MORAL PHILOSOPHY OF KINGSHIP
Ancient Indians abhorred absolutism. Even their deities were not expected to act arbitrarily. As early as the Rāveda deities were invariably to conduct themselves in accordance with a universal discipline or a cosmic order which was called Rta. As their counterpart in the mundane world the kings were also expected to rule in accordance with the higher values of life which went to constitute Dharma. Ever since the Rgvedic age the ancient Indian thinkers went on developing a moral philosophy of kingship which would, in the absence of a written constitution as we understand it today, make the king responsive and responsible to the wishes of the people.

In the Rāveda the concept of Rta stands in close contact with Varuṇa, who has been described as the support of Rta, the fountain of Rta, on whom as on a mountain ever lasting ordinances are based. He is the guardian and cherisher of moral order. 'The Rta from meaning the order of the heavenly bodies became in time the name for moral order and righteousness'. In another reference Varuṇa is described as the protector and bestower of happiness of his devotees.

The character of Varuṇa as reflected in
the Rgveda leads us to form an idea that the earthly king was also expected to rule as exemplified by the god varuṇa. The king was required to be Dhartavrata and protector of the people, both against internal disturbances and foreign invasions. He was required to be the upholder of law and order, customs and traditions.

The Brāhmanical literature contains various references to show that the king was the upholder of the law. With the introduction of multifarious sacrifices the concept of Dharma, as a moral check on King’s authority, became more and more apparent. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa has it that the king is the guardian of the Brāhmaṇas, the law and order. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa enjoins upon the king to uphold the sacred law, "for he is not capable of all and every speech, nor of all and every deed, but that he should speak only what is right, and do what is right..." The same source at another place says that Varuṇa, the protector of law, makes him (the king) the protector of law; and that truly is the supreme state, when one is lord of the law; for whoever attains to that supreme state, to him they come in law ....

We think that during this period kingship was basically founded on moral obligations. The
kingdom which was offered to the king, was not meant for his dissipation but for its prosperity.

The Brāhmaṇa versed in the sacred lore and the king these two were the custodians of the sacred law. This indicates the high moral status of the king.

"By attaching the notion of unrivalled moral greatness to the king along with the learned Brāhmaṇa, marks a distinct phase in the evolution of Vedic kingship. The Vedic king, according to this view, is the embodiment of the moral law, being matched only by the learned Brāhmaṇa."

The Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad maintains that 'Dharma' is the ruler of rulers, therefore, there is nothing higher than Dharma. Thenceforth, even a weak man rules a stronger with the help of Dharma as with the help of a king. Thus Dharma is what is called the true."

In the Jātaka stories we find that the king was required to promote morality and maintain law and order. It was known to the people that every thing depended on the king. It is said that "Figs are sweet when the king exercises his rule with justice and equity. But in the times of unjust kings, oils, honey, molasses and the like, as well as the wild roots and fruits, loose their sweetness and flavour and not these only but the whole realm becomes
bad and flavourless. The Jātakas inform us that at various occasions the king acted as a moral teacher and said to his subjects, 'give alms, practise virtue, righteously follow your business and calling, educate your self in the days of youth, gain wealth, do not behave like a village cheat, be not harsh, do your duty towards mother and father, in family life, honour your elders.' It is to be mentioned that the ruler was held responsible, and was accused for all sorts of sufferings imaginable, which may everfall to the lot of man.

In the Buddhist Parables is reproduced a story of a king who took upon himself the sins and sufferings of his people. In this story the king is represented as accepting his moral responsibility for the sins and suffering of the subjects. "If there are any, he says, 'in my kingdom that suffer from hunger it is I that have made them hungry'. "If there are among my people those that suffer from cold, it is I that have stripped them of their clothes". The material and spiritual progress depended on the king. Therefore, the king is the maker of his age, as it is he who sustains dharma.

The Jātakāmāla solemnly advises the king: 'Betake yourself to dharma'. The same source
adds that the king should be righteous and he should direct his mind to secure the salvation of his subjects. The description of Suddhodana given by Asvaghosa represents him as illuminating his people on every side, showing them the path they were to follow.

