CHAPTER I

THE CONTESTED TERRAIN OF IDEOLOGY

The Evolution of Jaina Ideology of Kingship from a Comparative Perspective

Do ideologies of kingship - Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jaina, have any relevance for understanding the institution of kingship in early India? The answer to this question depends on whether they exerted any influence on the practices of statecraft. Our problem is an instance of what is certainly one of the most important issues of the social sciences – what is the relation between the ideologies and ‘material processes’ of a society? Certainly norms are significant upto the extent they influence behavior- of individuals and various aggregates thereof. As the Nobel laureate economist Douglass North points out in his autobiographical essay “....people had the ideologies and ideas that determined the choices they made.”¹ About the importance of ideology in social action, Weber said that ideas have functioned as switchmen determining “the tracks along which action has been pushed by the dynamic of interest.”² Thus our problem boils down to determining the extent to which Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jaina ideologies of kingship motivated the behaviour of the rulers-kings and their subordinates. In this chapter our task is limited to tracing the genesis and development of the Jaina discourses of kingship in the framework of their interactions with the Brahmanical and Buddhist ideologies of statecraft. For reasons listed below we have decided to focus on the Jaina notions of kingcraft. Before

¹ Breit W. and Hirsch B.T., Lives of the Laureates, Massachusetts, 2004 P.215
proceeding to discuss our problem we must come to terms with the hugely controversial concept of ideology.

What is ideology? A great confusion prevails in the social sciences over the definition of ideology and the explanation of the ideological phenomenon. Boudon describes the situation most succinctly and accurately:

Definitions differ enormously between writers, and explanations of the phenomenon are based on a wide variety of principles. Overall, the impression is that the same word is used to describe a multitude of phenomena rather than a single one, that theories of ideology are at odds on something they define differently, and that the large corpus which they constitute seems therefore like a dialogue of the deaf.³

Obviously we must have a firm grasp on the concept of ideology before starting the discussion. Without knowing what one's problem is how anyone can begin his attempt to solve it. In a lighter vein, Blaug says "Ideology is one of those words that everyone defines for himself to express whatever ideas he does not like."⁴ At the outset we must distinguish two aspects of the problem:

1. The Definition of Ideology: this aspect deals with the identification of the ideological phenomenon. The definition must allow a clear identification of the objects to which it refers. We must decide what types of beliefs and values fall under the content of ideology. To illustrate by examples, for Marx, ideologies are the false ideas like the camera obscura images which the


material interactions of people inspire in them. Geertz conceptualises it as symbolic action whereas Shils saw it as a specific type of belief system. Parsons defines ideology as a deviation from scientific objectivity.\(^5\) In a similar way, Bergmann defines ideological statements as value judgments parading as statements of facts.\(^6\) Thus his definition rescues what is valuable in the Marxist 'false consciousness' thesis. This approach to the problem of ideology is clearly related to the Weberian concept of Wertfreiheit.\(^7\)

2. The explanation of the Ideological phenomenon: here we investigate the causes and motivations behind ideology. To illustrate again, Marx explained it as the blindness caused by class interests whereas Shils understood it as the adherence to false ideas through fanaticism.\(^8\)

In his comprehensive analytical survey Boudon has made a critical appraisal of the views of Weber, Lenin, Mannheim, Aron and others, in addition to the above mentioned theorists of

---

\(^5\) Blaug, M., p. 23

\(^6\) Ibid, p. 119

\(^7\) For a very good discussion of the possibility as well as desirability of a 'value free social sciences', which is the Weberian ideal of Wertfreiheit, discussed in the context of 'positive and normative economics' see pp. 112-34 of Blaug's monograph. A good place to find Weber's methodological views is The Methodology of the Social Sciences, trs. And eds., E. A. Shills and H. A. Finch, Glencoe, Ill., 1949. Kenneth J. Arrow, one of the finest economist, found this book somewhat 'problematical' but was sure of the significance of the issues addressed by Weber. "It raised deep issues of value neutrality and of the ways we understand motives and intentions without giving the clear answers apparently supplied by logical positivism with which I was then enamoured." Vide Swedberg, R., ed., Economics and Sociology, New Delhi, 1991 p. 134

\(^8\) Boudon, R., op. cit., p. 57
ideology. Taking an eclectic approach he has incorporated into his theory the useful insights, which stood the test of critical scrutiny, of his predecessors-Marxists and Non-Marxists, traditional as well as modern. He enumerates the following effects\(^9\) which jointly constitute the definition of his 'restricted theory of ideology':

1. Situation effects take into consideration the position and dispositions of the actors. In certain circumstances these effects tend to make social actors perceive reality not as it is and as others can see it, but in a distorted or incomplete way. This category includes but is broader than Marx's classic conception of 'class interests'. 'Weber did not seek to refute Marx\(^10\), but improved upon his perspective when he said that it is not ideas but interests—material and ideal, which moves a man.\(^11\).'

The situation effects helps us to understand how in every Indian soteriology, be they Brahmanical, Budhist or Jaina, the most privileged place is accorded to the pronouncers of the ideological system internally and to the community as a whole vis-a-vis the others. To put it simply, the Brahmans or their counterparts viz. the Bhikkhus or the Jaina acaryas occupy the

---

\(^9\) Boudon, R., op. cit., pp.71-93 for details.

\(^10\) Drekmeier, C., op. cit., p. 3.

highest status in their respective hierarchies and the followers of other traditions are denied every privilege naturally deserved by the followers of a particular tradition.

2. Communication effects are another category of effects essential to the analysis of ideological phenomena. It says that communication is not always true and perfect because everybody does not possess the same level of competence in all subjects. Therefore the phenomena of authority partly explains how people come to believe in false ideas. It roughly corresponds to the aptavacana type of means of knowledge much discussed in early Indian philosophical schools. This brings us to the third type of effects.

3. Epistemological effects investigates the role of theories of knowledge in the explanation of the ideological phenomenon. We will be discussing this effect under the section of theological doctrines and the ideologies of kingship.

The most interesting fact about early Indian political theories, if one may use the phrase, is the fact that their proponents were religious figures, founders of religious sects and their prominent ascetic and monk disciples. Modern explorations of early Indian political ideas have been focused mainly on the Brahmanical tradition. Buddhist discourses of kingship have got some attention but its Jaina counterpart has been relegated to the almost invisible margins of historiography. It is not the case that Jaina authors did not give a look at kingly affairs. Long ago Beniprasad said “In point of extent Buddhist political literature is surpassed by the Jaina.”\(^\text{12}\) Another prominent student of early Indian political affairs concurs “…the political significance of Jainism has been little recognized by the scholars…… Neglect of the political potential of

Jainism is curious." But our main motivation is to determine the influence, if any, of the Jaina doctrines of statecraft on the practices of Kumārpāla Caulukya (c.A.D.1143-72), king of Gujarat, who was allegedly converted to Jainism during the middle of his reign.

An ideology of kingship should be differentiated from stray reflections and idiosyncratic idea of a particular author about kingly affairs. In our view it should describe, in some detail, the origin, nature and functions of kingship elaborated within the framework of cosmological thoughts of a people. Here, Jaina ideology of kingship will denote beliefs i.e. what a particular thing 'is' and values i.e. 'what it ought to be' about political institutions shared by the Jainas. However, it must be pointed out that these two aspects are rather closely intertwined.

In the existing literature dealing with Jaina theories of statecraft a very significant gap has been the failure to trace the evolution of Jaina ideology of kingship. There are two aspects of this issue, the first is to examine this development from the canons to the post-canonical texts. This gap explains the errors committed by some well-known authorities. For example, Ghoshal in his 'encyclopaedia of early Indian political ideas' says that the Adipurāṇa presents the first "systematic account of ....the evolution of man and his institutions..."14

In a like manner, and this the second aspect of the problem, we will make a brief comparison with the Brahmanical and the Buddhist traditions of kingship in order to situate the Jaina ideas about polity in a broader context. Failing to do so may result in denying the Jainas the credit

13 Stein, B., ‘All the king’s mana ...’, in J.F.Richards ed. Kingship and Authority in South Asia , New Delhi, 1998 (1978) p.6

they deserve or ignoring the debt the Jainas owe to the Buddhist and Brahmanical traditions. Our brief comparative account of the genesis of the sociopolitical order and the development of the theories of cakravartin in Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jaina traditions will illustrate this point. It is obvious that an exhaustive treatment of this topic is beyond our scope.

