

With all these, deterioration is to be avoided, efforts to be made for maintenance of the acquired position and with better opportunity paramountcy is to be sought for.

In an unstable political condition, states or princes had no guarantee for their existence and the slightest disturbance was sure to lead to universal unrest. States strengthened their position by means of alliances and such an alliance was sure to give rise to a counter-alliance. At the root of alliances or hostilities work some natural principles and according to Kautilya, a state has a natural enemy in an adjacent state, while a state which is separated by a buffer state from the first becomes an enemy's enemy and hence a friend. Similarly, we have an enemy's friend and a friend's friend. Kautilya takes into account states in the fifth degree and according to him, a state with its friends and friends' friends etc. constituted a circle of states. Similarly we have the circle of state of the enemy, of the Madhyama king and the Udāsina king, about whom no further details are given since these will be out of place here.

Next to the enunciation of natural causes of friendship or enmity Kautilya investigates the conditions of war, peace, neutrality or the assumption of a dubious attitude. He lays down a number of political maxims, the value of which may still be appreciated in our modern world. Certainly, these in themselves form an interesting study, though beyond the scope of a work on polity. Here only the briefest summary of his views on interstatal relations is given *e.g.*

(a) He recognizes the importance of 'force' in politics, since without it, a state cannot think even of peace through an alliance with a powerful state. (तेजो हि सन्धानकारणं नातमलोहं लोहेन सन्धत्ते ।)

(b) A weak state should strengthen itself by an alliance with

a more powerful state. It might if circumstances permitted wage war on a weaker power.

(c) When war and peace bring equal profits, peace is to be preferred. (सन्धिविग्रहयोस्तुल्यायां वृद्धौ सन्धिसुपेयात् ।)

(d) In all offensive undertakings, care must be taken to protect the rear from attacks, and a proper selection of time and place be made (Bk. IX., pp. 337-9).

(e) Care should be taken to ensure the contentment of subjects at home, while discontent may be fomented in the enemy's country by means of bribes or other active propaganda work.

(f) At the proper opportunity, war should be waged, after completely safeguarding one's own position and care should be taken to assail the enemy in his vital points and in his moments of difficulty.

(g) The conqueror should constantly add to his strength and exert in the weakening of his rivals.

(h) Real allies are to be sought for and corporations are to be won over.

(i) The direct enemy is to be conquered first, then the Madhyama and the Udāsīna are to be assailed. Or, the enemy's subjects may be won over first, then more remote conquests attempted. By this principle the territories of friends or enemies are to be acquired.

(j) Having completed his conquests, the conqueror should aim at consolidation by re-establishing peace and order, winning over the people by rewarding the virtuous, by removing the distress of the people, by improving the laws, by introducing new methods of adding to the wealth of the country and by adopting even the language, manners and customs of the people.

The aim of Kautilīyan diplomacy was primarily to attain the threefold objective, *e.g.* (a) preservation of the territory already

in hand, (b) recovery of that lost previously (c) and the acquisition of new lands. By the continuance of such a policy, universal dominion was to be attained, provided the would-be conqueror had the requisite wisdom, the necessary resources and the proper opportunity. Lastly, when paramountcy was attained or conquest completed, the first duty of the conqueror was to re-establish peace and restore the economic prosperity of the people.

With all his faith in the establishment of a paramount power, Kauṭilya is not an advocate of ruthless conquests. He assigns a higher position to the conqueror who is satisfied with the acknowledgment of his suzerainty (*Dharma-vijayī*), and denounces a policy of wanton destruction (*Asura-vijaya*) or of excessive greed and exploitation (*Lobha-vijaya* Kau. pp. 380-82). In some places, he advocates the retention of conquered princes in their principalities on terms of loyalty and service (Kau. pp. 308-310). He is moreover averse to unnecessary sufferings inflicted on the enemy's combatants, as would appear from his directions against setting fire to forts and cities (K. p. 403). War was never his objective, since, he preferred success attained through diplomacy to that won by bloodshed, and directed princes never to go to war, unless it was the last alternative and the only means of attaining success (338-339).

All these topics, however, are dealt with in such a way as to make Kauṭilya's directions applicable to all possible cases and all times and conditions. Some European scholars have, however, harped on the theme that Kauṭilya's work was intended for a small kingdom. At first sight, this receives credence, but a thorough enquiry makes us believe that the end and aim of his work was to further the establishment of a paramount power in India which was a *Cakravarti-kṣetram*. The fourth chapter of the thirteenth book (Kau. p. 405) lays down clearly the

four ways of conquering the earth (मार्गैः पृथिवीं जेतुम्) and this is followed by that remarkable chapter which gives us the measures for consolidating sovereignty. This vein of imperialism in Kauṭilya is further indicated by his broad political outlook and the comprehensive economic data supplied by his book. The chapters on gems and valuables to be accepted in the treasury enumerate the products of all the different localities of India, from Viṣi and Mahāviṣi and Nepal and Cīna in the Himalayan region to the extreme south including Tāmraparnī, Ceylon and the various localities of Malabar. In the east we are carried to the region of of Puṇḍra, Magadha and even the country beyond the Lauhitya, while in the west Kāpisa and Gāndhāra are enumerated in connection with varieties of wines. Gāndhāra and Prārjunaka figure in the Criminal Code (on Vākpārusya). Again, his conqueror is not to remain satisfied with the wealth of the north, but must hanker after the gold, gems and minerals of Dakṣiṇāpatha (p. 298). These are significant facts and point to no other conclusion than that the author of the Arthaśāstra born and bred in an atmosphere of growing imperialism had the only ambition in writing out his treatise of making his disciple and *protégé*, the universal ruler of India. This receives the strongest support from the statements of his successors including even his detractor Bāṇa who condemns him for his advocay of an imperial power after "the extermination of thousands of royal families".

(f) Last of all, we come to the discussion of the important topic of Kauṭilya's supposed disregard for morality. Here, the *prima facie* evidence is very strong against him. His book is a repository of all the crooked political principles which were current in his days. Certainly, it leads up to an atmosphere of universal suspicion and distrust and gives us all the leading traits of an unscrupulous

age and an unmoral political existence. Kauṭilya himself, too, countenances the use of means and methods which in our days are sure to cause a revulsion of feeling. He advocates an extensive spy system, calls upon princes to put their trust in none—not even in their wives and sons, and in diplomacy, advocates dissimulation to outwit an enemy, a rival and a friend even, when the fullest advantages have been realised from his services. In war, he advocates the employment of active spies, the bribing of the enemy's chief officers, fomentation of discord in the enemy's country, the creation of division in the enemy's camp and the assassination of the enemy's leaders.

Certainly, these do not hold him out in a favourable light or make him appear as a man of inscrutable moral principles. Looked at from the absolute moral standpoint, he deserves censure. But, with all these, we must not go too far and forget the fact that his game was politics and not morality and the age in which he lived was responsible for many of these. Politics from time immemorial to our own times has never been free from these things nor will it ever be so until the chances of war and aggrandisement are removed for ever. Again, much of his censure is due to the fact that he was unfortunate in enumerating the vices and vicious practices of which he was not the originator but which existed in his own days. Ideas change and have changed immensely from his days to the present age and it will be unfair to accuse him by judging him according to our elevated standard of morality.

Again, with all his acceptance of the means and methods of his age,—since he had no other way out, we find in him no denunciation of virtue or an acceptance of immorality or its glorification. For though in many cases he inclines towards the acceptance of

unscrupulous means leading to success, we find in him a clear denunciation of ignoble means when they affect vital principles. And on these heads, he appears to be nothing but a reformer and a moralist compared with his predecessors. Thus, he will never agree to the violation of the law of property or family and emphasises the importance of discipline for kings. He will not consent to the degradation of royal princes by wine or women, since the degradation of princes was sure to affect the fortunes of the country. Next, he will not consent to ministerial usurpation or such other unscrupulous measures. In war, too, he was opposed to the infliction of unnecessary sufferings on non-combatants.

To sum up, the author of the *Arthaśāstra* cannot be condemned for his innate crookedness or his denunciation of virtue. The worst that could be condemned in him is his acceptance of the usages of the age. Even in this, his objective was to outwit villainy through villainy and he surely stands on a higher level than Machiavelli who finds an object of admiration in that human monster Borgia.

Furthermore, though our ideas have changed and our methods modified, yet many of the vicious practices for which we denounce this ancient writer subsist even to our own days. Even to-day, we have an extensive employment of active spies not only to gather information but to inflict injury on the enemy, espionage on a larger scale, poisoning of water, inoculation of diseases, bombing of cities, starvation of non-combatants, disregard for the interests of weaker nations and a desire for conquests in the case of the greater powers of the world. The political history of the period before the world war, and the events of that conflict prove the truth of the above statement. A reaction against militarism has brought into existence the League of Nations,

but it would be long before the principles and practices of men and nations are changed*.

* The author has entered into a detailed discussion of this topic in the second volume of his *Kautilya* and has attempted to support his line of argument with parallels from Mediæval and Modern History. Certainly, judged by abstract principles or by an absolute standard of morality, the moral principles of Kautilya are not very high. But as no such abstract principles exist in politics even in our own days, much of this adverse criticism is unmerited. Compared with our standards, the Greek and Roman methods were inhuman and let us hope that a more humane generation will denounce the diplomacy and methods of warfare of our own times.

BOOK EIGHT

Foreign Invasions and Resurrection (2nd Cen. B.C. to 3rd Cen. A. D.)

The fall of the empire was the greatest catastrophe in the political history of Ancient India. It checked further political progress, destroyed the continuity of development, and the traditions and institutions of the Empire received a rude shock. For the next four centuries, the greater part of northern and western India became the exploiting ground of barbarians who once bowed before Indian greatness and whose pretensions had been kept in check by the might of the Indian Emperor.

Fraught with the gravest political consequences as this period was, it was remarkable for momentous social and political changes, which were partly the outcome of foreign influence and partly the product of a reaction which it brought about. In the foreigners who came and settled on Indian soil, the country received new and more virile ethnic elements with peculiar social and political ideas. The contact of races brought in a commixture of ideas which acted and reacted on each other and thus made room for a new social and political order. The barbarian with his low culture could not think of the sweeping away of the culture of the conquered, but became eager to assimilate it and to pride upon his transformation. In course of a few generations, the barbarian rulers and races became Hinduised, gave up their old names and assumed Hindu styles and titles. Many

of them became converts to one or other of the Indian faiths and became the votaries of Indian gods or religious teachers.