The Mārga Nikāya lays down that the king should have the following ten qualities: giving alms, leading an ideal life, be an embodiment of sacrifice, truthfulness, mildness, patience and yielding disposition. He should be well born, handsome, wealthy, powerful, learned and intelligent. Moreover, he (the king) is described as the supplier of food and corn to the farmer, capital to the trader and wages to the people in the service of the government.

The Rāmāyana clearly shows that the king was required to be an ideal character. He was thought to be the first citizen and his subjects prone to follow his example. 'In the Rāmāyanaic period it is not king's right's but his duties that are specially stressed. The king's office was never insecure in India. It was burdened with heavy responsibilities and king's duties were onerous and numerous. The Rāmāyana informs us that the king was required to be well versed in the sacred lore. He was expected to be a supporter and upholder
of law. Great importance has been attached to *Satya* in the *Rāmāyana*. It was believed that the divine *Dharma* was grounded in its entirety in *Satya* and it was the greatest *Dharma* of the king. We learn from the *Rāmāyana* that Vasiṣṭha reminds Dasaratha when the latter was not prepared to send his son with Viśvāmitra: "Having promised that you would, O King, if you did not act up to your word you will loose all the merits you have earned by *ṣṭaputra*."

Closely related to the ideals of *Dharma* were the concept of *Pāpa* and *Puruṣa* Hell and Heaven. The *Rāmāyana* lays down that a king who applies *danda* in accordance with *Dharma* conquers the whole earth and goes to Heaven after his death. Again, a king who protects his subject according to *Dharma* attains one fourth of the merits of those *āśīra* who perform penances in his kingdom. The epic exhibits an ideal that a king should give up his dear wife if asked to do so by his subjects: a popular and somewhat crude way of expressing the king's position, but all the same enshrining the radical demand of the Hindu Constitution from its king to sink his individuality into his office.

Since all the activities of the State depended on the king's conduct much emphasis has been laid on
the moral discipline to the princes in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The prince was trained by way of telling him the stories of ancient kings and religion and by the company of aged and experienced. The king was required to become truthful, righteous, not malevolent, ungrudging and free from blamish. The king was expected to regard his subjects with affection and respect the elders and Brāhmanas. We find in the *Rāmāyaṇa* that Rāma behaved like a father towards his subjects and shared their sorrows and felt happiness when they celebrated functions.

Thus, on the basis of the above mentioned references, we can say that the king during the Rāmāyanic age was expected to rule in accordance with *Dharma*. He was to protect the subjects and look upon them like a father towards his children.

To the *Mahābhārata* rulership was the highest of all *Dharma* and that the unrighteous king was to be shunned like a leaky boat in the sea. The same source gives us more glimpses into the significance of the concept of *Dharma* as determining the moral foundations of the kingship during that period. The *Mahābhārata* lays down that the king was required to take an oath at the time of coronation ceremony that
he will rule in accordance with Dharma and never act independently. The oath runs as follows: "I shall always look to the welfare of the country, regarding it the 'Supreme being' whatever is law and whatever is prescribed by the rules of the ethics and politics, I shall always abide by it. I shall never be independent." 27 The same source informs us that king Prthu had taken the oath to do so. It further adds that the king who does not protect his subjects even after taking the oath was regarded as a false king. 28 We learn that Vena and Nahusa were killed and dethroned respectively. 29 Only such a king who honours knowledge, who is devoted to the scriptures and good of his subjects, who follows righteousness and is liberal deserves to rule according to the Mahabharata. 30

The great Epic recommends that the king who does not grant protection to his subjects should be abandoned. Again, the king who fails to administer justice can never attain Heaven nor fame. 31 The primary duty of the king according to the great epic is to protect the people by constantly upholding the rod of chastisement. 32 The king is enjoined not to allow sin to be committed in his kingdom. He should cause virtue to be practised. It was the duty of the king to please the people to protect them and seek their welfare. 33 The Mahabharata lays-down that the king who after declaring 'I shall protect you' does not protect his subjects should be killed by the people after
forming a confederacy, like a mad dog that is afflicted with madness. 34 The king was required to be an embodiment of all virtues, all beneficence and heroism. It is laid down that the king should be conversant with the Vedas and their branches, possessed of wisdom, engaged in penances, charitable and devoted to the performance of sacrifices. 35

