ence. The members or groups constituting society-Hindu political science does not know of society constituting individuals, it does not even bring it into prominence that society was composed of families as in the Vedic age-consisted of groups, castes and communities such as Indian society has at present; and had therefore for the primary idea of social existence a society in which individuals and groups can pursue the plan of their life whatever that be, with a view to the attainment of the ultimate object of existence, according to the notions of each group of individuals and families. That is what is understood by *Dharma.* Each group, or individual, may plan out its life as men of religion, atheists or agnostics, and each one, man or group, can pursue life according to the particular plan of his adoption. The function of the state is to provide the means by which each individual or group pursued this life freely, but for the one limitation that, in the pursuit of any plan of life that each may have formed, it does not interfere with the freedom of its neighbours to pursue their own life their own way. That ought to be borne in mind in discussing Hindu polity, and this is what is understood generally by the term *Dharma.* This for the average Hindu is composed of the *Dharma, Artha* and *Kāma,* that is, (1) doing that which is good and unobjectionable; (2) the gaining of that which is worth having as a means to the higher ends; and (3) the application of that which has thus been acquired in the pursuit of happiness that is unobjectionable, and not demoralising to the individual or group. Society therefore exists for the pursuit of the *Dharma,* and a state comes into existence in society with a view to enable those con-

stituting society to pursue this *Dharma* unhampered of those with whom their lot in life is cast[1]

It is this idea of *Dharma* and the pursuit thereof that constitutes the motive of social life, and the duty of a government as a necessary organ of society is to provide for the undisturbed pursuit of this Dharma on earth. This naturally would involve, (1) the laying down of a norm for that which is a good life, and the adopting of it in practice in the course of life, (2) the acquiring of the means by which that life would become possible, and (3) the application of that which has been acquired for the purpose of enjoyment, the enjoyment being such as would not offend the norm laid down in the first or turn out to be the misapplication of that which is acquired under the second, as either of these is likely to affect prejudicially the ultimate end. This is what writers on political science understand by the term *Svadharma,* and life, on the basis of this pursuit of *Svadharma,* is such as to provide for the pursuit of this *Svadharma* on the one hand and the government that ought to provide for this pursuit unmolested on the other.[2] Hence it is that the fourth of the main ends of existence, *Moksha,* is left out of treatment here. The scope of political science therefore narrows down to the three objects of pursuit in life, generally called (Sans: *Trivarga,* Tam: the three divisions or *Muppāl*). One of the characteristic names of the Kuṛal is *Muppāl,* and that is what is understood

[1]Manu. IV. 176.

[2]Mahā Bhārata. Śāntiparvan 63. 5 ff. Artha. Śas. I 3; also Wintertniz. On Dharma Śāstra and Arthaśāstra. Sir Asutosh Memorial Volume, Patna University.

exactly by the term *Trivarga,* both by writers on Dharma Śāstras and even those of the Arthaśāstra. Hence it is that both the Dharma Śāstras and the Kuṛal provide for this general life comprising these three objects, and therefore are content with merely laying down general instructions for the attainment of these three. The Arthaśāstra, on the contrary, lays itself out to treat of these three, but prominently of the second of these as subserving the ends of existence as a whole, and therefore taking into consideration in a subsidiary way the other two as well, with the result that the Arthaśāstra could deal with the one section in far greater detail than codes of ethics like the Dharma Śāstras and Kuṛal. A comparison of the divisions main and subsidiary of the Arthaśāstra on the one hand, and the Dharma Śāstras, the Kuṛal and even an abbreviated handbook of the Arthaśāstra itself, such as the Kāmandaka, shows the same general method and does not go into the details of administration that the Arthaśāstra actually does. It will be found that the divisions of the Kuṛaḷ in chapters follows to a great extent the general sections of the Arthaśāstra, and abbreviates the smaller section by combining the second and the third, and bringing them for treatment under one section for one thing. Secondly it passes over a certain number of *Adhikaraṇas* or main divisions as being too practical and detailed, and beyond the scope therefore of a general work. For instance, the Kuṛaḷ does not treat of the *Vyavahāra* section at all, although details of this topic here and there peer out in the treatment of the other sections. In point of revenue and revenue collection, the Arthaśāstra is about the most

detailed, whereas the Kuṛaḷ adopts the Dharmaśāstraic method and merely lays down the general principles underlying governmental resources.[1]

It is just possible to take the view, and such view is taken and often-times vigorously urged, that the Kuṛaḷ is an original work, and is not indebted to any work, Sanskrit or other. The statement is several times made also that the Kuṛaḷ is a pure Tamil work and is entirely independent of Sanskrit. Both these are statements, which a constructive study of the question hardly justifies. These questions can be considered only by a careful study both of the Kuṛaḷ itself and of the Sanskrit works bearing on the subject with a view to noting similarities and dissimilarities, and arriving at a conclusion after a careful consideration in detail whether there is any possible inter-relation between the one and the other. The fact that the Kuṛaḷ is written in pure Tamil, that is, in Tamil which is not so much mixed with Sanskrit, is to a very great extent true, and that is not merely a characteristic of the Kuṛaḷ alone. That is equally the characteristic of the whole collection of works generally called the Śangam works. It marks a stage in the growth of the language when, as a vehicle of expression, it had more flexibility and richness than in later times, and much that would seem exceedingly difficult to render in pure Tamil now seems to have been ordinarily capable of being expressed in comparatively easy Tamil. There is a variety of diction and a facility of manipulation of the language as a means of expressing thought, which

[1]In only one chapter Ch. 76.

one may say is not found to exist to the same degree in writers of a later period. That is only so far as the handling of the language is concerned. The writers themselves generally appear to have showed no disinclination when they could borrow either from Sanskrit, or from elsewhere, wherever they could borrow usefully. They could borrow, as all people with a great deal of originality often do, and so adapted what was borrowed to their own purpose that the borrowing becomes really beneficial and far from objectionable. That is the kind of borrowing that one meets with in works of this class of Tamil; but not the comparatively more narrow-minded, petty notion that the language must be self-contained. A language cannot be self-contained unless it makes an effort to contain within itself ideas in all departments of human life, and this width of knowledge could be acquired only by the use of experience—experience not only one's own self or of the group but of all human experience generally, the circle of humanity being wider or narrower according as contact with the outside world and communication admits of more or less intercourse. A careful examination of the Kuṛaḷ shows that it is not so free from knowledge of what is found in Sanskrit literature, nor is it so entirely free from the influence of Sanskrit diction. There are words in it even, that are borrowed from Sanskrit, and that is true not only of Kuṛaḷ, but of the whole class of this literature. The borrowing in this period, however, does not appear to be quite so much borrowing directly from Sanskrit, but seems to be through the Prakrit generally. The Sanskrit words therefore are

hidden from view by the double transformation that the words have undergone, the transformation they attain to in the Prakrit form, and the further transformation that they had to undergo to suit themselves to Tamil usage. It is not necessary for this position that the words should have been all of Sanskrit origin and put into the Prakrit form. It is just possible that the words are originally Prakrit, but Sanskritised for purposes of classical use. That does not concern us in this context.

