INTRODUCTION

Political Potential of Jainism

Our main aim was to explore the 'political potential' of Jainism. As Beniprasad has noted, in point of extent Buddhist political literature is surpassed by the Jaina writings on kingship. In contradistinction to Brahmanical political theory, and to a lesser extent even Buddhist notions of kingship, Jaina political ideas occupy the relatively invisible margins of historiography. We have many examples of rulers such as Khāravela, Pulakesīna, Mārasimha II, Cāmuṇḍarāya – the famous western Ganga general, Rāstrakūta Indra IV and Kumārapāla Caulukya, who were Jainas. We decided to make an in-depth study of a Jaina king in order to understand what might have been the differences between Jaina statecraft and its Brahmanical and Buddhist counterparts.

We selected Kumārapāla for two or three reasons. First was the abundance of materials, both epigraphic and literary. Majumdar noted this fact by saying that Kumārapāla is the monarch about whom maximum number of chronicles has been written:

To a large section of his countrymen, particularly the Jainas, Kumarapala remains the greatest king that ever sat on the throne of Gujarat. His fame rests on his propagation of the Jaina faith which he adopted. ...about him the largest number of chronicles has been written. This makes his life an interesting study. 

Secondly, as hinted above, he was converted to Jainism in A. D. 1160 by Hemacandra

---

1 For details vide infra chapter 1. pp. 56-57

2 Majumdar, A. K., Cauḷukyas of Gujarat, Bombay, 1956, p.89
(A. D. 1088-1172), the famous śvetāmbara polymath of Gujarat. A quick survey of the sources confirmed that he was closely associated with Kumārapāla Caulukya in the role of his spiritual preceptor. Hemacandra has left rich materials to explore the Jaina ideas of statecraft. Gujarat being a stronghold of śvetāmbara Jainism, Kumārapāla was a fit case to investigate the ‘political potential’ of Jainism. Before conversion he was a Śaiva, like his Caulukya predecessors. This provided an opportunity to compare his pre-conversion era to post-conversion period to study the differences in the practices of statecraft which might be attributed to the influence of Jainism.

**Historiography**

In our survey of the existing works dealing with early Indian political ideas and the nature of ancient Indian polity, we have given more space to some authors for two reasons. Firstly, the existing surveys of historiography have not given proper attention to these works. For example, the comprehensive review compiled by Kulke does not even mention the names of Derrett, Drekmeier and Inden, while Tambiah finds place in a footnote. Secondly, these authors are all the more noteworthy for the methodological significance of their works. They simultaneously deal with early Indian political ideas and institutions and try to see how these two were related. Hence their approach is better than those authors who investigate early Indian political ideas only as well as those who focus on the nature of ancient Indian polity to the total exclusion of the former.

Kane gives a detailed descriptive account of the political ideas as elaborated in the *Vedas*.

---

Dharmasutras, Smritis and later nibandhas in his monumental work. He has arranged the discussion within the framework of the saptāṅga theory of the state. Thus he starts from the duties and responsibilities of the king and finishes on the mitra along with a brief discussion of the purpose of rājadharma. Then he gives a detailed account of the administration of justice as described under the 18 heads of litigation (vyavahārapadās).

At the end of his work he considers the very significant question of the treatment of customs and customary laws by the Dharmaśāstras.

Ghoshal's comprehensive survey of ancient Indian political ideas is divided into certain chronological spans. The first part of the ancient period i.e. from 1500 B.C. to 600 B.C. covers the Vedas and the Brahmanas. The next division stretches upto A.D. 800 and the last span of A.D. 800-1200 is termed as the period of transition from the ancient to the medieval India. He takes up for analysis all the available sources belonging to the Brahmanas, the Buddhists as well as the Jainas falling within these periods. Roughly we can say that he gives a descriptive summary of all the important texts of these three traditions. He divides the texts as sacred literary sources (sometimes termed as 'secular') and what Ghoshal terms the 'technical works on the science of polity', such as the Arthaśāstra and the Nītīvākyāṁritam. Under this last head he wrongly includes the Arihantī of Hemacandra, which actually is a spurious work of the 19th century attributed

5 Ibid, pp. 242 ff.
6 Ibid, pp. 825 ff.
7 Ghoshal, U.N., A History of Indian Political Ideas, Madras, 1959 pp. 475 ff.
to this famous Śvetāmbara ācārya.8

He puts set questions like ideas of kingship, origin of the social order, authority and obligations of temporal rulers and principles and policies of government, to his sources. Besides the study of normative texts and narrative literature Ghoshal explores the inscriptions and a few numismatic records of ‘historical kings and dynasties’ to ascertain conceptions of kingship therein. Two things must be said about this, firstly these ‘historical references to political ideas’ are a bit too brief. Moreover, they are limited to conceptions of kingship and their connections with gods and their earthly representatives. Thus one should not hope for practices of kingcraft here, even if we must acknowledge that these references are significant. After noting the epigraphic references to the Mauryas and their successors9, he notes the representations of imperial Guptas and later kings. For example, Samudragupta is said to be one “who was equal to the gods Varuna, Indra and Antaka (Yama)” and someone who was “a god dwelling on earth”. This emphasis on their divinity is indicated by the use of paramadaivata, the unique epithet of the Gupta kings.10

Ghoshal notes a new development in the nature of kingship during the ‘period of transition’ noted above. The epigraphs of Western, Southern, as well as those of Northern India describes the existence of a cult as elaborated in the Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava texts. They provide for the erection of images of kings and other prominent bhaktas such as the ācāryas, either in separate temples built for them or in the temples housing Śaiva or Vaiṣṇava deities. Ghoshal says that here “...we have historical instances of the application

8 See infra pp. 35-36 for details.
10 Ibid. p.397
of bhakti cult of deification to royalties, of a cult of king worship as such there is in this case not the slightest trace."

The nature of early Indian polity has been the subject of huge controversy and lively debates. The Imperialists castigated it as 'oriental despotism' and the Nationalist response exalted it as 'constitutional monarchy' where the king was the 'salaried servant of the people'. The feudalism model of Kosambi is slightly different from the Indian Feudalism school represented by Sharma and his followers, notably Yadava and Jha. Mukhia vehemently denied that there was anything like feudalism in India. Sircar accused the feudalists of confusing landlordism with feudalism and he termed the feudatories as the 'subordinate allies' of the emperor. For the south, Stein's segmentary state, as an alternative to the feudal polity model, became the 'plundering state' of Spencer. These positions are well known and discussed at many places. Recently we have the 'integrative polity' model developed by Chattopadhyaya and Kulke and supported by Talbot, Sinha-Kapur and Singh.

Sharma's brief discussion of the saptânga theory is based mostly on the Arthasāstra, which, he says, is the first text to define the state. It is a unique contribution of Ancient India to the history of political philosophy for apart from coherence and systematization...
contains many elements of the modern definitions of the state. He examines the contract theory of the origin of the state as given in the Brahmanas, the Dīghanikāya, the Arthasastra, the Mahāvastu and the Śāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata.

He finds three major trends in the relation between religion and politics in the Arthasastra. It upholds the Brahmanical ideology as set forth in the early law-books, but the ‘Kautilyan state’ is not obedient to an all-potent sacerdotal authority. Because it disregards, this being his second point, and suppresses those religious practices, Brahmanical or heretical which undermine the authority of the state. Lastly, it exploits the ignorance and superstitions of the masses, especially in external policy, for serving the ends of the state. Thus Kauṭilya, like his contemporary Plato, advocates the policy “...the ruling class should foster superstitions for the preservation and extension of its power.”