The peculiar ideas and instincts of the foreign conquerors strengthened the forces and factors which had been long working in favour of the Bhāgavata religion, characterised by the prominence it gave to a beneficent and ever-active personal god, ready to be won over by the faith of the devotee, as opposed to the *Paramātman* or *Brahman* of mere philosophical abstractions conceived as the inert yet everpresent principle underlying the eternal changes and modifications of the phenomenal world. Faith took the place of higher knowledge as the true road to salvation. The attributes of the divinity were interpreted in terms of those of man and with the predominance of humanistic principles, the doctrine of incarnation became more and more deep-rooted in men's minds. The religion of exclusion and meditation gave way to one of active devotion, manifested and characterised by charity, pilgrimage, the glorification of the divine bounty through artistic temples and monuments and by gorgeous rites and penances.

This Bhāgavata religion was the outcome of a desire long felt for a path of salvation through the fervour of faith and active social work and the worship of concrete objects of veneration typifying abstract principles. Such a hankering on the part of the commonalty had already transformed Buddha himself into the nucleus for a theistic element and he became the god in a system, which had explained the phenomena of changes, through the errors of senses falsely attributing a reality to the really non-existent. Of the Bhāgavata systems, the chief were *Theistic Buddhism*, *Vaiṣṇavism* and *Saivism*. Most of the hardier barbarians like the Sakas and Kuṣānas embraced Saivism, while Buddhism

and Vaiṣṇavism appealed to the more cultured and enervated half-Greeks of Bactria.

Next to this, politics was deeply influenced and modified. Repeated irruptions and changes of hand of provinces led to the rise of families of local rulers who ensured personal safety by transferring their allegiance from time to time to more powerful conquerors. Feudal principles thus gradually gained ground. The king's powers and prerogatives, too, increased day by day. The Central Asian Conquerors brought with them the idea of the king's divinity. Indigenous thinkers, too, extolled the king's position, since anarchy made men look to him as the people's saviour through appointment by the Almighty. Religion made a deeper impression on politics. The new princes attributed their success to the grace of their presiding family-gods and made a reverential reference to them in their official styles and titles.

Furthermore, the age of foreign conquest transferred for a time the centre of political life (so far as the indigenous people were concerned) from the north to the south. The south became for a time the stronghold of Indian political life and tradition and the southerner so long looked down upon by the men of the north became the champions of Indianism. Secure in his distant natural defences and strongholds, he proved his tenacity and showed those qualities which conferred on him political greatness.

This successful resistance on the part of the southerner created in him a political consciousness which gave rise to a separatist tendency in later Indian history. A few centuries later, India freed herself from the foreign yoke, but henceforth, the political supremacy of the north over the south was almost a thing of the past. The southerner rolled back the tide of northern conquest and, conscious of a separate political destiny, with

cultural peculiarities and distinct dialects and vernaculars, came to hanker after a separate political existence. For the next few centuries after the resurrection, India became divided more or less into four distinct political *littorals*, viz.,—

(a) The Trans-Indus North west—which almost separated itself from the political movements of the plain of Hindustan.

(b) The North *i.e.*, the plain of Hindustan.

(c) The Deccan, with a predominant suzerain power flanked by a number of smaller states.

(d) The Tāmil Country or the extreme south with a predominant political power keeping under its control a number of feudatory states.

Summary of Political History—On the fall of the Maurya Empire, Bactrian Greeks found again a chance for making good a bid for supremacy which had once been snatched away from their hands by Candragupta and his successors. With a dual political programme, they revolted under Diodotus against the Seleucidan Emperor of Syria 248 B.C. Diodotus founded a kingdom where one of his successors ruled. A third Prince, Euthydemus, suffered an attack from Antiochus the great. But the victor made peace with him and gave his son his daughter in marriage. This son-in-law Demetrios, not only ruled Bactria but conquered a part of the Punjab and Sind.

Greeks—The region of the Indian border was gradually parcelled out amongst a number of Greek princelings. One of those was Menander who ruled over a large part of the Punjab and had his capital at Sagala (Sākala). Other such Graeco-Indian princes existed, but the Greeks never succeeded in founding an empire. Their peculiar Hellenic genius stood in the path of their political consolidation.

The exact date of the Greek irruption* is not known, but both Demetrios and Menander are supposed to have been contemporaries of Pushyamitra and according to Indian tradition the Greeks led two raids into India, in course of which they beseiged Sāketa and Mādhyamikā. (अरुणद् यवनः साकेतम्. अरुणद् यवनो मध्य-सिकाम्—See V. Smith. *Early History of India* pp. 187, 204 & 226).

Parthians—The Greeks themselves did not enjoy power very long. They had more powerful enemies at their rear to deal with. First of all, there were the Parthians who had under Arsakes (almost contemporary with Diodotus) established a national power in the region of North Persia, to the south-east of the Caspian. Their independence was recognized in 248 B.C. and the Arsakidan dynasty produced eminent rulers like Mithridates I who became overlord of the region up to the Jhelum and many of the Greek princes were compelled to bow down before him.†

S'akas—About the middle of the second century B. C., the country was swept by the invasions of the Sc or the Sakas who were pushed downwards by the pressure of the nomadic hordes of the Yueh-Chi. They swept away the kingdom of Heliokles north of the Hindu-kush and swamping the whole border region penetrated far into the plain of Hindustan and the peninsula of

* During the Indian wars of Demetrios, another Greek chief Eukratides established himself in Bactria. He was followed by Pantaleon, Agathocles and Antimachus and others. One of his sons Helioclos was the last Greek ruler north of the Hindu-kush. Altogether we have coins of 37 Greek princes and princesses.

† The Parthians:—Under Mithridates, the Sakas were checked in their western march and flowed into the Indus Valley. Consequent upon this, the Sakas of Seistan came under Parthian suzerainty. It is therefore merely a convenient nomenclature which takes the princes of the house of Maues as Sakas while those of Drangiana and Arachosia are termed Pahlava. Vonones, the Parthian, ruled in Eastern Iran with the Imperial title. Probably in his family the two ruling elements blended and he ruled on jointly with his brothers and nephews. For the subsequent history of the Pahlavas, we are to depend on the tradition of St. Thomas and the Takht-i-Bahai inscription. That inscription gives us the name of king Gondopernes identified with the king who patronised St. Thomas. Gondopernes seems to have acted as viceroy under Orthugnes, along with his brother. His immediate predecessor was Azes II, since the Stratigos Aspavarman (son of Indravarman) was associated with both these princes.

Kathiawad. The early history of these Sakas is difficult to find out, but they have been identified with the Sai-Wang who according to Prof. Sten Konow, were identical with the Saka-Murundas familiar to Indian writers. They seem to have halted in the region of Kipin, (identified with the district to the north of the Kabul river; Sten Konow, *Ep. Ind. Ant.* XIV p. 291) destroyed the Greek kingdoms there and with further pressure marched south and east. Probably, there were two important streams of Saka invaders, one through Beluchistan along the Indus valley downwards to Gujarat-Kathiawad and Malwa, the other through the Punjab and penetrating the northern plain. A large number of Saka principalities was established in north India—presumably in Gāndhāra, Kāpiśa, Western Punjab and Mathura. The Northern Saka Satraps* came under Parthian influence. Many of them adopted Parthian or Persian styles and some of them evidently acknowledged Parthian supremacy. The Saka domination of the lower Indus valley lasted longer and even Ptolemy mentions them.

Southern Sakas—Of the southern branch of the Sakas, we have two prominent lines, *e.g.*, (a) The Khaharāta or Chaharātas of Kathiawad. A large part of Mahārāṣṭra was within their dominions and a large number of their inscriptions and coins has been discovered. The most prominent prince of this line was

* The Northern Saka Satraps—The Sakas seem to have overrun a large part of the Punjab and the Yamunā Valley. We have references to a Saka Prince Maues or Moga of the Taxila copper plate dated in the year 78 of an unknown era, and he is described as a Paramount Prince (Mahārāja). His empire was an extensive one and included Gāndhāra, Taxila and Puskalāvati. He seems to have flourished in the middle of the second cen. B.C., though nothing as yet has been settled definitely. He was followed by Princes like Azes I and Azilises.

In addition to such powerful Saka princes, we have references to lines of Saka Satraps ruling in the Punjab, in Kapisa and in a place as far east as Mathura. Very little is known of the Kapisa Satraps but in the Punjab we have references to three families *e.g.* the families of Liaka and Patika, of Miangula and Jehonia, and that of Aspavarman. In Mathura, a long line of Sakas ruled, *e.g.* Hagana, Hāgumāsha, Rañjuyala, Soḍisa &c. For our purpose, the chronology or order of these princes is not at all important.

Nahapāna, whose inscriptions are recorded in an unnamed era. This prince had a continuous struggle with the Andhras, who destroyed his power.

Sakas of Ujjain—(b) While the Andhra victory put an end to this Khaharāta line, another branch of the Śakas established a dynasty at Ujjain which lasted for nearly four centuries. The founder of this line was Yasmotika's son Caṣṭana. The grandson of Caṣṭana was the celebrated Rudra-dāman who defeated the Andhras and established almost imperial sway over a vast region including Sind, Gujarat-kathiawad, part of Rājputana, Cutch, Konkon and a part of the Vindhyan hill regions. A long line of Rudra-dāman's successors ruled in Ujjain till the close of the fourth cen. A. D. when they were destroyed by Candragupta II of the Gupta line.

Kusanas—The history of the decline of the Śaka power and the exact relations of the Śakas with the other conquering tribes of the border region is not exactly known. Towards the close of the second cen. B.C., another race-migration began and the Yueh-chi began to press the Śakas hard. As the result of a series of internecine wars, the Kusānas themselves defeated the other Yueh-chi sections and established an empire which included a great part of north and western India up to Mathura. The more important princes of the Kusānas were the two Kadphises, Kaniska, Vasiṣka, Huviṣka and Vāsudeva. The chronology and the order of the princes of the

* The date of the foundation of the Kusāna power is disputed, as well as the relation between the princes of the Kadphises group and successors of Kaniska. Anyhow, the two lines can be easily distinguished, since the Kaniska group distinguished itself by the use of Deva and Devaputra titles and the use of years which seem to connect themselves into a particular era. Kennedy tried to prove (J.R.A.S. 1913: Secret of Kaniska) that there were two Kusana lines, one extra-Indian and the other Indian ruled by Kaniska. Others like Thomas have placed the Kadphises group before Kaniska. The date of Kaniska is therefore uncertain. There are many theories about his accession, including one which makes him the founder of the 56 B.C. era and another making him the originator of the Śaka era. In any case, Kaniska cannot be placed earlier than 56 B.C. and not later than the first century A.D.