Apart from this question purely of diction, the parallelisms in subject matter are so many and so frequent that it would be taking too much upon ourselves to assert that in the subject-matter the work is quite independent of Sanskrit. The author of the Kuṛaḷ does not appear to have cherished the notion that his merit lay in his being completely independent of contact with the other culture. He seems to have cherished a very considerable amount of regard for that which was of use in the other cultures without sacrificing any of his regard for the language that he handled with so much facility and effect. He acknowledges his indebtedness in places explicity, not to mention those in which the acknowledgment is more or less recondite and not so readily seen. There are certain places in which he refers to *Nūl* in the text.[1] The term *Nūl* certainly does occur in several places and with different meanings. But in certain contexts it stands for the Veda and Vedic learning generally.[2] But there are con-

[1] 54. 3, 59. 1, 65. 69. 3. 75. 3.

[2] 56 10.

texts in which he undoubtedly refers to something far more secular, and he cannot refer to anything else than a work of political science of some kind. Unless it is possible for us to point out, if not actually quote, an actual pre-existing work on the Arthaśāstra in Tamil, we shall have to accept it that it refers to the Arthaśāstra-Arthasastra the well-known one, either the Kautilīyan, or its abridgment the Kāmandaka. Kuṛaḷs 683 and 743 are instances in point. The first occurs in the chapter on *toodu,* which word itself is a Sanskrit word, and institutes a comparison between the most efficient ambassador and the most efficient warrior, as it were. That ambassador is most efficient, who among the proficients in political science is the most proficient, as that warrior is the most proficient in the use of his javelin, who could give a good account of himself in a body of experts in the use of that weapon. There is no other science (*Nūl*) which is so essential and comes in handy for an ambassador than the science that treats of that particular subject, which forms an essential and integral part of political science or Arthaśāstra. The other Kuṛaḷ has reference to what ought to be the essential requirements of a fortress. There again the Kuṛaḷ has it that height, width, strength and rarity are the essential characteristics of an efficient fortress according to science (*Nūl*). The *Nūl* here could be no other than a work which lays down the instructions for the building of fortresses for military purposes, and that must be a work either on military science, or a science of which military science is an integral part. Here again we are face to face with the position that it could refer to nothing else than the Arthaśāstra.

Therefore then the Kuṛaḷ polity is one that applies to the society of Tamil India when that society had already become constituted on a basis offering analogies of no remote character to the society depicted in the Arthaśāstra. That is the view that comes out from the Tolkāppiyam itself notwithstanding the fact that the Sūtras of the Tolkāppiyam could not be explicit and detailed in regard to these, and the details have to be supplied by the commentator as no Sūtra in the whole range of Sūtra literature can be complete in itself and self-explanatory. It is undoubtedly complete in itself provided only when you understand the full extent of the implication of the technical language employed and what it is intended to convey, and that could be understood only by a man who has had the Sūtra expounded to him. This is an implication which is inherent in the character of the Sūtra itself. It is utter ignorance and want of understanding that could charge commentators with having imported ideas when they expound what is merely implied in the Sūtras; not that commentators are not up to importing their own ideas, or the original ideas that had undergone modification into their interpretation. They are actually expected to do so in regard to certain classes of works. But at the same time what ought to be borne in mind carefully is that the commentators are there commenting with a view to expounding the Sūtras primarily, as they were understood by those that first put them into that form, and indicate the changes that that original idea might have undergone in process of time. Where we find it necessary to say that a commentator has gone beyond his limits, the responsibility is undoubtedly ours to

prove that that is a fact. We have no right to assume the fact that a commentator is a fraud who reads his ideas into the Sūtras composed centuries before his time. These remarks are offered here, as it is often asserted that Parimēlaḻagar's profound learning in Sanskrit is what is responsible for the affiliation of the ideas of the Kuṛaḷ to Sanskrit works. Not only that, but sometimes it is pointed out that other commentators do not always see eye to eye with Parimēlaḻagar in the interpretation of particular verses of the Kuṛaḷ. Ignorance of Sanskrit and the necessarily imperfect exposition of a Kuṛaḷ are not certainly features of higher authority. It is knowledge of what the Sanskritists have to say, and a comparison of the two in their contexts that really would lead to anything like a justifiable inference rather than the ignorance that would shut its eyes to all possible sources of light from elsewhere. Many of those passages would be obscure and hardly understandable unless you let into it the light that Sanskrit literature has to offer. This would become clear from verses in certain chapters which do not explain themselves unless the technical senses of certain words, for instance, are understood; and in some cases it is impossible to understand them without the aid of Sanskrit. We may refer particularly to Kuṛaḷ 501 as affording a very good illustration of this. There are numbers of other passages which are equally sound illustrations, but may not be quite so complete as this particular one, where without introducing the idea of the *Upadā* of the Arthaśāstrakāras[1] which is not unknown or quite so unfamiliar to ordinary people

[1]Arthasas. Bk. I Ch. X.

the passage can hardly be understood. The idea of the *Upadā* is explained in the Rāmāyaṇa, and occurs even in the inscriptions of the Guptas in the fourth century A.D.[1] as an idea that is familiarly known to all. Why should we deny that knowledge to Tiruvaḷḷuvar, and read his verses and understand them but imperfectly? This is hardly justifiable criticism.

