favours. These sacred tīrthas were of immense importance for purposes of legitimacy. Thapar rightly says “Kumarapala’s rebuilding of at least two important saiva temples may well have been, among other things, an attempt to get endorsement of his right to rule since he was not the son of the previous ruler.”99 These land grants to

97 Vide supra.

98 EI, I, pp.303-04

99 Thapar, R., Somanatha, p. 115
temples and Brahmanas were made with a view to 'domesticating the masses' which is indispensable for peace and stability and the main source of legitimacy for the rulers. Chatttopadhyaya says:

From the perspective of the interdependence between temporal power and sacred authority, it becomes understandable that assignments such as brahmadeyas and devadanas were not an administrative but socio-religious necessity for the temporal power; the earthly agents of the sacred domain.....generated a pattern of dominance in their areas of preserve.¹⁰⁰

Lingat has pointed towards the motive behind the kings' patronage to the dharmasastris. He says:

...the kings of history tried to enlighten their subjects and themselves upon their duties, giving their patronage to commentators and digest writers. This was only one way in which they acquired renown as pious princes, devoted to dharma.¹⁰¹

Patronage was not confined to the Jainas and the 'Hindus'. Jayasimha built a mosque in Cambay for the use of Arab traders who were either settled there or frequently visited it for trading purposes and added substantially to the commercial profits of this important port.¹⁰² We have already noted the economic significance of the sea-ports for the Caulukyas and these were largely controlled precisely for this reason.

The famous poets and musicians enhanced the prestige and reputation of their patrons in a ranking society and are not altogether irrelevant from the legitimation point of view. If we use patronage in a broader sense then the Rajaputas were patronized as a warrior aristocracy. As we saw in chapter II, they were given lands with administrative

¹⁰⁰ Chattopadhyaya, B. D., op. cit., p. 211

¹⁰¹ Lingat, R., op. cit., p. 229

¹⁰² Ibid., pp.112-13
rights in lieu of providing a certain quota of troops and horses. They constituted a part of the military apparatus of the state.

The old scholars who have taken up the case of Kumārapala have noted his patronage to both Jainism and Saivism even after his alleged conversion to Jainism. It goes to their credit that they have clearly recognized the pattern, if not the politics of ‘patronage to all’, as far as the practices of kingcraft is concerned. In his classic biography of Hemacandra Buhler notes that if the favors to Jainism enabled the Jaina authors to call him Paramārhatā, his patronage to Brahmanical institutions rightly earned him the epithet Maheśvararpaṇgrāṇīh. Then he concludes:

A perfectly complete victory Hemacandra could not therefore attain, .... It is true that he could not wholly lure Kumarapala away from Saivism. But he succeeded in inducing him to constantly observe the most important Jaina vows, and in exerting a great influence over the government.\(^{103}\)

Ray was of similar opinion “...though influenced by Jainism he never formally gave up his traditional Saiva faith.”\(^{104}\) After a critical evaluation of the sources Majumdar concluded in these words:

Kumarapala adopted the Jaina faith; but he does not seem to have totally forsaken the faith of his ancestors. Probably like Harsavaedhana, he adopted another creed without ceasing to be a follower of the Brahmanical religion.\(^{105}\)

\(^{103}\) Buhler, G., op. cit., p. 47

\(^{104}\) DHNL, II, p. 996

\(^{105}\) Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., p. 124
Thapar means the same “Kumarapala did not foresake Saivism but followed the policy of many Indian rulers who have frequently been patrons to a range of prominent religious sects.”

What we have termed the politics of patronage is a fairly well understood phenomena commonly referred to as the interdependence of the spiritual and the temporal domains, where material support was exchanged for legitimacy.

Dumont puts it very clearly “While spiritually, absolutely, the priest is superior, he is at the same time, from a temporal or material point of view, subject and dependent.”

As we noted above, sources of legitimacy are multiple and its pattern is subject to change, therefore at a particular point of time a king chose among the various religious sects, representatives of the sacred domain. Then the crucial point is to know “how in the early medieval context the relevance of sacred domain was defined by temporal power.” Kumārāpāla’s choice was Saivism and Jainism for this purpose.

Among historians Ray has rightly captured the king’s motive. After doubting Kumārāpāla’s sincerity towards acceptance of Jainism as noted above, Ray has made a
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careful observation:

It is not unlikely that his leanings towards Jainism had a material object in view, the winning of the support of the powerful and wealthy Bania corporations, who were predominantly Jaina. The king’s numerous wars must have drained his treasury, and may have made him increasingly dependent for financial assistance on the Jaina community, who appeared to have formed, then as now, the backbone of industry, commerce and banking in Gujarat. It may not be without significance that Hemacandra himself was a Modha Bania by caste, while Udayana, the prime minister was also a rich merchant of the Srimala-vamsa. 110

We must add two of Udayana’s sons who were also ministers and numerous unknown others. Instead of a single purpose, we should ascribe multiple motives behind human action. Thus nothing would have given Kumārapāla better legitimacy among the Jaina masses than a prophecy by Mahāvīra of this great Jaina king, as Hemacandra did through his TSPC. Thus besides the economic motive, very perceptively pointed out by Ray, Kumārapāla was also motivated to have religious sanction behind his rule. What is really interesting here is the fact that both material support and legitimacy was given to the temporal domain from the representatives of sacred domain. Saivism was the most popular religion in western India during this time, therefore it was patronised by Kumārapāla to gain the support of the masses, a most significant factor for the purposes of legitimacy. For this purpose patronage to famous poets, artists and musicians is relevant, for they enhanced the king’s respect in a ranking society. Maintenance of charitable institutions was motivated to acquire the attribute of generosity, which is, along with bravery, the most praised quality of kingship since Rgvedic times.

110 DHNI, II, p. 997
After discussing the benefits of temporal power, let us see what the spiritual domain got in this relation of reciprocity. The most obvious as well as the most significant is the material support in the form of grants of revenue accruing from the land, or trade and commerce or various crafts which was assigned to religious institutions by the rules. Thus holy men and temples were given entire villages or a specified piece of land therein besides the fines for crimes (sadaṇḍadaśaparādha). A fixed amount of monthly payment from the sulkaṃḍaṇḍapikās or from the taxes on craftsmen and artisans to the temples was a most frequent gift. Building and repairing of temples by the rulers and manifold gifts and donations to these and to the famous places of pilgrimage (tīrthasthānas) was equally widespread. For missionary purposes a tīrthayātrā to a sacred shrine or worship in a famous temple was much to be valued, for it enhanced the prestige of spiritual domain and was very helpful in winning followers, besides the rich gifts given on such occasions. Thus there was intense rivalry among ‘Hinduism’, Buddhism and Jainism for patronage.

Moreover, svetambaras fought with the digambaras and within each of them there was some competition among the various gacchas and sākhās. Within ‘Hinduism’, Saivism rivaled with Vaiṣṇavism for material support and we can assume some competition between various schools of both, for example, among the four main Śaiva schools found in western India, referred to above.

Jacobi pointed out the significance of political patronage in the context of intense rivalry among competing sects. He says that the success of Buddha and Mahāvīra must be attributed in no small measure to the support by the ruling elites, which was not
available to their rival teachers.\textsuperscript{111} Weber very perceptively says that the nobility supported these heterodoxies to counterbalance the considerable influence of the Brahmanas.\textsuperscript{112} Williams says that from the 5\textsuperscript{th} to the end of 13\textsuperscript{th} century was the period of greatest achievement for Jainism during which the Jainas in parts of southern and western India exerted considerable influence on political developments and contrasts this period with post-14\textsuperscript{th} century when they lost access to political power. "The fourteenth century is the great divide. From then on Jainism is on the defensive, and its adherents having lost access to the sources of power are relegated to the role of a scattered minority, no longer proselytizing, and increasingly identified with certain narrow social groups."\textsuperscript{113} Now, during the early medieval period a change took place in the pattern of patronage. Jainism was supported by kings in western India to win the support of the economically very powerful though numerically small Jaina laity. Similarly during this period Brahmanas were patronized for their hold over the masses to domesticate them.

The kings presided over the sectarian religious debates and issued \textit{jayapatra} to the winner. Apart from intellectual merits of the arguments political considerations must have been involved and this victory certified by the royal authority enormously enhanced the prestige of the sect among the masses. One such famous debate took place between svetambara Devasuri and Digambara Kumudacandra in the presence of Jayasimha in V.S. 1181. Hemacandra was present as a supporter of Devasuri and he

\textsuperscript{111} Jacobi, H., tr. \textit{Jaina Sutras}, part I, \textit{SBE} vol. XXII, Translator’s introduction p. xviii

\textsuperscript{112} Weber, M., op. cit., p. 202

\textsuperscript{113} Williams, R., op. cit., p. xii
succeeded in winning the favour of the King’s mother Mayanalladevi for his side. Presumably śvetambara influence in the court based on its greater number of followers in Gujarat was the reason behind the success of Devasuri, who got the Jayapatra from Jayasimha. As noted above Vigrahārāja IV issued the decree of anāryā-ghosanā. Prthvirāj III decided the religious debates of the Jaina monks and granted a jayapatra to Jinapati suri in V.S.1239.

Lingat says “It is difficult to doubt that royal patronage assured the works a measure of official status and consequently a certain authority.” The Viramitrodaya, Mitāksara, Krtyakalpataru, and the Sarasvati-vilāsa, inter alia, can be cited as examples.

Weber puts all of the above most succinctly:

The souls of the laity for whom these religions struggled were ...made up of educated nobles, courtiers, the literate officials and the petty bourgeois and peasants. Princes, priests and monks alike had an interest in how religious needs were met. The holders of political power saw in it an instrument to domesticate the masses. The champions of religion saw an opportunity to win pillars of spiritual power and a source of prebends and causal fees. Thus opened a plebeian epoch of orthodox Indian soteriology or more correctly speaking, an epoch aimed at satisfying plebeian religious needs. [our italics].”