The Mahabharata says that the king acquires one fourth part of the sins that his subject commit in consequences of any distress in the kingdom arising out of his neglect in discharging the duty of protection. 36 At another place we find that a person who always protects the good and restrains the wicked deserves to become a king and govern the world. 37 The same source informs us that a righteous king attains one fourth part of those righteous acts which his subjects properly protected perform in his kingdom. 38 It is said that the merits a king earns by protecting his subjects righteously for a single day is such that he enjoys its reward in Heaven for ten thousand years. 39 The Mahabharata enjoins the king to look upon his subjects as his own children. 40 The king has been ordained to bear himself towards his subjects as a mother towards the child of her womb. 41 The character of the king counted more for the prosperity of the kingdom, therefore, the princes were trained under the supervision of competent teachers. They were expected to become self controlled, religious, sweet in speech, eager to respect the elders, experienced and sensitive to public opinion.
The king was required to guard himself against *vyasanas* viz. hunting, drinking, indulgence in sexual enjoyment, inflicting improper punishment and misuse of public funds. The following virtues were expected of an ideal king according to the *Mahabharata*: compassion, adherence to *Dharma*, generosity, righteousness and piety. Only a righteous king was regarded as a god on the earth. The great epic critically remarks that the king who realises taxes from his subjects and does not protect them and spends the public funds for his enjoyment is a thief.

The theory of kingship as described in the *Mahabharata* makes us in a position to point out that the king during the *Mahabharata* age was not left to act arbitrarily. The concept of *Dharma*, Hell and Heaven, *Pānā* and *Puruṣa* continued to exercise a great moral check on king’s authority. He was expected to rule in accordance with the dictates of the Vedas and Sāstras and not according to his wishes.

Kautilya, like the previous writers, maintains that the protection of social order by the king was of utmost importance. He says that the king should not allow the special duties of the different beings to be transgressed. Kautilya though a staunch monarchist is a firm believer in the moral order of the universe. He recognises the supremacy of *Dharma* over *Artha*.
may say that the Kautilyan state is not free from moral ideals. The kingship as described by Kautilya has a moral purpose to fulfill. The major function of the king is to maintain Dharma. The king, according to Kautilya, is the pivot of the governmental machinery. The prosperity of the kingdom depends upon the king.

It is to be added that in the ultimate analysis of his political theory the moral philosophy is found to be the cornerstone of his political thought. He did not believe in an immoral and unrighteous king. He emphasized the importance of the king being religious and righteous one. He clearly states that if Dharma is ignored by the king it destroys him since the king was Dharma-parvartaka. He did not go beyond the limits of Dharma. It is said that the righteous performance of his duties ensures Heaven for the king.

The most remarkable point in the Kautilyan political thought can readily be understood from the fact that Kautilya has compared the performer of the duties to that of a sacrifice. In the words of R.S. Sharma: "In Indian tradition the special importance of Kautilya lies in the fact that in many ways his text over rides religious considerations to serve the cause of the state. In this sense he made the first serious attempt to reconstruct the science of polity and emanciate it from the influence of religion and theology. But because of the predominantly religious character of society in which he lived could not completely disentangle the state from the trendom of religion."
Kauṭilya laid much emphasis on the welfare of the subjects. He went up to the extent of saying that 'in the happiness of the subjects lies the happiness of king and what is beneficial to the subjects is the benefit of the king, but what is dear to the subjects is beneficial to his own benefit'. What is dear to the king is not beneficial to the king, but what is dear to the subjects is beneficial to his own benefit. The king was required to look personally into the matter of the persons learned in the Vedas and of the ascetics after going to the fire sanctuary in the company of the Chaplain.

Kauṭilya lays down the following qualities which were expected of an ideal king viz noble birth, god like intelligence, valour, ability to see through the eyes of the experienced persons, love of virtue, truthfulness, straightforwardness, gratefulness, comprehensiveness of outlook, enthusiasm, profound knowledge, good memory, a strong mind, versality, dignity, and freedom from passions.

We find that king Jāmadagnya and Ambariśa, the son of Nabhāga, enjoyed the earth for a long time by casting out the group of six enemies.