He points towards the importance of varṇas as a significant element in law and politics from 600 B.C. onwards. Considerations of varṇa influenced the functioning of the state-apparatus. For example, the sastric injunctions of royal responsibility to uphold the varṇāśrama dharma is corroborated by epigraphic evidence, ‘which throws light on the actual position’, although conventional in some cases. The origin and growth of the Dharmaśāstra law were conditioned by the varṇa system and the civil and the criminal laws discriminated between one varṇa and another. The dominance of the upper two varṇas was based on their combination and cooperation, and the exclusion and weakness
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14 Sharma, R.S., Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India, Delhi, 1959 pp. 14-32
15 Ibid, pp. 47ff
16 Ibid, pp. 163-64
of the lower two classes is explained by their failure to do so, Sharma concludes.¹⁷

Drekmeier turned to early India in order to understand how ideas, particularly political thoughts, are related to the socio-economic institutions. He says:

The study of history is unavoidable in the analysis of ideas and ideologies, in making us mindful of the changing role of philosophic ideas and deepening our perception of the relation of ideas to economic interests and social institutions as well as the relation of ideas to one another.¹⁸

Methodologically, he discusses two important questions. Firstly, he briefly points to the two main approaches of social theorists in explaining what does hold a society together. The coercion model stresses the direct power relationship and describes society simply in terms of coercion of some men by others. For example, Wittfogel views power as power over others in the struggle for scarce values. According to him, the all important fact of Oriental ‘hydraulic’ social systems is their centralized, despotic government; and in these states there are no other centres of power capable of challenging the bureaucracy. Their greater attention to sources of conflict may indicate, like the Marxist theory, more about the dynamic processes at work in society than the consensus model theories that stress values and integration and pays attention to the interrelationships of social institutions and the role of consensus in holding a society together. This model highlights the importance of the normative context in which social action takes place and recognizes the power of social norms in regulating conduct. Drekmeier cites Evans-Pritchard’s statement about tribal Africa as being equally applicable to ancient India "...the material interests that actuate individuals or groups in an African society operate in the frame of a body of

¹⁷ Sharma, R. S., op. cit., pp. 183ff

¹⁸ Drekmeier, C., Kingship and Community in Early India, California, 1962. pp. vii-viii
interconnected moral and legal norms the order and stability of which is maintained by the political organization."¹⁹ Coercion theorists such as Wittfogel make the mistake of overlooking the dependence of the ruler on different groups and institutions within the community. Eisenstadt has pointed towards this "The political institutions are one part of the social structure, they are necessarily dependent on other institutions for their smooth functioning. They are dependent on them for various material resources, for their basic legitimation, and for support for various policies and activities."²⁰ Drekmeier concludes that neither a consensus nor a coercion theory is sufficient in itself and points to the methodological importance of Max Weber whose work 'suggests possibilities for relating the two images of society.'²¹

Secondly, social scientists must take notice of two things to establish standards of behavior, particularly interaction of people. The subjective meaning of action refers to the consciously perceived relation between means and end. Behavior must be understood not merely in terms of its social function, but also in terms of the significance the actor attaches to his actions and to the way these actions are organized into institutions. What are the norms of the society, the values that integrate and legitimate actions, organize interests and provide the basis of an interpretation of the world, and establish alternative modes of conduct. Besides the intentions of the actor one must also determine the nature of the social structure and the way social relationships affect behavior. Any analysis of the dynamics of social systems must concern itself with the motivational processes of human

¹⁹ Drekmeier, C., op. cit., p. 2

²⁰ Ibid, p. 321 fn. 3

²¹ Ibid, p. 3
beings. Intentions of the actor, it includes the author, has been a notoriously difficult subject to understand. Psychological findings about motivations are important here. Weber's famous Verstehen thesis has been a topic of debate but Drekmeier rightly says that knowledge must inevitably draw upon whatever experiences of our own are apposite. We can never escape completely the method of empathetic understanding if we wish to do more than observe the externals of action.

Drekmeier probably exaggerates the importance of religion as an integrative factor for the society. He says that Weber's answer to Marx's question "why does the history of the East appear as a history of religions?" might have been that appearance is not to be discounted, that a knowledge of Asian societies presupposes an appreciation of the coordinating function of religion. Accordingly he wants to focus the attention on the significance of myth in giving purpose and meaning to life, in explaining the fact of death and catastrophe, and in holding groups of men together. Myth tells men how they are to live in order to achieve the goals of their lives, and it tells them what their relationship to other men is to be. In his appreciation of the relative importance of various factors in the emergence of political ideas and institutions in early India, Drekmeier says:

The decline of tribal culture and the emergence of an agricultural economy clearly influenced the evolution of political forms; but generally speaking, changes in modes of production and technology exerted less influence on political thought than did religious ideas, and far less than comparable social changes have exerted on modern political thought.22

Drekmeier seems to be extrapolating from Evans-Pritchard's classical African Political Systems. Certainly the role of religion in social integration was much less significant in
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22 Drekmeier, C., op. cit., p. 2
post-Vedic India, and one must feel hesitant in applying to this period of Indian history the latter’s remark on tribal Africa “Bonds of utilitarian interests between individuals and between groups are not so strong as the bonds implied in common attachment to mystical symbols.”

Drekmeier investigates the relations between the frequently commented upon interrelated phenomena of economic surplus and political systems capable of coordinating large territories and the ‘somewhat obscure tie’ between such institutional developments and the philosophical ideas and institutional developments that seem to accompany them. He concentrates upon the ‘critical period’ of ancient Indian history spanning from the seventh to the mid-third century B.C. when we witness the fullest development of Mauryan administration under Asoka.

He identifies the following three responses to the break up of old tribal values and institutions during these formative years of the emergence of the ancient Indian state when economic change and the incorporation of indigenous peoples into the ‘Aryan community’ rendered the traditional agencies of social integration inadequate.

1. The first answer, given by Buddha, was in essence psychological which involved a discipline that aimed at the transcendence of the dichotomy of subject and object. Though not without certain problems, we are not concerned with the details of this construct.

2. The other two solutions were organizational, the second being the bureaucratic state designed for the efficient mobilization of the societal resources as described in the
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23 Drekmeier, C., op. cit., p.321 fn. 1
24 Ibid, p.282
25 Ibid, pp. 283ff
Arthaśāstra of Kautilya. Here ‘politics as interaction’ of the tribal polity was replaced by ‘politics as administration’ of the hierarchically organized Mauryan polity which Drekmeier sees as an alternative to the earlier communal polity in the form of bureaucratic rationalizing of areas of conflict.

With the failure of politics in the sense of face-to-face political relationships, political and moral philosophy flourish. Justifications and explanations were sought for the new social relationships that appeared with the emergence of the state. As political life became increasingly abstract, the need for political symbolization became more acute. In the literature we find new attention to questions of authority and legitimacy, and political theory begins to take on a systematic and sophisticated form. 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.

3. The third response was the more or less ‘self-regulating 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. Drekmeier says that law became a system of detailed status-differentiated prescriptions and prohibitions based on the inherited differing capabilities of various castes.

The legal code, which depended on the coercive power of the king for its enforcement, was
rationalized as the safeguard of the moral order; it ensured the hierarchy of social duties [svadharma]-duties which, if performed faithfully and effectively, ultimately qualified men for those disciplines leading to spiritual emancipation [mokṣa].

Drekmeier has found four or five points as the main features of Indian society which are in contradistinction with the Western society. Probably the most significant of them is the relationship between the caste system which he terms 'the fundamental sociological context of Hindu polity' and the state. Benefiting from Evans-Pritchards' findings, he says about the origin of state-societies in India that the transition from relatively homogenous tribal organization to centralized administrative systems appear to indicate that economic and cultural heterogeneity is frequently associated with a state-like form of political organization. Centralized authority provides a framework for the accommodation of diverse peoples, and if economic and cultural differences are considerable, a class system will usually result. After the emergence of social stratification caste/varṇa ideology was a most appropriate type of coordination for cultural heterogeneity and large territories along with the state whose administrative staff enables it to take an active part in social regulation. Drekmeier calls the first social integration and the second political integration. In the first case 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. The problem of conflict, 'for all practical purposes, is solved.' Thus the varṇaśramadharma ideology was responsible for the weakness of the state. Drekmeier says that where

26 Drekmeier, C., op. cit., p. 292

27 Ibid, pp. 291-300 for the details.
different social strata, which he terms class, 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.' He does not altogether deny the presence of the rājapurūsas but gives them little credit for social integration when he maintains that political roles exist in "traditional" societies, but 'integration is accomplished by religion and custom.'

This explains the diffusion of authority among the various strata of polity, generally applauded as 'local autonomy' in historical writings. Drekmeier is worth quoting in full:

Rarely in Indian history was there a concentration of authority at the center; authority was located in caste, custom, guild, religious tradition, the teaching and example of sage, and the village council, as well as in provincial and central governments. Throughout Indian history, the basic unit of administration was the village. Hindu law exhibits great respect for local variance in custom and tradition, allowing a remarkable autonomy to the village and the corporation.28

Drekmeier's second point is 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.'29 This 'religious depreciation of the world' implied in the theory of saṃsāra and mokṣa, something shared by all the three traditions, profoundly influenced the political thoughts as well as 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
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28 Drekmeier, C., op. cit., p. 293. For details see pp. 269 ff.
29 Ibid, p. 6
no place in a culture resigned to an imperfect world. Aspiration and anticipation were relevant only to the future life of the soul. Thus was hope diverted to another world. Another contention of Drekmeier is about “the apparently invincible institutions of caste and the village’ which were the preserver of the integrity of India during most of her history, rather than ‘the political and administrative organization.’

He says that the essential weakness of the Indian theory of state was that it was not concerned with the ‘rights of men’ and it failed to provide any searching analysis of the relation between the government and the governed. This was due to fact that the relation of the state to the stratified dharmic order ‘preempted any consideration of human rights’ which were nothing as compared to the requirements of mokṣa. Another western bulwark ‘freedom’ was conceived as the escape from the saṃsāra and this latter could be attained only through the faithful discharge of one’s duties. Thus “civil obligation rather than civil right formed the basis of the relation of the state and subject.” One is amused to know that ‘human rights’ / ‘fundamental rights’, which are modern avaraś of ancient Natural Law theories, were altogether absent in India. No historian would contend that right to life, property, trade and commerce etc. were completely unknown to the early Indians and the state provided no protection in this regard because it was concerned only with the duties of the prajā.