Kusāna line is far from being definitely settled. Most of the Kusāna kings were Indianised and became devoted adherents of some or other of the Hindu gods, especially Śiva. Kanīška according to the northern Buddhists was a patron of their religion and did much for the development of the Mahāyāna School. Gradually, the Kusāna power declined and by the beginning of the fourth century A. D., the Kusānas were reduced to the position of local sovereigns, of the Kabul region and held power as local chiefs for a long time.

Indigenous Powers :—In this dark age, the greater part of northern and western India, was thus overrun by foreign hordes. The only indigenous powers that remained maintained themselves in the south and the east. In regard to eastern India proper, very little is known and we have no detailed records about the regions of Magadha or Bengal. Only the kingdom of Kalinga meets our eyes and we have only a stray allusion to its powerful ruler the Ceta Mahā-Megha-vāhana Khāravela, who calls himself a Bhikṣu-mahārāja or Dharma-mahārāja.* In his Hāthigumphā inscription, he gives an account of his line and of his own doings. From the meagre data and doubtful language of this inscriptional record we simply know, that he was the fourth of his line, a Jain by religion and

* Our information regarding Khāravela is mainly derived from the Hāthigumphā inscription, discovered as early as 1825 and of which an eye-copy by Bhagwantall Indrajī held the ground till 1910, when Indrajī's readings were attacked by a number of scholars. The reading of Mr. Jayaswal made in 1917 and amended in 1928, is now accepted by most scholars. From the inscription we know for certain that Khāravela belonged to the Ceta (Cedi) rulers of Kalinga and was the fourth of his line. Of his more remarkable exploits may be mentioned his expedition "disregarding the attitude of Śātakarni," his expedition to Rājagriha, which compelled the Yavana invader to beat a retreat (line 8), and his victory over Bahasatimitra of Magadha. In the end, he calls himself a descendant of a *rājara* family, a Khemarāja, and Bhikṣurāja, Dhammarāja and prides himself upon his patronage of all religious sects (See J. B. O. Rs. 1928 January).

From the internal evidences, Jayaswal has placed Khāravela in the first half of the 2nd Cen. B.C. The Ceta dynasty was probably founded in 225 B.C. Khāravela was born in 207 B.C. and became King in 183 B.C. By 132 B.C. he was dead. He reformed the Jain worship in Kalinga and performed the Rājasūya sacrifice.

having defied "a Sātakarni Lord of the Deccan" led an expedition to Pātaliputra. Nothing more definite is known as regards his date or his successors.

The Andhras—In regard to the Andhras, we are in almost the same region of mist and darkness. The Purāṇas give us only the names of Andhra princes and we know but little as to the beginning of the dynasty. A number of scholars has relied solely on the Paurāṇic testimony and has made the Andhras, successors to the Suṅga-Kāṇvas, assigning Simuka, their founder, to the third or first quarter of the first century B. C. This however is absolutely untenable, especially on the evidence of epigraphy. Moreover, the Andhras were already a powerful dynasty in the days of Megasthenes, who mentions a tradition about their powerful military force. The dynasty was established according to all evidences by Simuka and gained ascendancy over a large part of western and southern India, but the Andhras seem never to have established Imperial dominion in the plains of Hindustan.* The dynasty produced a number of energetic rulers the total of such being twenty-nine or thirty with a total regnal period of about 460 years. About the three earliest princes we have epigraphic details, but after them there is a gap in such records. This was probably due to the ascendancy of the Khaharātas and Śakas who were however checked by king Gautami-putra Sātakarni, who destroyed the ascendancy of Nabhāpāna, restructed large numbers of foreign coins and restored the bounds of the Andhra Empire by conquering the Śakas, Yavanas

* The beginning of the Andhras must be placed in the last quarter of the 3rd cen. B.C. Bühler on epigraphical grounds had placed them in the second century while according to Rapson the line began soon after 232 B.C. Other scholars like the late Sir R. G. Bhandarkar placed them after the fall of the Suṅga-Kāṇvas. For a discussion of this, see Rapson's introduction to *Andhra Coins and Inscriptions*, Bhandarkar's, *Early History of the Deccan*, and Jouveau-Dubreuil's *Ancient History of the Deccan*.

Palhavas, Khaharātas and some Kṣatttriyas.* He had the usual title of Sātavāhana, but he seems to have belonged to a new royal family. The mention of Brāhmaṇic metonymics is also significant. Gautamiputra's† vast empire comprised Gujarat, Malwa, Central India, Berar, Konkan and a large part of the present Bombay presidency. Owing to these exploits, he must be regarded as the second founder of the Andhra Empire. He was succeeded by a number of energetic princes but soon afterwards the Andhras were hard pressed by the Śakas who under Caṣṭana's grandson Rudradaman, had established a powerful kingdom, and reduced the Andhra king to impotence ('though the latter was not exterminated owing to very near relationship.') After the lapse of some considerable time, the Andhra Empire sank into decay and the different feudatories established independent rule in different localities. This is proved by Paurāṇic and other evidences. According to the former, there were seven Andhra-bhṛtyas who ruled probably at Sriparvata, the dynasty of Ābhiras comprising ten kings, the seven Gardabhilas, the Yavanas, the Tusāras and the Muruṇḍas. From archaeological evidences we find dynasties like those of the Cuṭus related to the Nāgas, the Mahārathis, and of princes bearing the title of Sātakarni, ruling near Banavāsi, who seem afterwards to have been succeeded by the Kadambas of Vaijayantipura. The region about Nasik passed to the Ābhiras as proved by an inscription of the Ābhira Išvarasena. In some other districts, they were supplanted by the Pallavas.

* See the Nasik inscription of Queen-dowager Gautami Bālaśri, the mother of Gautamiputra Sātakarni Sātavāhana.

† The suggestion was made very early that Gautamiputra was the traditional Vikramāditya but was not accepted by all scholars. More recently, this question has been examined in detail by Mr. Haritkrishna Deb, M.A. and he has succeeded in raising important points regarding the identity of Gautamiputra and Vikramāditya. The name Vikramāditya occurs even in Hāla's great poetical work.

All these happened in or about the third century A. D. which still remains a dark and unexplored region before the historian. Perhaps in that age, India remained under the domination of tribes of savages and foreigners. In regions of North India, probably, the Sassanians claimed overlordship. The period is entirely obscure and its history is yet to be written.

Fourth Century Revival ; the Guptas—Towards the close of this period there was a revival of indigenous powers. In north India, the Guptas rose to power, but not before a struggle for supremacy had been waged by lines which produced the Nāgas of Padmāvati or the conqueror Candrar of the Meherauli pillar.

The Vākātakas—In central India arose a new power. It was the Vākātakas of whom we have but little in the Purāṇas except traditions about Vindhyaśakti and Pravarasena. Yet they were a great power who ruled over a vast area of central India and the Deccan. The extent of their power, their cultural peculiarities and their services to the cause of Hindu culture have been rightly emphasised by M. Jouveau-Dubreuil.

The Pallavas—In the extreme south, the Cera, Cola and the Pāṇḍyas held local sway* but in the fourth century A. D., a new power rose in that locality. It was the Pallavas, whose founder

* As regards the extreme south, our knowledge is still meagre, especially for the earliest period. It is reasonable to believe that the extreme south was known to the people of the north even in the IVth and Vth centuries B.C., and Greek travellers have preserved accounts of the Pāṇḍyas. Aryan immigration introduced Aryan culture, and Brahmin sages like Agastya came to be regarded as the fathers of south Indian culture. The social and political life of the south however retained the stamp of an indigenous evolution and the country was parcelled out among a large number of small principalities or tribal states ruled by local princes or Assemblies.

At the dawn of the Christian era, there were 13 *naḍas* and three crowned kings e.g. Cera, Cola and Pāṇḍya who held supreme sway over seven smaller chiefs. There was a struggle for supremacy among these for overlordship over Tamilakam. The first to attain a supreme position was Kārikala the Black-foot, the Cola ruler of Kaveripattam (1st cen. A.D.) and he invaded Ceylon. In the second cen. A.D. Senguttuvan, the Red Cera, rose to power, but his son was defeated and imprisoned by Nedun-jelyan the Pāṇḍya. The Pāṇḍyas retained their supremacy till the fourth cen. A.D. when the Pallavas rose to power.

was, as M. Jouveau Dubreuil rightly points out, not a foreigner but a feudatory of the Abdhra who consolidated ruling authority by marrying a Nāga princess. (See Dubreuil's *History of the Deccan*—pp. 46-51; and Gopalan's *History of the Pallavas* (pp. 1-32).

The Republics—Some other local powers maintained themselves during this age of anarchy and political turmoil. They were the non-monarchical tribes which held their own both against Indian enemies and foreign invaders. Prominent among these were the Yaudheyas, who, though compelled to shift from their old locality, fought with Rudradāman. Next came the Mālavas who moved to Eastern Rājputana where they had to fight the Uttamabhādras in league with the Khaharāta Nahapāna as we are told in the records of the latter's son-in-law, Usavadāta. The Arjunāyanas, the Śibis, the Trigartas, as well as the Rājanyas, the Vṛṣṇis, the Andumbaras and the Mahārājas existed and maintained their ground. They strove to uphold the dignity of their race as well as the non-monarchical tradition. Some of their coins and records have come down to us. As to their mode of government and their political ideals, we shall go into some details in the next section. For fuller details, we refer our readers to Sir Alexander Cunningham's *Ancient Indian Coins* and his *Archaeological Survey Reports* (Vol. XIV).