The king is ordained to enjoy the three goals of life equally which are bound up with one another. The Arthaśāstra reminds that the king
who does not control his senses perishes very soon.\textsuperscript{31}
The same source informs us that Bhoja king Dāṇḍakya
perished along with his kinsmen for sinful desire
for a Brāhmaṇa girl. Janamejaya perished due to
anger towards a Brāhmaṇa. Allā was perished for
extorting money from the four Varnaṣ out of greed.
Rāvana who did not restore the wife of other perished
through pride. Damśhebdnaṇa who did not treat
creatures with contempt out of arrogance perished and
same was the case with Arjuna of Haihayas. Vātāpi
perished in try to assail Agastya out of foolhardiness.\textsuperscript{32}

Kauṭilya compares the king to a sacrificer
whose (sacrificial) vow is activity, sacrifice the
administration of affairs; the sacrificial fee, however
is impartiality of behaviour, and sacrificial initiation
for him is the coronation.\textsuperscript{33} According to Kauṭilya,
'kingship and Dhama are closely related and the king
is the fountain of justice (Dharmaprajñā). It
is king's responsibility to maintain Dhama and to
protect his subjects with justice\textsuperscript{34} for its
observance leads him to Heaven.\textsuperscript{35} Speaking on the
Ardhaśāstra of Kauṭilya, R.P.Kangle says, "However,
though one cannot find in the text any true theory
of the source of the authority wielded by the ruler
over the ruled, there are in it frequent references
to his obligations towards them, obligations which
flow from that authority. His first and the foremost
duty is said to be the protection of his subjects.56

Much emphasis is laid on the proper training to the princes by Kauṭilya. He says that the prince should study the triple Vedas, the science of Ānikṣakī, the science of Vārā and Dandaśīti, in addition to Arithmetic and Alphabets. The same work adds that the princes should be taught by learned teachers of science, since in them the discipline had firm root.57

_Dharma_, the supreme ruler, which governed the kings and subjects alike, finds its mention even in the inscriptions of Aśoka. In the words of very sober scholar G. Bongard Levin, _Dharma_ is usually held to mean, rules for man's behaviour and righteous way of life, although the term can mean doctrine as such in the more narrow sense as associated with Buddhist teaching.58 We are informed about his firm faith in _Dharma_. It is said that good deeds, freedom from depravity, mercy, liberality, truthfulness, purity of mind and gentleness are the main constituents of _Dharma_.59 Passions such as violence, cruelty, anger, conceit and envy were the major causes leading to depravity and Aśoka did not wish to cause his fall by these vices. The king has been enjoined
to control his senses. More liberality and firm attachment are of no use if the king has no control over the senses. 60

Asoka's non-injurious attitude towards whole of life, respectable behaviour towards the Brāhmanas and Śramanas, respect to father, the mother and regard for aged shows high moral ideals of the kingship during that period. 61 Paternal attitude towards the subjects is clearly indicated in the inscriptions of Asoka when he says, 'all men are my children; just as for my children I desire that they be united with all welfare and happiness of this world and of the next, precisely do I desire it for all men.' 62 The impressions of Hell and Heaven are also indicated in the inscriptions of Asoka when he says, 'this is to my good for this world and this again to my good for the next world.' 63 Romila Thapar rightly points out that 'a close study of the Asokan Edicts, however, reveals that Asoka did not regard himself as the Great Elect in his relations with his subjects, but rather as a father figure.' 64

Protection of the subjects has been regarded as the primary duty of the king by Asoka. 'As a pious Hindu he acknowledged the debt which every king owes to his subjects in return for the revenues levied from them which constructs in affording them protection.' 65 We learn that Asoka tried his best to
promote the welfare of his subjects and considered it above all duties. We are told that he made efforts to discharge his debt which he owed to his subjects. We hear of the Mahābhāratas being sent for the promotion of Dharma to the frontier countries.

Manu states that the king was created to protect the laws of castes and stages. At another place he says that the king who harasses his subjects looses his life, family and kingdom. Manu lays down that the protection of the subjects is the highest Dharma of the king. According to Manu a king who is pure, truthful and follows the treatise can inflict the punishment. At another place he warns the king that the king should not alter the rule he arranges for those he likes and punishment for those he dislikes.