Legal history gives us the best perspective in this regard, “Law is an index to usage. Law shows what people do and suffer. It tells about India’s real beliefs... irrespective of her

---

20 Drekmeier, C., op. cit., p. 293
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pretensions."\(^{32}\) In several essays spanning throughout his career Derrett has given us a minute and empirically sound description of the relations between the state and the law-religious, royal or customary. If one ignores or fails to grasp the details one cannot get a proper understanding of the real functioning of the political institutions in early India, particularly how the state was related to various social groups. Determined ‘to find out at first hand what was going on,’ he concludes ‘[India’s] law tells a minutely varied tale.....the search for generalizations is indefinitely prolonged.'\(^{33}\) He defines “Law is that aggregate or totality of rules which are or may be enforced upon the subject by the courts of the state.”\(^{34}\)

There are serious problems with this definition. For example, are the societies without the ‘courts of the state’ lawless. Anthropologists vehemently deny this. Even in state-societies a very significant domain of law consists of ‘non-state laws’.

Thus Derrett inappropriately narrows his scope of inquiry when he asserts “...the customs enforced by caste tribunals are not normally law”, particularly when he already knew:

The caste tribunal had an option to enquire into offences of a non-criminal nature. A wide discretion appertained to it and in pre-British times its jurisdiction was as wide, as important and as effective as that of the civil and the criminal court.\(^{35}\)


\(^{33}\) Ibid, pp. 23; 32

\(^{34}\) Ibid, p. 35

\(^{35}\) Ibid, p. 83
For us his most fruitful contribution is a reliable analysis of the relation between rājasāsana on the one hand and the sastric and the customary laws on the other. Up to what extent śāstras were binding upon the kings has been a topic of some lively debate. Derrett’s two observations are noteworthy in this regard:

The political authority has in fact supplemented and contradicted the Dharmasastras where it seemed necessary in the public interest. The capacity to legislate irrespective of sastric authority undoubtedly existed and was utilized in countless [instances].

He further states that the rulers decided whether their kingdoms were to be governed upon orthodox Brahmanical principles or not. Significantly, this decision was a political one since it was guided by the temper inclinations of the prajā, who would support a rival claimant to the throne if offended in this regard. Thus “The authority for using the sastras as a residual system lay in the Hinduism or Hinduising tendency of the ruler and ultimately of the ruled.”

Where did the authority of the state stand when it was pitted against the customs? Derrett is of the opinion that there was no period in Indian history during which custom was not open to “modifications or even abrogations at the hands of the ruler.” “...royal injunctions, general or particular, could override caritra (custom) ....” and “…customary laws would be effectively varied by properly constituted legislative bodies.”

Finally, to what extent consent/assent of the concerned ones among the ruled was
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36 Derrett, J. D. M., op. cit., p. 96
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necessary for the validity of royal decisions? Derrett says that all rājaśāsanas required the consent of the concerned persons. The exceptions were the king’s prerogatives in matters of criminal laws, fiscal administration, national defense and foreign relations. “... in these two provinces of criminal and military law on the one hand and fiscal and analogous laws on the other the subject’s assent was dispensed with as superfluous.”39 Thus this monopoly over use of force was made possible through the exclusive jurisdiction over fiscal laws. One can easily see that this modus operandi of the early Indian state supports the empirical validity of Max Weber’s definition of the state.40 Inden’s monograph is about ‘human agency’ which he defines as ‘the capacity of the people to order their world’ and his main critique being ‘the Indological branch of the “Orientalist discourse” and the accounts of India that it has produced since the enlightenment.’

He says:

I wish to make possible studies of ‘ancient’ India that would restore the agency that those histories have stripped off from its people and institutions. Scholars did this by imagining an India kept eternally ancient by various essences attributed to it, most notably that of caste.41

39 Derrett, J. D. M., op. cit., pp. 194-95

40 It is significant that Lingat’s analysis of the sastric perspective on the royal function comes rather close to Derrett’s conclusions about the scope of rājaśāsana. Hence any approach to the study of early Indian statecraft which completely denies any importance to the sastras as ‘normative literature’ is deplorable. Oleville has expressed a similar opinion. Vide infra chapter 2.

41 Inden, R., Imagining India, Delhi 2000 reprint, p. 1
His 'main argument' is worth quoting in full:

[T]he agency of Indians, the capacity of Indian's to make their world, has been displaced in those knowledges on to other agents. The makers of these knowledges have, in the first instance, displaced the agency of Indian's on to one or4 more 'essences', and in the second instance on to themselves. The essences they have imagined have been caste, the Indian mind, divine kingship and the like. ...Lacking the essences taken to be the characteristic of the west- the individual, political freedom, and science- Indian's did not have the capacity on their own to know these essences. They did not ...have the capacity to act in the world with rationality. The European scholars and their doubles, the colonial administrators and traders. assumed to themselves the power to know these hidden essences of the 'Other' and to act upon them. They would act both for themselves and for the Indians.42

Probably the most significant lacunae of Inden's approach is his complete rejection of the motives of his agents. Without considering what moves a person to action the unity imputed to the 'agency of the Indians' by Inden exists only as a word. When we consider 'the motive' of the agents we cannot plausibly talk in terms like 'the world of Indians'. Neither the social action of the agents nor their world can be envisaged as a monolith. To illustrate, Inden says that the Rastrakutas were represented as 'the truest earthly representation of Visnu that a Cakravartin was' but Amoghavarsa I was claimed by the Jainas as a devotee of their founder, the Jina'.43 How can a king simultaneously be a Jaina and an avatāra of Visnu when the Jainas believed the Vaisnavas were followers of mithyātva and who in turn were castigated as pāṣandis by the Vaisnavas. The world of the

42 Inden, R., op. cit., pp. 5-6

43 Ibid. p.250
Jainas was different from that of the Vaiṣṇavas and from the perspective of Amoghavarṣa the leaders of these sectarian groups were merely instruments for 'domesticating the masses'. Similarly administrative staff can be viewed as instruments not agents from the perspective of the kings. And lastly, when the underlords might be shown to be working for contrary motives can we use the term agency to denote a single unity of actors.

Moreover, one should not ignore the huge differences in the capacities of the agents when it comes to ordering their world. We agree that various assemblies of 'subject-citizenries' comprising rural and urban residents enjoyed 'limited and partial capacities to combine and order their own affairs'. But Inden gives the impression that there were no patients in the polity. Even the assemblies at the lowest rungs of the polity consisted of 'local notables' only and a large proportion of the masses, in all probability the majority of the praṇā, were merely tools for the agents' well-being, without any agency to order their own world.

Inden's second major inadequacy is that he does not provide a proper analysis of the structure-agency linkage. If we fail to take into consideration the structural context in which the agents have to operate we get a picture of free-willing and hence omnipotent agents which is certainly false, and this is the picture one gets after reading Inden. Take the example of caste. It may not be one of the essences of India and certainly not the agent in the establishment of order in the world. Nevertheless, caste has been a very significant

44 Inden, R., op. cit., pp. 217ff
46 For a really good analysis of Weber's approach to this problem, see Karlberg, S., Max Weber's Comparative-Historical Sociology, U.K., 1994, pp. 21ff.
tool in the hands of the agents. The ancient kings declared themselves to be champions of *varnāśramadharma* and modern rulers not infrequently appeal to it in order to ‘acquire and preserve’ political power. Why they do so? Inden has not considered this question for he is simply not bothered about the motives of his agents. But as we saw above, we can give two possible reasons. In view of the wide jurisdiction of caste pancayats, the institution of caste was very significant for administrative convenience. More importantly, as Derrett has argued, the rulers could not ignore the ‘hinduising tendencies’ of the ruled for if he offended the subjects in this regard the latter ‘may support a rival claimant to the throne’. This sheds some light over the structural limitations upon the capacity of agents when it comes to ordering their world. Here a better approach (in contradistinction to Inden’s free-willing agents) will be to avail of the ‘path dependence’ theory of economics and the evolutionary premise that function is based on the structure which sets the boundaries for any agent.

Thus Inden has done a commendable job in restoring the agency to the Indians, but he has gone to the other extreme of making them free-willing and omnipotent to the point of total rejection of the limitations imposed by the structure. Moreover, his excellent meta-narrative of ‘the agency of the Indians’ is blind towards those who were functioning as merely patients, for example those household groups who could not find a place in any constituent of the ‘Imperial Formations’, even at the lowest levels.