The Polity of the Age of Conflict and Resurrection

The polity of this dark age was one of reactions and compromises. During the earlier part of the period the reaction against the Imperial institutions was very great. The foreigner conquered the outlying provinces and there instituted new systems of government retaining very little of the past. The higher machinery of government crumbled to dust. The principles of government and the autonomous local institutions however survived. The tenacity of these local institutions was due to many causes. They had received acceptance from the people through centuries, before the advent of imperialism. Furthermore they ensured the independence and good government of the localities.

Above these were imposed the innovations of the conquering hordes. But these affected the people very little. Generally speaking, the higher machinery of government established by the conquering races was one suited to those who could not devise a lasting system but wished to hold the country in military subjection only. It was thus fortunate for India that her new conquerors lacked the genius to create but had to borrow either from the powerful nations of the neighbourhood or from the conquered themselves. The early Sakas and Parthians borrowed from the Parthian or Persian rulers, whose culture had impressed them most. The Greeks alone had the presumption to impose a system of their own, but even then

in reality nothing new was introduced, except certain official titles and names which survived as long as the Greeks ruled.

Changes introduced by Greeks—It appears from the meagre records that the Greek princes like the Śakas and the Parthians remained content with appointing local governors, who held important centres under military occupation. These Greek officials were naturally designated by words of Greek origin. The princes themselves assumed titles like *Megaloy*, or *Basileus Basileon*. The officials appointed by them were known as *Strategos** or *Meridarch*.† Some scholars have also detected the title of *Horamurta*‡. We have coins or inscription which bear these titles, but they cease with the fall of the Greeks.

Saka-Palhavas—The Śakas or Saka-Pahlavas seem to have borrowed from Parthian or Persian models. Probably, there was a supreme Saka ruler presiding over the fortunes of the so-called Sakastan. Under him were Satraps ruling different territorial units, divided into two classes, distinguished from each other by the addition of the prefix *Mahā* to the lower title. The Saka Maues was designated a *Mahārāya* while Parthian princes assumed titles like '*Khcyathianām khayathiya*'. Some of the Mathura Satraps like *Soḍāsa* assumed titles like *Mahāksatrapa* and *Svāmī* (Lüders 59). The Satrapal designation was probably borrowed from Persia and was adopted by all Śakas whether in the north or in the south. In most families, a *Mahāksatrapa* was associated with his son or heir who bore the lower title. Below the higher Satraps, were

* We have a large number of coins of Azes II on which the name of his subordinate Asparvama, the *strategos*, occurs.

† The title *Meridarchos* occurs in a Kharoṣṭhi inscription from Taxila (Thomas, J. R. A. S. 1916).

‡ According to Lüders (J. R. A. S. 1909.) the Manikiala inscription mentions the *horamurta* Lala of the Satrap Vasi.

military leaders designated Satraps or Strategos who collected tributes and reduced refractory tributaries to subjection.

Southern Sakas—Like the Satraps of the north, the Sakas of the south followed the model of Persia during the early part of the period. But the greatest borrowers were the Kusāna Emperors, whose geographical position enabled and compelled them to borrow indiscriminately from all nations, *e.g.* from the Mongols and the Chinese, from the Romans and Greeks as well as from the Hindus.

The Kusānas—This spirit of indiscriminate borrowing characterised the Kusānas not only in politics but in religion. In the Kusāna coins, we find not only Greek legends, but the figures of deities belonging to the Hindu, Buddhist, Zoroastrian, Elamite and even Babylonian pantheon. In addition to the Sun-god, we have figures of Śiva, of the Windgod, of Nanaia, of the goddess Maq and of Helios. Heracles, Mithra and Lakṣmī appear on the coins of Kaniska's successors. The titles assumed by Kaniska are significant. We find the following styles and titles on his coins and inscriptions, *e.g.*

- (a) The Son of Heaven or *Devaputra*—probably borrowed from the Chinese.
- (b) King of Kings—*Sahano-Shao*—from the Perso-Parthians.
- (c) Sovereign lord of kings—or *Mahārājātirāja* borrowed from India.
- (d) King of Kings—*Basileus Basileon* from the Greeks.
- (e) *Kaisar* or *Kazar* (Īśvara ?)—borrowed from the Mongols.
- (f) In the coins of Kadphises, other titles appear *viz.*
Rājātirāja Sarva-loka-īśvara, Mahisvara-himaka and
Makasisa, Tradata.

In course of time, the Kusānas like the other foreigners became not only Indianised but became patrons of Śaivism or

Buddhism as their coins show. They continued to call themselves *Deva* or *Devaputra** and this influenced Indian ideas too deeply. The identification of the king with the vicegerent of the gods and the assumption of the *Deva* title became the universal practice of later Hindu kings. In this respect, a great influence was exerted by the foreigners upon Hindu polity :

While this was the course of events in northern and western India, the indigenous powers which either grew out of the downfall of the Empire or enlarged themselves at the cost of the fallen dynasty, practically maintained the old governmental system, though there was a visible reaction against the centralising and exploiting tendencies of the imperial rule. Of these indigenous powers, the more important were the Andhras and the Cēṭas, in addition to the three states of the extreme south.

The Andhras—The Andhra records give us very little details about their administrative system or the form of government, but from what we have, we may draw the following conclusions.

(a) The Andhra empire comprised territories directly ruled by the Andhra kings, some of these being provinces wrested from the Mauryas.

(b) There were other provinces and areas which were in the hands of hereditary feudatories, calling themselves Mahābhōjis or Mahārāṭhis (Karli No. 14). These families were very powerful and there were often marital alliances between these families and the Andhra rulers. The Andhra queen, Nayanikā, was the daughter of such a Mahārāṭhi (*Sadakana-kala-lāya-Mahārāṭhi*), and we have instances of coins being struck by these feudatories. The

* This title is almost a common characteristic of the successors of Kaniska. Kaniska is called Devaputra in a number of records (see Lüders No. 18, 21, 23). The same epithet is applied to Huska and Huviska (Lüders No. 35, 38, 41-45, 50, 52, 56, 62, 918). Vāsudeva is similarly styled (see Lüders 60). Elsewhere, he is spoken of as Mahārāja and Rājātirāja.

Mahābhojis who probably inherited the styles of the *Bhaujyas* or the *Bhojas* of the Epic, enjoyed similar powers and prerogatives. Other tributaries were the *Outas*, *Nāgas* and *Mundānandas*. In course of time, most of these feudatories asserted their independence. (Rapson C. I. of Andhras, Introduction pp XLII to XLV).

(c) In those portions of the Maurya Empire which were annexed to the Andhra monarchy, the old system lasted more or less with modifications. The provincial government was in the hands of *Amātyas* or *Rājāmātyas*, and we hear of *Amātyas* like *Viṣṇupālita* or *Sivagupta*. There were also military officers-like *Senāpatīs* or *Mahāsenāpatīs* stationed at different centres (Cf. Nasik 24, *Senāpati Vasu*). We have references to *Mahāmātras* in charge of the *Śramaṇas* (No. 22 Nāsik, of cava nō. 19). One inscription speaks of *Bhāṇḍāgārikas*. Subject to these officials, the local areas enjoyed full autonomy and guilds were active, as we know from *Uśavadāta*'s records speaking of *Nigama-sabhās*.

In addition to the ordinary taxes, the Andhras seemed to have preserved some of those fiscal rights which were enjoyed by their Maurya predecessors. We hear of royal villages (*Rājakam Khetam*) and in connection with grants to religious orders, we know that they too preserved their salt monopoly and exacted ferry-dues. This is evident from the fact that whenever villages were granted, the Andhras conferred with that grant the right of making salt and other privileges (अपावेश अनोमस अलोन्खादक सवजात परिहारिक etc. See Ins. of Sātakarni Gautamiputra. No. 5.)

Detailed information on these heads is indeed scanty, but from some of the inscriptions, we have interesting informations about the styles, titles or the pretensions of the Andhras. The kings of the Andhra line were satisfied with the simple titles of *Rāja**

* Apart from *rāja* and *mahārāja*, the assumption of the titles, *Satāvāhana* and *Sātakarni*

and *Mahārāja* and their wives and mothers were designated *Mahādevī*. Many of the rulers assumed the name of *Sātakarni** and some designated themselves *Sātavāhana*, later on corrupted into *Sālivāhana*. The successor of Gautamiputra, the restorer of the glories of the line, makes that king pride upon his hereditary dignity (*kula-purisa-paraparāgata*), enumerates the different provinces under the royal rule, the races of enemies conquered by him and allows Gautamiputra to be compared with the great heroes of Indian history. While most of the epithets are of no importance to the historian, some details are really suggestive. Thus, in the great inscription of Gautamiputra's mother, the king is not only extolled for his mercy to enemies, his efforts for the preservation of the order of the *Varnas* (*vinivāṭita-cāturvanna-kārasa*) and his patronage of the Brahmins as well as the lower castes (*Dijāvara-kuṭva-vivadhanasa*) but claims to be remembered and honoured on account of his having lived a dedicated life which shared fully the joys and sorrows of his subjects (*Porajana-nivisesa-sama-sukha-dukhasa*) and devoted to the attainment of the three objects of existence (*Subibhata-tivaga-desakālasa*). Another source of the king's pride was that he never imposed any taxes not sanctioned by custom or justice (*Dharmopajita-kara-viniyoga-karasa*), nor did his arms fail to smite the enemy and protect his own people.* A King with all enemies

is significant. But no satisfactory meaning has been assigned to these words (lord of seven *sātā*—hills—*karni*?). One prince calls him *Nava-narasvāmi* (Lord of *nava-nagara*—or lord of nine classes of men?).

* Many of these expressions are significant. The reference to the devotion to the happiness of the people is but an echo of the ancient Hindu regal ideal and reminds us of Kautilya's line—*प्रजासुखं सुखं राज्ञः प्रजानाञ्च हिते हितम्*. The allusion to the *Trivargas* and the consideration of *desa* and *kāla* seem to echo Kautilyan ideas. The mention of the exaction of taxes only sanctioned by *Dharma* shows the mentality of a reaction against the fiscal tyranny of the Empire.

subdued, with all subjects treated with kindress, he was great like Rāma, Keśava, Arjuna and other heroes, the first and unrivalled fighter of his age and the "Sole Brahmin" (*Ekadhanu*, *Ekasura* and *Ekabamhana*).*

From these we may safely presume that the political ideals of these indigenous rulers of south India were not much different from those of the Arthaśāstra, though in one or two respects they came to bear the stamp of the pacifism introduced by the great Emperor Aśoka. The references to the threefold aims and the identification of the king with his subjects' interest clearly point to the continuance of the traditional Arthaśāstra ideals. But the mention of non-violence to enemies (*Satujane apanahisā-ruchisa*) or the allusion to taxation with Dharma, are but the indications which shew the reaction against the policy of bloody conquests or of unbridled fiscal tyranny which is so prominent in the code of Kauṭilya.