The Kuṛaḷ ideal then, as projected in the seventy chapters constituting the second section, is a monarchical state as depicted in the Dharmaśāstras, and to a very considerable extent in the Artha Śāśtra as well. As was pointed out above, the Kuṛaḷ begins with the notion of *Araśu,* that is, not in the style of the Artha Śāstra with the abstract notion of *svadharma* and the application of the *daṇḍa.* So it takes up the state, at the head of which there was a king. The qualities he ought to possess, the education that he has to undergo, and the discipline to which he has to submit himself are expounded, and then follows naturally the treatment of ministers and friends with whom he ought to associate, and the relations that he ought to admit to his presence. These are dealt with under the heads *amaichchu* and *śuṛṛam.* The word *amaichchu* is again a Sanskrit word coming through the Prakrit, one of which has a form of *amachcha* corresponding to the Tamil *amaichchar.* The whole body is treated as a group of ministers constituting various classes, the *Mantri, Purohita* and others of the Artha Śāstra. The Kuṛaḷ follows generally the same kind of division. The ministers and the relations are sometimes spoken of as

[1]Junagadh inscription of Skandagupta, F. G. I. No. 14.

those in immediate attendance, and the term *amaichchu* itself is expounded as those near about, on the formation of the word from a Sanskrit root. Where the Pingalandai[1] groups them together and gives them the common name *śuṛṛam,* as the eighteen *śuṛṛattār* to which reference has already been made, it follows a recognised usage. Where therefore we find the Maḍurai Kānji[2] speaking of the five groups of ministers, and the Śilapadhikāram[3] refers to these five groups and the eight of the other section, and the Kuṛaḷ[4] more or less indirectly lays down who ought to constitute the *inam* (the ministers) and what their qualifications should be, what constituted the *śuṛṛam* and how far they ought to be allowed to influence the work of the monarch, it is following probably the divisions of the Artha Śāstra, and possibly what was the existing practice in Tamil India of the times. This will become clear when we remember that the Kuṛaḷ deals in a number of sections with what constituted the qualifications for ministers and what exactly a king was expected to do to secure the right kind for his service.[5] This is followed by a section bearing upon how exactly to treat those that are related to him and dependent upon him. In this treatment, he uses two expressions *inam* and *śuṛṛam,* which are synonymous in Tamil. But the author of the Kuṛaḷ, however, seems to make a distinction that when he speaks of the *inam,* he means the councillors, the ministers and those trusted servants

1 64. 8.

2 Above. p. 19. n. 3.

3 Above. p. 19 n. 1 & 2 and p. 21.

4 Chapt. 51-53.

5 Of Arthaśastra I. 4—5.

in immediate attendance, and relatives generally. But he makes use of the word *śuṟṟam* for the last class alone. In any case, all the three groups are there and therefore the expression, "the five great bodies and the eight groups" of Tamil literature, have to be taken to be what was in the mind of the author of the Kuṟaḷ.

The Kuṟaḷ polity therefore not merely reflects the social life of the times but represents, more or less, faithfully the state of society and the arrangements for the administration of government at the time, and perhaps would warrant the inference that it is not a mere abstract book of aphorisms of merely theoretical value, but a work that reflects correctly the prevalent ideas and the practice to which those ideas gave rise in the department of political activity of the age. At the same time, it must be recognised, as was pointed out before, that it is not a full or detailed description of the administrative machinery of the times, being not an administrative manual. It will be noticed that what it lays down in the seventy chapters out of a total of 133 may be regarded, more or less as an accurate description of the general principles which ought to underly the creation of the administrative machinery for the carrying on of the government of a state such as an Indian state was conceived to be in the Tamil India of the time, or we might even say, in the whole of India of the time. There is such a similarity between the northern organisation and the southern as described here that perhaps it will not be justifiable to regard the one as entirely distinct from the other. Where this polity shows itself to be defective is, as was pointed out

already, in the details of the general administration, while those relating to the local are practically absent. That is a feature not peculiar to the Kuṛaḷ; but it is a feature quite common to the *Smritis* and even Kāmandaka, a professed treatise on politics. The idea seems to be more or less that, except for a technical student, such general notions as are given in these treatises are ample and if further knowledge be required, it is for those that seek it to go to the really technical treatises, which deal with the subject in detail. Similarly those that wish to gain a complete idea of the administrative machinery by means of which the administration was actually carried on, must acquaint themselves necessarily with the details of the local administration before they can feel justifiably that they have gained a complete idea of the actual machinery of government. To do this, we have to go to the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya to fill in the details from a text-book or treatise, and we shall have to, as a supplement, make a close study or a fairly full survey of such details as we gain from the inscriptions both of Asoka and his successors, drawing even occasionally from such notes as we have from the foreign travellers who have left accounts of the administrative system of the Mauryan times. The Greek accounts and the Asokan inscriptions would, to some extent, supplement each other and give, not a complete, but an adequate picture of the administration, and the agreement between the details that we get from there and the Arthaśāstra are so close that we would perhaps be justified in assuming that such glimpses as we get in the inscriptions and the accounts

of the foreign travellers reflect a society formed on the basis underlying the Arthaśāstra, and the Arthaśāstra polity therefore would give a more or less complete picture. Sometimes we still find that even the Arthaśāstra does not go down to the full details, and these may be found in the inscriptions of a later period where we have them in some number and in full detail. There again we shall have to take it that the Artha Śāstra omission is not necessarily evidence of the non-existence of the institutions but may be due to the exigencies of a treatise, which has to conform to certain requirements which may necessitate the avoidance of details of too technical or too local a character. With these cautions we may project a picture of the political life of India, and the political machinery by means of which the aims of that life were attained, by a combined study of all these.

Before passing from this subject, however, one remarkable omission of the Kuṛaḷ has to be noted. The Arthaśāstra treatises generally and the political chapters of the Mahābhārata[1] alike begin the subject by a discussion as to the origin of society as arising out of the social needs of humanity, and then proceed to point out the need of a government for regulating that life. The discussion is on the subject society and state. They arrive at a state of society perhaps not altogether theoretically, although definite statements are not wanting that they regarded that society existed without an administrative guardian of some kind where people were expected to live together and respect the law.

[1] Śānti Parvan 582.

The preservation of that society becomes impossible, and that kind of a social life soon lapses into a life where might is right. This is what they describe as the *Mātsaya-Nyāya,*[1] the law of the fish, the bigger fish eating the smaller, the stronger oppressing the weaker and taking forcible possession of all that is worth having. In such a state of things they felt the need of a machinery, the function of which would be to regulate life, and to see that the real interests of society as a whole are not actually sacrificed to the interest of the stronger individuals: in other words, to see that social progress is not hampered by the pursuit of individual ambition. They therefore created consciously a kingship which came into existence either by the decree of providence at the request of the sufferers, or created by the voluntary agreement of the people among themselves, or by a compact between the people on the one side, and some one that was prepared to take the responsibility on the other. According to the first, Manu was ordained to give protection to society in return for his being placed beyond need for pursuing life and securing the wherewithal for himself and his family. There again it takes on the form more or less of a contract. He was to get a portion of the produce of the earth and all else from which a revenue was derivable generally by the processes of pursuing gain. That is the more orthodox view. The heterodox view, the Buddhistic view, for instance, frankly states that it was the result of a contract, the *Mahāsammata*[2] between the Ikshvāku kings and people generally.

[1]Arth. Śas. I. 13.