After a comprehensive survey of the sources Tambiah developed the model of ‘galactic polity’ for the pre-modern South East Asian states which, he says, is equally applicable to the Mauryan polity.47 Before proceeding further let us note his argument which is of some
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significance. He emphasizes that these polities were 'quite other than centralized and bureaucratised systems'. Hence, we must realize that:

Certain externalist comparative criteria such as the degree of centralization as measured by the central authority's control over bureaucracy, over a hierarchy of courts for the dispersion of justice, over the monopoly of force, though useful up to a point, do not inform us what these traditional polities were really about. [Therefore] certain concepts in the toolkit of modern political science are of limited use for a positive understanding of these polities as historical totalisations.\footnote{Tambiah, S.J., op. cit., p.123}

Here, the centre-periphery relations are represented by a concentric-circle system wherein "the center was the king's capital and the region of its direct control, which was surrounded by circle of provinces ruled by princes or governors appointed by the king, and these again were surrounded by more or less independent 'tributary' polities."\footnote{Ibid, p. 112} Galactic polity's provinces and satellites are replicas of the center on a smaller scale 'which constitute a galactic constellation rather than a bureaucratic hierarchy'. Tambiah emphasises the importance of this fact for a proper understanding of the polity's centripetal aspects and how the centre attempts to hold the remainder.\footnote{Ibid, p. 114}

The fluctuating fortunes of galactic polity is characterized by two forms- the more usual weaker and the exceptional stronger. The weaker picture of the origins of the polity is that a dominant principality emerges from among certain decentralized autonomous petty principalities or chiefdoms and it attempts to pull them together and hold them as a
differentiated whole. But significantly “…this centripitality is achieved not so much by the
real exercise of power and control as by the devices and mechanisms of a ritual kind that
have performative validity.” This is something akin to Stein’s ‘ritual sovereignty’.

Tambiah is certain that the stronger form was only rarely and temporarily achieved in
Southeast Asia by strong rulers seizing the opportunity of favorable circumstances. This
process presents similarities with Weber’s account of how a patrimonial prince attempts to
expand his direct control over the outlying extra-patrimonial areas by extending the links
of personal links of dependency, loyalty and fidelity; by securing military control
through exercising levying power and through forming an independent army that frees
him from the dependence on vassals; by enforcing monopoly over trade in luxury goods,
weapons etc. etc.52

Probably the most significant fact about Tambiah’s model is his insistence that the ‘much
cited but little understood cakravartin model’ of kingship remarkably fits the galactic
polity. He says that Asokan polity was held together by the ideology of dhamma, headed
at the apex by a king of kings subsuming in superior ritual and even fiscal relation a vast
collection of local principalities and regional clusters. It was not so much a bureaucratized
centralized imperial monarchy as a kind of galaxy-type structure with lesser political
replicas revolving around the central entity and in perpetual motion of fission or
incorporation. Tambiah says that the cakkavatti model was a closer representation of

51 Tambiah, S. J., op. cit., p.125

52 Ibid, pp.126 ff. for details
actual facts than has usually been written:

[A] king as a wheel rolling world ruler by definition required lesser kings under him who in turn encompassed still lesser rulers, that the raja of the rajas was more a apical coordinator than a totalitarian authority between whom and the people nothing intervened except his own agencies and agents of control.\(^{53}\)

He cites the pre-Asokan text of the *Vinayapiṭaka* as the evidence of the galactic structure of the eastern Indian polity of the early Buddhist period which defines a king in the following words: Rājānā māna pathaṭarāja, padesarāja, maṇḍalika, antarabhogika, akkhadasa, mahamattas. Padesa and maṇḍala were political units headed by subordinate kings or king’s nominees in the distant part of large kingdoms who accepted the suzerainty of the central head.\(^{54}\)

These findings are singularly important for early Indian polity because if found acceptable, they show not only structural continuity from ancient to the so called early medieval period but also greater conformity of the ideologies of kingship to reality than hitherto generally accepted. Probably for this very reason these findings of Tambiah may not find a wide recognition. Its utility will become obvious if we undertake a detailed study of the processes through which the Mauryan empire emerged from the 16 *mahājanapadas*. Another significant model of early medieval polity developed by Kulke and Chattopadhyaya, called ‘integrative polity’ will be discussed in some detail in the chapter on Caulukya Polity.

\(^{53}\) Tambiah, S. J, op. cit., p. 70

\(^{54}\) Ibid, p.71
The Caulukyas: A Rajaput Lineage (vamsa) of Early Medieval India

Origin of the Rajputs

Various theories have been put forward to account for this phenomenon which point out the indigenous and foreign origin of the Rajputs. Chattopadhyaya says that this origin should be examined as a 'total process' in all its political, economic and social aspects. About the traditional list of 36 clans he says that for the contemporary compilers the criteria for inclusion in the list was the status of the clan and the regular occurrence of Cahamanas and Pratiharas may be due to their political dominance. He emphasizes two important pointers in the process of the emergence of rajputs. The first being in the sphere of economy and it was the colonization of new areas resulting in the expansion of number of settlements and of agrarian economy. Here the emergence of rajputs is associated with certain new features of land distribution and territorial system, for example the distribution of land to royal kinsmen and the new land unit of 6 or 84 villages known as the 'caurasia' system. These were attached to (pratibaddha) a mandala, bhukti or visaya and these units became the nuclei of some kind of local control.

In Western India this expansion of rajput power was at the expense of erstwhile tribal settlements. The sources speak of the suppression of the Sabaras, Bhillas, Pulindas etc, it says that areas which were abhirajanadārmanah aseyah sādhunām now came to be crowded by Brahmanas, soldiers, mahajanās and hattas. The Nadol branch of Cahamanas, who were one of the subordinates of the Caulukyas of Anhilapataka, came into being at
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55 For references vide Chattopadhyaya, B.D., 'Origin of the Rajputs...' in his The Making of Early Medieval India, New Delhi, 1994 p. 57 fn.1
56 Chattopadhyaya, B.D., ‘Origin of the Rajputs...’, pp. 73ff.
the expense of the Medas of southern Marwar area.\textsuperscript{57}

Secondly, he views the mobility to \textit{kṣatriya} status and the construction of mostly fabricated genealogies as the political process. He says that instead of looking for the original ancestry of the clans we should search for the historical stages in which the rajput clan structure came to be developed and has identified two important stages in the formulation of the genealogies. He makes two significant remarks about the detailed genealogies of the ruling clans which was formulated during change from feudatory to independent status because "..feudatory status was incompatible with the stage when detailed and fabricated reference to a respectable ancestry could be made."\textsuperscript{58} Firstly, these can hardly be extrapolated for an assessment of actual origin, 'although some parts may be based on a genuine tradition'. Secondly, it also reveals the political process of the upward mobility from an initial feudatory position through growth of military strength. The Cahamānas, Paramāras, Guhīlas as well as Caulukyas were the feudatories of the Gurjara-Pratihāras and this latter imperial dynasty came into being as a result of the stratification in their ancestral 'pastoral stock'.

Thus the emergence of the rajputs took place within the existing hierarchical political structure and it was by no means a sudden brilliant debut on the north Indian political scene.\textsuperscript{59} As the entry into the rajput fold continued, basically through political power, these claims to \textit{kṣatriya} Solar, Lunar lines provided the much needed legitimacy to the

\textsuperscript{57} Chattopadhyaya, B. D., op. cit., pp. 61-62. Our study supports his findings, see infra chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid, p.64

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid, p. 72
political power.

He makes two observations about the proliferation of the rajaput clans in early medieval India during the 11th-12th centuries. The system of ranking in administrative arrangement—rājaputra, rauta, rāvala, rānaka, sāmanta, maṇḍalika, mahāmaṇḍalesvara etc.—was a measure of flexibility of the system in which new groups can be accommodated by virtue of their political initiative and power. This partly accounts for the proliferation both inside and outside the clans. Secondly, it was due to the emergence of the sub-clans resulting from the movement to new areas of the branches of established clans, as well as the absorption of local elements into the clan framework and 'not necessarily a result of direct segmentation of clans.' Thus Rajaputisation was a process of social mobility which drew such disparate groups as the Medas and the Hunas in the wake of its formation into a structure.

**Formation of the Regional Imperial Kingdom of the Caulukyas**

Mūlarāja (941-997 A.D.), the founder of the dynasty overthrew the Cāpoṭkatas or Cāvadas, who might have been his relatives and established himself in their kingdom Pancasara, which had its capital at Anahilaṃṭaka/Anhilvad. This territory falls between Radhanpur and Hari Patan mahalas of the Baroda state. This small, semi-arid land is called Sarasvata maṇḍala, i.e. the province formed by the Sarasvati river and located in its valley, in the earliest Caulukya inscriptions. The circumstances were favorable for expansion because the Gurmara-Pratihara empire was tottering to pieces. Mūlarāja, who was probably a general of the Gurjara-Pratiharas prepared for subjugating his neighbours.