The Dharma Reaction—The influence of this Dharma ideal was more far-reaching than it has been hitherto supposed. Perhaps, it was greater in the country, the conquest of which evoked in Aśoka those sentiments which swelled the flood-tide of his repentance and made his memory so dear to humanity. It is remarkable to note its influence on Mahā-meghavāhana

* The word *Ekabamhana* has not been clearly explained. It means 'the sole Brāhmaṇa' and may be taken to point to the fact that the later Sātavāhanas were Brahmins by caste. This view receives support from the occurrence of Brahmanical gotra metronyms like Vāśiṣṭhi-putra or Gautamīputra. Acting upon this interpretation, we must incline to the fact that probably after the weakening of the Andhra power on account of the Śaka invasion, a Brahmin dynasty supplanted the earlier Andhra kings who were Śūdras by caste. We had a recurrence of this many centuries later, in the same region, where the Peśwas supplanted the successors of Siyāji.

This together with the Brāhmanical origin of the Suṅgas point to a Brahmanical reaction in that age of foreign invasion. Later on, we find the Pallavas claiming descent from Asvatthāman, and the Kadambas calling themselves Brahmins. The same thing is repeated five centuries later when the Sāhis of Kabul, the last kings of Sind and some of the Pratihāras claimed to have been of Brahmin descent.

Khāravēla, the Cēṭa prince of Kalinga* who restored the greatness of his line. Great as he was and glorious as his political achievements were, he, too, felt the influence of that man who had reduced his country into a province of his empire. In imitation of the piety of the adversary of his line, he took the title of Kṣemarāja, Bhikṣurāja and Dharmarāja, titles assumed by many of the later Indian princes, and the practice continued for a long time.†

In course of time, all these pacific and humane ideals passed to all the races of barbarian invaders of India. The half-Greeks of Bactria were the first to feel the spiritual influence of the conquered. They readily gave up their soulless paganism and adopted either the teachings of Buddha or embraced like Heliodoros the rising Bhāgavata religion. Many of their princes assumed the style of the Righteous (Dhārmika)‡ and soon the Hellenes lost their individuality, political and cultural.

The savager elements resisted longer, but they too succumbed fast and adopted not only the religion but also the social and political institutions of the conquered. So far as political and social

* The inscription of Khāravēla derives importance from other causes. It gives us the early history of Jainism and shows how that religion had spread over Kalinga. It shows also how, with their faith riveted to the extreme of *ahimsā*, Jain princes could fight and undertake military expeditions.

Other inscription of this line of Kalinga kings have come down to us. But as regards the date, differences of opinion still exist.

† Khāravēla enumerates his proficiency in many sciences (*lekha-rupa-gananā-bidhi-visāradena*) and towards the end of his inscription prides upon his universal toleration (*Savapāsanda-pūjaka*) and assumes these above titles (*e.g.* Khemarāja, Budharāja, Bhikkhurāja and Dharmarāja.).

‡ The coins of Greek princes bear impressions of gods and goddesses like Pallas, Zeus, Nike, or Heracles, or contain the dioscuri or the tripod, in addition to the bull. Most of the coins bear a Kharoṣṭhi legend and the king is styled Mahārāja in addition to the Greek titles. In some cases, the titles 'Tradarasa' and 'Apratihata' are added. Some coins of Heliodoros and some joint coins of Strato and Agathocleia contain the word 'dharmka' in addition to other titles. The word 'Mahatasa' is found on the coins of Maues while the Indo-parthian Azes I also uses the appellation of 'Dhārmika.'

ideals are concerned, they are best exemplified by the history of the Khaharātas and the Kṣatrapas.

Hinduisation—The Karle inscription (No. 10 Lüders, nos. 1099, 1131, 1133) of Nahapāna's son-in-law, Ushavadīta, reflects all the sentiments of a pious Hindu and an ideal Indian king. A son-in-law of a Khaharāta king, styled Kṣatrapa and Rājā and occasionally designated *Svāmi*, this Śaka prince celebrates his victory over the Mālavas by charitable acts and pious deeds of which a genuine Hindu could be proud. He visits Hindu sacred places, makes immense gift to Brahmins, endows caves for Buddhist monks, but not satisfied with these, he digs wells and tanks, establishes tree rest-houses, raises embankments and even supports free ferries. The kingdom of Nahapāna did not last long. His line was put an end to by Gautamīputra Śātakarni, but very soon the Andhra domination was supplanted there by that of another line of Śakas founded by Ćastana and holding court at Ujjain.

This line held sway for more than three centuries and produced powerful rulers. Rudradāman, the greatest king of the line, speaks like a true Hindu and tries to govern according to the old Hindu ideal. The Junāgaḍh inscription of the Mahākṣatrapa Svāmi Rudradāman (Lüders No. 965) is an important document which speaks for itself. Like a pious Hindu, Rudradāmana speaks in this inscription written in Sanskrit, of his election by men of all castes, and Śaiva though he was, he prides upon his not killing any body except in war. His government of the provinces, wrested from the Andhras, seems to have been modelled on that of the Mauryas, to whom these originally belonged. He seems to have been well versed in the art of government, especially in the Arthaśāstra. He maintained two sets of officers under him who are styled (a) *Mati-sacivas*, and (b) *Karma-sacivas*.

Clearly, the function of the first body was to give advice to the king on affairs of state. Whether the Matisacivas still constituted the *Parīṣat*, we do not know, but this much is clear that a body of advisers remained under the king. The karmasacivas were executive officers, who had charge of departments which are unfortunately not enumerated. But this much we can presume that there were officials with various duties. Some were employed to collect royal dues in various shapes, *e.g.* *Bali*, or *Bhāga* from royal lands as in Maurya times. Others collected the *Sulka* or Toll, while the *Bhāṇḍāgārikas*, were in charge of treasure-houses containing not only gold, silver, precious gems and stones but also the produce of fields, or taxes paid in kind (a practice which continued even up to Gupta times). Other officials were in charge of irrigation and water-supply and this is clearly confirmed by the inscription of Usavadāta and of Rudradāman, whose Junāgaḍh inscription (Lüders 965) gives us a detailed description of the Sudarśana lake (see also Lüders, nos 1137-1186). The Karmāntas or workshops were also in existence as we know from another inscription and this is confirmed by the evidence of the Kāmasūtra which speaks of Adhyakṣas in charge of factories.

There existed also judges, criminal magistrates, police officers as well as chiefs of military pickets. The higher military officers included the Senapatis and Maha-senāpatis and these commanded the troops and garrisons in different localities. The different provinces and local divisions were probably under Amātyas as under the Anṭhras. Villages and local areas, guilds, and townships probably continued to enjoy autonomy, though the officers in charge, whether appointed by the king or elected, were accountable to the king.

While in this way, the traditional system remained undisturbed,

Rudradāman shared the feeling against the oppressive measures of the Empire. Like the Andhra rulers (who claimed to have exacted no taxes except those sanctioned by *Dharma*), he was opposed to fiscal tyranny and he speaks clearly against excessive taxes (*kara*), forced labour (*vis̥ti*) and benevolences (*Pranayas*).

Political tendencies and influences—In the light of available evidences, we may summarise the political tendencies and influences of this period.

First of all, the foreign invasions, though they caused the downfall of the imperial structure, did not materially injure the cultural and social life of the Indian people or destroy the subordinate administrative machinery, or the autonomy of village life. The foreign invaders ultimately reinforced the ethnic element already existing and paved the way to a neo-Hindu social and religious revival.

Secondly, the foreign domination of the north led to the political consciousness of the south, which for a long time became a stronghold of Indian culture.

Thirdly, the monarchical principle became stronger than ever and though some of the republics maintained their political existence in the fringe areas or in secluded regions, the vigour of the republican discipline gradually passed away. A few centuries more, and these republics passed out of existence. The principle of monarchy was not only strengthened, but everywhere the powers and prerogatives of the king were extolled. The king in that age of foreign domination and anarchy came to be looked upon as the saviour of the people and the upholder of the social and moral existence. The transcendental *Dharma* idea became the dominant principle in social and political life and materialism passed to the back-ground. The influence of the central Asian races, made the

king to be looked upon as the incarnation of the divine spirit and this *deva* idea was accepted everywhere. Following the Kusāna example, later Hindu kings came to be styled *Devas* and the old sacerdotal principle received a strong re-inforcement. Along with this, an intimate connection was established between the king and the religion he professed. This is apparent from the styles assumed by the various dynasties which ruled India from this time. Each line claimed to derive success from the grace of the deity it worshipped. In this, too, the foreigners led the way. The Greek kings put the figures of their own divinities on coins and Pallas, Nike, Demeter, Hermes or Zeus made their appearance. The Kusānas followed their example. Kadphises II put the Śiva image on his coins in addition to the bull. Under Kanīška, these gods and goddess were multiplied and Indian, Roman, Greek or Babylonian deities made their appearance on coins. (See Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum, p. 10-26). Sectarianism also invaded politics and soon afterwards the king's name everywhere was associated with the cult to which he belonged. From the fourth century downwards, kings distinguished themselves by assuming distinctly religious titles like *Parama-Bhāgavata*, *Parama-Māheshvara* or *Parama-Saṃgata*.

Lastly, a distinct feudal tendency was infused into the spirit of Hindu politics. Repeated invasions and the continual changes of hand of local areas led to the growth of numerous lines of subordinate princes, who always saved their own heads by transferring their allegiance to the dominant power of the day. The Scytho-Persian ideal of government by means of a series of Satraps led also to the creation of such an indigenous aristocracy and most probably the old centralised character of administration as under the Mauryas passed away. The rise of innumerable Mitra families

points to the same. The Satrapal families also strengthened the same principle and the rise of feudatory families under the Guptas is a fact which every historian is bound to take into account. These ruled their own dominions on conditions of military aid and tribute. The representatives of the central power were installed in all centres of importance and probably the later official grade of Kāyasthas grew out of the imitation of the Persian and Parthian *Khayathiya*.*

The Republican Ideal

In the midst of these innovations and turmoils, the republics maintained more or less their own time-honoured institutions and the tradition of independence. In the absence of detailed records, their coins alone show their corporate political existence and the dominance of the idea of a '*res publica*.'