---

114 Buhler, G., op. cit., p. 14
115 Lingat, R., op. cit., p. 230
116 Weber, M., The Religion of India, p. 236
Charismatic Authority of Kumārapāla

We referred to the presence of elements of charismatic authority in the Caulukya kingship. It was said to rest on charismatic grounds, based on devotion to the ‘exceptional sanctity’ and ‘heroism’ of an individual person. This sanctity gives legitimacy to the normative pattern or order headed by him. Many Caulukya inscriptions describe the manner in which ‘divine sanctity’ was bestowed upon the Caulukyanvaya and praises the heroism of its kings. For example, the Vadanagara praśasti of Kumārapāla dated A. D. 1151\(^\text{117}\) says:

\begin{verbatim}
girvanaivvitagarvam danujaparibhavāt-prārthitastrayakārtha
vedhah sargdhya namasyannapi nija-culuke punyaganṣābupurne I
sadyo vīram culukyahvayamsṛjam-idam yena kīrtipravāhaiḥ
putam trailokya-metanniyatamamūhramtyeva heto falam śrīh II (sloka 2)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
vamśaḥ kopi tato babhuva vividhacayairkalilaspadam
yasmāt-bhūmi-bhṛtopi vītaganitaḥ prādurbhavamti-anvaham I
chayam yah prathita-pratāpa-mahātim dhe vipannopi sanyoh
anyavadhi sarvadapi jagato visvasya datte falam II (sloka 3)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
vaṁś-asyasya yaśahprakasanavidhau nirmulya-muktāmanīḥ
ksoni-pāla-kirīṭa-kalpita-pādah śrī-mūlarājāh-abhavat .....II (sloka 4)
\end{verbatim}

\(^{117}\) El, 1, pp.296-97.
Humbly asked by the gods for a protector against the insults of the sons of Danu, the creator, though about to perform the samddhya, produced forthwith in his culuka filled with the holy water of Ganga, that hero named Culukya who sanctified the trailokya with the floods of his fame. 2

From him sprang a varsha, the sole sporting ground of many marvels, in which countless kings daily appear, which even in its decay possessed a lustre, great on account of its famed valor, and which ever bestows blessings on the whole world down to common men. 3

......was born Mularaja. 4

......his majesty king Kumrapala, the crest-jewel of the reign of Sri. 14

Later bardic tradition known as the ‘agnikula myth’ gives another version of the ‘divine and heroic’ origin of the Caulukyas. It says that the Caulkyas along with the Paramaras, Pratiharas and Cahamanas belonged to the ‘agnikula’. 118

Hemacandra in the Mahaviracarita of his TSPC, a version of Jaina universal history which is accorded canonical status among the Svetambaras, puts these words in the mouth of Mahavir in terms of a prophecy:

When, O Abhaya, 1669 years would have passed after my nirvana [i.e. in V.S.1199], then there will live in that city [Anhillapattana] the long armed king Kumarapala, the moon of the Caulukya lineage, a powerful lord of all.”

118 Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., pp. 7-8
We have already noted that Weber was fully aware of the Charismatic authority in Indian kingship and accordingly attributed the special position of the kṣatriya of classical literature to 'sib and clan charisma'. This charisma spread to the splinter lineages of the ruling rājputa-vamsa. 'As a rule, in India, in accordance with the universal principle of clan charisma, only sib and clan members of the ruling clan tended to be enfeoffed.'

**Methodological Significance**

Jacobi says "I believe that in many [cases] the Jainas claim more honor than is their due in connecting every Indian celebrity with the history of their creed." Among these were the Cakravartins who were taken over from other sects.\(^{119}\) The situation is similar with reference to the historical, as opposed to the mythological, kings. After a comprehensive survey of the Jaina canons and the Buddhist texts, Jain says "...most of the well known rulers [e.g., Śrenika, Ajātaśatru, Pradyota, Udayana] are claimed by both Jains and Buddhists as their own. In fact, they showed equal regard towards religious teachers of different sects and hence it is very difficult to say that they belonged to a particular faith."\(^{120}\) The situation is not different for the early medieval period. Apart from Kumārapāla, a Jaina author claimed Jayasimha as his own.

A praśasti of 1400 A.D. says that Maladhāri Hemacandra, an elder contemporary of Hemacandra, converted Jayasimha and induced him to adorn the Jaina temples in his own kingdom and foreign lands with golden flag-staffs and knobs and also to issue an

---


120 Jain, J.C., op. cit., p. 403
edict which prohibited the killing of animals on 80 days in each year. Probably the author of this eulogy based his claim on the 13th century work which says that “Jayasimha drank the nectar of his speech.” The situation is exactly similar with reference to Akbar. There is the belief in being able to call Emperor Akbar a svetmbara Jaina. He requested the Jainas to send Hiravijaya of Tapagaccha, this so called jagad-guru spent some years at the Mughal court. After his departure in 1584 three other Jaina monks were active in the same direction of making Akbar familiar with the Jaina dharma. The emperor probably issued some regionally and temporally limited prohibitions in accordance with their teaching, presumably to appease the Jainas.

121 Buhler, G., op. cit., p. 23

122 Schubring, W., p. 57. The author says that the Jaina monks went to ‘the court of Delhi’ which is factually incorrect. Akbar never lived in Delhi, the reference should actually pertain to the famous ibadatkahuna debates held at Fatehpur Sikri. Vide Richards, J.F. The Mughal Empire, 1993. Medieval scholars seem to have accepted the official and non-official (by Mulla Badayuni) accounts of this rather famous example of the Emperor’s tolerance towards all creeds at their face value. Akbar’s curiosity to know ‘the true nature of religion’ reminds us of Kumarapala’s sincere anxiety to know the true nature of the faith (dharmasvarupajijnasa) path. Particularly in view of the former’s being a consummate politician who was, moreover, surrounded by some really wise counselors and very effective propagandists such as Abul Fazl who devised an innovative discourse of legitimacy for his patron, we should suspect that these officially arranged and widely publicized debates by holy men of all faiths was meant to gain widest possible acceptance for his rule and reminds us of our ‘patronage to all’ policy; even if
As is well known, Akbar was not converted to Jainism, but we are not fortunate to have conclusive evidence about many other kings, who are claimed by rival sects to be their own. To give one example, was the Rastrakuta king Amoghavāra I (A.D.814-878) a Jaina? Altekar seems to be uncertain. He says “Amoghavāra I was undoubtedly a follower of Jainism” and oscillates to “...among the Rastrakūta emperors Amoghavāra I was more a Jaina than a Hindu.”

Inden mentions that the Jainas claimed that Amoghavāra was a follower of the Jina. Altekar gives evidence from the Parsvābhudaya where Jinasena claims to be the chief preceptor (parama guru) of this king. The contemporary Ganaṭāsārasamgṛaha refers to him as a follower of syādavāda. Besides, the king appointed Guṇabhadra as the guru of his son Krṣṇa II (A.D. 878-915).

Altekar’s evidence is not tenable. A Jaina spiritual preceptor does not necessarily mean that the royal disciple was a Jaina. To give some examples, Avinīta, the early western Ganga king of Talakad, had the learned Jaina monk Vijayakirti as his preceptor. But one inscription of this dynasty says that Avinīta held the Brahmanas in supreme respect and as devoted to the worship of Trayamvaka Ṣiva. The celebrated Jaina grammarian Pujyapāda was the guru of his son Durvīnīta (A.D. 482-517). But in one of his inscriptions he celebrates the upholding of varṇāśramadharma and appears to have even if we should accept that some interest was not altogether lacking to know the doctrines of different religions.


124 Inden, R., op. cit., p.252

125 Altekar, op. cit., pp. 410-14 and 311-12 respectively.
favored Vaisnavism and calls himself a devotee of Visnu. The religious affiliation of these kings have long been a subject of controversy. Conversely, Marasiha II (A.D. 961-74) of Talkad, a Jaina king, had the great Vadighanaghala Bhatta as his ūrutaguru and gave to this Brahmana a village in the form of an agrahāra as his daksinā. Thus spiritual preceptor of a particular sect, as well as patronage to a particular faith, in itself, is no evidence at all of the assertion that the royal patron in question was a follower of that sect. The example of emperor Akbar, cited above is one incontrovertible proof of this assertion.

In view of the above discussion, two hypotheses and a suggestion can be put forward:

1) We can advance a 'rule of experience' that patronage to sects and sectarian spiritual preceptors are not sufficient evidence to decide the personal religious affiliation of a particular king, though it may be a supplementary proof. Moreover, only rites de passage such as those related to birth, upanayana, marriage and śrāddha along with the family tutelary deities worshipped and propitiated on these occasions can count as sufficient evidence of the personal religion of a particular king.

2) We must be specific whenever we use the term denoting the sectarian following of a ruler, e.g., a Jaina/Buddhist/ 'Hindu' king, about the meaning of this designation. Its two senses are i.) the personal religious affiliation of the king. Here the differences should be specified, such as a svetambara/digambara if Jaina or a Śaiva/ Vaiṣṇava etc. if Hindu, but it may not mean much.

---

126 Rice, B.L., Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions, London, 1909 pp. 34-36
127 Ibid., pp. 49-50
128 M. Phil. Diss., p. 79
ii) Logopraxis of kingcraft. By it we mean the ideology and practices of statecraft. Our study, though very much limited in scope, points towards the fact that we can not speak of a Buddhist or a Jaina king, for besides lacking a comprehensive ideology of kingship and this is particularly true for the Buddhists, their practices of kingcraft cannot be differentiated from the Brahmanical/ Hindu kings, in fact there was non. The ideology of statecraft enunciated by these two sramanic tradition in question bears the stamp of its progenitor. All of them were monks, who were looking at the world from the outside, after renouncing it. As a consequence, their discourses of kingship, seeking salvation for all was impractical, not only because there was no place for the non-believers in it. The high intellectualism of these 'cultured professional monks', to use Weber's phrase\textsuperscript{129}, show their ignorance of kingly affairs. Only a renouncer could dream of a non-violent, passionless king who renounces the throne. In reality, one most significance source of revenue was booty, and no king could get this without war, and patricide and fratricide were not infrequent to gain the throne. Only a monk can think of a monarch who ruled without indulging in sensual pleasures 'like an ascetic consuming food'. Thus there was no Buddhist or Jaina king in our second sense.