---

60 Chattopadhyaya, B. D., op. cit., pp. 81ff
Having established himself in Sarasvata mandala, he conquered Satyapura mandala, it is located around modern Sanchor in the Jodhpur or Marwar state, to the north of the Sarasvati valley.

Bhima I added parts of Kaccha mandala to the Caulukyan kingdom and further extension took place under Karna who conquered portions of Lata mandala. It was converted into a regional imperial kingdom by Jayasima who added Surastramandala, Kathiavad, whole of Malwa, Dadhipadra mandala or modern Pancamahala district with Dohad, and an unidentified mandala in Rajputna comprising modern Jodhpur and Udaypur states.

Kumārapāla (A.D.1144-72) and his successor Ajayapāla retained their hold over these far-flung provinces constituting modern Gujarat, Kathiavār, Kutch, Malwa and Southern Rajputna. Later rulers' control over Malwa, southern Rajputna and even Lata was precarious. It was often challenged and at times wrested by the Paramaras, Cahamanas and Yadavas of Devagiri. Nevertheless, Kutch and Kathiavār remained part of the Caulukya empire till A.D. 1296, the very end of this dynasty. The core of this regional imperial kingdom was northern Gujarat.

As we shall discuss in detail in chapter 2, the formation of the Caulukyan state largely supports Kulke and Chattopadhyaya's 'integrative polity' and 'processural model' of state formation.

Sources: 'The Many Voices of History'

Before discussing in detail a brief acquaintance with the more important sources should facilitate the understanding. We have used 48 inscriptions of the Caulukyas, half of them belongs to the reign of Kumārapāla. Another significant source the Lekhapaddhati is a
collection of government model documents and correspondences as well as private letters. The dated document range from 745 to 1376 A.D., though only a few are later than the Caulukya period and all of them are related to Gujarat.

The Aparājitapṛcchā of Bhuwanadevacarya is a book on architecture written in simple Sanskrit during the reign of Kumarapala.

In addition we have used works of Hemacandra such as the Dvyāśrayamahākāvyya and the Prakrit Kumvarapālacariya which is a biography of Kumārapāla whereas the former presents a general history of the Caulukyas. The commentary on this was written by Abhayatilaka Gani and Purnakalasa Gani, sometime during the middle of the 14th century A.D. His Triṣaṣṭisālkāpurusācaritra is rightly termed 'the encyclopedia of Jaina universal history' which has a canonical status among the svetambaras. We also used some of his other works like the Yogasūstra and Desināmāmālā. Other Jaina chronicles include Yasahpala's Moharājaparājaya, Somaprabha's Kumvarapālapratibodha and Merutung's Prabandhacintāmani. Besides some works of other Jaina authors we have used the Kirtikāmudī of Someśvara, the Guriṣvarapurohitā.

Before starting a detailed description of the sources let us clarify our approach to them. Personal religious affiliations of a particular author may be a dubious guide to categorize him as representing a particular perspective. Somesvara was the royal chaplain (Guriṣvarapurohitā) of the Caulukyas. But he was patronized by the famous Vastupala, the richest Jaina merchant of western India. He was a frank partisan of the Vastupala and Tejahpala brothers. His main intention in writing the Kirtikāmudī was to eulogise Vastupala and he indulges in all sorts of exaggeration in praising the deeds of his Jaina patron. Can we categorize his works as representing the Brahmanical
Hemacandra certainly represents the Jaina voice. But any juxtaposition of his Dvyāśrayakāvya, which is sort of a court history of the Caulukyas, with the Trisāṣṭisalākāpurusacaritra and the Kunvaravālacakarita makes it clear that the latter two texts were written exclusively for the Jaina layman. Here Kumarapala is depicted as a devout Jaina ruler who diligently follows and enforces the Jinadharma throughout his realm. But the Kumarapala of the Dvyāśrayakāvya comes as a patron of all prominent sects. Indeed, he appears to be more favorably disposed towards the Brahmanical Saiva sect.

Other Jaina authors such as Somaprabhasuri and Maṇḍana Upādhyāya were appropriating Kumārapāla for propagandistic purposes. Therefore the motives and intentions of a author must be examined to ascertain the historical worth of his compositions.

We must carefully distinguish between voices, whether dissenting or not, speaking about a particular aspect of an object of investigation and different aspects of the same problem. For example, on the question of whether Kumārapāla was converted to Jainism we get contradictory answer from the Brahmanical and Jaina sources. Similarly, Jaina authors say that Ajayapāla was a nephew of Kumārapāla and poisoned him to get the throne. But a careful examination of other sources reveal that he was the son of Kumārapāla and the succession was peaceful.61

But if we want to know the structure of the Caulukya polity, territorial divisions of the Caulukya kingdom, extent and manner of Kumārapāla’s control over the different areas of his kingdom and ‘law-in-action’. we must give priority to the inscriptions particularly

the copper plate charters and the *Lekhapaddhati*. These aspects of the topic of study are only touched by the above sources which are more interested in appropriating the Caulukya monarch to further their own interests.

History cannot end by recording the many voices from the past. What is most important is examining the reliability of the sources. The depiction of Kumārapāla as a convert to Jainism and as an anti-brahmana Jaina king represents a particular voice. That he was poisoned by his nephew Ajayapāla who occupied the Caulukya throne after this successful conspiracy. In chapter 4 we shall examine the case of Viśnuvardhana Hoyasala who is said to be converted from Jainism to Srivaisnavism and is depicted by one of the many voices of history to be the persecutor of the Jainas. All of that is false, as we shall see in detail. Kumārapāla was never converted to Jainism. Ajayapāla was his son and succeeded him in peaceful manner. Instead of oppressing the Jainas Viṣṇuvardhana patronized them.

This situation prevails from a very early time where all the popular monarchs are depicted by the three traditions as exclusively their own and resented their patronage to other rival sects. But the inscriptions tell an altogether different story. If we stop after recording their dissenting voices we have no way to decide what might have been the actual situation- *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist* (Ranke’s famous dictum, much malingned by many later philosophers of history).

Therefore we decided to give priority to the epigraphs and the *Lekhapaddhati* over the chronicles, whether written by the Brahmanas or the Jainas. These latter accounts were used mainly as supplementary sources. In most cases their reliability was examined on the basis of the epigraphic evidence, besides internal as well as cross-chronicle
consistency. We have interpreted the texts according to the intentions, motives, patronage and the audience of a particular author.

Let us give a brief account of the sources:

**Literary Sources**

**Works of Hemacandra:** The *Siddhahemaśabdamīśāsana:* This is a grammar of Sanskrit and Prakrit, the latter being its eighth chapter. Hemacandra wrote two commentaries on this grammar, called *Laghuvṛtti* and *Vṛhadvṛtti*, the commentary on Prakrit is called *prakāśikā*. Keilhorn has praised it as the 'best grammar of the Indian middle ages.' This grammar is divided into 32 sections, at the end of each of which he wrote a sanskrit couplet eulogizing the virtue of a Caulukya king. It was finished during the reign of Jayasimha, and these verses describe the good qualities of the Caulukya kings from Mularaja I to Siddharaja.

The *Dvīśrayamahākāvya (DKV):* Hemacandra wrote this kāvya to illustrate the rules of his grammars. This is divided into 28 cantos, of these the first twenty cantos are written in Sanskrit and illustrate the rules of his Sanskrit grammar, and the last eight cantos are written in Prakrit illustrating the rules of the Prakrit language. For all practical purposes they are two distinct works. The Prakrit *Dvīśraya* is called *Kumarapālacariya (KVC)* and it is a biography of Kumarapala whereas the *DKV* presents a general history of the Caulukyas. The *DKV* consists of 2439 verses forming 20 sargas of unequal length.

---

63 *Dvīśrayakāvya* with the commentary of Abhayatilaka Gani. Edited by A.V. Kathavate. 2 vols., Bombay, 1915-21
Practically every verse contains word or words which illustrate the rules of his grammar, and the verses are so arranged that the examples follow in strict order the arrangement of the rules of the grammar.