A significant lacuna of the existing literature is their imposition of homogeneity on the Jaina textual traditions of kingship which distorts their portrayal of political ideas. In other words, modern works dealing with Jaina ideas of kingship treat this subject as a monolith, thereby ironing out the differences between the two Jaina traditions. Although we will note some differences in the notions of kingship found in the Digambara texts, the details are beyond the scope of this paper and we are concerned with the historical development of the ideas of kingship shared by the Śvetāmbara Jainas. Moreover even within the Digambāras we witness fundamental differences in their attitude towards kingly affairs. For example the celebrated Nītīvākyāṁrtam of Somadevasuri is virtually a paraphrase of the ĀŚ and Dundas is right to assert “…the 10th century textbook of political theory, Somadeva’s Nītīvākyāṁrtam barely shows any Jaina traits at all.”

Ghoshal clarifies the situation by saying that Somadeva drew his “…political ideas almost exclusively from the Arthasastra-Smṛti tradition, especially as represented by Kautilya and by Manu and Bhisma.” The epigraphs issued from Sravana Belagola, the most sacred shrine of the Digambāras which is famous for the gigantic statue of


16 Ghoshal, op. cit., p. 475. For similar opinions of others see Jha, P.K., Jaina Discourses of Kingship in Early Medieval India, unpublished M. Phil Dissertation submitted at CHS/SSS, JNU, 2002 p. 9. (hereafter M.Phil Diss.)
Bāhubali who renounced kingdom instead of taking recourse to violence against his elder brother Cakravartin Bharata, celebrate the exploits of Jaina Generals and Ministers who are depicted as wading through blood –*rudhiradharapravāhapūrita*– to gain victory in wars to acquire and preserve kingdoms!, without any moral compunctions.¹⁷

The Ideologies of Kingship in the Three Indian Traditions

Here we will compare the Genesis Myth of these traditions to see how do they account for the origin of the sociopolitical order. Then will be discussed the norms they prescribe for the guidance of the rulers. As noted above, our focus will be on the Jaina discourses. As a background to understand the Jaina notions of kingcraft, we will present a very brief account of the chronology of the texts along with the cosmological thoughts of the Jainas. This may be a bit distracting but nevertheless indispensable for a proper appraisal of the political ideas of the Jainas. In the next section we will make a comparative study of the Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jaina notions of Cakravartins – the ideology of kingship par excellence.

The Brahmanical account of Kingcraft

The well-known *Purusāśākta* of the *Rgveda* gives the first account of the origin of the social order. Here we find the first account in the Brahmanical tradition which tries to make sense of the world and describes the origin of the universe including all animate and inanimate beings. This hymn is of paramount significance for three important reasons. It is also found in the

¹⁷ For details see M.Phil. Diss. pp. 77 ff.
Sama, Yajus and Atharva Vedas; in various Sutras and Smriti texts as well as later classical sanskrit literature. Secondly, as we shall see, the Buddhists and the Jainas conceptualised their myth of creation in response to it.

Lastly, this hymn gives the Brahmanical ideology of the origin of social order in statu nascendi rather than the later fully-fledged varnasramadharma form. And as Weber pointed out, it is much easier to understand what an idea means when one looks at it when it is emerging. In this nascent state its relationship with everyday concerns can be seen clearly. Later the idea becomes more complex and subject to manipulation by specialist groups and ends up by having a semi-independent existence vis-à-vis the ‘material processes’. In this more complicated form, the relationship between the original idea and the state of society may become more and more difficult to grasp. This creation myth describes the sacrifice of the purusa by the Gods-yat purusena haviṣa deva yajnam-atanvata, whose various limbs became the source of the manifest universe.

For our purposes the most important verse of the hymn says:

Brāhmṇah-asya mukham-āsita-bāhu rājanyah kṛtaḥ
Uru tadasya yat-vaisyaḥ pādhyam śudro ajāyat.

18 Boudon, R., op.cit., p. 195
19 Rig-Veda Samhita with the commentary of Sayanacarya. Ed. F. Max Muller, Chowkambha sanskrit series, 99, Varanasi ,1966 reprint. X.90.6 (hereafter RV)
20 RV X.90.12. this verse occurs at AV 19.6.6;VS 31.11;TA 3.12.5;VaDh 4.2 Vide Vedic Concordance, p.662
Geldner gives the following translation:

"Sein mund ward zum Brahmanen, seine beiden Arme wurden zum Rajanya gemacht, seine beiden schenkel zum Vaisya, aus seinen Füssen entstand der Sudra."\(^{21}\)

'His mouth became the Brāhmanas, from his arms were made the Rājanya, his thighs turned into the Vaisya and from his feet the Sudra was born.'

This hymn must not be earlier than the later Vedic period, for it describes the origin of the three other Vedas from this sacrifice - \(\text{tasmāt yajñāī}....\text{Reah Śamanai Yajuh}\).\(^{22}\) Geldner says, in his gloss on this verse, that the words rājanya, vaiśya and śudra occurs here only in the entire Rg-Veda. Thus the occurrence of this verse in the four vedas may be roughly simultaneous. Probably we can situate this hymn in the spatio-temporal and ritual-political context of what Witzel has termed the 'Kuru Orthopraxy'.\(^{23}\) Here we can see the beginnings of what later crystallised as the Varṇāśramadharma ideology with the king as its upholder. Thus in Brahmanical scheme of things the origin of social order preceded that of kingship. King is the upholder of this divine social order, Manu makes it clear when he says "in order to protect this universe He assigned separate (duties and ) occupations to those who sprang from his mouth, arms, thighs and feet."\(^{24}\) This view of kingship as the enforcer of varṇāśramadharma remained the essence of Brahmanical ideology and is found in the dharmasutras, smṛtis, epics, purāṇas,

---

\(^{21}\) Geldner, K.F., *Der Rig-Veda. Aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche Uebersetzt*. Dritter Teil, Masschussets, 1951. We have given Geldner's translation because it is considered the best one.

\(^{22}\) RV, X.90.9

\(^{23}\) Witzel, M., *Das Alten Indien*, Springer, 2003 s.18

\(^{24}\) Manusmrīti, 1.87 Buhler's translation.
arthaśāstras and even the works of poets and dramatists. Sabine, in his classic account of western political ideas puts the matters in the right perspective “…..theories of politics are themselves a part of politics. They are produced as a normal part of the social milieu in which politics itself has its being. Invariably …it includes valuations and predilections, personal or collective [of its proponents].”

Derrett has made a fruitful attempt towards an interpretation of the Brahmanical ideology of kingship. After repeated examination of the Brahmanical sources, with a view to trace their historical development, Derrett has pointed out ‘eight propositions on which the entire sastra rests.’ He says that the legal rules, which include many of the detailed instructions about kingcraft ‘did not owe their origin to religion’ but paradoxically their framework is religious. The Brahmanical ideology of kingship must be, and in fact are, derivable from these 8 propositions. Indeed, these present a succinct account of Brahmanical kingship, according to the author. One must appreciate his painstaking effort in arriving at these propositions which contains some truth about the actual state of affairs. They are the following:

1. The world depends upon rain, which is produced by the sacrifices to the gods.
2. All beings require sacrifices to be performed. The teachings contained in the Vedas are eternal and sustains all creatures, who need water.
3. Sacrifices can be performed only by Brahmins, who hereditarily possess the Veda, purity and other necessary skills.

25 Beniprasad, op. cit., pp. xiviii-xlix


27 Derrett, J. D. M., Religion Law and the State in India, London, pp.97 ff
4. The Brahmin ideal ethic...must be facilitated and established. Order and good government, the protection of the people, are therefore required. Mixture of castes due to lust or greed, or mere misgovernment must be avoided. Positive patronage through charitable and especially educational endowments is inculcated.

5. The Brahmin household, protected and endowed, must continue indefinitely along with the sciences subsidiary to sacrifices (dharmasastra). Labor to cultivate the fields, and especially artisans and merchants to supply Brahmins with their various needs, must reliably perform these functions, or those similar to them. Such avocations must never afford temptation to the Brahmins to compete (they often did) against the sastra. To protect the people, and it was in Brahmin’s professional interests, ksatriya varna was needed. Brahmins were not supposed to usurp its function, if they did they lost their claim to be ideal Brahmins. The rights of property, of the family, and of inheritance must be preserved with care, particularly the relative property entitlements of the various castes. To illustrate, the king must never take Brahmin’s property, for that would invert the natural order.

6. Since all these rights are often doubted in good faith, as well as dishonestly, litigation must be contemplated and rules of law must be established, positive, substantive and adjectival. Thus the contentment and efficiency of the ideal Brahmin is secured.

7. Decisions given in courts must be based upon truthful evidence and judgement must be impartial.

8. To achieve these ends the superstitions of the public may be resorted to. Inconsistencies of philosophy are immaterial, as long as actual beliefs can be tapped. The doctrine of karma and transmigration of souls, which was held as a fact, the theory of sufferings of wrongdoers in this and future life, may be utilized. They cannot be allowed to be questioned. Dharma requires that
such beliefs shall be exploited in order that those free to act on their own initiative may have a strong sanction against dishonesty and corruption. If the civil and criminal law does not work efficiently the same sanctions operate to hinder all manner of wrongdoing. Penance was as important as punishment, and normally more degrading to the offender and his family.