What about the Brahmanical kings. Their case is a complex one and the next section can only touch the essential points.

3) To understand the institution of kingship, the proper area of investigation should be practices of kingcraft, based, in the main, on the inscriptions. As an indispensable supplementary source the \textit{Arthaśāstra} texts and the \textit{vyavahāra} section of the

\textsuperscript{129} Weber, M., op. cit., p. 192
Dharmasastra are useful. Dumont rightly says "...the picture we get from the Arthasastra is probably closer to the actuality of life than the one from the dharma literature with the exception of the administration of justice." Methodologically, we must focus on the self-interests of the kings as the motives behind their policies and specific acts, and should not look into the sectarian ideologies of kingship or precepts of a particular religion. Here, some formulations of sister disciplines of the social sciences such as the Rational choice theory of Economics and Psychologists' finding about motivation i.e. what moves someone to action is useful, for example the concept of multiple motivation behind any action. We assume a multiplicity of motives behind any action "Human motives are almost always mixed; action is, as we say in psychoanalysis, overdetermined."

For any understanding of the structure and functions of the state apparatus some knowledge of a few fundamental facts about law, particularly anthropology of law is of much value. For understanding the nature of the early Indian state a basic familiarity

\[130\] Dumont, L., op. cit., Appendix C p. 309

\[131\] For a good introductory text, see Lichbach, M. I., *Is Rational Choice Theory All of Social Science?*, Ann Arbour, 2006; also Elster, J., ed., op. cit.


with political anthropology is of some significance. The LP says “son, friend and wife [not to talk of others] seem to be devoted as far as their self interest is involved, but indifferent otherwise.” \( \text{pntra-mitra-kalattrdikam ca svarthasampatya nirvikaramanyathu savikari} \). We must keep this maxim in mind while analyzing the motives behind action, whether royal or plebeian.

A very good framework to study rulership is given by Weber. At the core of his approach to rulership is the triangular struggle between ruler, bureaucratic staff as a vested interest group and subjects. His ‘rules of experience’ are a summary of a number of historical constellations, which are used as heuristic propositions. For example:

Weber’s theory of monarchy includes the observation that monarchs throughout the ages, from ancient Mesopotamia to Imperial Germany, have been welfare minded because they needed the support of the lower strata against the higher. However, these higher strata of nobility and priesthood [the greatest force of legitimation in history], usually remain important to the maintenance of monarchic power and legitimacy. Hence, the stability of monarchy rest in part on the ruler’s ability to balance the two groups.

---


135 LP, 2.2.2

136 ES, p.36

137 Ibid, p. xxxix
The Secularity of the early Indian State

Apter says that the secularization of political norms occurred in three steps, the first being the nationalization of the church. The second was the extension of that process to government which established the idea of a sovereign government with rights to protect itself against external sacerdotal power. The last step was the rise of individualism based on the Protestant doctrine along with the rise of capitalism. These helped to create conditions of secularization with an emphasis on legal and constitutional political devices whereby law has replaced religion as the foundation of the community. In this manner a 'wall of separation' arose between the church and the state.\(^{138}\)

In India, religious life of the people was independent of state control. As we saw the sastras deny the king any legislative authority in the domain of what we term 'the personal laws' such as those relating to marriage and inheritance, more or less this was the reality. Moreover, the rulers were not bothered about which deity one must worship and what rituals one must observe. Examples of kings enforcing the Jinadharma precepts of conduct are a figment of imagination of the Jaina monks. They have represented Kumarapala as an instrument of proselytisation in the hands of Jaina acaryas, the reality was altogether different. In any kingdom where we find multisectarian population, secularism is the only practicable approach available to monarchs, no matter what the monks say. The philosopher Charles Taylor says "secularism in some form is a necessity for the democratic life of religiously diverse

\(^{138}\) IESS, vol. 6 pp. 222-23
This exactly was the situation in India where both religious persecution of the non-believers as well as the war of the two domains was absent altogether. Even Islam in its earlier phase when both temporal and spiritual power was concentrated in the hands of the king, could not do otherwise when they conquered the people following different faiths. The ‘wall of separation’ between the church and the state, the distinguishing feature of secularism is as old as kingship in India. During the Rgvedic period itself, the religious function was the monopoly of the priests as the performance of various yajnas make evident.

Therefore Dumont’s secularization hypothesis is open to doubt. He cites the example of Ancient Egyptian or Sumerian or Chinese Kingship where the supreme religious functions were vested in the Sovereign, “he was the priest par excellence and those who were called the priests were the only ritual specialists subordinate to him.” In the Indian case the king depends upon the purohita for the religious functions, he cannot be his own sacrificer. He elaborates:

Through this disassociation, the function of the king in India has been secularized. It is from this point that a differentiation has occurred, the separation within the religious universe of a sphere or realm opposed to the religious, and roughly corresponding to what we call political. As opposed to the dharma... it is the realm of interest or advantage, artha.  

---

139 Veer, Peter van der., ‘The Secularity of the State’ in Kimura and Tanabe, eds., The State In India: Past And Present, New Delhi, 2006 p. 261

140 Dumont, L., op. cit., p. 293
According to Dumont this secularization took place in the Vedic period, for from the time of the Brahmanas onwards the duality of the religious universe has been the case.

In fact Dumont’s thesis is based on an erroneous presupposition. He says that the Indian king has retained 'something of the magico-religious aspects' found elsewhere in complete form. He says “In most of the societies in which kingship is found, it is a magico-religious as well as a political function. This is commonplace.”\textsuperscript{141} Obviously 'most' does not mean 'all' and no rule of logic says that India is to be included in the former of these two terms. We do not have any evidence to assert that during the Vedic period, at any point of time, the king was the master of both the domains, provided we can use the term 'king' for this period.

Derrett is of the same opinion. He says that there was no question of secularising the political element, it was from the beginning a practical, seen question, a matter of ways and means. From the beginning the king was the chief manipulator of politics.\textsuperscript{142}

The separation of church and the state pertains to the relation between political and the ecclesiastical authority, the central issue being that of political loyalty: can one be loyal to the state when one is not following the religion of the state? der Veer points out that the outcome of the French, American and British revolutions was that political loyalty could rest on citizenship instead of the membership of the state church. However, the relationship between these two was different, the French revolution developed into

\textsuperscript{141} Dumont, L., op. cit., pp. 293-94

\textsuperscript{142} Derrett, J.D.M., 'Rajadharma', JAS, 35, 1976 pp. 164ff
something anti-clerical in its secularism and carried a direct attack on the religious
institutions and in America it was aimed at gaining religious freedom from state
interference which was rooted in the spirit of religious dissent carried from Britain. In
both countries the revolution put an end to the association between royal absolutism and
the established church. But in Britain the early 19th century saw the gradual
enfranchisement of Catholics and Dissenters. 143 We are not sure whether we can talk of
the 'state church' or 'state religion' in India, and certainly the war of the spheres never
took place for kingship was a secular institutions from the beginning. 144

So perceptive and objective a scholar as Weber is wrong to assert "In some southern
Indian areas and in the realm of the western chalukya [sic] kings it [Jainism] was, at
times, accepted as the state religion." 145 Here probably he refers to the reign of
Kumārapāla during which Jainism was accepted as the state church, according to Weber.
Probably he based his argument on a not too critical examination of the primary sources
along with secondary sources like Buhler's biography of Hemacandra which was
available to him.

---

143 Veer, P. van der., op. cit., p. 258

144 Even Dumont, the proponent of the secularization thesis has denied that there was any
war between the Brahma and the Kṣatra in India, which he terms as 'the supposition of
an important but entirely imaginary historical event'. Vide p. 287 of his monograph.

145 Weber, M., op. cit., p. 203
We have not made an in-depth study of the south Indian cases nor did Weber is specific in his reference, but the situation was similar or worse for his argument because from this area we do not have even the edicts of non-slaughter of animals, instead the Sravana Belgola epigraphs celebrate the victory of Jaina kings and commanders earned after much bloodshed in wars! vividly described in these records.\textsuperscript{146}

As we saw in some detail, enforcement of Jaina precepts of Kingship which are nothing but the 12 vows of a Jaina layman, is a figment of monkish imagination. All we are left with is the evidence of \textit{amāri-rudhi} which can not qualify as state religion for the observance of \textit{ahimsā} was a common trait of all religions, a secular heritage of India, even Akbar is said to have enforced it in selected areas.

\textit{Rites de passage} and other religious rituals were the exclusive preserve of the spiritual domain from the very beginning in India, as noted above. Even the personal laws dealing with marriage, adoption and succession etc., which are allegedly religious in origin, are nothing but the customary laws sanctified by religious authority, as Derrett has shown.\textsuperscript{147}

Thus at every period of Indian history the religious life of people was in the hands of the 'churches', and the 'state' had the monopoly over the military and fiscal laws. If the king declared themselves as the upholder of the \textit{varnasramadharma}, they are merely

\textsuperscript{146} M. Phil Diss., pp. 77ff.
\textsuperscript{147} Derrett, J. D. M., op. cit., pp. 104ff.
approving what the people are already observing of their own accord, not enforcing the sastric injunctions. The king had no authority to legislate in the matters reserved for the sastras, as Lingat has so painstakingly shown.

_Purohitas_ were family priests of the kings, not the ecclesiastical authorities appointed by the state. Temples were built and consigned to the care of existing representatives of the spiritual domain. From the very beginning we have an instance of interdependence between two distinct domains, the 'wall of separation' existed but was not insurmountable.

Thus seen, there was no 'Hindu' king in our second sense, strictly speaking, the institution of kingship was secular/non-sectarian in early India.
CONCLUSION

Die Herrscher wechseln nie; es wechseln nur die Namen.

‘The ruler remains the same, what changes is only the name.’