The DKV is a mahākāvya. Hemacandra was a good scholar of Sanskrit poetics and has written the chaṇḍānasāsana. Thus he knew the conventional features of a mahākāvya and we must expect all the traditional exaggerations pertaining to the description of the nāyaka, beauties of nature, and descriptions of cities and wars etc. etc. We should also expect the omission of facts which speak poorly of his patrons, such as the fugitive days of Kumārāṇa during the early part of his life. Majumdar is of similar opinion "...Hemacandra habitually overlooked facts which were derogatory to the reputation of the Caulukya kings." Moreover, we must not assume that exigencies of illustrating the rules of grammar might have made it difficult for Hemacandra to do justice to the historical aspects of his mahākāvya:

He was quite capable of writing a tolerably good history even within the limits of the Dvīṃśāṣṭraya, and it is evident that his selection and omission of subjects were deliberate. He set out to write a eulogy of the Caulukyas, and particularly that of Siddharaja, and from that standpoint his work should be judged.65

The KVC clearly shows traces that it was written exclusively for the Jaina audience, while the Sanskrit dvīṃśāṣṭraya is meant for a wider audience.66 The DKV is different from works
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64 Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., p. 408

65 Ibid, p.409

66 For details, see infra chapter 4.
like Halāyudha's *Kavirahasya*, a metrical guide to poets in the employment of verbal forms, and an eulogy of Rāṣṭrakūta Kṛṣṇa III. It does not give us historical information beyond stating the name of the ruling monarch, but the *DKV* gives us many facts of historical value. On the other hand, it compares unfavorably with the *Rājatarangini* as a source of history. According to Majumdar, the *DKV* falls in the same category as Bilhana's *Vikramañakadevacaritra*.

With reference to its chronology, Merutunga says that when the grammar was finished, some envious persons pointed out to Siddharāja that the grammar contained no description of the Caulukyas. Soon Hemacandra came to learn of the intrigue against him, and he composed overnight thirty two ślokas praising the Caulukya kings and inserted one at the end of each section of his grammar. He further says that Hemacandra composed the *DKV* to describe the conquest of Jayasimha.

The *KVC* consists of 742 ślokas forming eight sarags. The plan of this work is exactly like that of the Sanskrit *dvīpaśraya*. The first two cantos describe the daily life of Kumārapāla. The sixth sarga describe the fight of the Caulukyan army against Mallikarjuna, the king of Konkana. The rest of the sixth canto describes in the conventional exaggerated form a number of kings who paid obeisance to Kumārapāla. The rest of this work is devoted to a description of trees, flowers and seasons etc., and little information of historical worth. The seventh sarga describes the pious thoughts of Kumārapāla, and Hemacandra points towards the dangers of coming into any form of contact with women, so typical of a monk's ethics. Then finally the Goddess Śrutadevi appears in the eighth canto to instruct

---

Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., p. 409
Kumārāpāla on various aspects of Jainism. 68

The commentary on the DKV and the KVC: sometime during the middle of the 14th century A.D. Jinesvara suri ordered his two disciples, Abhayatilaka Gani and Purṇakalaśa Gani, to write the commentary on these works of Hemacandra. They finished the commentary in V.S. 1312 at Palhanapur. Abhayatilaka admits gratefully that his commentary was kindly revised and corrected by his co-pupil, the poet Laksmitilaka Gani. The Kharataragaccha-pattāvali says that Upadhyaya Abhayatilaka, probably our commentator who belonged to this gaccha, defeated at Ujjaiyini one Vidyananda of the Tapagaccha and received a jayapatra in V.S. 1319. Majumdar is all praise for the great erudition of the commentator and the dexterity with which he explains the tortuous obscurity of Hemacandra’s ślokas. 69 He says that the commentator was guided by Hemacandra’s famous dictum -iīkā nirantararavākhyā ānājikā padabhañjikā. Therefore we get a connected narrative in Abhayadeva’s commentary, he fills up many gaps left in the narrative by the author. His drawback was that he has accepted every statement of Hemacandra as true, we should not expect a svetambara monk to do otherwise. Gani has performed his task extremely well. Without his commentary, large part of the DKV would have remained unintelligible. Purṇakalaśa Gani wrote the commentary on the Prakrit dvāśrāya in Sanskrit. His scope was limited but even he has done a commendable job.


69 Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., p. 411
The *Trisastisalākāpurusācaritra* (TSPC): This is a text of 34000 verses divided into ten *parvans* and each of the *parva* is further divided into several *sargas*. According to Buhler, Hemacandra composed it during A.D. 1161-72. Johnson termed it ‘the encyclopedia of Jaina universal history’ which has a canonical status among the svaetambaras. He further says “Hemacandra’s sources and his imitators would require a volume in itself; as, in one form or the other all the well known episodes in Hindu as well as Jaina literature are incorporated in the TSPC.” With reference to the sources Hemacandra says “...something from the *sutras* is related here, something from fiction, something from *Yogapata*...” *Yogapata* is the secret tradition of knowledge handed down orally by a guru to a disciple as his successor. Among the post-canonical literature of the Jainas, the TSPC is a very significant source to understand the nature and function of Jaina kingship, along with the *CMC* and the *Ādipuraṇa* of Jinasena (A.D. 770-850).

The *Yogasūtra*: Also called the *Adhyātmopaniṣada* it is one the most important didactic works of the Jainas. Written at the request of Kumārapala, it gives, along with the *svopajñavṛtti* by the author himself “the clearest and most comprehensive presentation of the [Jaina] system which has ever been written.”

The *Laghvarhannītisūtra*: It is a work on law and politics, written in the framework of

---
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74 Winternitz, M., op. cit., vol. II p. 485
the Brahmanical *Arthasastra*. It is said to be a summary of a larger work in Prakrit and is attributed to Hemacandra. Ghoshal discusses this ‘post-canonical technical work of the Jainas’ at some length.\(^7\) Winternitz refers to P.C. Nahar’s opinion that it is a spurious work of the 19th century.\(^6\) Apparently Ghoshal did not know this. Later, Derrett convincingly argued that it is indeed a spurious work whose authorship is attributed to Hemacandra.\(^7\)

**Yasahpāla:** He wrote the *Mohanājaparājaya (MRP)* which is an allegorical drama in five acts, describe the process and the consequences of Kumārapāla’s conversion to Jainism. It has been pointed out that the play resembles in some respects the Christian plays of medieval Europe. All the dramatis personae, except the king, his *vidusaka* and Hemacandra, represent abstract qualities good as well as evil. An earlier specimen of *rupaka* in the Sanskrit literature is the famous *Prabodhacandrodaya* of Kṛṣṇamiśra, composed in the second half of the 11th century A.D.

The author says that his father Dhanadeva was a *mantri*. Yasahpāla styles himself as a ‘swan at the lotus-feet of cakravartin Ajayadeva’, the son and successor of Kumārapāla. This indicates that the author might have been a minister of Ajayapāla (A. D. 1172-75). Therefore the drama must have been written during this period.\(^8\)
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77 Derrett, J.D.M., ‘Hemacandra’s Arhanniti’, *ABORI*, pp. 1-21

Somaprabha: His Kumārapalapratibodha (KPP) contains a general description of the teachings of the Jaina doctrine said to have been given from time to time by Hemacandra to Kumārapala. It also describes how the tenets of Jaina thought influenced his practices of kingcraft and how finally the king was converted to Jainism. The work is mostly written in Prakrit, but a few stories in the last chapter are written in Sanskrit. It is a voluminous work, but its historical worth is very insignificant. Actually at the commencement of his work the author denies any intention of writing a biography either of Hemacandra or of Kumārapāla. It was written in V.S. 1241, roughly a decade after the death of Kumārapāla.

Someśvara: The earliest known member of his family was appointed purohita by the first Caulukya king Mularaja I. since then the members of his family serves the Caulukya kings as royal chaplains. He calls himself Gurjaresvarapurohita and was a favorite of the Vaghelas. He wrote the Dabhol prasasti in A.D. 1253 and many other prasāstis. He begins the Kirtikaumudi (KK) with an invocation to gods and then praises famous poets. His list of poets gives prominent place to Prahladana, the Paramara prince of Abu, Yaśovirā who was a minister of the Cahamanas and the famous Vastupala, the richest Jaina merchant of western India who was a minister of the Vaghelas. He says that Prahladana was the son of Sarasvatī and husband of the goddess of victory and in comparison to him, even Kālidāsa and Magha were of little account! Someśvara was a frank partisan of the Vaghela kings and Vastupala and Tejahpala brothers and their interests were more important than historical facts for him. But wherever the interests of his patrons were not involved, he has
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presented unbiased views. The narrative in the second canto of the KK up to the death of Mularaja II gives possibly the best history of the Caulukyas till that period, according to Majumdar.\(^8\) His description of the Yadava invasion of Gujarat is graphic and convincing. But his main intention in writing the KK was to eulogize Vastupala and he indulges in all sorts of exaggeration in praising the deeds of his Jaina patron. The KK is divided into nine cantos and is generally called a mahākāvya. But in form it resembles a campu more than a mahākāvya. It was a popular work and Merutunga has quoted freely from it.\(^8\)

The Surathotsava is a mahākāvya of fourteen sargas. It presents the mythical story of King Suratha’s loss of kingdom through the treachery of his ministers, his retirement to a forest, and worship of the mother goddess through whose divine intervention he regained the throne. The story of king Suratha resembles closely the political career of Bhima II during whose reign this work was written, thus it might actually be a political allegory.\(^8\)

**Arisimha:** His Sukrtasamkirtana (SK) is a mahākāvya divided into 11 sargas. It was finished in V.S. 1285. The first canto describes the history of the Capotkatas and the second sarga that of the Caulukyas. Historically these two cantos are the most important part of the work, the rest of the SK are devoted to descriptions of the pious deeds of Vastupala and Tejahpala.
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**Prabhācandra and Pradyumnasuri:** They wrote the Prabhavakacaritra (PRC) containing the biographies of 22 Jaina ācāryas including Hemacandra. It was completed in v.s. 1334. the authors say at the commencement of the PRC that they begin where Hemacandra has left. Hemacandra wrote the Parisistaparavan or the Sthavirāvalicaritra as an appendix to his TSPC, in which he wrote the biographies of the Jaina acaryas upto Vajrasvāmī. Beginning from Vajrasvāmī the PRC brings the narrative to the biography of Hemacandra.