[2]Digha Nikaya III. p. 73.

Either way, this preliminary discussion both in the Mahābhārata and, in a somewhat abbreviated form, in the Arthaśāstra brings into view how the Hindus attempted to explain the coming of society into existence, and the creation therein as it were, of a state. The preliminary discussion of society and state, and the circumstances leading to the creation of the one from the other, are absent from the Kuṛaḷ which starts with the statement that there is a king and he has a kingdom to govern. The author indicates thereby clearly that he is more really concerned with the realistic description of a kingdom that existed rather than to trouble himself to expound how a kingdom or a state is a necessary organisation for the conduct of human life. This seems, however, implicit in what he says, and the whole polity of the Kuṛaḷ could not be well understood without presuming the background of the Arthaśāstraic or Rajanīti culture, as it is expounded in the Arthasastras and the Mahābhārata respectively.

II

THE KUṚAL POLITY.

The following abridgement of the Kuṛal polity may then be of interest to give an idea of what exactly the state was that was projected by the political chapters of the Kuṛal which may be regarded as an ideal presentation of what an actual state really was. According to the Kuṛal, he is the most excellent king who is possessed of an efficient army, a flourishing population, growing wealth, faithful ministers, dependable allies. These six make him eminent among kings. This lays down, as has been pointed out, the idea of the *Saptaprakriti,* as in the Artha Śāstra, Manu and Śukra, it does not deal with the *Saptānga* as such, but proceeds on the division for which there is warrant in these works on the principle of Rāja and Rājyam as constituting the more convenient kind of a division. The king was to see that he himself does not fall away from the path of duty laid down for him as protector of society, that he carefully removes that which is detrimental to the pursuit of Dharma or duty, and that he maintains himself in this position of high responsibility. This is an idea not peculiar to the Kuṛal itself. Even other Tamil works which lay it down that Dharma or duty is at the root of society, as for instance, the Puranānūṛu, (poem 55), set down that at the root of the valour of the king lies the pursuit of a path of virtuous duty. Once a king, he has to see to it that he creates fresh

sources of income producing additional revenue for himself, collects what is due to him, provides for its safety and increase, and ultimately applies it to purposes which are worthy of that which constitutes the grand duty of the king. That king is counted among people a god, who protects the people and administers justice righteously. His duties therefore would resolve themselves into generous gifts to those in need, kindness to all those who come under his protection, unswerving justice and efficient protection to his subjects. The king possessed of all these four features preeminently, is the most illustrious among kings. The king that rightly understands what is acceptable to the people generally and adopts that in his life of action, possesses the right discernment among kings. This is noted as one of the essential qualities of an ideal king and the great dramatist Bhavabhūti puts it into the mouth of his ideal character, Rama, where he is made to say that for the sake of pleasing his subjects (*loka, Tam:. ulakam*), he was quite prepared to give up friendship, mercy, his own well-being and even his beloved Jānaki herself.[1] It would cause him no sorrow to give up these if only the world would thereby be pleased. The king ought to surround himself with friends, older than himself who have a thorough understanding of the nice details of the *Dharma*. The idea here is just exactly the same as is contained in Manu, Chapter VII, 11, 32-38. As the king's ministerial surroundings constitute his eyes, a king must choose only those that could be used as trustworthily as his own eyes. That king who is surrounded by worthy men, ministers and officials. and

[1]Uttararāmacharita. I.

do his duty acceptable to them can suffer but little from his enemies.[1] That king would destroy himself even without having enemies to do so, if he has not among his surroundings those that are not afraid of speaking unpleasant truths (Manu VII. 40). There is nothing that a king cannot achieve whose action is based on deliberation in a council of knowing ministers (Manu VII. 155-57). When action is called for, it is best that one takes action after due deliberation. Deliberation following action is useless.[2] Here what is stated has reference to the choice of the particular line of action on an emergency arising, and though put in general terms in the context, it has reference to the adoption of the means to the end on the lines laid down in treatises on political science generally. That is the adoption of the four kinds of means against an actual or possible enemy, viz., the familiar, *Dāna, Sāma, Bēda* and *Daṇḍa* or gifts, pacification, detaching possible allies, and war.[3] That is the most appropriate way for the proper maintenance of the treasury and application of that treasury which in gifts gives just what is necessary and adequate. This has reference to what is found clearly stated elsewhere in the Sanskrit treatises on polity as well as even Tamil texts, and has relation to the division of state revenues into four parts, of which two parts are intended for his own expenditure, holding one fourth as a reserve and applying the remaining part for these purposes.[4] When no hostile action is called

[1] Manu. VII. 39.
[2] Ar. śās. I. 15.
[3] Manu. VII 106.
[4] Trikaṭukam. 21

for, remain quiet like a crane listlessly waiting for the appearance of a suitable victim; when action is called for, see to it that it is quick and decisive as that of that self-same crane when the victim comes before it. This is clearly an injunction that one finds scattered through the Arthaśāstra, and is generally put down for one of those teachings of Kautilya regarded unmoral, if not immoral. Tiruvaḷḷuvar could hardly be accused of want of morality, not to speak of immorality. The minister is best chosen whose choice has stood the test of morality, worth, desire and fear of life. This has reference to the choice of the ministers and the staff of a king in attendance upon him, and what is said here and the chapter following in regard to this matter apply also to other officials. In this clearly the Kuṛal follows the teachings of the Artha Śāstra and what is said here in this particular verse has reference to the *Upadā* of the texts on Dharma, which as was remarked already, finds exposition in a work like the Rāmāyaṇa and was familiarly enough known in the days of the Guptas. An inscription of Skandagupta refers to his choice of a suitable Governor for the province of Gujarat, which at that time offered the most anxious responsibility among provincial governments. What the Kuṛal discusses in chapters 51 and 52 generally follows more closely than usual the injunctions of the Kautilīya.[1]

Chapter 51 begins with the statement that the minister is best chosen when the choice is made after testing him by means of ethical standards, impending

[1] Bk. I. Chapter X.

danger to his religious faith, possible acquisition of wealth, attractive gratification of the senses and fear of life. It is only those who come out of these tests unscathed, that ought to be chosen. The twenty verses that constitute the two chapters follow the usual method of Tiruvaḷḷuvar, but cover practically the whole of the subject matter under discussion in the chapters relating to these topics in the Arthaśāstra even to the point of detail. Without going into too much of detail, this very chapter lays down that a choice without test, and suspicion of one that has been chosen, are alike productive of evil from the consequences of which escape would be impossible. The duties of a minister ordinarily are the increase of sources of income, the adopting of the means to make the wealth of the king grow quickly, and the removal of that which would diminish either of these.[1] His daily attention ought to be how to canvas these three ends. The country is not likely to go wrong unless the protecting hand of the administration goes astray. The constant and unremitting attention of the king therefore is called for to see that those that carry on the administration for him do not swerve from the righteous course of action. That is the real relationship between king and Minister which continues unchanged even when the king suffers badly in regard to his prosperity. When old friends had fallen away from the king, and they return to friendship again for good reasons, the king ought to accept their services again on an examination of the motives inducing their return. Relaxation in effort does not lead to fame. This is the conviction of all