A German Proverb

Evolution of the Jaina Political Theory

In this chapter we tried to trace the genesis and development of the Jaina political theory. We found that for all practical purposes Jaina ideology of kingship was fully expressed in the canonical descriptions of the Cakravartins. They were the earthly counterparts of the Tirthankaras. Indeed, some of the salakāpurūṣas were both. The post-canonical Jaina political theory is substantially the same. A failure to trace this development has resulted in Ghoshal’s assertion that the Adipurāṇa of Jinasena presents the first systematic Jaina version of the origin of socio-political institutions. Even within the post-canonical tradition Jinasena’s celebrated account is by no means earlier than Śīlaṃka’s Cauppanamahāpurisacaria. This prakrit work might even predate the AP. To put the matter in a single sentence, an ideal Jaina ruler is a Śrāvaka who diligently follows the 12 vows of a Jaina layman (dvādasāsārāvakavratāṇi) in his personal life as well as in matters of royal policy. We summarized Hemacandra’s depiction of Jaina rulership by saying that he put a devout śrāvaka on the throne.

Any historical investigation of ideologies of kingship might fail to give credit where it is due if it studies the Brahmanical, Buddhist or the Jaina tradition in isolation. Accordingly, we attempted a very brief comparison of these three textual traditions.
Like the Buddhists, the Jainas were responding to the *puruṣasūkta* of the *Ṛgveda* in their account of the origin of the socio-political order. The Digamberas were less hesitant in their adaptation of the Brahmanical tradition. We noted that the 14 Jaina *kulakaras* were modeled after the 14 *manus* of the Brahmanical tradition. A significant difference was that the Jaina rulers were invariably the renouncers.

The most interesting topic was a comparison of the Cakravartins— the ideology of kingship *par excellence*, of the three traditions. The *ratnis* of the *brāhmaṇas* gave birth to the 5 jewels of the Buddhist *cakkavattis*. The 14 jewels of the Jaina universal monarchs was an appropriation of the earlier two and these emblems of royalty of the cakravartins of the Brahmanical Puranas are modeled after the Jaina ones. We noted that the idea of a universal monarch, envisaged as the *śrīvaṃśa/cakravartin* who performed the *aśvamedha-yajña* certainly predates the Mauryas.

We also noted some differences within the Jaina tradition itself. We found that the *Nītivākyāmṛtam* of Somadeva contains nothing that can be termed Jaina and it is a paraphrase of the *Arthaśāstra*, a point emphasized by many. We referred to the Sravanabelagola inscriptions celebrating Jaina generals and kings who waded through the blood to attain victories.

**Diffusion of Political Theories in Early India**

Harold Lasswell has noted that one of the most significant problems of political science is to account for the factors which determine the diffusion of political ideologies. We hope
that our concluding remarks may be of some help towards this end with reference to early Indian political theories.

We would like to highlight the most significant differences between the Brahmanical ideology of kingcraft and its Sramanic counterparts. In the Brahmanical scheme of things the domain of 'personal laws' (ācāra) such as marriage and adoption is independent of state control. The king was instructed not to interfere in this matter even if the conduct is contrary to what the sastra teaches. In contradistinction the Buddhist Cakkavatti is a preacher of the Buddhavacana and his Jaina counterpart is nothing more than a sravaka on the throne who enforces the 12 vows of a layman throughout his realm. In this sense under the Sramanic traditions the state dictates the form of salvation and becomes theocratic and enforces the Buddhavacana or the Jinadharma.

Other significant difference is the completely moralistic, one can say religious, tone of the Sramanic political philosophy. Drekmeyer has observed that changes in modes of production and technology exerted less influence on political thought than did religious ideas. In the case of the Jainas, their soteriology of salvation determined their political theory.

As we saw in the case of ahimsā, for example, their political thoughts loses all connections with the realities of statecraft and is nothing more than wishful thinking on the parts of the monks, entirely impracticable, impossible indeed. This may sound harsh, but nevertheless it is true. A Jaina king, a diligent follower of the 12 vows, was a śrāvaka on the throne who enforced the Jinadharma on even the non-believers. He had to renounce, because he could not attain mokṣa without sarvavirati. Jaina ideology of
kingship thoroughly bears the mark of their proponents. Actually, the canonical theory of *samsāra* and *mokṣa* preempted any ideology of kingcraft. These must have acted as rather serious constraints against its adoption by the rulers.

The only alternative left was either a thorough adoption of the Brahmanical theory, like the *Ādi-purāṇa* of Jinasena which is nothing but a paraphrase of the *Arthāśāstra*; or an uninhibited celebration of royal patrons and their violent conquests which entailed a convenient forgetting of canonical injunctions. This was the case with Sravanabelagola inscriptions issued during 10th-12th century period.

But the biggest difference lies in what the Sramanic traditions omit. Here we are talking of what is discussed under the *vyavahāra* section of the Brahmanical texts. State may mean many different things from a variety of perspectives but one of its invariable characteristic features is the enforcement of laws by the threat or actual use of force. The settlement of disputes by administering justice was the prime responsibility of the king. The Brahmanical sources dilate upon the 18 heads of litigation called *vyavahārapadas* and how the rulers were related to different types of cases. We have nothing in the Sramanic traditions which corresponds to this very important jurisprudential part of a political theory. Now it is important to note that the injunctions recorded in the *Vyavahāra* sections are a collection of customary laws prevalent at various places and usages current among various peoples. Barring matters of 'personal laws' and a few other cases where what we find in the texts is a result of the interactions between the mostly north Indian norms of the *śīṣṭas* and what the texts call *dēśācāra*, rest of the *vyavahāra* section consists of mostly recordings of regional customary laws whose decipherment is
made difficult by the uncertainties regarding the spacio-temporal context of the sastras. Thus they present an amalgam of facts and values, the latter mostly in the form of opinions of eminent jurists. As is well known the earliest Dharmasutras record the customary laws of various regions and groups of people and extol the king to respect these. In view of this fact one feels hesitant in calling the Buddhist and Jaina notions of kingship a political theory, whatever might have been the causes behind this rather significant omission.

Probably it will not be far too wrong to say that the Buddhist and Jaina ideologies of Kingship were not meant for the guidance of kings and courts. Two factors were primarily responsible for this. Both Buddhism and Jainism were philosophy of salvation for the world renouncers (whom Weber calls 'the cultured professional monks') and hence kingcraft was anathema for them. This is reflected in the hostility of the Buddhist sources to khattiyaavijjā and the injunction of the Jaina canons – 'keep away from kingly affairs'. Our interpretation is supported by the supreme place given to ahimsā in their Weltanschung. Both Buddhist and Jaina monks were wise enough to see the inherent contradiction between practices of statecraft and ahimsā. Secondly, by the time the Buddhists and particularly the Jainas showed any real interest in kingly affairs, practices of statecraft were too deeply entrenched to allow any significant alterations, if these were not already excluded by the Sramanic doctrines. Thus instead of being 'mirror for the princes' Buddhist and Jaina discourses of kingship were tapping the popularity of Cakravartin narratives to dazzle the gullible masses by the Royal splender
and inspire hope in them. A well calculated propagandistic move to further the missionary motive of the monks.

We noted the doctrinal elements of Jainism which preempted any meaningful ideology of kingship and acted as constraints on its diffusion. So what were the factors operating which made the Brahmanical theory so successful.

The widespread diffusion of Brahmanical political theory can be explained in terms of its inherent capacity to achieve social integration by making hierarchy divinely ordained through the Puruṣasūkta. As Drekmeier has noted, after the emergence of social stratification caste/varna ideology was a most appropriate type of coordination for cultural heterogeneity and large territories. It envisages a society based on clearly defined status groupings among which different social functions would be distributed. Caste emphasized the integrative imperative of society and it is no less than a professionalizing of society, the freezing of actions in the mold of role. Integration is based on social duty, rigidly defined and hierarchically arranged. A man is born into a set of obligations, he knows his place in the total scheme of things and will perform his duties diligently, which is necessary for his salvation. This kind of division of labour mitigates the problem of conflict in a society. Drekmeier says that where different social strata is combined with an ideology that rationalizes completely the hierarchy of status, different groups may live in peaceful proximity ‘without the need for a strong central authority to ensure order and arbitrate differences arising among them.’ Thus it was the best possible theory to be adopted by a newly stratified society. Brahmanical theory of kingship legitimizes the hierarchical ordering of society, hence the horizontal spread of state society into peripheral areas was related to its diffusion there. During the early
medieval period, the numerical preponderance of the Hindus in any realm must have worked in the favor of the Brahmanical political theory.

The Caulukya Polity

In the second chapter we located elements of various 'pure types' of rulership in the Caulukya polity, including that of Pfruendenfeudalismus. To facilitate comprehension we very briefly reproduce three kinds of relevant evidence having a bearing upon the nature of the Caulukya polity.

I. Administration of the Extended Core Region: these were mandalas other than the Sārasvatamanḍala which underwent economic-administrative restructuring after their conquest and annexation by the Caulukyas.

We have discussed how Caulukya kings issued Copper plate charters from Anhilvad recording grants of villages in the far away Lata without even bothering to mention the Mahāmandalesvaras governing those areas. Indeed, in one such case the Caulukya monarch (Karn A. D. 1064-94) reprimanded a Solamki Mahāmandalesvara, who was ruling over Lātamanḍala, for daring to mention his name in grandiloquent terms in a copper plate charter issued by him from Anhilapāṭaka.