The main purpose of this work was to describe the lives of the Jaina ācāryas. In order to provide a historical background to their activities, anecdotes about many kings have been introduced, more prominent among them being Bhoja Paramara, Bhima I, Jayasimha and Kumarapala. It was impossible to write the biography of Hemacandra without including the lives of Jayasimha and Kumarapala. Thus the most significant part of the PRC is the Hemacandrasuricaritram in terms of history. In the Vadidevasuricaritram a detailed description of the debate between Digambara Kumudacandra and Śvetāmbara Devacandra at the court of Jayasimha is given.

The author says at the beginning that the material of this work was collected from the books by his predecessors and the stories which were current when the work was being written. This book contains the earliest biography of Hemacandra.

**Merutunga:** His Prabandhacintāmani (PC) may be considered a general history of Gujarat of the period v.s. 940-1250. Like Prabhācandra, Merutunga went through many works of his predecessors, and also relied upon current oral traditions. The first three sections of the first chapter contain anecdotes about Vikramāditya, Satavāhana and
Bhuyaraja. The fourth section called Vanarājādi-prabandha gives a short history of the Capotkatas. With the fifth section called Mularājādi-prabandha begins the history of the Caulukyas. The sixth section records the anecdotes about the Paramara king Vākpati Munja. Then begins the second chapter, called Bhoja-bhima-prabandha, in which after describing the last days of Bhima and the reign of Karna in a couple of pages, more than twenty pages are devoted to the narration of the events of Jayasimha’s reign. The first section of the fourth chapter describes the rule of Kumārapāla and is as long as chapter three. At the end of chapter four is described the evil deeds of Ajayapāla, reign of Mularaja II, Bhima II and the accession of Viradhavala. Section two of this chapter called Vastupala-Tejahpala-praśasti, records the activities of the two brothers.

Merutunga finished writing the PC in V.S. 1361 (A.D. 1304), but his history of Gujarat really comes to a close with the death of Kumārapāla in V.S. 1229. Of the Vaghelas, who were his contemporaries Merutunga has not written anything. But he did realize the significance of the genealogy of kings and their dates for writing of history. Majumdar says that most of the dates given in the PC are wrong by a few months or a year. Probably Merutunga consulted old documents and traced the year of accession of a king but not the exact date and this he wrote by intelligent guesses. The importance of his dates becomes evident when we reflect upon the paucity of dates in the sanskrit literature. In the whole of the DKV or the KK and in many other works mentioned here not a single date is given. Merutunga also realized the importance of writing a single narrative. All his anecdotes are woven around a core of history, the course of which is never impeded, and the facts are
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83 Majumdar, A. K., op. cit., p. 419
usually arranged in chronological order. His method of presentation is usually precise and unambiguous. Merutunga also recognized a very significance of the history of the Caulukys, that it was impossible to write their history without describing the history of the Paramaras of Malwa.

The *Vicārasreṇi* is a chronology of the kings of many dynasties and includes a chronology of the Caulukya kings. The work, not without merits, being almost a pioneer attempt to reconstruct history, is full of errors and consequently unreliable. It was written in or after V.S. 1371, for it records an event of that year. It is also known as the Theravali.

**Rājasekharā:** His *Prabandhakośa* (*PK*) is also known as the *caturvinsatiprabandha*, named after the 24 biographical *prabandhas*, and was finished in V.S. 1405. It contains the biography of 10 Jaina acaryas, four poets, seven kings and three commoners. Most of his biographies are of important historical personalities. Among all Gujarat chroniclers, Rajasekharā was the worst and the *PK* abound in absurdities, more dangerous because they have an appearance of vermisimilitude.

**Jayasimha Suri:** He finished the *Kumārapālabhūpalacaritra* in V.S. 1422 and contains 6053 verses and is full of fanciful tales. The last canto of the book gives the origin of the first Calukya king, not found elsewhere. The rest of the work i.e. *sargas* 2-10, gives the history of Kumarapala and Hemacandra in which facts and fictions are inextricably mixed up and demands total suspension of disbelief from the reader. The author is different from the writer of the *Hammiramadamardana*.

**Jinamandana Upādhyāya:** He completed the *Kumārapālaprabandha* (*KPP*) in V.S. 1405.
1492. His materials are taken mainly from the \textit{PC} and the work of Jayasimhasuri and freely quotes verses from the latter, though his work is written in prose. Besides he consulted the \textit{PRC} and an unidentified Prakrit work. He has given the summary of the \textit{MRP} as if the events of that drama really happened.

The \textit{Dharmāraṇyamāhātya} of the \textit{Skandapurāṇa}: We have included it in our sources to show the memory of Kumārapāla among the Brahmanas. In terms of a historical source of information on Kumārapāla, this text is worse than simply worthless.\footnote{The \textit{Skandapurāṇa}, part III, Bombay. 1910}

The \textit{Aparājitapṛcchā}, also known as \textit{Sutrasantuṇagunaprakāśa}, of Bhuavanadevacarya is a book on architecture written in simple Sanskrit and \textit{Purāṇa} like style in the form of questions by Aparājita and their answers by his father Visvakarman.\footnote{Winternitz. M., \textit{A History of Indian Literature}, vol. III, Delhi, 1977 reprint, p. 653} Its author was the master builder of Jayasimha and Kumārapāla. According to Dhaky, this text was compiled during the reign of Kumārapāla.\footnote{Dhaky. M.A., \textit{Temple Architecture in India}. p.126. for a discussion of the chronology and sources of the \textit{Aparājitapṛcchā} see this author’s articles at \textit{Journal of Oriental Institute}. Baroda. vols. IX-X, 1960-61 pp. 424ff and 226 ff respectively.}
catergories of ruling elites including *dandaṇāyakas*, *maṇḍalesas*, *maṇḍalikas*, *mahāsāmantas*, *sāmantas*, *rājaputras* ... and so on.

He further adds that its system of ranking in relation to the overlord may be reflective of "the text's perception of cakravartin power than an actual order, but a correlation between their political hold and rank can be detected in its description."\(^{87}\)

The *Lekhapaddhati*, the most important one among literary sources, is a collection of government model document and correspondences. The dated document range from 745 to 1376 A.D., though only a few are later than the Caulukya period and all of them are related to Gujarat. We have some copper-plate charters of the Caulukya kings given here and Lingat has rightly called it the richest source of 'law-in-action'.\(^{88}\)

This text is an indispensable source for any study of statecraft, particularly in western India. Strauch has produced an excellent revised edition and a fine translation of this text into German.\(^{89}\)

---

\(^{87}\) Kulke, H., ed., op. cit., p. 230


\(^{89}\) Strauch, I., ed. and tr., *Die Lekhapaddhati-Lekhapancasika: Text, Uebersetzung, Kommentar*, Berlin, 2002. English translation by Pushpa Prasad, (*The Lekhapaddhati*, New Delhi, 2008), is far inferior to Strauch’s fine rendering into German.
About its significance for the social, political and economic history of Gujarat, he says:

Während die Privatbriefe ein lebendiges Bild des zivilen Lebens zeichnen, bieten die Rechtsurkunden einen umfassenden Einblick in die öffentliche Administration und Steuerpolitik, in die ökonomischen Verhältnisse, die Rechtspraxis und die sozialen und politischen Strukturen des mittelalterlichen Gujarat, wie er aus anderen Quellen kaum zu gewinnen wäre.90

Along with Kṣemendra's *Lokaprakāśa* (11th century A.D.) and Vidyāpati's *Likhānāvali* (14th century A.D.) it forms a genre of text which can be termed 'legal documents'.91

**Inscriptions**

We have used 24 inscriptions of Kumarapāla or his subordinates along with 22 copper plate charters and 2 stone inscriptions of the other Caulukya kings.92 All the charters except a couple of them were issued from Anhilvad, the Caulukya capital. Their provenance and the location of the villages donated provide an invaluable aid in determining the gradually expanding territorial contours of the Caulukya kingdom besides showing the extent of the control of the Caulukya kings. These epigraphs are our most important sources.