[1] Ar. Sas. I. 5.

sciences (not merely of the science of politics). A king is bound to pursue by all means in his power that which has been held up as the duty of the king. Such as neglect these will come to no good even in "the seven births."[1] The seven births here referred to are the various classes of beings and even inanimate creation, among any of which one could be borne. Of course what is recognised here are the recommendations laid down in the Artha Śāstra, and they are certainly detailed by the commentator. To interpret merely in general terms would prove to be quite unintelligible in the context. A king's righteous rule is that which is ever watchful to note the shortcomings of his officials, to punish these according to measure after deliberation with his council, and discharge his duty with strict impartiality. The righteous rule of a king stands at the root of the whole learning of the Brahman and at the root of morality alike.[2] It is not the weapons of war that bring victory to a king; it is the impartiality of his rule. A similar idea to the first gets expressed in the Maṇimēkhalai, a Buddhist work of a Buddhist author, where rendering almost the same idea, he puts it down that the religious observances of those devoted to ascetic penance and the chastity of women alike are under the guardianship of the ruler.[3] The Puṟanānūṟu expresses a similar sentiment to that of the second verse when it states in poem 55 that the valour of a king has its root in the morality honoured of old. The whole world is protected by a righteous king while he himself finds equally efficient protection in the righteousness of his rule.

[1]Ar. Śas. I. 19 [2]*Ibid* Bk. I. 5 & 6. [3]XXII. 208—10.

Where a king punishes people of evil propensities with death, he is doing just what a cultivator does when he pulls out the weeds from his cultivated fields. The king who oppresses his people by undue imposts is worse than an enemy, who makes killing the object of his campaign. Where a king fails to offer efficient protection there the very cow ceases to yield; and those whose duty it is to conduct the six[1] occupations forget their works of authority. The king that does not discharge his duties after due consultation with those with whom he associates himself for this purpose, and throws the blame on them when actions miscarry, is one whose prosperity will dwindle gradually and disappear. Commissioners of secret information, and knowledge of the science of government, are both of them the eyes of the king. Here the word used is *Oṟṟu,* which means a person sent out to inform himself and make reports of what is taking place confidentially, and is ordinarily translated spy. It is an unsuitable translation,[2] as according to the Artha Śāstra works as well as the Kuṟal itself, this class of people is included among ministers, and the qualifications which are necessary are something far superior to anything that may be expected of a spy. This class of people are sent out within and without while the actual spies are another class and are treated of separately. The author of the Kuṟal does go the whole length of the Artha Śāstra itself when he lays down in 586 that he is the best of

[1]Learning, teaching, sacrificing for themselves and sacrificing for others giving in gifts and accepting gifts are recognised as the six duties of the Brahman both in Sanskrit works and in the Tolkāppiyam. For a similar idea. See M. Bh. Śānti 68, 28.

[2]Ar. Śās. I. 12.

this class of people who, assuming the disguise of ascetics,[1] could get entry into the most confidential places of others, and will not give out the information gained even when put to the greatest pain. The only course of action in regard to these agents of information, by the king is to see to it that one of them does not know what another is about, and accept that information as correct only when three such separate informants agree in conveying the same report independently.[2] Just as a stock of a waterlily is longer or shorter, according to the depth of the water, so men are greater or smaller according as they exhibit more or less of courage and determination. That king who shows no relaxation in his effort rightly directed, will become at once ruler over all that the great God measured with his feet. Here the author points out that a king must be capable of great and unremitting effort, and one that is possessed of it in a large measure is likely to be a ruler of the whole earth—the whole earth, in fact, the whole universe described as that which was measured by the three strides of Vishṇu.

The above is a summary of the qualities that are essential to a king, what comes within the sphere of his action, how he has to carry action to effect, and what high qualities he is to exhibit in the course of this action together with the instruments that he should make use of in the successful carrying out of action such as he might have resolved upon. The author then proceeds to deal with the limbs of a state. As was already pointed out, Tiruvalluvar, unlike the Sanskritists, re-

[1] *Ibid* Ch. XIII. [2] *Ibid* Ch. XII.

gards the other six of the seven *prakritis* or *angas* as really the limbs of the state, having dealt with the king separately. He then proceeds to deal with them in the order of the Artha Śāstra, although in the first Kuṛal of this section, he recited them in a different order. The first section therefore deals with *Amaichchu* or ministers in a general sense. Those that constituted the ministry must be possessed of the following five qualities in a high degree: unswerving determination, efficient protection of subjects, great expertness in the sciences relating to government, fully developed understanding acquired thereby, and capacity for great effort.[1] Those that are possessed of these in a very high degree are those fit to constitute a ministry. That minister is the most dependable assistant to the king, who has complete knowledge of what actually are the duties of a king, who is possessed of learning to expound those duties in a persuasive way, and who has the capacity and discernment to select the best means in carrying out what has to be done. To the minister who combines a penetrating natural intelligence and has cultivated it by education in the science of polity, there is nothing that is really too difficult of understanding. Even where a king shows neither capacity to understand what others have placed before him, nor the discernment to understand it himself, it is still the duty of those near him to place before him what they consider is the best course of action. Here the term used for the minister is worthy of notice. The man near to the king is the Tamil periphrasis by which a minister is indicated, showing that the Tamil

[1]Bk. I. 9.

word *amaichchu* is the Sanskrit word *amātya,* and this is translated by the term *uḷaiyinan,* he who is near. Where a minister speaks, let him speak with knowledge of the capacity of those whom he addresses. There is no morality or worth superior to that. Here so much importance is attached to the proper method of offering counsel as the acceptance of good counsel depends upon its proper presentation. Where something has to be done, and the good minister placed it in proper form and order, the whole world will accept his advice without question. No minister should do that which will not appeal to the intelligence of the cultured, even if his mother should suffer from hunger; that is even in a supreme moment of necessity he ought not to swerve from the path of rectitude. In the pursuit of action, a minister ought not to take it upon himself to do that which is likely to fail, and not to lose heart when that which was undertaken fails by chance. These two are the best methods of action for a minister according to the experts in the science of politics. In adopting a course of action, a minister has to take care that he adopts the course of war only when he has got a fair guarantee of success. Where this is impossible, he ought to adopt his action to suit the circumstances actually. Here Tiruvaḷḷuvar is actually laying down, when exactly the minister should adopt the last means of the four, the arbitrament of war. That has to be adopted only where he is certain of success. Where this is uncertain, other means have to be tried before proceeding to war. In adopting a course of action, a minister must have full consideration for the five elements constituting action, need of action, meāns for

carrying it out, the instruments to carry it out, the time that is suitable for doing so, the kind of action that is useful and the place to be chosen.[1] He must have an eye to the end to be attained, to what might possibly intervene to prevent the attainment of what actually is to be gained when the end is reached. These he has to calculate beforehand in taking action.