Several specimens of the LP describes that the Caulukya mahamatya send grāssalopana orders to be implemented by pathaka level bureaucracy situated outside the Sārasvata mandala. Thus these mandalas which constituted the 'extended core region' of the Caulukyas were not placed in the hands of the 'feudal lords'.
The desottara/margakṣara (pass/permit) documents of the LP attest the control of the Caulukyas over the business traffic and subordinate administrative staff and most importantly police/military stations (sthāna) all the way from Anhilvad to modern Naosari in Lata. One dated A.D. 1231 says:

Balādhikṛta-srī-amuka-vacanan mārge samasta-desaṭhakura-desatalāra-grāmatalāra-
humdiyaka-pratisāraka-volāpika prabhṛtin samādisyate yathā Vahana-bṛta-samasta-
kiyamāṇakāṇāṁ śrīmat-Pattanāt Navasārikā-upari-sādhu-bṛta-balivarddanam ca
daṇa-volāpanādi-visaye kenūpi na sammukham avalokanīyam iti 12.4.1

The following dānasthikamaṇḍapikāpatra dated A.D. 1231 issued by Mahāmatya Āliga from the Caulukyan capital should be read in conjunction with the desottara discussed above:

Adyeha srīmad-Anahilapatane yathāsamṭisthamāna-rājāvali-purvam mahāmatya-srī-
Āliga-pancakulam śrī-Nusāri-pathake samasta-maṇḍavi[manda]pikā-pathakīyakānāṁ
padīśārinam uparihindiyam-prabhṛtinam sarvesāṁ dāna-sambamādhinaṁ samādisyate
yathā...

Besides describing the control of the Caulukya kings over these areas these desottara, dāna maṇḍapikāpatra also certifies the regular fiscal flows towards the centre from these regions.

II. Administration of Peripheral Areas

The Cahasmanas of Nadol and Jalor and the Paramaras of Abu are not ‘feudatories’ as Majumdar thought. They were tributary princes and best described as ‘subordinate allies’
as Sircar says. These are acted as the buffer state between the Caulukyas and the Cahamānas of Śākambhari. Along with the Mehr king of Timvanaka-mandala in Kathiavad they were more or less autonomous princes ruling over peripheral areas.

III. Transfer of Judicial Authority by the Caulukya Rulers and Instances of ‘Political Feudalism’ in the Caulukya Polity

This last type of evidence describe the transfer of fiscal rights and of political power (which entails judicial authority) to many individuals by the state authorities.

1. Military prebendalism or ‘service grants’ with judicial authority is illustrated by the pattala type documents. The earliest is dated A.D. 745? and says:

grāme rākapālatvam kāryam 1 kṣudrapadravādikam rakṣaniyam 1
sva-simā-madhye panthānam grāme-vasamāna-lokānām ca gata-dacham valāyitvā
pradātavyam 1
aparam evam grāmasya-āypadam bhogavata padāti-ja-100 ghotaka-20-etaih ghotaka-
mānuṣaih kaṭakakayam rājadhānyāṁ śrī-asmākam sevā kāryā 1

This record explicitly describes the transfer of judicial authority to the assignee (in addition to a given number of foot-soldiers and horsemen). The relevant condition reads:

“A watchmen should be appointed in the village. In the village minor disturbances are to be prevented. Property lost within its boundaries by the travellers or residents should be traced and restored, and force should be used to have it given to the owners.”
Second is dated A.D. 1451 and goes like this:

Deśamadhye caura-curaṭādi-ksudra-upadravādikam rakṣaniyam 1 Rucira rakṣā kāryā 1

Svasimāyam gatam vastu dātavyam 1

Aparam ca rāṇaka śrī-amukakena pālā-paḍāti-jana 400 vārughotaka 100 etavad-bala-

haranena avalaṅgā kavaniyāl

Like the above the following conditions entail transfer of judicial authority:

“....the said territory should be protected from thieves and robbers. There should be good

protection. Property lost within the boundaries (of the territory) should be compensated

for or restored.”

Thus with reference to these service grants two things must be noted:

a. transfer of judicial authority, such as punishment of criminals and protection from

wrongdoers, to the rajaputras receiving the service grant.

b. condition of a specified amount of pālā/padati i.e. foot-soldiers and vārughotaka (saddle horse) and pravahamāna ghoṭaka or drought horses, for the use of the king by the

recipient of the service grant.

2. Revenue farming and lease holding with judicial authority:

We have examples in the LP called Grāmapattakas/ guṇakṣara/gunapatra (a deed about

lease of land) where land was farmed out or given on lease by the state authorities. A

record dated A.D 1231 stipulates the protection of the roads within the boundary of the

village: Svasimā-madhye mārgo lohamayo rakṣaniyāh.
The $LP$ also gives examples where judicial authority was explicitly transferred by the state to the revenue farmers and lease holders. One specimen dated A.D. 1476 says: 

$svasimayam svasanjetana cauradikopadrava-raksanaya matangunanama grhe gavam nisedhanaya.$

3. Temple prebendalism with judicial rights:

We have some examples when even the so called \textquote{religous grants} were accompanied by political rights which entails transfer of judicial authority. In terms of reliability, including that of the date, it is the most important record. The Kadi plates of Tribhuvanapala Caulukya dated A.D. 1242 says

$Svabhujyamana -Visaya-pathaka-Dandahi-pathakayoh.......... Bhansara-Garamarajapurigramau vvasim........$

$Anayoh gramayoh simayam tambulika-vanjyarak-pathika-prabhyinam madhyat yah kopi cauraih-grhyate tasya pratikara anayoh grmayoh satka-bhotkaraapasvat pratitirlabhya uddhalagabhago nahi$

This \textquote{sasana} has been made over to the head of the monastery (Sthanapati), the illustrious Vedagarbharasi, the superior of the Saiva monastery at Mandali. He and his successors have been made trustees. The possessors of the two villages, which were situated in different pathakos of Sarasvata-mandala, are responsible for thefts and robberies commited within their boundaries. Thus in this case the usual condition given in the grants, which is present even here, viz. \textquote{sadmdadaasparudha} must not be construed as only fines on the 10 crimes.
Weber's Two Pure Types of Feudalism

Like the state, feudalism too, has proved difficult to define. We get valuable insights into the causes of this difficulty when Weber explains why a given historical case can only rarely be assigned with 'complete definiteness' into either of the two pure types of feudalism which he distinguished in his typology of rulership on a world historical scale. First of all 'feudalism' and the 'fief' can be defined in various ways. The complexity of the problem is partly due to the fluid nature of the transition between prebends/benefices or 'service grants' and 'fiefs'. One important difference is prebends with only economic or fiscal rights and those with 'strictly political powers, notably judicial and military authority.'

'The transitions between fiefs and military benefices is so gradual that at times they are at times almost indistinguishable.' The fluid nature of the transition between 'service grants' and 'fiefs' stems from the fact that 'numerous transitional forms and irregularities remain' between the appropriation of 'fiscal rights' and that of 'political powers' in transfers of land through 'service grants', revenue farming or lease holding. Thus it is seldom possible to classify cases with 'complete definiteness' under Lehensfeudalismus or Pfruendenfeudalismus "Es ist klar, dass die beiden Kategorien durch unmerkliche Uebergaenge verbunden sind und eine eindeutige Zuteilung an den einen oder anderen nur selten moglich ist." At times it appears indistinguishable from patrimonialism. Feudalism was a marginal and most fragmented case of patrimonialism, and the feudal vassal was a patrimonial lord in relation to his own retainers and because
the feudal principle did not completely replace the patrimonial administration of the
realm.

And thus in those cases where the use of land is granted in exchange for military service
and which fall under the rubric of feudalism Weber distinguishes two types:
1. Those based on fiefs (*Lehensfeudalismus*) which existed in European Middle Ages.
2. The second type is called *Pfruenden-Feudalismus* or prebendal feudalism, which has a
   fiscal basis. This was the case in India particularly under the Moguls "Typisch im Indien
der Mogul-Herrschaft."

The most important feature of prebendal feudalism:
It does not involve primarily a free relationship of personal fealty arising from a contract
of personal loyalty with the lord as the basis of a particular fief. It is rather a matter
primarily of fiscal considerations in the context of a system of financing which is
otherwise patrimonial, often sultanistic. This is for the most part made evident by the fact
that the prebends are assessed according to their tax value.
The main motive behind *Lehensfeudalismus* was to replace the insufficiently trained
popular levy whose members can no longer equip themselves and are needed in the
economy as manpower, with a well trained and self equipped army of warriors.
In contradistinction *Pfruendenfeudalismus* usually originates in the reversion from
monetary financing to financing in kind. Weber says that the administration by early
Indian kings increasingly sought both to raise the army and collect the taxes by means of
stipulation of taxes in lump sums and prebendalisation (service grants). This led to the
establishment of Jagir-prebends which were obviously modelled after ancient Temple and Brahmanical prebends.

The main reasons behind this policy were:

1. A sort of tax farming by which the risk involved in fluctuating income is transferred to an entrepreneur by rights of land use in return for services (‘service land’). Rights to such income may be transferred in return for undertaking to supply certain particular army contingents such as cavalry and armoured troops (infantry called pālā/padāti in our sources) for a patrimonial army.

Either in addition to the above or alone, Pfruedenfeudalismus may be established as a means of meeting the costs of civil administration and of securing tax payments for the royal treasury which was common in India.

2. In return for these various services, in the first instance to enable those who undertook them to meet their obligations, an appropriation of governmental power in varying degrees and respects were permitted. This means transfer of political power which entails judicial authority. Such appropriation has usually been for a limited period and subject to repurchase or vyāsedha. But when the means to do this have been lacking, it has often in fact been definitive and the holdings tend to become hereditary.

Those who hold such definitively appropriated powers then become, at the very least, landlords, and often come into possession of extensive political powers. It is the source of the powers over land of the Zamindaras, Jagiradaras and Tuluqdaras. Weber emphatically says “So, vor allem, in Indien, wo die Zamindor-, Jagirdar und Tuluqdar-Grundherrschaften durchweg so entstanden sind.”
We discussed how the grass/pattalā/gramapattaka holders might have become a class of landlords. In Gujarat the land was divided between raiyati villages and the ta’alūqa of zamindars, which corresponds to the ‘khalsa’ and ‘Grassia’ of Elphinston’s minute of 1821. Rogers reports ‘a division of village lands in Gujarat into talpat or state property [‘without any co-sharer in the revenue’], and vanta or ‘divided’ land held by the original grassia proprietors ousted by the Mussalmans in former days’. According to the Mirat-I Ahmadi, the Sultans of Gujarat, after their consolidation of power, confiscated the land and divided it into two categories. The revenue of the Banth/vanta (1/4 of the ‘grassia proprietors’) was to be retained by the zamindars and that of the talapad (the remaining 3/4) was to be collected by the state authorities.