The king, according to Manu, was required to rule righteously in his kingdom and act severely towards enemies. He should be straightforward towards friends and patient towards Brāhmaṇas. It has been stated that the king should pay respect to the Brāhmaṇas learned in the Vedas. We learn that Vena and Nahuṣa lost their lives for bad conduct and Prithu achieved the throne through his good behaviour. It is laid
down that the good conduct should be attained through discipline. Hama did not favour an unrighteous ruler to rule over the subjects. That is why he says that the king is dead and lives not, from whose kingdom the people crying out are carried off by savages while he with his ministers looks on. At another place he states that the chief duty of the king is the protection of the people, for he receives the recompense mentioned, is bound by law. It is interesting to point out that Hama brings the king on the same footing as an ordinary man when he says, 'in any case where a private individual would be fined one Kārapana in that case the king ought to be fined one thousand, this is the law.' Hama lays down that subjects for king's education are four i.e. Āṅvīkṣikī, Travī, Vārtā and Dādanīti.

Nārada enjoins upon a king to enforce the usage prevent in the guilds. He states that the king's duty is to protect his subjects to listen to the aged and wise to look into the disputes of the people and to be energetic in the royal functions. At another place he lays down that attending to the dictates of the law books and adhering to the opinion of his chief judge the king should try causes in due order. Nārada also regards the revenues as the king's pay for the protection of his people.
Yājñavalkya remarks that the king gets his share of revenues in return of the protection that he efforts to his people. Aparārtha commenting on Yājñavalkya also confirms that the king was paid his dues for protection.  

Brhaspati reminds the king that the usage of the localities, caste and kula are to be maintained. He recognised the fact that public had a great force and advised the king to give up even the smallest undertaking if there was popular glamour against it.  

Kātyāyana also enjoins upon the king to act in accordance with the dictates of Dharma. He states that the people remain happy where the king looks into all the actions according to the dictates of Dharma. It was the duty of the king to eradicate the evil-doers, protect the subjects and honour the Brāhmaṇas. The king who levied taxes by unjust means was liable to incur sin according to Kātyāyana.  

The Kātyāyana Samhitā says that the king is the protector of the homeless, the son of the sonless, the father of the fatherless. It states that if a king decides a case by his own fiat counter to the texts it leads him away from Heaven it causes ruin to the people and strikes down the rest of his long life.
The Panchatantra states that just as seedling in time bears fruits similarly subjects well protected by the king become source of joy and happiness. 67

According to Kāmandaka, a king who behaves righteously and protects his subjects like his children becomes worthy of praise. He maintains that it is only by following the law that a king can enjoy for a long time. The king who acts against the rules of Dharma goes to Hell, Dharma alone brings prosperity to the kingdom and fame to the king. 68 He adds that the king should protect his subjects by an equitable distribution of rewards and punishments. 69 We learn from the Kāmandakanātisāra that the princes were given education in the art of government and were stimulated to cultivate righteousness. They were expected to be trained to realise that protection of the subjects was the first and the foremost responsibility of the king.

The epigraphical records also, shed some light on the moral ideals of the kingship. The Allahabad Pillar inscription bears the testimony that Samudragupta protects the people, builds the path of religion, supports the miserable, the poor the helpless, the afflicted, patronises the arts and celebrates the rites and observances of mankind. Samudragupta has been described as the supporter of the real truth of scriptures whose happy mind was always desirous of
company with the learned ones. The Mathura stone pillar inscription of Chandragupta II informs us that he is the giver of millions of (lawfully acquired) cows and gold, and is the restorer of the Aśvamedha sacrifice.

The Junāgadh Rock Inscription of Skandagupta tells us that in his reign no body among his subjects deviates from the path of religion and there is no one who is distressed or in poverty and misery.

The khoh copper plate grant of Mahārāja Hastin (A.D. 476), the Alina copper plate grant of Śīlāditya VII (A.D. 766) and the inscription of Dhruvasēna III states that the king is the giver of a thousand cows and of gold; he levies taxes even from the enemies land according to the proper custom. The Ganjam plate of Śaidodbhava king Mādhavarāja tells us that wealth was enjoyed by the distressed, the helpless, the poor and the mendicants. The Nagari plates of Ganga king Ananga Bhima III in Orissa record that heaps of gold were granted by him to people in distress.