Prominent among these republicans were the Yaudheyas, who had survived the imperial domination of the Mauryas. In that age of foreign invasion, they had to fight hard against the Saka ruler Rudradāman, who speaks of their valour and military pride. (Ep. Ind. VIII.). Three types of Yaudheya coins have been discovered, especially in the eastern Punjab, with the elephant and bull symbol, with the figure of Kārtikeya and with

* It is a significant fact that just after the foreign invasion and settlement in India, the official grade of Kāyasthas becomes very prominent. That the Kāyasthas were in origin an occupational caste has been admitted by all, but no satisfactory derivation of the name has been suggested.

It has been suggested by Mr. A. K. Dev that the word Kāyastha is nothing but the sanskritised form of the Persian or Parthian '*khayathiya*' meaning a prince. Probably the institution of these officers should be attributed to the Saka-parthians who borrowed largely from the Persians. After the fall of the Saka-parthians, the institutions survived and the fiscal officers of the various kings retained that old name, though sanskritised. I think that this suggestion of Mr. Dev is very pertinent and worthy of the attention of scholars. The exactions of the early Kāyasthas made them unpopular and gradually they came to form a caste. Kāyasthas are mentioned in the Smṛti of Yājñavalkya in connection with the constitution of law courts and in the very old drama of Mṛcchakatika we find a Kāyastha in the law court of the day.

the figure of a warrior. In the absence of recorded history, the inscriptions on some of these coins throw light on their staunch republicanism. On some coins we have the words 'Yaudheya-gaṇasya Jaya' while in other places we find the expression 'Yaudheyānam Jaya Mantra dharānām.' Clearly, these speak of their corporate Gaṇa and their elected elders and are an eye-opener to those who deny the existence of the republican principle in ancient India. Cunningham has identified the Johiya Rajputs with the descendants of the ancient Yaudheyas (see Cunningham's *Ancient Coins of India*, pp. 75-79; also *Arch. Sur. Rep. Ind.* Vol. XIV on Autonomous coins).

The coins of the Mālavas, who, too, survived and fought Nahapāna's son-in-law are equally suggestive and show how there was one commonly accepted style among the republicans. The Mālavas like the Yaudheyas also issued coins in the name of their corporation. Their coins bear a bull, lion or tree, with the legend 'Malava-gaṇasya or Mālavānām Jaya, meaning victory to their corporation.

The Śibis whose coins are found near modern Chitor issued their coins in the name of their *Janapada of Sibi in Madhyamikā* (*Majhamikāyā Sibijanapadasa*; See Cunningham on Autonomous Coins of India; A. S. R. Vol. XIV).

Similar to these, we have the coins of the Arjunāyanas and these belonging to the Suṅga period, bear the legend 'Ārjunāyana' and *Ārjunāyana Jaya*. Thus, these reflect the same spirit as the other states mentioned above.

We have coins of other autonomous non-monarchical states, namely, those of the Auḍumvaras, Aparāntas, Kunindas, Vṛṣṇis, and of the Mahārāja-janapada and the Rājanya Janapada. The Mahārāja and Rājanya coins were issued in the name of their

respective Janapadas. The real significance of the word Janapada is yet to be discovered. Probably, among the Mahārāja and Rājanyas there was the growth of an oligarchy of chiefs or fighters. This is clearly discernible in the case of the Vṛṣṇis and the Auḍumvaras some of whose later coins bear the legend of a ruler who is mentioned by name *e.g.* *Mahādevasa rāṇo Dharaghosasa*.^{*} This seems to point to the gradual or occasional supplanting of gaṇa rule by semi-monarchical authority. We find an instance of this clearly in the case of the Yaudheyas, one whose chiefs is mentioned Swāmi Brāhmaṇya Yaudheya and another is later on styled Mahārāja and Mahāsenāpati. The single Vṛṣṇi coin is issued in the name of 'Vṛṣṇi-rājanya-janāśya bhūbhārasya *e.g.* the corporation of Vṛṣṇi Kṣattriyas. (See J. R. A.S. 1900, pp. 416-420).

The coins of the Kunindas have been referred to a period immediately before the Christian era. The same is also the case with the Aparānta coins (near Shahbazghari). For further details see Cunningham A.S. Reports. Vol. XIV—on Autonomous coins, (pp. 129 1 *et seq.*).

Indian Republicans—It will be out of place to dwell at large on the history of these states or peoples, since it is not within the scope of a volume like this. But this may be pointed out that these coins and their legends are sufficient to dispel the idea entertained by many European scholars and tacitly accepted by some Indian writers that republics were unknown in ancient India. Why and how such ideas originate is difficult to understand, except on the axiomatic acceptance

^{*} Some of the Auḍumvara coins throw doubt on their republican character. In some of their coins, bearing the Trident, battle axe, tree, plough or a temple, we find three names of chiefs—*e.g.*, Dharaghosa, Śivadāsa and Rudradāsa, bearing the titles, Mahādeva, Mahārāja or Rājārāja.

of the inferiority of the Indian political genius and the assumption that republics and republicanism were an exclusive patent of the West. Yet the facts are that Indian tradition as well as recorded documents clearly distinguish these from the monarchical states. They issued coins in the name, not of rulers, nor of castes, but of political communities, who believed in their own separate and corporate political existence and manifested their faith in a *res publica*.

Again such states maintained their existence for as long a period (and occasionally for longer periods) as the republican states of Greece and Italy. The republican *régime* in Athens lasted for not more than eight hundred years and that in Rome for not more than six hundred years roughly. In India the facts are that the Yaudheyas existed from Pāṇini's time to the date of the Vijayagarh Inscription which is more than nine hundred years. In the case of the Mālavas we have real historical evidence of their existence from the time of Alexander to the rise of the Guptas which is more than six hundred years, even if we neglect their unrecorded early history.

Next, it has been advanced in some quarters that the Indian republics were nothing more nor less than tribal oligarchies, which reserved political power for the ruling few. Here again facts prove something to the contrary. The Mālavas, as stated already, certainly admitted Brahmins and men of other castes to live in their territory and to exercise the franchise. Certainly, this was not to be expected in an oligarchy. (See *supra* I, pp. 245 and 246). And does it not compare fairly with the state of affairs in Greece? Take Athens for example. In the hey-day of her prosperity, political power at Athens was in the hands of a ruling section only. Slaves formed more than half of the population and they had no

political rights. The *Metiks* were also excluded and even among *bona fide* Athenians, the tie of the *phratrics* and of religion was so powerful that it was difficult for a new-comer to get admission into the political life of the city. Certainly, here too the Indians stood on a higher political level.

Democracies in the modern sense existed neither in Greece nor in India. Man's political rights were, in the ancient world, everywhere subordinated to certain notions of status and certain privileges of birth. These were the same in India as in the West. But the misfortune of India lay in the fact that her people exhibited a premature and precocious political genius longing for a higher type of evolution and this tended even in that remote age towards a cosmopolitan goal, though in society there existed divergences of race and culture standing in the path of a uniform social life. Though differing in blood or race, Indians could bring themselves under a common political sway and solved their social problems in a peculiar way. This was unknown in Greece, where the people though loving equality and extolling freedom looked only for a social uniformity in a narrow political frame. The republican city-state with its few thousand citizens remained the chief ideal of Greece. The Hellenes could not modify it or think of an extensive empire. It remained foreign to their genius. That task was undertaken later on by Alexander, himself a semi-barbarian empire-builder. But that dream was but half realised when the Greek lost his political individuality. He was swallowed up and lost in the midst of the races whom he pretended to conquer.

Practically, a similar state of affairs reigned in Italy. All the city-states were republics. Rome was one of them. By her conquests she imposed her yoke on the other cities of Latium and of Italy. Soon she became the mistress of a vast empire. But that meant the end of democracy and gradually of republicanism. The republic came

under *triumvirs* and military leaders and very soon they became despots, who were deified by the people.

In India, the line of development was not dissimilar. At first the republics were numerous. Gradually they became fewer and monarchy regulated by laws and public opinion gained ground. Later on monarchy became the political ideal of Indian thinkers. This was necessitated by the conflicts of races and principles. Universalism became the order of the day. Imperialism triumphed and the republics passed out of existence, after lasting for many centuries.

III

Political Speculations of the Reaction

The consequences of the political disruption and foreign invasion deeply influenced the speculations of the age. A strong reaction set in with a view to modifying the social outlook and the political ideal. Men lost their faith in the ideals of the preceding age and yearned for a social and political order more likely to conserve than to lead to progress. The champions of orthodoxy attributed the disasters to the heterodox religious propaganda and the upheaval of the masses. Social disruption and political downfall were regarded as the consequences of false religious teachings and deviations in moral conduct. Consequently, the lawgivers of the reactionary age ushered in an era of social repression and political subjugation. The aims and objectives of the Arthaśāstra teachers were denounced and the task of social reconstruction was entrusted to the exponents of the orthodox Dharma ideal. They repudiated the secular ideals of the Arthaśāstra writers and condemned the goal of material prosperity. In place of these, they thought of raising a state, more moral than material and more spiritual than political. The Dharma ideal, which had been raised so high by Aśoka, was resuscitated and the importance of Artha was minimised. The Smṛti-writers, however, while they proposed to follow the canon of the Dharmasūtras and Dharmaśāstras, could not remain blind to facts. Consciously and unconsciously

they utilised much of the Arthaśāstra material. Consequently, most of the regulations and principles accepted during the Imperialistic rule of the Mauryas remained intact, but the social and political outlook was entirely changed.

The earliest of these Dharmaśāstra-writers was the author of the Bhārgava recension of the Mānava Dharmaśāstra. The author flourished most probably during the Śuṅga age and the present Manusamhitā cannot be ascribed to a period later than the 1st century B. C. The next great works of importance were the Yājñavalkya Smṛti and the Smṛti of Viṣṇu, which closely follow the principles and tenets of the Mānava writer. Some of the views on ethics or law of the latter find support from the greatest commentator of the Mīmāṃsā, namely Śabara Svāmin who also belonged to the period immediately posterior to that of Manu. The general acceptance of the views of the Smṛti-writers is also proved by the evidence of social life presented by the dramas of Bhāsa and more particularly by the Mṛcchakaṭika⁽¹⁾ attributed to King Śūdraka and composed most probably during the later Kuṣāna period which was marked by Southern domination over the country round Avanti.