By the time of Todd, the Pattawatas (doubtlessly holders of grāmapattakas of the LP) were almost indistinguishable from the zamindars (bhumias) whom he calls ‘allodial proprietors’. But Todd recognized that during the earlier period they were servants of the state holding revenue assignments.

Majumdar termed the rulers of Abu, Jalor and Nadol as the ‘feudatories’ of the Caulukyas. Recently V.M. Jha has ‘relocated’ them as the feudal elements in the Caulukya polity.¹ We found their position untenable. These were nominally dependent autonomous princes ruling over peripheral areas. As noted above, the maṇḍalesvaras ruling over the extended core region were not feudal lords.

---
Where do we relocate them? Kulke, while criticizing Jha, has put emphasis on the absence of ‘contract’ in India. But we can not deny this for the Caulukya polity during the 13th century. When these ‘service contracts’ meant transfer of judicial authority, and we have some evidence of it; then whether the holders of these grants appropriated ‘the means of administration’ on a hereditary basis by avoiding state intervention in the form of grāssalopana or not, this situation can be termed as instances of Pfruendenfeudalismus in the Caulukya polity. Chattopadhyaya has rightly pointed out the ‘late’ chronology of these developments as well as the small portion of territory under such administration.

**Elements of Charismatic Authority in the Caulukya Kingship**

We referred to the presence of elements of charismatic authority in the Caulukya kingship. It was said to rest on charismatic grounds, based on devotion to the ‘exceptional sanctity’ and ‘heroism’ of an individual person. This sanctity gives legitimacy to the normative pattern or order headed by him. Many Caulukya inscriptions describe the manner in which ‘divine sanctity’ was bestowed upon the Caulukyānvaya and praises the heroism of its kings. They describe the creation of the hero Culukya from the culuka of Brahma, when humbly asked by the gods for a protector against the insults of the sons of Danu. Culukya founded the lineage of the Caulukyas.

---

Later bardic tradition known as the ‘agnikula myth’ gives another version of the ‘divine and heroic’ origin of the Caulukyas. It says that the Caulkyas along with the Paramāras, Pratihāras and Cahamānas belonged to the ‘agnikula’.

Hemacandra in the *Mahāvīrācarita* of his *TSPC*, a version of Jaina universal history which is accorded canonical status among the Svetambaras, puts these words in the mouth of Mahavir in terms of a prophecy:

“When, O Abhaya, 1669 years would have passed after my nirvana [i.e. in V.S.1199], then there will live in that city [Anhillapattana] the long armed king Kumarapala, the moon of the Caulukya lineage, a powerful lord of all.”

We have noted that Weber was fully aware of the Charismatic authority in Indian kingship and accordingly attributed the special position of the rajaputa vamsas to ‘sib and clan charisma’. This charisma spread to the splinter lineages- ‘sib and clan members of the ruling clan’- ‘in accordance with the universal principle of clan charisma’.

**Representative Features of the Caulukya Polity**

The village headman (*pattakila*, modern patel) had a dual authority. First, as a traditional representative of the village society and secondly as a official headman of the village. This post was hereditary. He was appointed/confirmed by the state authorities. He performed a wide variety of administrative and judicial functions.

The caste pancayatas and to a lesser degree village pancayatas represented all the members of a caste or dominant groups of a village. They possessed substantial judicial authority and settled disputes through arbitration and adjudication.
Another such representative institutions was the Pancamukhanagara which existed only in the towns. A very wide variety of interests groups were represented on this body of the city dwellers.

To conclude, the third category of evidence makes almost certain the presence of *Pfruendenfeudalismus* or political feudalism in the Caulukya dominions during the 13\textsuperscript{th} century. This by no means contradicts the discussion of the ‘extended core region’. Area under *Pfruendenfeudalismus* constituted a very small portion of the Caulukya territory. Hence we have called the Caulukya polity as an instance of primarily ‘Patrimonial Bureaucracy’ with elements of *Pfruendenfeudalismus*, ‘charismatic authority’ as well as ‘representative government’ present therein.

Thus the Caulukya polity can be described as a mixture of Weberian ‘pure types’ of rulership to various degrees. It should be noted that this conceptual scheme of describing a concrete type of rulership as a mixture of various ‘pure types’ is not something which exclusively belongs to Weber. Long before him, Polybius described the government of Greek city-states in similar terms.

**The Functioning of the Political Structure**

We have discussed the importance of the insights of Weber for any understanding of how the various hierarchised constituents of the Caulukya polity functioned. As Roth as noted that at the core of Weber’s approach to rulership is the triangular struggle between ruler, bureaucratic staff as a vested interest group and the subjects. His theory of monarchy
includes the observation that throughout the ages monarchs have been welfare minded because they needed the support of the lower strata against the higher. However, these higher strata of nobility and priesthood have remained important to the maintenance of monarchical power and legitimacy. Hence, the stability of monarchy rest in part on the ruler’s ability to balance the two groups.

We noted the points along which the functioning of early medieval polities was different from the modern state. Thus it can be said to be the sine qua non for a proper understanding of the institution of kingship in early India. We recapitulate the main points.

**Traditional Authority**

Customs, calculations of personal advantage, purely affectual or ideal motives of solidarity which bind the administrative staff to obey their superior/s or the ruled to obey the commands of their rulers, do not form a sufficiently reliable basis for a given domination. In no instance does domination voluntarily limit itself to the above motives for its compliance. In addition, every system of domination attempts to establish and to cultivate belief in its legitimacy. In traditional Herrschaft the validity of the claims to legitimacy is based on traditional grounds. It rests on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under them.

The commands of a person who exercises traditional authority, for example a king or his administrative staff, are legitimised in one of two ways:

1. Partly in terms of traditions which themselves directly determine the content of the command and are believed to be valid within certain limits that cannot be overstepped
without endangering the master's traditional status. This is the sphere of operation that is bound to specific traditions. We termed this sphere of action the realm of tradition.

2. Partly in terms of the master's discretion in that sphere which tradition leaves open to him. This constitutes that field of action which is free of specific rules and designated by us the sphere of discretion.

We made a careful study of the Sātra Perspective on the Domain and Scope of Rājasāsana in order to delimit the spheres of tradition and discretion which constitute the totality of royal decision making. Accordingly we discussed various views, from the sastras to modern times, dealing with the very complex relations between Sastra, custom and rājasāsana. From the perspective of the state, it is basically a struggle between customs (whether recorded in or approved by the sastras or not) and royal discretion (rājasāsana). Weber's insight about the exercise of authority by the rulers in terms of 'tradition' (customs, conventions) and 'discretion' (rājasāsanas) is supported by what Derrett and Lingat say after a careful analysis of the sātra perspective, developed by early Indian Jurists, on the royal function. We must discuss it very briefly.

Brhaspati said that the 'customs (dharma) of countries, castes, families and other groups must be maintained intact; otherwise the subjects would take an aversion to their king, and the people would revolt.' Thus the interests of the rulers compelled them to overrule the sastra when it came in conflict with a firmly entrenched custom. Moreover, customs also put constraints upon royal discretion (rājasāsana). Therefore Weber has correctly said that the exercise of power is oriented toward the consideration of how far the kings and his rājapurūṣas can go in view of the subjects' traditional compliance
This remark of Weber we consider to be the most penetrating insight he shares with us about the functioning of the traditional authority.

This struggle for supremacy between the 'autonomous spaces' governed by customary laws and 'royal discretion' (rājasāsana) over the decision making process of the state has continued apace since at least the 8th-7th centuries B.C. when we first witness the beginnings of the emergence of the state in early India. Drekmeier has noted that in the changing conditions custom and the natural bonds of the tribal nation were no longer sufficient to the needs of the ordered life, and it remained for the kings of Magadha to superimpose the artificial bonds of the state on 'a situation moving towards anarchy.' New types of law were required for resolving disputes, and the rājasāsana came to be increasingly emphasized.

We must not assume that in this initial phase the increasing domain of rājasāsana was not touched by the interests of the rulers. But certainly this 'contractual phase' of the early Indian state must have produced many beneficial effects which are in marked contrast with the later 'exploitative phase' of the evolution of the state when its nature became 'predatory'.

The state could not grow strong enough to seize the authority of these 'local jurisdictions' completely and they continued to function as gradually less and less 'autonomous spaces' till the serious intervention by the Englishmen. Derrett has put it succinctly "Royal jurisdictions were gradually absorbing and displacing local jurisdictions, until one secular law would apply throughout the country. In India this
could not be dreamt of until the coming of Europeans’ (not the Islamic) supremacy.” It
is noteworthy that a fundamental difference between India and the West, in the evolution
of the ‘state’ lies here. In India, the last phase of the development resulted from colonial
intervention.
In our view, a rājaśāsana (whether ‘edict’ or ‘ordinance’) should be understood to be
based on discretion when it is not explicitly based on customary laws (whether recorded
in the sastras or not), as well as in cases of conflict between the sastras and customs. Thus
a rājaśāsana might be based on dharma, caritra, vyavahāra or ruler’s discretion.
Moreover, as is clear from the discussion of precedence, the ultimate authority rested
with the rājaśāsana. Thus for purposes of litigation as well as in matters of royal policy
sastra and ācāra were equally vulnerable to modification by royal orders.
We have emphasized the gradually increasing scope of rājaśāsana at the cost of local
jurisdictions aptly called ‘multiplicity of dharmas’ by Chattopadhyaya. And it was made
clear that the preservation of these was motivated by the interests of the rulers. The
weakness of the state apparatus prevented it from superceding these local jurisdictions
and replacing them by a ‘rule of law’ emanating from a center and equally applicable
throughout the realm irrespective of the ‘status’ of the ruled.
Traditional authority is primarily based on personal loyalty which results from common
upbringing. The person exercising authority is not a ‘superior’ but a personal master, his
administrative staff does not consist mainly of officials but of kismen, personal retainers
and favorites. The praja are not members of an association but king’s ‘subjects’. Personal

\[^3\] Derrett, J. D. M., op. cit., p.223
loyalty, not the official's impersonal duty, determines the relations of the administrative staff to the master. Obedience is owed not to enacted rules but to the person who occupies a position of authority by tradition or who has been chosen for it by the traditional master.