**Buddhist theory of Kingship**

Tambiah has given an insightful analysis of the Buddhist canonical version of the origin of the world, society and polity.\textsuperscript{28} He says that the Buddhist genesis myth develops in two grand movements. The first states the story from the dissolution and re-formation of the world to the point of differentiation in nature and among men, and then among the latter the occurrence of increasing immorality and greed. The second movement describes men getting together, as a result, and instituting kingship to regulate their affairs. Under the shade of this institution there develops graded society. Finally, seeking deliverance from such society arises the salvation-seeking bhikkhu. The salient features of this second movement, which describe the origins of sociopolitical order in the world of men via the institution of kingship, are noteworthy:

1. the four strata of society (vannas) are described as forming after the founding of kingship itself. Society and gradations thereof develop under the umbrella of kingship which provides the shade of law and order.

2. these four vannas are described as forming according to the ‘norm’, i.e. legitimately, on a voluntaristic basis. Beings by the virtue of way of life they engage in become members of a

\textsuperscript{28} Tambiah, S.J., *World Conqueror And World Renouncer*, London, 1976 pp. 9 ff
particular stratum. Thus the lowest grade of folk who took to hunting and 'suchlike trifling pursuits' are called Suddas. In contradistinction to the Brhmanical account of the origin of social order where social division of labour is based on birth, the Buddhist 'Book of Genesis' based it on occupational followings.

3. these strata are given an ordering that places the khattiyas above the Brahmanas.

4. the last sequence describes the bhikkhu as the recluse drawn from all the four vannas irrespective of rank. He is 'chief among them all' by virtue of the norm he follows. It consists in laying down the burden, destroying the fetter of rebirth and achieving the knowledge that makes him free.

By this 'elective and contractual theory of kingship', a king is chosen by the people who is remunerated by the payment of a rice tax. He is called mahāsammata khattiya raja and is different from the Brahmanical possessor of ksatra, the Buddhist khattiya rulers and nobles are said to be khettamanam pati, who receive a tax of rice as 'lords of the field'.

Tambiah has given a synoptic 'total view' of this myth of genesis which is worth quoting in full:

It begins with a state of existence as ethereal mind and describes the evolution of the world as a process of increasing materialization, differentiation and disorder. It then postulates the institution of kingship as providing order and regulation in the world, and under whose aegis society as ordered vannas develops. Then it begins the opposite course by which a bhikkhu becomes a classless or vannaless person, breaks through the fetters of society, and follows the higher norm. His upward course is one by which salvation
from the fetters of rebirth and materiality is sought along a salvation quest that leads to the ultimate freedom of nibbana.29

There are significant sectarian differences in the Buddhist theory of kingship. Both Mahāyāna and Theravāda strands of Buddhism developed conceptions of bodhisattva, who defer their entry into nirvana to help others in the quest for liberation. The former developed in addition the figure of Avalokitesvara, who with his eleven heads and thousand hands represented and an inexhaustible repository of protection and liberality, the two min attributes of sovereignty. Theravāda on the other hand, besides its reverence for the Buddha as the compassionate teacher, assimilated ideas of bodhisattva to kingship and concentrated on the theory and norm of its cakkavatti and the righteous ruler. Through this it moved towards actual historical kingship itself, as exemplified by Aśoka and kings of SriLankan and South-East Asian Theravāda polities. Another more fundamental difference pertains to the vital issue of the relation between the saṅgha and the polity. In Theravāda the community is the saṅgha only whereas in Mahayana it includes the layfolk. The order of the bhikkhus do not need a transcendental representative of dharma but the laity does, if it forms part of the saṅgha. Thus "..for Mahayana the polity is the part of the very body of the saṅgha, whilst in Theravāda it is context only.30 In the case of Jainism, the polity is part of the fourfold Jinasamgha.

The Jaina as well as the Buddhist versions of the origin of sociopolitical order are elaborated as a response to the creation myth of the Puruṣasūkta. We saw how Jinasena and Hemacandra

29 Tambiah, S.J., op. cit., p. 14
30 Ibid, p. 39 and fn. 5 thereof.
responded to it. The Buddha is described as explicitly referring to this Rgvedic hymn in his rebuttal of the Brahmanical claim of superiority based on birth and placing khattiya in front of the Brahmanas.31

Jaina Ideology of Kingship

Date of the Jaina canons: To trace the evolution of the Jaina ideology of kingship we must have an acquaintance with the chronology of the Jaina literature-canonical as well as post-canonical.32 As is well known the post-canonical Jaina authors are relatively more careful with the dates but this is not true of their early literature and there we face the same difficulties as in the case of the Buddhists and the Brahmanas. Like their Sramanic counterparts the Jainas are said to have held many councils to compile as well as edit, and needless to say compose in the form of additions and interpolations, their sacred texts.

The first of such councils was held in Pataliputra in c.307 B.C.and is called the Pataliputra vācana /version of the canons. The second council was held at Mathura under Skandil and is called the Mathuri vācana; and another at Valabhi under Nāgārjuna, known as the Valabhi vācana. Both of these took place during 360-73 A.D.

31 Tambiah, S.J., op. cit., p. 10

Third Valabhi council, which is relatively better known, was held under Devardhigani in A.D. 513/526. He attempted to reconcile the three vācanās of the two councils, and 'taking down from the mouth of learned theologians only such works of which the manuscripts were not available.' Jacobi adds "Devardhi's edition of Siddhānta is therefore only a redaction of the sacred book which existed in nearly the same form. Any single passage in the sacred text may have been introduced by the editor, but the bulk of the siddhānta is certainly not of his making."\textsuperscript{33}

Jain says that "The Jaina canons collectively do not belong to one particular period ... the age of every part of it should be judged on its own merits..." and adds that after the patna council "the sacred books of the jainas had to undergo considerable changes and as a result of which several works or portions of the work were added to them from time to time. Finally, the canons were written down by devardhigani in the sixth century A.D. which must be taken as the latest date of the siddhānta."\textsuperscript{34}

The Jaina Cosmic System

The Jaina textual tradition presents its ideology of kingship within the framework of Jaina universal history. A brief exposition of Jaina world-view will be helpful in a proper understanding of the evolution of this ideology. The cosmic system denotes the general plan of the universe and the organization as well as the activities of its occupants as envisaged by the Jaina authors and described in the following canonical texts. The cosmographic sections of the

\textsuperscript{33} Jain, J.C., op. cit., pp. 38 and 43.
two Angas-Thāna and Samavīya, and the Upāngas-Jīvabhīgam with the Divaśagarapannatti, Pannavāna and the Jambuddivapannatti. After having a look at the Jaina notions of time and their conceptions of space we will examine their doctrine of transmigration.

The Jaina universe is uncreated and everlasting. The world (loga) is surrounded on all sides like a hollow sphere by the non-world (aloga) which is beyond reach since beyond the boundaries of the world the medium of motion is absent. Canonically the three sections of this world are called: The Lower world (ahe-loga) occupied mostly by the hell-beings, The centre world (tīrya-loga) and the Upper world (Uddha-loga). The uppermost part is the abode of the Siddhas above which the world comes to an end.

The Jambuddiva makes the surface of the tīrya-loga and is divided into seven parts called Bharaha, Videha, Eravaya, Hemavaya etc. including the Uttarakura wherein lies the Jambu tree giving the continent its name. Here we have mountains like Mandara, Hiamavanta etc and the two rivers Ganga and Sindhu with five tributaries each. On the slopes we find forests like Nandana, Pandaga etc the latter contains four sacred places (abhisega-silā) for the Cakkavattis and the Titthagaras.

---

35 All the general expositions of Jainism describe the Jaina cosmology. This section is based on the English translation of the revised edition of the celebrated Die Lehre der Jainas 1934 pp.204ff. by W. Schubring. I have choosen this work because here the Jaina cosmic system is based on an exhaustive study of the Svetambara canons. Williams evaluates it as one of the two best general works on Jainism which covers its subject “as it figures in the canonical literature, with his usual masterly concision and impeccable scholarship.” Williams, J., Jaina Yoga, OUP, London, 1963 p. xiv,
The mountains, rivers and the forests form, in equal distances, the boundaries of the empires (cakkavatti-vijaya) ruled by a cakkavatti. There are 34 of them in all. The empire of Bharaha with its geographical details is merely copied by the others.

**Saṃsāra And Siddhi**

The heterogenousness of human beings results from their karma, which penetrates the soul through the activity of body, soul and the senses. These influences (Asava) by the different passions (kasāya) of anger, pride, fraud, quarrel, love and hate etc. They are all preceded by the five main vices i.e. damage done to living beings, untruthfulness, appropriation and possession. As long as any asava is left the jiva wanders through the cycle of transmigration (samsāra).