He then passes on to that class of ministers, whose function is to be deputed as ambassadors, and lays down their qualifications very high indeed. That is what is called *Dutū* (ambassadors). The qualities that an ambassador should possess[2] are preeminently affection for his people and dependants, high birth, and other qualities that are attractive to kings. Those possessed of these qualities alone are fit for being sent out as ambassadors. Among these the best is he who has full knowledge of what he has to do before the king to whom he is deputed. He ought to be able to understand thoroughly the time suitable for conveying his message. He ought also to understand the circumstances, which would assure success to his embassy. He would make a success who considers all these beforehand on information, and proceeds to action. Here Tiruvaḷḷuvar in general terms includes all the three classes of ambassadors, described in Sanskrit works on the subject, viz., ambassadors, who can use their discretion and successfully acheive that which is good for their government. He mentions as the first the man who can use a good deal of his discretion in the carrying out of his mission. The man who has not to exer-

[1] *Ibid* Bk. I. 15. [2] *Ibid* Bk. I. 16.

cise that amount of discretion but is merely to convey that which he has been previously tutored to convey would be the second. But the man who actually carries the very message by means of a letter would be the third. By referring to the first class here as the best, he implies knowledge of the other classes as well. An ambassador must achieve the object of his embassy, even if it should involve, in the course of its carrying out, his own death. Ministers ought not to keep away from kings, nor ought they to get too near him in familiarity; but ought to keep at the proper distance, just like those who approach a fire to warm themselves. Ministers with understanding will not hold a king in little esteem because he happens to be young, because he happens to be a relation, of such and such a degree. They must always conduct themselves towards him as becomes the illustriousness of his position. Among ministers the highest quality is the capacity for understanding the wishes of the ruler without explicit direction. That minister who can understand the inner mind of his master with certitude is to be regarded as a god. A minister ought to weigh his words and use only such as are suitable to the assembly in which he speaks. In order fearlessly to speak in an assembly with success, a minister ought to cultivate the use of language by means of the proper sciences, viz., grammar and logic.

This brings us to the close of the section on ministers. In the ten chapters Tiruvaḷḷuvar deals with those that are worthy of being ministers to a government as a whole group. Although he lays down the qualifica-

tions and the duties of a minister in general terms, he indicates in the course of his treatment what classes were included among those that are called ministers. There is a special class of ambassadors, who stand distinctly out of the group. But among the general group other than those, we can find a detailed study of the socalled five groups constituting the ministry of Tamil monarchs, including in it not merely the actual counsellors but even those whose function it is to carry on the administration.

The next section deals with *Nāḍu,* what the Sanskritists call *Janapada,*[1] in general terms the country or territory that makes one of the important constituents of a state. The author of the Kuṛal starts with definnig Nāḍu as that which is capable of an abundance of production, and containing as its inhabitants men that are worthy and men that are possessed of growing wealth. By the plentifulness and value of its production it ought to be attractive, and by the absence of circumstances hindering production it ought to be capable of producing plenty. That is really good country which is capable of affording great advantages to its inhabitants, and at the same time maintain the income of the king undiminished. That is really good country which does not contain different communities of people (of opposing interests), internal enmities which are destructive to the country and the anarchical feudatories who are always a source of trouble to the king. That country is the best among countries, which is free from the evils of enemy occupation, and maintains its

[1]Ar. Śas. Bk. II. 1 & 2.

fruitfulness undiminished. The two sources of water (spring water and rain water), hills well set and perennial water courses coming from them, and well constructed fortresses, these constituents make a good country. That is a happy country which is free from diseases, is possessed of wealth, is capable of plenty, gives happiness to its inhabitants and is well provided for protection. These constitute elements that go to beautify a country. That is really good country which is fertile by nature; and that country which has to be made fertile by the work of man is nothing like so good. Even where territory is possessed of all these good features, it would be of no good to its inhabitants unless it be possessed of a worthy king. This, according to the Kuṛal, is what constitutes good territory and the territory that is really good by nature would not be of any good to the inhabitants unless it is equipped with a good government at the same time. So good government is something indispensable to the prosperity of the inhabitants of a country.

The next section deals with fortresses.[1] Fortresses are of value to those kings that aspire, with capacity, to do great deeds. It is equally indispensable to those who have not that capacity and want protection. Fortresses offering protection are of four kinds: (1) protection afforded by clear deep water; (2) protection afforded by extensive plains round about; (3) protection afforded by well-set hills surrounding the locality; and (4) protection offered by dense forests. Works bearing on fortresses declare height, width,

[1] Cf. *Ibid* Ch. 5.

strength and comparative rarity as the necessary qualities of a good fort. A good fortress must be capable of efficient defence by a small force on guard. At the same time, it must be vast enough to give protection to a large number of people. Similarly it ought to be very difficult of being taken by an enemy, and must contain all that is necessary for those that seek its protection. That is an efficient fortress, which is provided with all that may be needed by the occupants, and is defended by efficient guards who can assure safety to the inhabitants. Fortresses must be incapable of being taken either by siege or by assault or by mining. However well provided a fortress may be in all these particulars, it would be of no value unless those in occupation of it are capable of making proper use of it. The description of fortification given in general terms by Tiruvaḷḷuvar, is confirmed in full detail by a description which is given of the fortress of Madura in the Śilapadhikāram. The passage under reference in that classic gives an actual description of the fortress and enumerates the variety of the weapons both of offence and defence with which the fortress was provided.