While Hinduism was changing its character and modifying its social outlook, Buddhism was fast losing its hold on the minds of the people. The age was marked by the rise of eminent exponents of a new Buddhist philosophy like Aśvaghoṣa, Nāgārjuna

(1) The date of the Mṛcchakaṭika has given rise to an almost endless controversy. Older Indologists used to assign it to the 1st century B.C. or A.D. But some recent writers have tried to place it in the Gupta period. This, however, is untenable and certain internal evidences militate against it. The Cāradatta tradition is undoubtedly old and the present book cannot be placed later than the 1st or 2nd century A.D. The author evidently knew the Nānaka coins of the Kuṣānas, and flourished in an age in which Southerners were supreme in Avanti. This takes us to the pre-Saka period.

or the authors of the Vibhāṣā and Sūtrānta school. But, it had nothing, as we shall see very soon, to contribute towards political or social ideas. As such, the age was eventually one of Neo-Hindu reaction and revival.

In the domain of ethics and political philosophy, the pre-eminent teacher of this reactionary age was, as we have said, the unknown author of the Bhārgava recension of the Mānava Dharmaśāstra. Unknown though he is, he deserves recognition on account of his thorough mastery of the orthodox canon, his knowledge of the diverse views of the different socio-ethical schools and his acumen as a lawgiver bent upon creating a system in opposition to the one which had gained acceptance for centuries merely by his interpretations. He rightly recognizes the normal desires and natural aspirations of man which impel him to action. Furthermore, he has the clearest idea about the prime duties of governments to maintain the life and property of subjects, and his ideal of social happiness is higher than that of most of his predecessors. But in spite of these, his outlook is entirely a changed one. He takes upon himself the task of presenting a social ideal which was more for conservation than for progress. With this object he adopts a new interpretation of the older canon, with a view to overemphasising the sacerdotal ideal and nullifying the force of arguments which might go against it. In doing this, he is often exposed to the charge of self-contradiction. But he proceeds carefully and cautiously and seems to have had the support of the age. His work was welcomed by the ruling orders and it is perhaps on account of this that his compilation gained universal credence and even now holds the foremost position among the Smṛti works.

The author of the Bhārgava text was essentially a reactionary, as can be easily seen from his views on the supremacy of the

Brāhmaṇa, the social relation of the castes, the perpetual degradation of the Sūdra, the denunciation of womankind, the blind and unmoral advocacy of the absolute authority of the father over family property, unequal division among sons and the rejection of the plea for the emancipation of slaves. A detailed discussion of these topics will be out of place here, but something requires to be said with a view to defining the author's place in the social and political history of India.

As regards the Brāhmaṇa, Manu leaves us no room for doubting his faith in the semi-divine position of the sacerdotal order and he utilises much of the Epic material to extol the position of the Brāhmaṇa. With him, the Brāhmaṇa is (along with the king) the upholder of the moral order, the highest of created beings, the divine representative of Dharma and the owner of everything on earth.⁽²⁾ With his characteristic fondness for hyperbole, the writer of the *Samhitā* uses language which only speaks for itself

(2) These views appear from the following verses of the *Manusamhitā*, taken mainly from the Epic tradition, *e.g.*—

सर्वकौवास्य सर्गस्य धर्मतो ब्राह्मणः प्रभुः ॥ M. S. I.93

ब्रह्मिणस्तु नराः श्रेष्ठा नरेषु ब्राह्मणाः स्मृताः ॥ M. S. I.96

उत्पत्तिरेव विप्रस्य मूर्तिर्धर्मस्य शश्वती ।

स हि धर्मार्थमुत्पन्नी ब्रह्मभूयाय कल्पते ॥ M. S. I.98

ब्राह्मणो जायमानो हि पृथिव्यामधिजायते ।

इंश्वरः सर्वभूतानां धर्मकोषस्य गुप्तये ॥ M. S. I.99

सर्वे स्व' ब्राह्मणस्येदं यत् किञ्चिद् जगतीगतम् ।

य' ष्टानामिजनिनेदं सर्वं वै ब्राह्मणोऽर्हति ॥ M. S. I.100.

स्वमेव ब्राह्मणो भुङ्क्ते स्व' वस्ते स्व' ददाति च ।

आयुश्च स्याद् ब्राह्मणस्य भुङ्क्ते हीतरेजनाः ॥ M. S. I.101

and he does everything to uphold his idealism by presenting a sternly rigid code for the Brāhmaṇa's guidance and denounces the slightest deviation from the type of Brahminhood laid down in his code. But, inspite of his high idealism, he makes himself assailable by the champions of humanity on account of his emancipation of the Brāhmaṇa from the rigours of a criminal code and his want of sympathy for the masses.

In the matter of relationship between caste and occupation, the lawgiver pretends merely to elaborate the directions of his predecessors and lays down the traditional occupations of castes and mixed castes.⁽³⁾ Generally speaking, he is averse to mixed marriages and manifests a tendency to lower the position of the children of such marriages. The marriage of a Brāhmaṇa or a Kṣātriya with a Śūdrā, he denounces in the most violent language⁽⁴⁾ and stigmatises such a union as a bar to salvation, though he himself admits the existence of customs to the contrary. Manu's violence to the Śūdra is one of the chief characteristics of his law-code and his constant declamations did more mischief by furnishing potent weapons to the more reactionary writers of a later and more decayed age. The Śūdra he excludes from higher judicial and

(3) Manu's caste theory is also important on account of the fact that he assigns to foreign tribes like the Sakas, Cīnas, Hūnas, and Yavanas an Aryan origin and attributes their downfall to a deviation from the teachings of the Brahmins (cf. M. S. X दृष्टव्यं गतं लोकं ब्राह्मणादर्थनेन च ॥).

(4) Manu's vehement denunciation of the marriage of Brāhmaṇas and Kṣātriyas with Śūdras is found in the IIIrd book of his work. Prior to this author, some of the Gṛhya writers like Gobhila had forbidden it, but they did not use so violent a language nor made it a bar to salvation. (Cf. Manu III—note the verses 13-19.) We quote one:—

शूद्रां शयनमारोप्य ब्राह्मणो यात्यधीमतिम् ।

जनयित्वा सुतं तस्या ब्राह्मणादिव होयते ॥

Elsewhere (IX. 22-23), however, he cites the cases of Akṣamālā and Sāraṅgi, who, though low-born, were married by ṛsis and proved virtuous.

executive services, assigns to him the only duty of serving the higher castes and reserves for him all the rigours of a merciless criminal code.⁽⁵⁾ Next to Sūdra, he denounces the female sex, as being naturally disposed towards untruth and guile.⁽⁶⁾ He excludes them from higher intellectual pursuits, denies their customary inheritance (though recognising Strīdhanam), forbids sacraments or Vedic rites, violently denounces the very idea of the remarriage of widows and prescribes household duties and loyalty to husband as the sole end and aim of their existence though often he has to admit facts to the contrary.

Almost in the same strain, he advocates the retention of slavery, justifies it as an institution of divine creation and conducive to the well-being of society. Curiously enough, the language he uses is almost similar to that of Aristotle.⁽⁷⁾

(5) The Sūdra is excluded from the office of counsellor and judge (*cf.* धर्मप्रवक्ता नृपतेर्न तु शूद्रः कदाचन ।). This is against the spirit of the Epics.

The only duty of the Sūdra according to Manu is service and the language used goes a long way to indentifying the Sūdra with the slave (*cf.* VII 413-414 दास्यार्थं व हि सृष्टोऽसौ ब्रह्मणस्य स्वयच्छुवा । न स्वामिना निमृष्टोऽपि शूद्रो दास्याद् विमुच्यते ॥). This is in curious contrast with the spirit of Arthasāstra.

(6) Manu denies freedom to women (*cf.* IX न स्त्री स्वातन्त्र्यमर्हति ।) and excludes them from sacraments and Vedic mantras (नास्ति स्त्रीणां क्रिया मन्त्रैरिति धर्मा व्यवस्थितः IX. 18). He harps on their innate perversity (*cf.* नरिन्द्रिया अमन्त्राश्च द्विद्योऽवृतमिति स्थितिः । IX. 18). Marriage was their only sacrament and loyal service to husbands the only duty (*cf.* M. S. II— वैवाहिकी विधिः स्त्रीणां संस्कारी वैदिकः स्मृतः । पतिसेवा गुरौ वासो गृहार्थोऽग्निपरिक्रिया ॥)

(7) On slavery the views of Manu go counter to the spirit of the Arthasāstra. While Kauṣilya is for unqualified emancipation of all, Manu pleads for slavery and regards the Sūdra as intended for the slavery of the Brahmin. What a reaction and what a degeneration in so short a period! *cf.*—

The same attitude of reaction marks the views of the law-giver on the end and aim of governments or the nature and extent of royal power. The lawgiver starts by laying stress on the anarchy which would arise in the absence of a king and then emphasises the creation of the regal office by the Almighty. His well-known lines on the origin of royal power make him a champion of regal authority out and out. He proceeds a step further than the Epic writers. In the eyes of the latter, the gods with whom the king was identified typified merely the different functions of the universal system. Indra represented leadership in war, Yama was the destroyer, Varuṇa was the judge, Agni was the punisher and purifier of sinners while Candra and Kubera were the supporters of life. But Manu identifies the king's essence with the collected essences of the divine rulers of the universal phenomena. Instead of harping on the parallelism of royal duties with those of the gods Indra, Vāyu, Yama, Agni, Varuṇa, Candra and Kubera, he tries to make the king a real counterpart of the divine rulers and clothes the regal office as well as its holder with divine veneration.⁽⁸⁾

शूद्रं तु कारयेद्वाच्यं क्रीतमक्रीतमिव वा ।

दास्याथैव हि मृष्टोऽही ब्राह्मणश्च स्वयंभुवः ॥ VIII.413

न स्वामिना निमृष्टोऽपि शूद्रो दास्यादिमुच्यते ।

निसर्गजं हि तत्तस्य कक्षायास्तदपीति ॥ VIII.414

As regards property, he makes the Śūdra incapable of inheriting or holding property and places sons and wives of freemen on the same footing (भार्या पुत्रश्च दसश्च त्वय एवाधनं स्यात्ताः) .