Through asceticism, meditation and right knowledge, succinctly put as samyakadarśanajyānacaritrāni one stops and then destructs the influence of karma and finally attains siddhi. This crowning point where the road of salvation culminates and all individuality vanishes into nothing can only be attained by taking the five great monastic vows (maha-\v\vaya). These vows are unconditional and comprehensive, aptly called the ethical fundamentals of monkhood.

1. The ‘reverence towards life’-The vow asking for the preservation of life (panaivayao veramanam) comprises life manifesting itself in any form or shape, either material or immaterial, superior or inferior.

2. The vow of truthful speech (musavayao ver.) discovers sources of untruthfulness in the main passions of anger, pride, fraud and greed along with fear and joy.
3. The vow of non-appropriation (*adinnadanão ver*) comprises all that is not expressly given as a present.

4. The vow of chastity (*mehunão ver*) has a vast range including normal sexuality.

5. The vow of being void of property (*pariggahão ver*). It concerns the abandonment of all one's possessions except alms and the outfit.

The duties a layman is bound to observe must be derived from those observed by the monk and are divided into three groups. The admission of the lay estate was regarded in theory as a "stage for the preparation for the ascetic life." Their number is twelve in all and hence the texts speak of *duvalasaviha āgara-dhamma*.

A. The small vows (*anu-vvaya*). While the great vows are unconditional, they are reduced for layman to their abstaining 1. from gross (*thulaga*) offences against jivas causing death. 2. from gross untruthfulness 3. from gross appropriation 4. from adultery by contenting oneself with one's wife (*sa-dãra-samtosã*) and 5. from greed by restricting one's striving after possession (*icchã-parimãna*).

B. The three additional vows (*guna-vvaya*). 1. refraining from useless actions which may cause damage(*anattha-danda*) 2. restrictions on journeys (*disi-vvaya*) 3. moderation in eating and drinking etc. (*upabhoga-paribhoga-parimãna*).

C. The four strengthening vows (*sikkhã-vvaya*) 1. *samaïya* is inward balance and everyday acts of devotion. 2. *desavagãsiya* means self limitation of one's dwelling and occupation area. 3. *posahovavãsa* is certain days of fasting in each fortnight and 4. *atihi-samvibhãga*.

In *samlehanã* the layman is at par with monks but it is voluntary not a duty.

---

36 Williams, R., op. cit., p. xvi
The monk and the nun who have come to be free from the four obscuring kinds of karma are in possession of omnicognition (kevala-nāna), however still some asaya is left. After the last remainders of karma have been annihilated the soul leaves its casing and reaches the abode of the siddhas. This process is known as nivvāna or siddhi or mutti. The siddhas are soul, soul pure and simple. This boundless realization of the nature of the soul alone conveys the notion of "eternal bliss."

The Jaina version of the Origin of the Socio-political order

The Canonical depiction of the origin of Sociopolitical order: The Jaina canons conceptualizes time by the symbol of a twelve-spoked wheel. Incessantly this wheel of time revolves from the paradisical to the catastrophic period. And back to the former, ceaselessly passing through the time denoting the present. Every half-course contains 6 periods wherein the condition of the world either deteriorates (osappini) or improves to perfection (ussappini). In the third period of ‘good-bad’ (susamā-dusamā), the legislators and founders of civilization (Kulagara) made their appearance in the southernmost continent of Bharaha of the Jambuddiva. The number of kulagaras are 7 in Thanānga and Samavāyaṅga or 15 in Jambuddivapannatti. Their names are: Sumai, Padissui, Simāṅkara, Simāṃdhara, Khemaṃdhara, Vimalavāhana, Cakkhumam, Jasamam, Abhicanada, candabha, pasenai, Marudeva, and Nabhi. The Jambuddiva unnecessarily adds the name of first Titthagara Usabha making it 15. These 14 are modeled after the example of the 14 Manu of Brahmanical tradition. Due to environmental changes

37 For the details of this section see Schubring, W., op.cit., pp. 18ff.
inevitable in bad times the Kulagaras introduced punishments (danad-nī) of admonition (hakkāra), warning (makkāra) and reprimand (dhikkāra). Every new kind was introduced by the sixth and eleventh kulagara. The means of the dandanī are sāma, bheya and danda says Thānāṅga.

Samavāyāṅga gives the names of the 12 cakkavattis and also distinguishes them by body size. The Jambuddiva. III gives detailed description of the career of first cakkavatti Bharaha, the son of first Titthagara Usabha. With the help of 14 jewels he conquers the entire continent and is called cauranta-cakkavatti. After a long reign Bharaha obtains kevala-nāṇa and enters the Nirvana on the Atthavaya mountain. This career is typical of all cakkavattis for Thānāṅga, says that they all gain the 14 jewels.

Schubring gives the names found in the svetambara canons: Bharaha, Sagara, Meghavam, Sanamkumāra, Sānti, Kunthu, Ara, Subhuma, Mahāpauma, Harisena, Jayanāma or Jayasena, Bambhadatta. The 5th-7th cakkavattis were also the 16th-18th Titthagaras.

For all practical purposes here we encounter the Jaina ideology of kingship in a complete form. Only a layman can be a king and a king must behave like a layman. In order to attain salvation the Jaina king must renounce his throne and take the five great monastic vows. As we shall notice these remain the fundamental tenets of kingship even in later traditions.

The Post-Canonical Tradition

---

38 For deviations of the Digambaras see Schubring, W., op. cit., p.22 footnote 2.
The Jaina versions of universal history is probably based on the Brahmanical *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* tradition. At any rate, these incorporate the popular mythological figures of the Brahmanical tradition. The chronological uncertainty of the texts makes it very difficult to determine the direction of borrowing.

Among the most comprehensive and best known is Hemacandra’s *Trīṣaṭīśalākāpurusācaritra*. Jinasena’s *Ādipurāṇa* is the most famous Digambara version of universal history. He could not finish the massive text and it was completed by one of his disciples. J.P. Jain gives the relative chronology of Jinasena as A.D. 770-850.39 Besides Hemacandra’s work we have many other Svetambar texts dealing with world history, relatively less known among them is Śīlaṅka’s *Cauppamamahapurīsacariya* finished in *samvat* 92540 or 866-67 A.D. This text is significant because it is the first Śvetāmbara version of universal history.41 Moreover it cannot be later than the 9th c.A.D. *Ādipurāṇa*, therefore Ghoshal’s assertion that the latter presents the first systematic version of Jaina world history must be modified. As noted above Śvetāmbara canons give a unified account of universal history including that of political institutions.

The Post-canonical Śvetāmbara version: According to *TSPC* and the *CMC* during an early period various *Kalpavṛkṣas* gave enough food, clothes, house, music etc. without any effort. Later due to the degeneration of time these wish-fulfilling trees became inadequate in supplying the basic necessities of life. At that time human beings developed a sense of attachment (*rāga*) to the *kalpavṛkṣas* ‘as if these were parts of their body.’ If someone took shelter under another’s


41 Ibid., p.7 fn. 1
tree, the later was unable to tolerate this (dveṣa). For a solution they went to Vimalavāhana, the first Kulakara, who distributed the kalpavrskas 'like an old man distributing the wealth among his family.' He instituted the policy (daṇḍaniti) of 'ḥākāra-Ah! You did this.' to prevent and restore the transgressions of his property laws. With the passage of time there was a progressive increment in the passions (kaśāya), and the ḥākāra proved inadequate for social order. The twins ignored it like 'an elephant on ichor ignores the goad.' The later Kulakaras had to take recourse to policies of increasing severity- 'mākāra-Do not do this' and 'Dhikkara-Shame on you, you did this!'