**Patrimonialism and Bureaucracy**

A careful meditation on the differences between the *modus operandi* of modern legal-rational bureaucracy and patrimonial staffs makes our ethnocentrism virtually transparent. It also shows how this bias on our part may color our interpretation of the sources. For Weber Patrimonialism was the most important kind of administration before the emergence of modern democracy. 'Patrimonialism' and 'Bureaucracy' are two pure types of rulership and the Caulukya polity was a mixture of both. For any accurate portrayal of how the Caulukya polity functioned it is absolutely imperative to understand the difference between patrimonialism and modern legal-rational bureaucracy. The most important difference between the two is the impersonal nature of the latter.

We have discussed the ministers and officers at the capital who controlled the mandala and pathaka level *rajasuras* as well as the officers in charge of the *sulkamandapikās*. This administrative staff was recruited from Patrimonial sources i.e. from persons who were already related to the king by traditional ties of loyalty. Most important were the kinsmen. Under traditionalist domination it is very common for the most important posts to be filled with members of the ruling family or clan. Bureaucracy first developed in patrimonial states with a body of officials recruited from extra-patrimonial sources which includes persons in a relation of purely personal loyalty such as all sorts of 'favorites'.
The regime of favorites is characteristics of every patrimonial rule. Another category consists of free men who voluntarily enter into a relation of personal loyalty as officials.

We described the differences between the pure type of traditional rule and the features of a bureaucratic administrative staff. The most important being 'a clearly defined sphere of competence subject to impersonal rules.' In general, the notion of an objectively defined official duty is unknown to the office that is based on purely personal relations of subordination.

The patrimonial office lacks above all the bureaucratic separation of the "Public" and "official" sphere. For the political administration, too, is treated as a purely personal affair of the ruler. Political power is considered part of his personal property which can be exploited by means of appropriation and fees. His exercise of power is therefore entirely discretionary, at least in so far as it is more or less limited by the ubiquitous intervention of sacred traditions. Indeed, the entire realm was the personal property of the king. In the saptanga theory of state, the use of the word svami is revealing.

Weber says that the personal discretion and favor or disfavor of the ruler also applies to the relation between the ruled and the officials. The latter are allowed to do whatever is compatible with the power of tradition and the ruler's interest in the preservation of the subject's compliance and economic capacity to support him. Absent are the binding norms and regulations of bureaucratic administration. Even the privileges and appropriations granted by the lord- including especially land grants (e.g., the grassalopana orders), however 'definitive' the grant- are very often revocable in the case of very vaguely defined 'ingratitude'. Their validity beyond the grantor's death is also
uncertain because of the personal quality of all relationships. These grants are therefore submitted to the successor for confirmation.

**Polity and the Economy**

Douglass North has rightly emphasized the problem of how the government is related to the economy and said that the key to understanding the state involves the potential use of violence to gain control over resources. One can not develop a useful analysis of the state divorced from property rights. Therefore a study of the creation and enforcement of property rights (due to legal complications Weber uses ‘appropriation’ for it), taking in view the huge comparative advantage in violence available to the state, becomes imperative to understand the supreme motive of the rulers.

Anthony Downs, one of the founding fathers of public choice theory, firmly believed that one must assume that the rulers carry out their social function primarily in order to attain their private ends and these ends are the same in all societies: power, prestige, income and the excitement of the political game. Only the particular manner in which the government is organized, which partly determines its social function, differs from one society to another.

Both the Chicago and the Virginia school of Public Choice Theory, though at odds over most of their findings, say unanimously that the government is primarily a mechanism utilized by rational *self-seeking* individuals to redistribute wealth within a society.

Thus a study of polity must consider government’s role in the economy from the perspective of ‘income’ motive of the rulers. As far as analysis of behavior goes, without
a knowledge of the motives - beliefs, desires, hopes and intentions- of the actor, one can only produce a huge distortion. Therefore every act of a king must be scrutinized with a view to ascertain what might have been his economic motive.

Most of the population inhabiting the realm of the Caulukyas (e.g.) must have lived in the villages. Our detailed examination of the evidence confirmed the 'light presence' of the state apparatus in the villages. The pathaka was the revenue cum administrative unit of the Caulukya kingdom. We could not find a single official appointed in the villages. All of the permanent village authorities- the headman, the accountant and probably the watchman (gramatalūra)- acted in a dual role. Indeed, we have definite evidence that the Kachavahas of Jaipur sold the public offices of the patel and patawari to gain money. We must not assume that it was something altogether new.

The analysis of the exercise of judicial authority in the villages, done largely on the basis of Singh's evidence from Rajasthan, confirmed that the 'maintenance of law and order' was left in the hands of the three permanent village officials just mentioned, the caste pancayatas and the village pancayatas/pancayatas of the dominant caste. Any interference by state authorities was exclusively motivated by the interests of the rulers, mainly to prevent resistance (vidroha) which might have threatened the legitimacy-stability of the regime, or at least might have disturbed 'fiscal flows' from the villages.

Thus Moreland was certainly correct in asserting that the Mughals were primarily interested in taxation and military protection. As usual Weber is more precise 'early Indian kings confined the interests of administration essentially to two objectives: the raising of manpower for the army and tax collection.' We have seen how even the warring
camps of modern 'economic theories of government' confirms this portrayal. Our analysis supports the exploitation theory of the state.

It considers the state to be the agency of a group or class which functions to extract income from the rest of the constituents in the interest of that group or class by specifying a set of property rights that maximized the revenue of the group in power. One wonders how accurately and honestly the rulers were called viśamattā.

We can not refrain from quoting Weber, even at the cost of repetition:

The patrimonial state offers the whole realm of the ruler's discretion [rajasasana] as a hunting ground for accumulating wealth. Wherever traditional or stereotyped prescription [caritracaritra/desacara] does not impose strict limitations, patrimonialism gives free rein to the enrichment of the ruler himself, the court officials, favorites, mandarins, tax collectors, influence peddlers and the great merchants and financiers who function as tax-farmers, purveyors and creditors. The ruler's favors and disfavors, grants and confiscations, continuously create new wealth and destroy it again.

The most important objection to this predatory picture of the rulers can be brought in the form of 'welfare statism'. Even elements of welfare state do not contradict our depiction of the rulers, here the Caulukyas of Gujarat. As Roth describes one of the historical 'rules of experience' of Weber:

Weber's theory of monarchy includes the observation that monarchs throughout the ages, from ancient Mesopotamia to Imperial Germany, have been welfare minded because they needed the support of the lower strata against the higher.⁴

⁴ ES, p. xxxix.
Succession Strife as a political process

In the third chapter we examined the early life of Kumārapāla i.e. the period when he was not the king of Gujarat, as far as the sources permitted us. Kumārapāla was not the son of his predecessor Jayasimha caulkuya. He was a son of a concubine of Bhīma I Caulukya. Jayasimha disliked Kumārapāla partly because he was heirless and partly due to the low descent of the latter. Kumarapala emerged victorious because he was supported by the Jaina elites– ministers, monks and merchants, and his kinsmen and supporters who held powerful posts in the Caulukya government. The usual sequence of rewards and punishments followed. The new Caulukya king awarded his patrimonial followers and other favorites and supporters with political posts and eliminated his opponents.

No Tenet of Jainism was Enforced by Kumārapāla

We undertook an exhaustive survey of the sources to find whether any measure of royal policy enforced by Kumārapāla can be termed ‘Jaina’. Nothing was found as adequate evidence to validate the claim of the Jaina authors. We found no epigraphic evidence which corroborated the Jaina chronicles. The celebrated edict, the sole epigraphic evidence, of amāri-rudhī (amāryā-ghoṣana) was issued by the Cahamāna princes of Nadol who were nominally dependent autonomous rajaputa rulers, not Jaina but worshipped goddess Durgā as their tutelary deity. Similar edicts were issued by the Cahamānas of Sākambhari.

Suppose that given the wealthy Jaina merchants residing in the Caulukya capital, Kumārapāla might have issued a similar edict which was enforced at Anhivad. Can this
be counted as following a Jaina precept of kingship. The Brahmanical sastras permitted the king to legislate in accordance with a sastric injunction. Devanna Bhatta explicitly said that the king may issue a rājasāśana forbidding the killing of animals because the sastras permit the king to do so. The case of Asoka is well known. Thus the amāri-ruḍhi is not a Jaina precept of kingship.

Kumārapāla abolished the custom whereby the estate of a man who died without sons passed to the crown. The Jaina chronicles attribute this measure to the humanitarian influence of Jainism. Lingat suspected this and said that the usage in question was abolished because it was repugnant to the smṛtis which called the king to the succession only in default of all other heirs. Besides, it was also a case of 'special interest litigation' whereby Kumārapāla did a favour to his wealthy Jaina supporters, most of them merchants and traders.

We have earlier examples. The charter of Viśṇusena dated A.D. 592 addressed to a merchant settlement of Gujarat orders, among other things, that the property of one who has died sonless is not to be attached by the crown. This careful examination of the practices of kingship by Kumārapāla made it certain that the Jaina authors were not reliable and therefore we decided to have a closer look at the sources in the fourth chapter.

Was Kumārapāla Converted to Jainism?

One of our most important findings was that Kumārapāla was not converted to Jainism. All the existing historical works, without a single exception, take it as given that
Kumarapāla was converted to Jainism by Hemacandra. What is more problematic, they took the anti-Brahmana portrayal of this Caulukya king by the Jaina sources at its face value. Thus most of the books as well as the articles describe Kumārapāla Caulukya as a paragon of Jainism. We strongly believe that the situation might be similar with many other kings of early India, for example, the Hoyasala Viśnuparddhana.