In the Mandasor Inscription Yasodharman has been described as full of worth and self control. Again the Rājia copper plate inscription of Rājā Tīvaradeva refers to the great rewards of protection. It is stated that 'the reward of protection ensures
a state of fortune condition and omission to protect a state of misfortune. Who, indeed, will (willingly) disregard Heaven and obtain Hell?

The Asirgadh copper plate inscription of the Maukhari king Sarvavarman compares the king with Viṣṇu for he preserves the Varnāśrama system.

In the Śākuntalam, Dushyanta accepts the king’s obligations to protect the weak, the widow and orphans and to be the father of the fatherless. It is said that Dalip collects taxes only for use in the people’s interest. The king was required to shoulder the responsibilities of administration in the manner of ‘sun who has his horses yoked but once in that of the wind which blows day and night and again in the manner of sesa who has the load of the earth placed on him for ever.’

The Rāshvaḍa maintains that the king was required to attain the knowledge of scriptures. He should be righteous and devoid of vices. The king was expected to be ever wakeful in the cause of his subjects. It was the duty of the king to maintain the Varnāśramadharma.

In the Harṣa charita the dying king...
PrabhākaraVardhana consoles his young son HarsaVardhana by exhorting him to reflect over the idea that the kings are to be deemed to have relatives in their subjects and not merely in agnates. Harsa is said to have taken the oath in the following words:

"The Government of a country is a responsible office and ever attended with the difficulties. As for myself, I am indeed of small eminence, but as my father and mother are no more, I must attend to the opinion of the world and forget my insufficiency."

The Harsa Charita informs us that the earth sitting comfortably on the king's knee is both his source of maintenance and enjoyed one. PrabhākaraVardhana claims to have regulated the system of all castes and stages.

The Agni Purāṇa states that the king should dispense even handed justice to his subjects. The king has been ordained to perform only such actions which attract the heart of his subjects and he should refrain from those creating hardships and displeasures. It says that people's love and loyalty brings territory, land and wealth to the king. The king was required to be virtuous, having faith in the Varṇamahāvarta, respect for god, cow and Brāhmanas. The king is
enjoined to follow the principles laid down in the code of punishment and in the Vedas. It is stated that the king who lives for the betterment of his subjects enjoys the Heaven itself and Hell prevails in the house of a king who neglects the good of his subjects. Like the previous work the Agni Purāṇa maintained that the sixth part of the income which a king receives from his subjects is for his protection afforded to them.

The king is advised to win the affection and loyalty of his people. The king is intended to be a source of pleasure to the people. The Agni Purāṇa says that a king who oppresses the people is soon deprived of his office and emoluments of a sovereign.

The Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa lays down the following five sacrifices for the king, viz to punish the wicked, to honour the good, to increase the treasury in the right way, to deal impartially with the litigants and to protect the kingdom. The Nārāyanadeva Purāṇa critically remarks that the body of the king is not meant for pleasure but for undergoing great trouble in protecting the earth and carrying out his duties.

Sukra went up to the extent of saying that the position of the king is really one of a dāśyata.
It becomes clear from the following passage from the Sukranitiśāra, the ruler has been made by Brahmā a servant of the people getting his revenues as remuneration. His sovereignty, however, is only for protection. The same work laid much emphasis on the qualities of the king than his birth. It says that the king is honoured because of his qualities. It is not birth that makes a king. He is not respected because of his ancestary, but for his prowess, strength and valour. At another place it observes that the prince is the cause of time and the good and the evil practices. The king has been asked to maintain the subjects each in proper sphere. The Sukranitiśāra stressed on the idea of a Sattvika ruler. The same work defines the Sattvika ruler as under:

'The king who is constant to his duty and is the protector of his subjects, who performs all the sacrifices and conquers his enemies, and who is charitable, forbearing and valorous, and has no attachment to the things of enjoyment and is dispassionate, is called Sattvika and attains salvation after death. Against this is the definition of a Rajasa ruler:

'The miserable king who is not compassionate and is mad through passions, who is envious and untruthful, who has vanity, cupidity and attachment for enjoyable things, who practises deceit and villainy who is not same or uniform in thought, speech and action, who is fond of picking up quarrels
and associate himself with the lower classes, who is independent and does not obey niti and who is of an intriguing disposition is called Raja and gets the condition of lower animals or immovable things after death.
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