The seven Kulakaras are:

**TSPC**  **CMC** (Gives Prakrit form of the names)

1. Vimalavāhana  
2. Caksusmāna  
3. Yaśasvi  
4. Abhicandra  
5. Prasenajita  
6. Marudeva  
7. Nābhi

Still later the efficacy of the kalpavrkṣas declined 'like the splendour of the torches at daybreak.' With the further growth of anger, deceit, love, hate etc the threefold daṇḍaniti proved inadequate for the humans 'just as rogue elephants disregard their threefold control'. In
this state of distress they approached Nabhi the seventh and last kulakara who advised them to choose his son Rsabh as their King to punish the wrongdoers.42

Thus according to the ‘great tradition’ of the Śvetāmabaras, limited availability of ‘nature’s bounty’ and growth of passions among human beings are held responsible for the origin of kingship. This reminds us of Hobbe’s grounding of political institutions in man’s evil nature. Our examination confirms Beniprasad’s opinion “In the Jaina account, government is not constituted by any definite contract. Pre-eminence on one side and need of guidance on the other establish a certain relationship. In course of time, as necessity demands, this informal relationship is converted into one of rulers and ruled.”43

The first Jaina king laid the foundation of monarchy and of civil and military administration consisting of ministers, the four-fold army, the court procedures, the nitiśāstra and various forms of punishments (daṇḍa). Besides teaching the methods of agriculture he created the four crafts of pot-making, carpentry, weaving and barberly.44 He gave the people knowledge of archery, arthaśāstra, scripts, mathematics and of arts like painting etc. Rsabha is said to have created social institutions like different rights of passage such as cudākarma, upanayana and vivāha. The first Jaina ruler divided the people into four groups. The ugrakulas were assigned the task of giving punishment, members of bhogakulas were his ministers etc. Rajanyas were

42 TSPC I.2.140-200. CMC pp.6-10, 37.
43 Beniprasad, op. cit., pp.224-5.
44 TSPC, I.2;947-59
his companions and the rest constituted the fourth group of the ksatriyas. The first Jaina monarch taught the spiritual path of mendicancy. After renouncing the kingdom, he put off all signs of royalty and took the five great vows. Ṛṣabha founded the fourfold assembly (caturvidha saṅgha) of śrāvaka, śrāvakī, sādhu and sādhvi. He is also the first Tirthankara of the Jainas. Hemacandra succinctly puts his role as the teacher par excellence and the founder of civilization by saying that without Ṛṣabha man would have behaved like animals. In this role the Jaina king is different from his Brahmanical counterpart who is the protector and upholder of existing social order. Later his son Bharata, the first cakravartin created the Brahmans out of the sravakas who were committed to the observance of the twelve vows. He drew on their body three lines representing samyakdarśanajñanarcaritrāṇi (later to be replaced by the sacred thread) and called them mahānas which later became Brahmana.

Differences in The Digambara Tradition

The Ādiṣṭhāna differs from the śvetāmbara texts mainly in its explicit borrowings from the Brahmanical usages as well as textual traditions. Jinasena is less cautious than Hemacandra in both his borrowings from the Brahmans- his account of the origin of four varṇas is virtually a paraphrasing of the Puruṣasūkta of the Rgveda, and in his denouncing of them – the Brahmans are called aksaramlecchas who must be deprived of privileges like dana, exemption from taxation etc. But in the same breath Jinasena claims these very privileges for the Jaina

45 TSPC, I:2.974-76
Brahmanas! He says that Rsabha instituted the order of ksatriyas with weapons in hands. He brought the Vaisyas into being from the thighs indicating the way of travel symbolizing trade. With his feet he created the Sudras. Beniprasad rightly says "the Adipurana makes a rather clumsy attempt to approximate its account to the orthodox Hindu versions of the Purusasukta of the Rigveda."  

The Adipurana gives a list of 14 kulakaras called manu beginning with Pratisruti, fifth was Simantak and Simamdhara being the sixth. Their first king is called srasta, adikarita etc. Jinasena 'is the final participant in a process of lore making going back to Rsabha himself, the first Tirthankara, who recited the Adipurana to his son Bharata. Neither the TSPC nor the CMC claims such status.

**Jinadharma And Jaina Kingship**

The fundamental tenets of the Jaina religion remains the same in the post canonical literature. However it was not without minor changes like the addition of 14 gunasthana etc. Here we shall examine how different precepts of Jinadharma shapes the nature and functions of Jaina

---


49 Ibid, p. 225


51 For Hemacandra’s description of jinadharma see TSPC, I:1.152-200. For a good discussion of the sravakavratas and the mendicant path see Jaini, P.S., The Jaina path of Purification, Delhi, 1990 pp.157ff and pp.241ff respectively.

52 Schubring, W., op. cit., p323, 325.
kingship. The doctrine of ahimsa mitigates the severity of danda in kingcraft—binding, beating, breaking of limbs, cruel punishments etc. of no one took place, while: he, the essence of command ruled the earth."\(^{53}\) The Jaina rulers managed without even a frown. The king “did not strike his people at all, even with a flower stock; he only guarded them like a new flower.” Another jaina monarch “did not become angry at anyone and protected the earth like the moon which lights up everything without harshness.”\(^ {54}\) Hemacandra advocates the policy of taxation without vexation. A “jaina ruler like a herdsman took proper care of the earth like a cow. He took taxes like milk at the right time, without any injury.” He was “very magnificent, did not oppress his people with taxes.”\(^ {55}\) During the 12 year coronation ceremony of every cakravartin a tax holiday was used to be declared, during which the capital was free from bhumi-kara.\(^ {56}\)

Now see the role of dāna in the Jaina ideology of kingship. The TSPC represents Jaina rulers as a kalpavrksa for the beggars. On the eve of pravajyā the cakravartins gave dāna for 12 months. So much gift was given to the poor and the orphans that ‘no one remained poor in the city.’\(^ {57}\) The Jaina kings protected the subjects like their own offsprings. They took away the pain from the afflicted. Their rule was like rain for the subject-peacock. Hemacandra expresses missionary zeal in these words—“even the praja followed the right path like a chariot driven by a good driver......because the people were free from quarrels and friendly to each other, the

\(^ {53}\) TSPC, Johnson’s tr. Vol. 4 p.11

\(^ {54}\) Ibid. vol.3 p.163 and vol. 4 p.12

\(^ {55}\) Ibid. vol. 3, p.164 , 390.

\(^ {56}\) TSPC, I:4.690-700.

\(^ {57}\) Ibid., I:3.17-25.
whole earth was like a monastic retreat."\(^5^8\) Hemacandra depicts kings as the most devout followers of Jainism, always engaged in the practice and propagation thereof—"dharma attendance on whom was never abandoned, neither on the throne, nor on the couch, neither in the city nor outside, it was like a friend of his." King Sura is described as "dharma alone dwelt in his heart like a second soul; wealth and love remained outside like a body." An ideal Jaina kingdom is represented in these words—"In its shrines dharma constantly rejoiced. In the royal palaces, in the houses of the people, in the gateways and other places—all that was filled with images of the Arhatas like the sky with planets."\(^5^9\)

Hemacandra constantly reminds of the dangers of kingship, especially to the moral condition of king’s soul. The \textit{raija\acute{\textit{lak\textasciitilde{}}}smi}\(^7^7\) is the obstacle between the king and his salvation. Therefore Jaina rulers are strongly advised to be cautious "just as he watched the twelfifold royal circle (\textit{rajacakra}) so he observed twelve vows of a layman (\textit{dv\textasciitilde{a}dasar\textasciitilde{a}\textit{vaka\textasciitilde{v}}rati\text{\textsc{\textasciitilde{n}}i}}). Just as he conquered the external enemies—though difficult to subjugate—so he, efficient in both spheres, conquered internal enemies (\textit{ka\textasciitilde{\textsc{\textasciitilde{a}}}\textit{yas}}).\(^6^0\) Hemacandra warns the Jaina kings to remain aloof from the pleasures of sovereignty, they should "enjoy sensual pleasures without injury to dharma......[they were] experiencing pleasures without devotion to them like an ascetic consuming food."\(^6^1\) The ideal Jaina rulers must "take the vows after abandoning the

\(^{58}\) TSPC, vol.4, p.11

\(^{59}\) TSPC, vol 4., p.12 and 2.

\(^{60}\) Ibid. vol. 6, p.253 \textit{rajacakra} is same as \textit{rajam\textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{d}}ala}.

\(^{61}\) TSPC, vol 3, p.164, vol. 5, p.28 , vol. 4, p.1
sovereignty like a straw.” The following extract of *TSPC* is a good illustration of nature and function of Jaina kingship:

[the ideal rulers] took the twelvefold vows of a layman under a muni, spent time holding astahnikā festivals in the temple of the Arhatas ....... giving presents to sadhus, taking away pain from the afflicted, meditating, keeping posadha in the pausadhaśāla near the temple....... to them the matchless jinadharma was dear, they daily worshipped the Arhatas ...... enlightened by a muni, installed their sons on the throne and took to mendicancy [to attain nirvāṇa].

A thorough examination of the *TSPC* reveals that an ideal Jaina ruler is an ideal Jaina layman, in his personal conduct as well as royal policies. A Jaina king takes the 12 vows of a sravaka and towards the end, he must renounce everything and take the 5 great vows of a monk to attain salvation. Thus Cort rightly concurs with Babb and Dundas that “for Jaina ideologues the institution of kingship is at best suspect and imperfect.”