The next section deals with the income of a state. The Kuṛaḷ begins with the statement that wealth is indispensable to a ruler. The author points out if only wealth could be acquired in the way that wealth should be acquired, by moral and legitimate means, it will give both happiness and subserve the ends of good morality. It will be noted that this particular kind of preeminence of the utility of wealth it is that gives the character to the so-called Artha Śāstra, which deals only with wealth, as it were. Even where that pre-

eminence is given to it, it is not done, it must be remembered, by negativing the other two, as has often been taken by some scholars. It was always intended to subserve the other ends as well. That is king's wealth for which there is no legitimate claimant. That is also king's wealth that is drawn from active trade and commerce. It is equally the king's wealth which is returned for the justice that the king administers. It will be noticed that there are three heads of revenue given here. The first is what may be regarded as unclaimed property. Both property left by those without claimants and property which had perhaps not been appropriated. The next one is the group which accrues by various customs and octroi sources of revenue. This is the revenue that is obtained by means of the commercial activity of the inhabitants. The third is the revenue that the king derives by the exercise of his authority, that is, the administration of justice. These are (have actually to be so regarded) over and above what is due to the king as his share, the recognised sixth of agricultural produce, etc., generally called by the Sanskritists *bhāga,*[1] his share of the general yield. A king ought, by all means in his power, to acquire wealth. There is nothing that destroys the enemy's power as efficiently as this. The section winds up with the following "acquired wealth as it increases in the legitimate process of growth, brings to the king the other two ends of existence, namely, moral life and legitimate happiness." Here again the Kural treatment is quite general, not altogether without hints which would let us into the details which are expounded in the treatises relating to the Artha Śāstra.

[1] Ar. Śas. II. 24.

The next section has to do with the army. The army, divided into distinct arms, which is not afraid of defeat in course of action is counted the best among a king's possessions. The fortitude with which an army maintains itself against odds even in suffering defeat is possible only to the hereditary forces of a king. Here, of course, the reference is to the distinct section of the army, which is generally called *Mūlabala*, or the main forces of a state,[1] coming in hereditary succession therefore with a permanent interest in the kingdom. This description naturally implies the other kinds of an army which Tamil and Sanskrit literature know of. These are usually divided into the hereditary forces already referred to, mercenary forces that may be engaged for the time, levies made for emergencies from the country (*Nāṭṭupaḍai*), levies improvised from the inhabitants of the forests (*Kāṭṭupaḍai*), auxiliaries from allies and states neutral, and lastly enemy forces brought under subjection and made use of in war afterwards (*Pahaippaḍai*).[2] Of these the best is, of course, the first, and that is what is kept up in a state of efficiency and good feeling by the king. That is what the author wishes to draw attention to in the next following Kuṛaḷ. The army which is not easily destroyed in war, which shows itself impossible of corruption by an enemy, and that which has come down from generation to generation of the ruling family is the best among the forces of a king. This Kuṛaḷ almost implies a reference to the famous poem[3] where a woman is made to say that her father stands a stone—that is the *vīragal* erected in honour of a warrior who fought and fell in

1Ar. Sas. Bk. VI. 1. 2*Ibid.* 3Puṛapporuḷ. Ch. VIII. 22.

the service of his sovereign—having fallen in battle; her husband died on the field of war, her brothers, fought at the front and fell, while her son occupying his place in the reserve behind, having been struck by an arrow, rushed against the enemy king and fell. That is an efficient army, which knows what modes of war are the most appropriate for the campaign in view, and marches forward to the attack in the face of an enemy charging. However efficient an army, and however firm the individuals composing it, it would be futile if it is not under good leaders. In regard to the bravery of individual soldiers, Tiruvaḷḷuvar has the following. When the army throws a javelin at him, the winking of the eye at the sight of it would be regarded as disgraceful as running away from the field. The warrior that is prepared to lay down his life on the field of battle, if it should go against him, is not counted less brave even where the king prevents him from going to battle. If it is given to a soldier to fall in battle to the regret of the king who maintained him, such a death is one that people ought to pray for and obtain.[1]

The author then passes on to allies and devotes as many as seventeen chapters to the subject. He divides the subject into two divisions describing what is good alliance in the first five, and what is not desirable in the next twelve. He begins by saying that a king could do nothing better than to secure a desirable alliance, because there is no more efficient protection to him than a good ally. He next lays down;—There is nothing in the field of battle, more hurtful than being alone with-

[1]Yāgñavalkya I. 324 and Mah. Bhar. Sānti. 97—25.

out an ally. The hand that salutes might hide a dangerous weapon. Even the tears of a secret enemy might hide in it something dangerous. Those who conduct themselves as dependable allies outwardly and harbour contemptible evil thoughts secretly, are best got rid of by oneself behaving similarly and putting an end to the friendship at the proper moment. Those that are extensively well read and capable of expounding their knowledge effectively to others, but are not themselves disciplined by that learning, they are, notwithstanding their learning, much worse than ignorant people. The friendship of an ignorant person is of great good as when their friendship terminates it brings no pain. The evil that those without knowledge can inflict upon themselves, is more even than what their enemies may have to inflict upon them. Those that are not capable of doing a thing even when directed, and are not able to do it properly by themselves, they constitute a disease to their friends all their days. Enmity is a disease which makes friendship impossible. Those whose knowledge extends to merely cherishing enmity cannot be held to understand the significance of the means for becoming victorious. Enmity produces all kinds of evil consequences, while friendship has good policy as its result. Where war is necessary, make an effort to avoid it as against those who are stronger. Adopt it as against those who are distinctly weaker. Accept the enmity of those vanquished in war, but never put yourself into enmity with those who are expert in the science of politics. Where a king has no allies, but has two enemies, the best course of action for him is to accept the better of the two enemies as an ally. Get rid

of an enemy while yet in the incipient stages of enmity, because a thorny tree can be easily pulled out when it is young. If it is full grown, it will damage the hand that cuts. In regard to secret enmity, take every care to protect yourself against it. If neglected, it is likely to cut without your knowing it, like the knife of the potter. Having to get on with those not in agreement with you is like living in a bower harbouring a cobra. Not to be contemptuous of those who are capable of carrying out what they resolve upon is the best security among all that has to be secured for one's safety. Here the reference is in the first instance to those possessed of the three qualities that invariably bring success, *viz.*, efficient command (Sans. *prabhāva;* Tam. *perumai*), penetrating knowledge (Sans. *mantram;* Tamil *aṟivu*), capacity for effort, (Sans. *utsāham*; Tam. *muyarchi*).[1] Those possessed of these in ample measure ought not to be disregarded. Those of elevated circumstances in life should not be displeased. By their displeasure even great Indra, the king of kings, lost his kingship in the course of its full enjoyment.