---
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92 For the details see the Bibliography.
We must say a few words about the content of the remaining chapters:

Chapter 1. The Contested Terrain of Ideology: Evolution of Jaina Ideology of Kingship from a Comparative Perspective

The Genesis and Diffusion of Political Theories

Here we have attempted to trace the evolution of Jaina ideology of kingship from the canonical to the post canonical texts as well as to compare it with the Buddhist and Brahmanical discourses of kingship, including that of the cakravartin. We shall see how the development of the Jaina theory of kingship was a result of the interactions of the Jaina philosophy of salvation with its Brahmanical and Buddhist counterparts. We shall discuss the factors which might have acted as constraints in a diffusion of the Sramanic political theories and causes responsible for the success of the Brahmanical ideology of kingship.

Although we will briefly discuss the theories of the origin of kingship as advanced by the Brahmanas, the Buddhists and the Jainas, we are not concerned with the origin of the state in India. 93

---

93 For which see, for example, Thapar, R., *From Lineage to State*; Sharma, R. S., *Aspects of Political...* Delhi, 1959; Drekmier., C., *Kingship and Community...* California, 1962.

These scholars have considered Magadha as the first state in India and ignoring completely the case of Harappa. Interestingly enough M. H. Fried, a political anthropologist, in his discussion of autonomous origin of the state in his monograph *The Evolution of the Political Society*, regards Harappa as the first Indian state. However, the
Chapter 2. The Caulukya Polity

Formation of the Caulukya Kingdom

As noted above we shall trace the formation of this kingdom in some detail. Chattopadhyaya and Kulke's 'integrative polity' and 'processural model' are invaluable in understanding the formation of early medieval states in terms of its expansion from a core region dominated by a particular lineage. This expansion took place primarily by the integration/encapsulation of many local bases of power.

Thus by the 7th century B.C. territorial states had come into existence in India. Recently, Yoffee has raised empirically grounded objections to the categorisation of 'alternate' forms of leadership in pre-historic societies in the framework of neo-evolutionalist global trajectory of 'band-tribe-chiefdom-state' taxonomy. He questions the validity of 'chiefdoms' as a necessary stage in the transition towards the state as posited by the 'social evolutionary mythology'. Vide his *Myths of the Archaic State*, Cambridge, 2005 pp. 161ff. At any rate, the transition from chiefdom to state is gradual and the differences between chiefdom and kingdom may be imperceptible. Thus M. Witzel describes the existence of many 'Rg-Vedic kingdoms' in his self-edited work *Inside The Text: Beyond The Text*, Cambridge, 1997, pp.272 ff. A welcome development in the study of the formation of the state is the efforts to bridge the gap between Anthropology and Political Science. For example, see R. Blanton and L. Fargher, *Collective Action in the Formation of the Pre-Modern States*, Springer, 2008.
Administrative Divisions of the Caulukya Kingdom

For convenience of exposition we shall divide the Caulukyan kingdom into a three tier system.

I. The dynastic nuclear area ruled by the paramount sovereign, i.e. Sarasvata mandala under Kumarapala caulukya.

II. The mandalas falling in the intermediate zone which were organised as an extended core region governed by centrally appointed Mandalesvaras. Eight of the ten mandalas, i.e. all except Sarasvata and Satyapura mandalas, were under this form of administration.

III. Peripheral territories ruled by the ‘subordinate allies’. These areas were ruled by the Cahamanas of Nadol and Jalor and the Paramaras of Abu. They were nominally dependent tributary princes, not ‘feudatories.

The Coercive Apparatus of the State I: The Caulukya Patrimonial Bureaucracy

Under this heading will be examined the administrative structures and its functioning in terms of the structure of Caulukya polity. The validity of any ‘model’ purporting to describe the structure of Early Indian Polity is obviously subject to the evidences and logical consistency of interpretation. Weber explicitly used this model while describing early Indian kingdoms whose administration was ‘patrimonial and bureaucratic’.

The Coercive Apparatus of the State II: Types of Armies of the Caulukyas

Here we will describe the sources from which the Caulukyas recruited their troops as well as the mode of recruitment and the methods of payment. A very brief discussion of the
three wings of the Caulukyan army will be given. We’ll examine whether the practice of military prebendalism (‘service grants), besides revenue farming etc., when accompanied by the transfer of judicial authority might have led to the emergence of *Pfruendenfeudalismus* in Western India.

### Administration of Justice by the Caulukyas

Taking a bottom up approach we’ll first discuss the very significant question of judicial authority in the Caulukya villages and how it was related to the apex authority. An assessment will be made of the nature and impact of the state apparatus in the villages. Our focus of attention will be the panchayats and other ‘autonomous spaces’. We shall argue that the state exerted a ‘light’ presence in the villages. Thereafter we’ll make an analysis of the state judiciary and its appellate jurisdiction over the ‘autonomous spaces’ which will reveal the true nature of the autonomy of these non-state institutions as well as the motive of the rulers’ behind their continuation.

### Public Finance: Caulukya Polity and the Economy

Here we will make a rather brief discussion of how the government was related to the economy. Our point of attention will be focused on the motives of the rulers. Was the government primarily a mechanism utilized by rational *self-seeking* individuals to redistribute wealth within a society, as public choice theorists view the modern state? Was the kingly administration primarily concerned with raising the manpower for the army and the collection of taxes?
Discretion and Tradition: The Domain and Scope of Rājasāsana

To acquire an understanding of how did the system work we have decided to explore Weber's writings for three reasons. Firstly, his width, depth and precision are something rare in the social sciences. He developed a typology of rulership on a truly world-historical scale in a comparative framework with conceptual precision. Secondly, in the existing works on early medieval polity Weber's relevant writings are conspicuous by their absence. Most importantly, his approach is similar to the perspective of the early medieval jurists expounded in the brahmanical sastras as analyzed by Derrett and Lingat.

We shall study the functioning of the Caulukya rājamandala in the Weberian framework of two spheres of action in terms of the determining factor in the decision making process- that of the spheres of tradition (ācāra/caritra) and of discretion (rājasāsanas). The first consists of decisions taken on the basis of customary laws, be they codified in the sastras or unwritten customs and conventions of various social groups such as jātis, śrenīs, pūgas etc. The second sphere of kingly operation is constituted by ruler's discretion such as matters of war and peace or appointment of administrative staff and the delimitation of their jurisdictions.

Chapter 3. Practices of Kingship by Kumārapāla

Here we shall see how the sectarian ideologies and representations of practices of kingcraft were at variance with the realities of statecraft and how significant it is to consider the motives of kings as well as the structural limitations within which they had to operate for any understanding of statecraft. Kumarapala's succession to the Caulukya
throne will be interpreted as a political process and his royal policies will be examined to find the influence of Jainism, if any.

Chapter 4. Religion and the State: Kumārapāla’s Conversion to Jainism

Whether Kumārapāla was Converted to Jainism

A careful examination of the sources will be undertaken to show whether the Jaina sources are reliable. We shall also briefly discuss some other cases whether kings were allegedly converted from one sect to another.

The Politics of Patronage to All Sects

Here we shall argue that the celebrated ‘tolerance’ of early Indian kings is nothing but political uses of religion for legitimacy and mass domestication.

Conclusion

In the first chapter we traced the genesis and evolution of the Jaina political theory in the framework of its interactions with the Brahmanical and Buddhist political ideas. We emphasized the similarity between the canonical and post-canonical situation. We also noted the differences between the svetambaras and the digambaras. We accounted for the factors which might have facilitated/constrained the diffusion of early Indian political theories.

We designated the Caulukya polity as an instance of ‘patrimonial bureaucracy’ with elements of charismatic authority, Pfruentenfeudalismus and representative government present therein. We tried to describe the working of the system in terms of Weber’s concept of ‘traditional authority’ and the differences between patrimonialism and modern
legal-rational bureaucracy.

An examination of the apparatus of the revenue administration of the Caulukyas along with the structure of judicial authority in the villages confirmed that the Caulukyas were mainly interested in raising the manpower for the army and the collection of the taxes. This supports the predatory/exploitative theory of the state.

In the third chapter we interpreted the succession struggle after the death of Jayasimha as a political process whereby Kumārapāla got the Caulukya throne. We found that no measure of Kumārapāla’s royal policies can be counted as the following of a Jaina tenet of kingship.

In the last chapter we found that a critical examination of the sources shows that Kumārapāla was not converted to Jainism. About the nature of relation between religion and the state, we took the rulers’ perspective and stressed the political uses of religion for legitimation and pacification (mass domestication). We asserted 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 which dictated that the king must patronize all prominent religious sects existing within his realm. In their turn, the leaders of the religious sects used kings’ patronage to further their missionary motive by bedazzling the laity with royal splendor. When we take the ‘perspective from the below’ we find that both the above phenomena was made possible largely because religion acted as the ‘opiate’ for the masses.