(8) Manu's way of putting things is significant. The Epic writer, in Ch. 68 of the Śānti Parva, explains the allegorical import of the king's identification with the gods, but Manu hints at the consubstantial equality of the king with the gods. Elsewhere, too, he explains the allegorical import lying behind such a conception (cf. Manu Ch. IX).

Again, in explaining the evolution of the regal office, the law-giver never takes the people into account. He does not mention the election of Manu (as in M. B. Sānti 67) but makes the people a passive and inert agent in whose interests the creation of kingship was decided on by the Almighty.

The main function of the king is to protect Dharma or the moral order, self-emanent and self-existent which the author of the Manusamhitā does not clearly define, but which in its objective aspect connotes the canon guiding the ways of men leading to happiness on earth and salvation after death. The sources of Dharma, according to the author of the present samhitā, are four, viz., the *Vedas*, *Smṛti* which derived authority from its being dependent on the *Śruti*, *Sadācāra* or the customs and practices of the virtuous and lastly the dictates of a disciplined and virtuous conscience.

To protect Dharma, the Almighty created Daṇḍa or regulated chastisement which impelled men to follow the right path. This Daṇḍa was created out of the essence of the Brahman and protected everything through the fear of punishment; cf.—

तदर्थं सर्वभूतानां गोप्तारं दण्डमात्मजम् ।
 ब्रह्मतेजोमयं दण्डमसृजत् पूर्वमीश्वरः ॥ VII-14
 तस्य सर्वाणि भूतानि स्थावराणि चराणि च ।
 भयाङ्गीराय कल्पन्ते स्वधर्मान्न चलन्ति च ॥ 15
 स राजा पुरुषो दण्डः स नेता शासिता च सः ।
 चतुर्णामाश्रमाणां च धर्मस्य प्रतिभूः स्मृतः ॥ 16
 दण्डः शास्ति प्रजाः सर्वा दण्ड एवाभिरक्षति ।
 दण्डः सुप्तेषु जागर्ति दण्डं धर्मं विदुर्बुधाः ॥ 17

Next, according to the author of the Manusamhitā, the king's sovereign authority arises out of his exercise of the laws of Daṇḍa

which is the upholder of Dharma. In its subjective aspect Daṇḍa is nothing but Dharma itself. Daṇḍa strikes terror into the heart of wrongdoers and restrains all from violating the path of righteousness. As such, Daṇḍa was the root and essence of moral order (*cf.* सर्वे दण्डजितो लोको दुर्लभो हि शुचिर्नरः । दण्डस्य हि भयात् सर्वं जगद् भोगाय कल्पते ॥).

The highest duty of the king is to wield the rod of punishment, impartially and with due deference to circumstances (VII 16). The king's coercive authority knows no limitations and there is no one free from the coercive authority of the king including his nearest relatives. Failure to wield the rod of punishment righteously was a sin which makes the king stray from the path of Dharma and paves the way to his downfall (VII 27-28). On earth, the king was the highest chastiser and above him stands King Varuṇa (पिताचार्यः सुहृन्माता भार्या पुत्रः पुरोहितः । नादण्डो नाम राज्ञोऽस्ति यः स्वधर्मं न तिष्ठति ॥ VIII 335). The king discharges his moral obligations by wielding the rod of punishment and the punishment inflicted by him purifies men from sin (VIII 318). If the king himself fails in awarding punishment, he in his turn is liable for his sin and has to make amends to Varuṇa (ईशो दण्डस्य वरुणो राज्ञां दण्डधरो हि सः । VIII 285).

By wielding the rod of punishment, the king is to preserve the right conduct of all and to maintain the Varṇas and Āśramas (castes and stages of life). The protection of Varṇas and Āśramas is the highest duty of the king { वर्णानामायमाणां च राजा सृष्टोऽभिरक्षिता । VII 35). To know the real essence of Dharma as well as of Daṇḍa, the king is to discipline himself and study the Vedas, Daṇḍanīti, Ānvikshikī or Ātmavidyā and Vārttā. He

should associate himself with the aged and always remain reverent to the Brahmins शुश्रूषा ब्राह्मणानां च राज्ञां श्रेयस्करं परम् ॥ VII 88).

The latter should be freed from punishment and taxation. They should also be made to enjoy fiscal privileges like the ownership of treasure-troves found by them and be patronised in all possible ways.

Next, the king should have learned and virtuous purohitas and experienced ministers of high quality numbering seven or eight. Dūtas (or ambassadors), collectors of taxes (Śamāhartr) superintendents (Adhyakṣas) and officials in cities (Sarvārthacintakas) and villages should be appointed. Groups of ten or twenty villages should have different officials to preside over, with still higher officials over groups of 50, 100 or a thousand villages. All these officials are to preserve peace, collect royal dues and eradicate thorns to peace by apprehending criminals or marauders. Careful attention is to be paid to the constitution of law-courts presided over by *Prāḍvivākas* trying all kind of suits arising out of the violation of rights. The whole of the VIIIth chapter is devoted to justice and gives us the laws as well as the judicial procedure.

In matters of taxation, the king is allowed the right to tax all sorts of income on account of his protection. He is allowed a share of the produce of lands, tolls on articles of trade, judicial fines and various other miscellaneous items. The amount of royal share, however, is not so high in the *Manusamhitā* as in the *Arthaśāstra*.

Secure at home and having ensured peace and good government, the king should have his army properly organised. Then he should devote his attention to the fourfold objective (VII 99 which is already enumerated by Kauṭilya, viz., preservation of that

already in hand, recovery of that lost, acquisition of new things and proper distribution or enjoyment of things obtained). To achieve supremacy in the *Maṇḍala* of states he should employ spies, know the difficulties of other kings and at the proper moment make wars of aggression. He should know the importance of the seven limbs of the state (*saptāṅga*), the principles ruling the *Maṇḍala*, the laws of the sixfold policy or *Ṣaḍguṇya* and the four means of attaining objectives, namely, *Sāma*, *Dāna*, *Bheda* and *Danḍa*.

Manu's dissertations on these topics prove him to be a careful student of the *Arthaśāstra* and he seems to have borrowed largely from his predecessors of that school. These borrowings are not confined to the domain of internal politics but extend to matters relating to the administrative machinery. Thus, in the matter of taxation, he mentions almost all the items of royal dues, though regarding the amount of royal share, he follows the older *Dharmaśāstras* or the *Epics*. He calls upon kings not to be over-greedy, exhorts them to put an end to all hindrances to peace (*Kaṇṭaka*) and justifies a levy of taxes on artisans and even forced labour. He advocates the punishment of low-caste people taking to orders but makes exceptions in the case of those people who leave their homes after making provisions for children and dependants.

But with all this, his is a narrower outlook inasmuch as he pays not the same amount of attention to the material development of the king's subjects, as was the case with the *Arthaśāstra* writers. The only people whose suffering he tries to remove and for whom he advocates the fullest amount of bounty are the *Śrotriya*s (VII 133-135). To sum up, Manu's ideals are the consolidation of regal authority and the maintenance of moral order.

To consolidate regal authority and to extol the king's position, Manu not only enunciates his theory of the divine origin of monarchy but goes on to free kings from the chances of revolt or opposition on the part of subjects. We have already seen how he has utilised the older ideas of the Epics to his purpose, but not satisfied with it he tries hard to safeguard the king's position by advancing a doctrine similar to non-resistance adopted by the advocates of regal authority when opposing a tyrannical king in Mediæval Europe. The Epic writers, though they advocated obedience, at least admitted the chances of subjects rising in revolt. Some of them, as we have already seen (I. p. 294), emphasised the moral right of revolution and the extremists among them went so far as to make tyrannicide a duty of subjects. But Manu does nothing of the kind. He harps merely on the excellence of the king, the omnipotence of his prerogatives and the consequences of royal anger. For unrighteous kings, he prescribes gradual decay and final downfall through the process of the immutable laws of nature, and enumerates the examples of Vena, Nahuṣa and Sudāsa losing everything through indiscipline. Under such circumstances, we find his veneration for the regal office carried too far and this is transferred to the holder of that office who, as we have seen is to be regarded as a *Devatā* on earth (महती देवता ह्येषा नररूपेण तिष्ठति । VII. 8).

While such a theory of unquestioned obedience gained acceptance in an age of anarchy and foreign invasion, the over-jealousness of the reactionary writer did not make him entirely forget some of the traditional limitations of regal power. Thus, Manu does not confer on the king the right to tamper with the laws and their interpretation which he vests solely in the Brāhmaṇas, the sacerdotal order, holding a position of privileged supremacy in

society (see Bk. XI). Similarly, Manu does not go so far as to recognise the king's ownership of land. According to him ownership resided in the community and he admits real ownership in a plot of land to be vested in him who cleared it. The king's right to taxation, similarly, arises according to him, from his function of protection and he prescribes downfall and a future life in hell for those who realised taxes without granting protection to their subjects; *cf.*—

योरुद्धन् बलिमादत्ते करं शुल्कं च पार्थिवः ।

प्रतिभोगं च दण्डं च स सद्यो नरकं व्रजेत् ॥ VIII-304 et seq.

To sum up, the spirit of Manu's ethics and politics was reaction in society and subjugation in politics. He extols coercion and discards altogether the primary principles of the Kautilyan ideal of paternal government. His sympathies were for the maintenance of the moral order and the patronage of the sacerdotal caste. For the masses or for the material progress of mankind he has not a word to say except that the former should be put down and kept completely in check.

The mischief done was incalculable. The influence of his law-code was too deep to last for a century or two. It affected the outlook of society for ages to come and smothered the spirit of reason or moderation in the individual. Whatever was good in him was forgotten but the evil swelled with the usury of ages and helped to bear down society to the abyss of downfall. The constant employment of *Arthavāda*, the systematic harping on the religious scruples and fears of the people, and the tendency to identify the aim of religion and politics bore bitter fruit. In later ages, his code became the ideal of reactionary lawgivers and was the gospel for those who followed without reasoning and accepted without