**Jaina Laymen as War Heroes**

We have seen how the supreme Jaina doctrine of ahimsa mitigates the cruelty of punishment and oppressive rates of taxation and Hemacandra has portrayed Jaina Cakravartins as completing their digviajaya without firing a shot. This emphasis on ahimsa determines the textual depiction of Jaina statecraft in Śvetāmbara as well as Digambara versions. The

---

62 *TSPC*, vol. 3 pp.207ff here I have summarized a narrative without altering Hemacandra’s words.

inscriptions issued from Sravanabelagola, the most sacred shrine of the Digambaras, tell an altogether different story. Their representation is near to actual state of affairs and sets the historical record straight by rectifying the Jaina textual traditions.\textsuperscript{64}

The Kundlur plates (A.D. 962-63) of Marasimha II satyavākya, the famous western Ganga ruler who might actually have performed sallekhana, naturally extols his promotion of jināśāsana during his rule and depicts him as \\textit{srijinarajaracaranarasiruhhamadhukarayamāna}. But at the same time, this epigraph vividly describes his successes in fierce battles “he was the beloved of the goddess of heroism abiding in his sword which was fond of sporting in the lakelike battlefield adorned with the assemblage of lotuslike severed heads and filled with the blood gussing out from the wounds of brave warriors…. \textit{rudhiradhārāpravāhāpūritanikarasisaroruhamanditītatibhīmasamgrāma}.”

It glorifies him as the sun who brings utter destruction to his enemies-\	extit{martandaivapracandariputimirasandakhandasaunditarapratap}.

These inscriptions describe Camundaraya (A.D. 979-993) as another paragon of Jainism. This devout Jaina layman built the famous statue of Gommata at Belagola and is credited with having written the kannada version of the \textit{Ādirūpāna}. He was given epithets like \textit{samyaktvaratnākara, satayudhiṁśthīra, saucābharaṇa} as well as \textit{samardhurandhara, pratipaksarāksasa} and \textit{bhatamāri}. The memorial inscriptions describe how his bloody fights offered a feast for the goblins, who revelled in drinking the blood of warriors from ‘the jewelled cup-the skull of heroes’.

\textsuperscript{64} For details and references see M. Phil. Diss. pp. 77ff
The Cakravartin in Indian Traditions

The concept of a universal monarch lording over the entire subcontinent was the highest ideal of kingship in all traditions of Indian thought-Brahmanical, Buddhist as well as the Jaina. To achieve this coveted status has been the ideal of every king big and small. Moreover this concept is well integrated in the universal histories of the Brahmanas, the Buddhists and the Jainas. Therefore it can be said that the notion of cakravartin is the ideology of kingship par excellance. In our opinion without a comparative-historical understanding of the origin and development of this concept i.e. the evolution of the concept cakravartin, any study of the political ideas and institutions in early India will be incomplete. Needless to say, a comprehensive understanding of this topic is enough to consume a lifetime of dedicated work. Our survey will be indicative of a possibility, not the outcome of a project, and confined to the textual traditions.

The word cakravartin means “a ruler the wheels of whose chariot roll everywhere without obstruction, emperor, sovereign of the world.”65 The idea of universal conquest occurs in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa which refers to the celebration of 1000 asvamedhas by Bharata, son of Dusyanta, after having conquered the whole earth-vijitya prthivim sarvam.66 The word cakravartin occurs as early as the Maitri Upanisad.67 Its synonym68 was Sarvabhauma meaning ‘lord of the whole earth’. This word already occurs in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and Aitareya

66 Sircar, D. C., The Emperor and the subordinate Ruler. Santiniketan, 1982 p.7fn 4
67 Gonda, J., op. cit., p.123.
68 Amarakośa, 1.3.4; 2.8.2
Brahmana in the sense of an emperor, universal monarch.\(^{69}\) \(\text{Paninī (5.1.41-42)}\) explains this word as ‘śārvabhūmeḥ ḛīvarah.’\(^{70}\) One of the most explicit formulations of an emperor wielding suzerainty over the entire Indian sub-continent occurs in the Arthasastra-deśaḥ prithivi tasyām himavatsamudrāntaram yojanasahasraparimānam tiryak cakravartī-ḳṣetram.\(^{71}\) By the Mauryan times it was no longer only the highest ideal of kingship, Asokan edicts refers to his empire as jambudvīpa and prthivi both meaning ‘the earth.’\(^{72}\)

That the idea of a cakravartin predates the Mauryas is supported by historians. Drekmeier says “The concept of a state spanning the length and breadth of the subcontinent under the rule of a Chakravartin goes back at least to the tenth century B.C.”\(^{73}\)

Inden says “…the idea of a cakravartin appeared before the time of the Mauryas.”\(^{74}\) Tambiah is certain that the Buddhist canons which are earlier than the Mauryan period provided the model of kingship for Asoka.\(^{75}\) Sircar is careful “…it is possible that the sections of the satapatha and Aitareya Brahmanas are later interpolations in the old works…”\(^{76}\) T.W. Rhys Davids says that the Buddhist conceptions

\(^{69}\) Monier-Williams, Sanskrit English Dictionary, p.1210

\(^{70}\) Katre, S. M, Astadhyayi of Panini, 1988


\(^{72}\) Sircar, D.C., op. cit., p.8 fn. 2

\(^{73}\) Drekmeier, C., Kingship And Community In Early India, California, 1962 p. 203


\(^{75}\) Tambiah, S. J., op. cit., pp. 54 ff
of a cakkavatti was known in the Pre-Mauryan times but "assumed its present form after the notorious career of Candragupta made him supreme in the valley of the Ganges." R. Thapar says that the idea of a cakravartin was known but not a 'fully developed political concept' before the mauryan period. To think that the idea of a cakravartin must come to consciousness only after an empire comes into material existence amounts to saying that the thought of soaring high into the sky must necessarily come only after the invention of aeroplanes!

Wijesekera points out the complex origin of the concept of cakravartin. He says that the cakravartin is one who causes the rotating of the wheel. Indra is represented in the Rgveda as wielder of cakra against his foes and as one who helps the cakra to roll forward. In early Palitexts it symbolizes the militaristic power of a conquering hero. He further says that the wheel as symbol of cakravartin’s universal sovereignty has an antecedent in Indra’s cakra of conquering might and paramount dominion.

The cakravarti is a conquering hero who performs the digvijaya of the whole subcontinent called prthivi or Jambudvipa or a delimited part thereof envisaged as the cakravarti-kṣetra. This popular tradition was adapted to suit the dogmatic needs of Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jaina soteriologies. As we shall see, this later Vedic notion with still recognizable elements of Rgveda, was borrowed and worked over by the Buddhists, The Jainas as well as the Brahmanas themselves upto the period of the Magadhan Empire. The final form in which we find it today is

---

76 Sircar, D. C., op. cit., p.8
77 Buddhist Suttas, Introduction p. xix
78 Thapar, R., Asoka and the Decline of the Mauryas, New Delhi, 1973 p.146
a result of a complex interaction among the three traditions of thought. This hypothesis gets support if we examine the various themes of the cakravartin narratives e. g., the 14 jewels, bodily marks etc. After noting the similarities we shall also note the differences among the three traditions.

The emblems of royalty

During the later Vedic period the entourage ratnin of the king were considered to be able to enhance the power of their possessor. Persons called ratnis may be considered to be the ruler’s most valuable assets. We find them in the Brahmanas in the context of Rājasiṣṭha and Vajapeya sacrifices. The MahāSudassana Sutta says that a cakkavattirāja possesses seven royal treasures.

A comparison of their names with those found in the Buddhist sources is instructive:

Table-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Brāhmaṇas</th>
<th>The Dīgha-nikāya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Satpatha and Tatt.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Purohita</td>
<td>1. Cakka ratnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rājanya</td>
<td>2. Hatthi ratnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Paṭṭa mahiṣi</td>
<td>3. Assa ratnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Itthi ratnam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80 Gonda, J., op. cit., p.38
81 Buddhist Suttas, pp.257-59
The *Grāmaṇi* was a *Vaisya* and an oblation to his house put the king in possession of food. In a functional sense he can be compared with the *gahapati*, both supported the king with material resources. *Rājanya* is the crown prince equivalent to *Parināyaka ratnam* of the Buddhists. He was the eldest son of the king according to Buddhaghosa and the *Lalitavistāra* makes him a general, does not this tell its own story. *Itthi ratnam* is the Queen of the later vedic sources. When we think of the importance of these to any ruler *Tatt. Br.* is literally true that these persons “bestow kingship upon the king-eta vai rastraya pradatarah.” Tambiah makes a wrong comparison when he says “such pragmatic discussion of the seven elements [arthaśāstra] should be compared with the notion of the seven treasures of the cakkavattī postulated in the Buddhist literature.”

Without doubt these ideas later metamorphosed into the 14 jewels of a Cakravartin. This much is clear when we compare the Brahmanical and the Jaina sources.

Table -2.