Methodologically, Kumārapāla’s conversion to Jainism presents a very interesting problem. It is axiomatic in historiography to take the fact-interpretation dichotomy as given. And question of fact are considered to fall beyond the domain of interpretation. Whether Kumārapāla was converted to Jainism or not is apparently a question of fact which can only be answered either yes or no. Is it really so? Let us briefly recapitulate our main arguments for and against conversion.

Among the Jaina authors, Jinamandana wrote in A.D. 1435-36 that Kumārapāla was converted to Jainism in A.D. 1160 and attributes the event as well as the date to the MRP which was written a few years after the death of Kumārapāla. He says: kṛpāsundarāyāḥ samvat 1216 mārga-sudi-dvitiyā-dine pānim jagrāha śrīkumārapāla-mahipālah śrīmad-arhaddevatā-samakṣam.

Buhler doubted the reliability of his statement and added the proviso that if this date ‘really’ occurs in the play. Now, the MRP- an allegorical play, is nothing but a figment of the imagination of its Jaina author. Moreover, it nowhere mentions the date of Kumārapāla’s conversion.

The sole explicit statement about the alleged conversion occurs in the Mahaviracarita of the TSPC where Hemacandra puts these words of prophecy in the mouth of the last
Tirthaṅkara ‘After he has heard with delight the noble sermon about the law from his lips, he will take the minor vows (āṇuvratāṇi) and will then strive after the vow of perfection (samyaktva).’

This means nothing more than a hopeful expectation of some return on the part of Hemacandra, who probably successfully conspired to put his protégé on the Caulukya throne. Kumarapala was not a son of his predecessor Jayasimha, but descended from a concubine of the distant Caulukya monarch Bhima I. Childless Jayasimha’s animosity towards Kumarapala on account of his ‘mean origin’ is well documented by the Jaina authors.

A juxtaposition of the DKV-sort of court history of the Caulukyas, with the TSPC and the prakṛta KVC leaves no doubt about the propagandistic purposes of the latter two texts which was written exclusively for the Jaina laity. We can not even altogether deny the probability of extrapolation in the TSPC.

If one inscription from a prominent Jaina center of Jalor written in A.D. 1185 gives the epithet param-arhata- ‘foremost among the worshippers of the Arhat’, then the Veraval inscription of Brhaspati, issued from the famous Saiva center Somanatha in A.D. 1169 calls him Maññhesvaranpā-agramih- ‘foremost among the Śaiva kings’.

Someśvara, the Gurjareśvara-purohita who was patronized by the paragons of Jainism-Vastupāla and Tejapāla, naturally had nothing to say about Kumārapāla’s conversion because it never took place. He says that Kumārapāla’s body was cremated and his ashes immersed in the holy water of the sangama at Prayaga and oblations were offered for his
departed soul at Gaya by the Brahmana purohita of his son and successor Ajayapāla. The 
Surathotsava says:

Kumarapālasya culukyabhurturangāni Gangāsalile nidhāya I
Śrisarvadevena Gayā-prayāga-viprah pradānena kytah kṛtārthāḥ II

This shows that Kumarapala was not converted to Jainism till his death, at least.

In light of the above discussion, it seems plausible that in history the fact-interpretation
dichotomy do not hold. Because whether Kumārapāla Caulukya was converted to Jainism
depends on our interpretation of the sources. The Jaina texts answer in the affirmative but
the Brahmanical sources and the epigraphs give a negative answer. Therefore the view that
there are no facts but only interpretations is apparently justified. Because in the instances
cited above the conversion of kings to a particular religion/sect turns out to be a question
of interpretation. Kumārapāla, for example, was converted to Śvetambara Jainism from
Śaivism by Hemacandra depends on interpretation. There is absolutely nothing which can
give an unequivocal yes/no answer to the conversion. The answer completely depends
was both converted and not converted to Jainism.

To be sure, this collapsing of the dichotomy violates a fundamental rule of logic. Known
as the law of contradiction is says that something cannot be both p and not-p. In other
words, nothing can be both true and false at the same time. Thus our example of
conversion can be said to challenge even the notion of bivalent theory of truth. We are of
the opinion that there can be no history without the notion of truth. Thus either we
abandon the firmly held belief in truth or prove that something is wrong with our
example.
Well, given that one can denote something real by conversion, by this we mean that conversion to Jainism denotes a real event (which, in turn, depends on a precise definition of conversion so that it is not something that exists only as a word), is Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism really a matter of interpretation and not of fact. In some schools of historiography we witness a denial of the holocaust by the Nazis. Our problem is substantially similar.

We would like to point out a categorical confusion in the above exposition. The question of Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism is not a question of interpretation of the sources, the meaning of the sources is not under dispute. What the Jaina sources say mean that from being a Śaiva king Kumārapāla became an ardent devotee of the Jina. Actually, it hinges on the reliability of the sources. These two things must be kept separate. Merutunga says that Jayasimha Caulukya was the king of Gujarat from V.S. 1150 to V.S. 1199. It is a question of fact. Its truth does not depend on how we interpret /what is the meaning of Merutunga's statement. It is completely dependent on whether Merutunga is reliable. To ascertain the reliability of a source we mainly do two things. We try to find out what was the intention of the author behind the assertion. Was he trying to fool someone to further his ulterior motives? Secondly, we juxtapose a text with other texts, particularly the contemporary ones which may be expected to have a reliable knowledge of the issue at hand.

Thus we reach the conclusion that Jaina authors were motivated by the fact that they wanted to give royal splendor to their missionary efforts by depicting Kumārapāla as a devout Jaina follower and thereby bedazzle the laymen. Moreover, not only fact-
interpretation dichotomy is valid, but truth turns out to be the lifeblood of history. And reliability of the sources is a bigger problem than has hitherto been recognized.

In this way we were led to investigate the nature of the reciprocity existing between the leaders of the temporal and those of the spiritual domains.

**Religion and the State: The Politics of Patronage to All Sects**

Religion is a very complex topic but our interest was limited to the relationship between it and the rulers. As is well known, most early Indian kings patronized the leaders of all prominent religious sects existing in their dominion. The Caulukyas of Gujarat, including Kumārapāla, were no exception. They patronized Śaivism and Jainism. We have looked at this relation from the perspective of the king. Along with Weber we have stressed the political uses of religion for legitimation and pacification (mass domestication).

Salvationary soteriologies were the work of the intellectuals, the ‘cultured professional monks’. Williams made an exhaustive survey of the huge body of Jaina śrāvakācāra (conduct of the laity) literature created during the 5th to 13th century period. He says that during this period Jainism was transformed from a philosophy to a religion. The Jaina sources say that the laity was admitted only later, for whom the rules of sarva-virati were relaxed and the resultant dvādasa-śrāvaka-vratāni were supposed to be a preparatory stage for the ascetic life. Thus the 12 vows of a layman as well as other elements of popular Jainism were due to the compromise on the part of the intellectual monks to
induct the masses into the Jinadharma. We witness a similar phenomenon in Buddhism and Hinduism. Thus these salvation religions, the creation of intellectuals of higher social rank 'devolved into the creed of the non-privileged strata', it became 'the opiate of the masses' to compensate their sufferings. The rulers encouraged, by patronage, the spread of these 'less complex magical beliefs among the masses for the sake of mass domestication.'

We have evidence to show that the religious leaders patronized by the kings actively tried to pacify and domesticate the masses.

The śrāvakācāras explicitly advocated the policy of conformity to the rulers. While discussing the ideal qualities of a layman (śrāvakaguṇa) Hemacandra says in his Yogasāstra, a very influential work on lay discipline- avarñarnavādī na kāpi rājādiṣu viśesataḥ, it means that a layman should not denigrate other people, particularly the rulers. The Dharmabindu of Municandra, another important text on śrāvakācāra, explains that the word rājādiṣu is intended to include ministers, court chaplains and other officials.

We have noted the charismatic legitimacy extended to the Caulukyas by making them descend from the culuka of Brahmā. Hemacandra made Mahavira to make a prophecy about the future king Kumārapāla. As Sharma argued long ago the Arthāśāstra taught the spreading of the divinity of kings among the gullible masses.

On a more general level the salvationary soteriologies gave the rulers a very good motive to extend patronage to them to further their own interests. Drekmeier's remarks in this regard are based on Weber's contention that Hindu social theory 'furnished no principles for an ethical universalism which would raise general demands for life in the world.' We
find instead ‘metaphysically and cosmologically substructured technology of the means to achieve salvation from this world.’ This ‘religious depreciation of the world’/ ‘other-worldliness’ (sarva-virati to attain mokṣa) of Indian religions, elaborated in the theory of samsara and mokṣa, something shared by all the three traditions, profoundly influenced the political thoughts and institutions in early India. The depoliticizing of society through the penance ideology of caste subverted the wish for a better life in this world. He says that the image of utopia had no place in a culture resigned to an imperfect world. Sufferings and privileges were not caused due to political arrangements but past actions. Aspiration and anticipation were relevant only to the future life of the soul. Thus was hope diverted to another world. One can easily see how this kind of ideology could provide legitimacy to oppressive regimes.

Like Marx, Weber stressed this compensatory function of religion and his remarks can be interpreted as a paraphrase of ‘opiate of the people’ dictum. But Marx and his followers were psychologically unable to take religion seriously enough, but he had a much more profound sense for the meaning of ethical conduct.

The priesthood has been ‘the greatest force of legitimation in history’ but their relationship with secular rulership has always been ambivalent, it is one of mutual antagonism as well as dependence. Monarchs needed the support of the lower strata against the higher. But these higher strata of nobility and priesthood have remained important to the maintenance of monarchic power and legitimacy. Hence, the stability of monarchy rest in part on the ruler’s ability to balance the two groups. This he tried to achieve by giving patronage to the higher strata to domesticate and pacify the masses. It is well known that, as a rule, Indian kings have patronized the leaders of all prominent
sects which existed within his realm. At the same time, the kings were busy in welfare activities to gain the support of the masses to balance the upper strata of nobility and priesthood.

We would like to assert that the non-sectarian nature of the state was not due to any benevolence on the part of the rulers. It was solely caused by the interests of the rulers in a multi-sectarian society. Indian history provides many examples which validate our claim.