---

82 Gonda, J., op. cit., p.38

83 *Buddhist Suttas*, p.259

84 Gonda, J., op. cit., p.39

85 Tambiah, S. J., op. cit., p. 31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Vayupurāṇa</th>
<th>CMC/Jambudd.III</th>
<th>TSPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cakram</td>
<td>Cakkam</td>
<td>cakram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Khaḍga</td>
<td>Khagga</td>
<td>khaḍga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dhanu/carma</td>
<td>Camma</td>
<td>carma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mani</td>
<td>mani</td>
<td>Mani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ratha</td>
<td>Danda</td>
<td>danda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ketu</td>
<td>Chattam</td>
<td>chatra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nidhi</td>
<td>Kāgani</td>
<td>Kāgini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Purohita</td>
<td>Purohiya</td>
<td>purohita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Senāni</td>
<td>Senāvai</td>
<td>Senāpati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bhāryā</td>
<td>Itthi</td>
<td>Strī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Asva</td>
<td>Hao</td>
<td>Aśva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Kalabha</td>
<td>Ḫatthi</td>
<td>Gaja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Mantri</td>
<td>Vaddhai</td>
<td>Vardhaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rathakṛc</td>
<td>Gahavai</td>
<td>Ghapati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These *ratnas* (Prakrt. *Rayanam*) helps a cakravartin at various stages of his career, particularly during *Digvijaya*, indeed by dint of these he is able to complete 'conquest of the quarters'. These emblems of royalty are a sine qua non of cakravartiship in all three traditions. Thus these

---

86 Tambiah, S. J., op. cit., p.44

87 The *TSPC* gives only the Sanskrit names of the canonical list for which see Schubring, op. cit., p.21 This list appears on p.55 of the *CMC*. 
give universal sovereignty to a cakravartin like the vedic Ratnins who “bestow kingship upon [the king] etevai rastrasya pradātāraḥ.”

Instead of the Nidhi ratna of the Vāyupurāṇa the Jaina canons has 9 treasures (nihi).88

Here we have an instance of mutual reciprocity between the Brahmanical and the Jaina sources.

**Laksanas of a mahāpuruṣa**

Certain bodily marks, dreams and miracles at the time of birth are tokens of a great man-a cakkavatti or Jina or the Buddha- in all the three traditions of Indian thought. Like the Buddha a cakkavatti possesses 32 auspicious marks on his body. The mahāpadāna sutta describes that a cakkavatti’s birth is attended by the same miracles as that of the Buddha.89 The Brahmanical Purāṇas e. g., the Vāyu, Mātysya, Brahmāṇda etc. tell that the body of a mahāpuruṣa is characterized by the 32 auspicious marks. Some of them are- a śrīvatsa on the breast, a cakra and fish on the feet, and on his palms a cakravartin possesses the conch-shell and the lotus.90

The TSPC says that a cakravartin is born with ‘all the auspicious marks on his body’ one of them being a srivatsa on the chest.91 The first c.A.D. Buddhacarita says that the Brahmanas after having considered the tokens, said to his father “...according to the signs found on this excellent one , he will certainly become either an enlightened seer or a cakravartin monarch...”92 The Jainas added the motif of dreams into this saga. The TSPC mentions that

---

88 Schubring, W., op. cit., p.21
89 Gonda, J., op. cit., pp.60-61.
90 Ibid., pp. 92-93
91 TSPC, Tr., vol. 5,p.331
92 Buddhacarita, 1.34 Text and Tr. By E.H. Johnson, Delhi, 1972
when a queen sees the 14 great dreams, the astrologers say to her “your son will be either a cakravartin or a Tirthanakara according to these dreams.”

Conquest of the Quarters (Digvijaya)

The Buddhist sources describe that cakkavattiraja Sudassana conquered the four quarters by dhamma not by sword (one is reminded of Asoka’s famous substitution of bherighosa by dhammadgosa). After sprinkling water over the cakkaratnam, Sudassana said “Roll onward, O my lord, the wheel! O my lord, go forth and overcome.” Then all the rival kings of the region of east, thereafter south etc., come to him and say “Come, O mighty king! Welcome, O mighty king! All is thine…..Do thou….be a teacher to us!” Then Sudassan said to them- “ye shall slay no living thing. Ye shall not take what has not been given etc.” In this fashion the cakkavatti of the Buddhist tradition, the possessor of the seven ratnas conquered “the whole earth to its very ocean boundary.”

The jaina yuddha: War minus the shooting

Jaini says “the greatest teaching of the Jina -Ahimsā is of paramount importance to every Jaina……. It is a serious indictment of a tradition so closely associated with the idea of non-violence that it could have remained ambivalent, or at best non-committal on the subject of warfare.” Dundas agrees “ In fact, Jainism has always been ambivalent towards war” and

93 TSPC, I:2.207-48
94 This reminds us of the Rgvedic representation of Indra with his cakra. See above.
95 Buddhist Suttas, pp.252-54
96 Jaini, P., op.cit., 312-13
refers to the bafflement expressed by historians at the incongruity involved in this. Here we shall see how the learned Jaina monks attempt to reconcile the diametrically opposite doctrines of ahimsa ‘a must’ for the Jaina kings and large scale bloodshed which is inherent in any practice of kingcraft.

The ideal Jaina cakravartins accomplish their digvijaya without recourse to violence. They gain the power of victory by observing various ascetic practices like the pausadha fast etc. and celebrate their victory by observing many Jaina festivals like the asfāñikā. Hemacandra says “wishing to conquer without any injury being inflicted, the lord sat on the excellent lion-throne.....concentrating without harshness” one after another the kings of the four quarters comes to the Jaina caktavartins and submits. In this way they become the paramount overlord of the Bharatakṣetra (cauranta cakkavatti) without firing a shot.

When Bahubali, younger brother of Bharata face one another in the battlefield, because the former refused to submit during the latter’s digvijaya, they ordered their armies to retreat to avoid great destruction of lives which takes place during any adham yuddha. They decided to wage a ‘uttima jujja’ where one fights with speech, gaze etc to avoid himsā , to use Silānika’s memorable phrase ‘ditthijujjham vāyajujjham bāhāhim muṭṭhihi đamdehi.’ In this single handed non violent combat Bahubali routs Bharata but instead of killing his brother conquers

---

97 Dundas, P., op. cit., p.174
98 TSPC, I:4.80-154
99 Ibid., V:5.130-70
100 CMC, p.47 For Sanskrit version of whole affair see TSPC, I:4.471-517
the greed of sovereignty and renounces its pleasures. Hemacandra puts these words in Bāhubali's mouth " Monarchs acquires kingdoms and enjoy the pleasures thereof as they wish. But like wine one can not be satisfied with rajyalaksmi, she is infidel and dark like the night of amāvasyā......she must be renounced, as was done by father Rsabha." He uprooted his hairs with fists and took the kāyotsargadhyāna in the battlefield itself. This uttimajujjha is said to be the inspiration Čāvundarāya's erection of the colossus of Bāhubali at Sravanabelagola.

The Jaina authors condemn the Brahmanical depiction of a digvijaya and thereby like the Buddhists the real ways in which kingdoms are acquired. The digvijaya of Brahmadatta and Subhuma, two of the 12 Jaina cakravartins illustrates this. Brahmadattaacakākathā is popular among Jaina authors. Subhuma's digvijaya presents 'the other' of the uttama yuddha and is worth quoting in full:

Making new rivers flow with the blood of the masses of destroyed kings, elephants, horses and infantry, he conquered the east first. With the ground adorned with the trunks of many soldiers cut down, he crossed the south like Yama....Making the ocean's shore bristle with soldiers bones like oyster-shells, he conquered the west. With the surface of the ground spread with a mass of blood spurting up, he destroyed the mlecchas there like elephant the sugarcane....extirpating the living beings in this way, huis soul always blazing with the fire of constant cruel meditation, Subhuma died and went to the seventh [the lowest] hell.

---

101 TSPC, I:5.725-55 ; CMC pp.46-47
102 Dundas, P., op. cit., p.176  But see also Schubring p.22
103 TSPC, vol.V , Translator's introduction, p.XXVIII
104 TSPC, vol. IV, pp.47-48 ; CMC, 165-67
Theology and the ideology of kingship

Theological differences between the three traditions, particularly the fundamental difference in the concept of god among them, profoundly influenced their ideologies of kingship. The Jain understanding of the nature of god (Jina, Arhata, Tirthankara) as fundamentally and totally absent from the earthly realm meant that the Jain cakravartins, like their Buddhist counterparts were quite different from Vaisnava or Saiva ones, where the cakravartin was an emanation of the divine. Hemacandra’s god was viññarāga i.e. one who has overcome all passions and has thus overcome all intentionality. God is not active nor even present in this world, he desires nothing nor even to help his devotees. Cort rightly points out “this theological definition of god as inactive served to reorient the cosmogical axis of the ideal king. The Jaina king was a leader of the congregation of Jaina devotees (sāṅghapati) rather than a divine emanation.”

For Jaina kings the absent lord was the ‘exemplary other.’ As we saw the Jaina king is a teacher par excellence. The Mahāvīra-carita says about Kumārapāla — “49. He will make people like unto himself, firm in the fulfillment of the law, as a wise teacher trains a good people. 61. ..he, who knows the general principles, the doctrine of jiva and ajiva and so forth, will, like a teacher, procure enlightenment for others also”

On the other hand the Brahmanical discourses of bhakti and avātāra blurred this distinction. “the puranical accounts hold that cakravartins are partial incarnation (aṃśāvatāra) of Viṣṇu.” The puranic narratives give not one but many scenarios and technologies through which a god, either Viṣṇu or Śiva makes himself partially or

---

105 Cort, J.E. op.cit., pp.101-02


107 Gonda, J., op. cit., pp. 92, 123.
wholly present in the world of men to effect his will.\textsuperscript{108} Thus in contradistinction to Buddhism and Jainism the Brahmanical cakravartin participated in the very being of the deity, Visnu or Śiva who is the ultimate overlord of the cosmos. Inden means the same "...but I would not want to impose this notion on a polity whose king took the Buddha as the cosmic overlord, for the gods in Buddhism were hardly accorded the same ontological status that they have in Vaiṣṇava or Śaiva religious orders. There is even difficulty in talking about the Buddha as a cosmic overlord in the same way that Vaiṣṇavas or Saivas do."\textsuperscript{109} In Jainism, a monk occupies the 6\textsuperscript{th} stage in the hierarchy of gunasthānas (14 stages on the road to salvation) whereas the king as a śrāvaka is toiling at the 5\textsuperscript{th}. Thus he is inferior to even a Jaina monk not to talk of Tirthankaras. In the Brahmanical discourses of kingship we expect to find different shades of opinion in its long course of evolution. To give one example, Basham has found two concepts of kingship in the Brahmanical ideology. The first makes the king a divinely appointed figure, but appointed by the will of the people e.g., in Manusmṛti. According to the second the king is an entirely divine figure where Visnu is said to have created the first king.\textsuperscript{110} However, this ‘divine origin’ is a later conception in the Brahmanical ideology of kingship. Lingat points out “Certain verses in the dharma-sastras attribute a divine origin to the king himself....This conception is foreign to the dharma-sutras."\textsuperscript{111} As witnessed above by the period of the Puranas a further shift took place within the Brahmanical ideology of kingship


\textsuperscript{109} Inden, R., op. cit., p.269


\textsuperscript{111} Lingat, R., \textit{The Classical Law of India}, Berkeley, 1973, p.208
itself. Now the king was no longer a creation of god, he was god himself. Even 'partial or incomplete cakravartins' like the Hoyasala king Viṣṇuvardhana (A.D 1108-42) is called the '11th avatāra of Viṣṇu.'

Tambiah has this to say about the Buddhist ideology of kingship and its relation to the Brahmanical version of it:

The Buddhist picture of the genesis of the world, society, and kingship is a studied and ironical reversal of certain aspects of the Brahmanical version that stems from the vedic times; but the Buddhist intention is more than simply ironical, for it aspires to generate a rival and wholly different scheme of meaning although sharing with Hinduism certain elementary and philosophical and conceptual particles.

Same can be said about the Jainas. To sum up our findings about Jaina ideology of kingship, a Jaina king is someone who not only diligently follows the 12 vows of a layman in his personal conduct, but also tries to enforce the same throughout his realm. This of course includes the non-Jainas, who are castigated as followers of false doctrines (mithyātva), and this includes the Buddhists. Patronage to Jaina groups and institutions and propagation of the Jinadharma are the most important among them. Towards the end of his reign he must take the 5 great vows of a monk, after renouncing everything, to attain salvation. This canonical and post-canonical ideology of Jaina kingship exactly fits the representations of Kumārapāla (A.D. 1144-72), the Caulukya king of Gujarat. After an examination of his biographies Cort says "the narratives of Kumārapāla indicate that Jaina theories also represent a different and distinctive theory of

112 Rice, B.L., ed. Mysore Inscriptions, 1878 no.146 p.260
113 Tambiah, op. cit., p. 19
114 Williams, R., op. cit., p. 41
The Jaina authors depict as someone who strictly enforced the 12 vows of a layman throughout the length and breadth of his realm, the Brahmanas were one of the main groups of non-believers at the receiving end of his rajasanas. Buhler says the DKV of Hemacandra shows that “Kumarapala strove after making Gujarat, in certain respects, a model Jaina state…” and concludes himself “…the edicts against the killing of animals, against spirituous drinks and against betting and playing at stakes were successfully enforced and thus some of the most important tenets of Jainism came to be rooted into the life of everyone [our italics].” Thus the Caulukyan state under Kumārapāla ‘dictated the form of salvation’ to use Drekmeier’s words. And this is in contradiction to ‘Hindu political thought which recognized the right to pursue that which is necessary to salvation’ and thus the Hindu polity can be said to “exist to ensure that each man is permitted to find his salvation in his own way…” as pointed out by the same author in his classical work. If the Jaina depictions of Kumārapāla can be found to be accurate then the Caulukyan state under him became theocratic, it was no longer secular. But Beniprasad puts the matter in right perspective when he says “From what he [Kumarapala] does appears the author’s idea of what a government ought to do.”

For a proper understanding of the genesis and development of the theory of kingship in early India we must attempt a comparative study of the three traditions. In some important matters the

115 Cort, J.E., op. cit., p. 86

116 Buhler, G., op. cit., pp. 43 and 47 respectively.

117 Drekmeier, C., op. cit., pp. 294 and 298 respectively.

118 Beniprasad, op. cit., p. 228
temporal precedence of the Brahmanical tradition is certain. For instance, both the Buddhists and the Jainas were responding to the purusasukta containing the genesis of the sociopolitical order. In other areas the direction of influence may be apparent. For example, the emphasis in Brahmanical sources on dharmavijaya, particularly with reference to bloodshed in war is probably due to the teachings of ahimsa by Buddhist and Jaina teachers. However, in many instances, such as the case of lakṣanas and ratnas of a cakravarti we saw how the three traditions show certain similarities. The final version we find today is a result of complex interactions among them. In this sort of cases it is very difficult to explain the similarities. Four possibilities exist:

1. One/two is borrowing from other/others.
2. Every tradition is a modified form of a single prototype.
3. There were many independent traditions and the three traditions are based on them.
4. A give and take i.e. a reciprocal relation exists between them.

For a knowledge of the origin and development of the ideology of kingship in any of the three traditions, taken singly or collectively, a detailed comparison of different issues, motifs and concepts pertaining to different facets of kingship discourses viz. its origin, nature and functions is necessary. The final picture of the structure and growth of the ideology of kingship will eventually emerge if we make a threefold comparison:

1. The Brahmanical tradition: Ṛgvedic notions of kingship and the later vedic texts should be compared with the post vedic Dharma sutra and Smṛti works followed by an exploration of the
Purāṇa literature to ascertain the influence of Bhakti ideology on the discourses of kingship. Can the Arthasastra texts be put in a different category, in terms of increasing secularization and reflection of realpolitik?

2. The Buddhist textual tradition.

3. The canonical and the post-canonical works of The Śvetāmbaras and the Digambaras.

As concluding remarks we want to highlight the most significant differences between the Brahmanical ideology of kingcraft and its Śramanic counterparts. As we shall see in some detail in the chapter on polity, in the Brahmanical scheme of things the domain of personal conduct i.e. what the sastras discuss under the rubric acara, is independent of state control. The king was instructed not to interfere in this matter even if the conduct is contrary to what the sastras teaches. In contrdistinction 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 Śramanic 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 Śramanic political philosophy. As we saw in the case of ahimsa, for example, their political theory 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.
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, as we shall examine in some detail in the chapter on polity. 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 *vyavahārāpadas* 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 *sistas* and what the texts call *desacāra*, rest of the *vyavahāra* section consists of mostly recordings of regional customary laws whose decipherment is made difficult by the uncertainties regarding the spatiotemporal 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 extoll the king to respect these. In view of this fact one feels hesitant in calling the Buddhist and Jain 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 Jain 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 khattavijja and the injunction of the Jaina canons - 'keep away from kingly affairs'. Our interpretation is supported by the supreme place given to ahimsa in their Weltanschauung. Both Buddha and Mahāvira were wise enough to see the inherent contradiction between practices of statecraft and ahimsa. 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 splendor and inspire hope in them. A well calculated propogandistic move to further the missionary motive of the monks.

Harold Lasswell has rightly noted that one of the most significant problems of political science is to account for the factors which determine the diffusion of political ideologies.\textsuperscript{119} We hope that our concluding remarks may be of some help towards this end with reference to early Indian political theories.

\textsuperscript{119} Lasswell, H.D., The Language of Politics, 1949 p. 23