The next five chapters of this section have to do with what the Arthaśāstra[2] writers call *Vyasanas.* Among them the most important, of course, is association with women. This is dealt with in two chapters; the first with what we might call legitimate and the next illegitimate; in other words to be henpecked is as much of an evil as to be led away by hireling women. Only the character of the dangerous consequences differs. The next is the vice of drink, which it is enjoined ought

[1]Ar. Śas. Bk. VI. II. [2]Bk. VIII. 3.

under all circumstances, to be avoided. The next one is the vice of dice. The last is the chapter dealing with illness and its treatment. The illnesses to which human flesh is heir are divided into two classes; those which are the result of bad deeds in a previous birth and therefore incurable; the cure for such diseases being only the removal of the causes. But those illnesses that come of accident are curable, and the treatment of those are dealt with in this last chapter. With this Tiruvalluvar brings to a close his treatment of the limbs of soverignty, or the constituents that go to make up a state.

Next comes a section named miscellaneous, which consists of thirteen chapters. The first chapter deals with high birth, that is, birth in a family of standing, and what ought to be the characteristics of well born people. After defining what exactly is meant by high birth and the characteristic features that mark it, he proceeds to deal with the regard and esteem that one should cherish for the maintenance of the high standing. The next is that which constitutes greatness, that is, the doing of deeds difficult of performance, the avoidance of vanity or mean pride, complete control of the evil propensities of talking ill of others. The next chapter has reference to the maintenance of the dignity that is thus acquired, and how to persevere in it. The next deals with the conduct that such people usually adopt, and ought to adopt, in order to maintain themselves in that high position, which is their due. The next deals with wealth, particularly the wealth which is *not* applied for the legitimate enjoyment of him that earns it, and

for giving to those that deserve it. To them that are not accustomed to giving to the deserving, nor used to enjoying it in legitimate ways, wealth is of no use even if it should be counted in a series of crores. That contains in a nutshell the idea of the whole section. The next section deals with shame, the feeling that makes people shrink from saying or doing things unworthy. The next one lays down instructions for raising the good family in which one may be born to a higher position. The efforts required to secure for it a higher position morally than what it actually possesses to start with. The following chapter relates to agriculture, which lays down the indispensable character and the ennobling virtue of agricultural work, as all good is possible only where living is possible, agriculture certainly comes in for the highest position in life. Then follows a section on poverty and what evils poverty is generally capable of producing. Then follows the section on begging. This is dealt with in two chapters. The first deals with the chapter, relating to cases where begging is not perhaps dishonourable, what is ordinarily understood by the term, mendicancy, which is held in high esteem rather than looked down upon. Notwithstanding this esteem, begging as begging is not held in high regard. It is generally looked down upon, and this feeling, and the other evil consequences that begging brings are dealt with in the next section. To the poverty that leads one to this kind of begging, death is preferrable. Then follows a chapter, the final one in this section, which treats of the vulgar, those given to low life and low living. Strangely enough, low people are compared to the Dēvas. But the comparison extends only to the similarity between the two in their being both alike not amenable to discipline. In the case of

the Devas, they are a law unto themselves and are not subject to outside control, while in the case of the other, outside control is useless and self discipline is absent. The rest of the section draws attention to the features that go to constitute this vulgar crowd and by implication, Tiruvaḷḷuvar wants that these qualities should be avoided by those that do not wish to be regarded as vulgar men.

It will be seen from this abbreviated analysis of the section, the largest of the three in the Muppāl or Kuṛal, that, while the section on polity does follow the *Smritis* and the Arthaśāstra teaching generally, the dominant note in the treatment is the teaching of morality. While therefore giving details of caution, the Kuṛal proceeds both by way of command (*vidhi*) and by way of prohibition (*nishēda*), to let its readers know what is commendable and therefore ought to be practised, and what is not commendable and therefore to be avoided. With this general moral purpose, dominating the whole, he still brings into his treatment, as far as is compatible from the point of view of literary propriety, as much of a detailed treatment of political life as it is possible to do. The Kuṛal polity therefore is not complete in itself. It requires to be supplemented, as in fact even the Arthaśāstra has to be supplemented, in certain particulars; but, being not so deliberately laid out for a detailed treatment of governance, the principles are given in general terms. When supplemented in the way it should be done, it gives a more or less complete, though general idea, of what political institutions were; at any rate, were intended to be.

III

DEVELOPMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE INSTITUTIONS IN THE AGE OF THE PALLAVAS.

The Pallavas of the Inscriptions, who they were—Tiraiyans, their predecessors—Tiraiyan of Pavattiri Iḷam-Tiraiyan of Kanchi—These known as Toṇḍamāns, also Pallavas, alternatively—The Pallavas of the inscriptions were Pallavas of Kāñchī—They ruled over Toṇḍamanḍalam and the territory north of it, up to the Krishna—Their early records, the Prakrit charters refer to the northern part of their territory generally—The glimpses of the administration from these charters—Same in character as the Āndhra Administration. How far are these in agreement with the Arthaśāstra and the Asokan organisation—Pallavas of the Sanskrit charters—Greater extent of their territory and influence. The Gangas and the Kadambas feudatory to them. The explanation of their dominant position. Glimpses of administration in the Sanskrit charters.

LECTURE III.

ADMINISTRATION IN THE AGE OF THE PALLAVAS.

The age of the Pallavas covers six centuries and like other chronological divisions is, more or less, an artificial division. It may be taken to cover the period from A.D. 300 to A.D. 900, the limits being only approximate in either case. These six centuries may be regarded as centuries in which the influence of the dynasty of the Pallavas of Kāñchī was dominant in South India. Before proceeding to study the political institutions of this particular period, we ought to know who the Pallavas were and what influences are likely to have been introduced, if any at all, during the period of their dominance, in this department primarily, and perhaps incidentally in others. These Pallavas as they show themselves in the earliest of their records are Pallavas of Kāñchī, that is, they were a dynasty of rulers who called themselves Pallavas, and who issued their charters, etc., constituting the inscriptional material that has come down to us from Kāñchī, as the royal headquarters of that dynasty. They are therefore described as Pallavas of Kāñchī and they were known throughout the period of history covered by their inscriptions by this designation. As far as the material accessible to us takes us at present, this dynasty of rulers seems to have come into the territory of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam of the Tamils, after the disappearance of the rule of the Āndhras in the Dakhan and the decline of the power of their successors, the Chūṭuṇāgas in the Karṇāṭak and the Southern Mahratta country to the north-westward.

They seem to have advanced from the region known as the special province of the Sātavāhanas, and occupied the territory to which Kānchī gives the name, the Tamil division known as Tonḍamanḍalam among the Tamils, Tunḍīra or Tunḍākarāshṭra among the Sanskritists.

The term "Pallava" is one of evil import, according to the standard Tamil lexicons, which give to it as a meaning or synonym the term *kayavar,* to whom the Kuṛaḷ itself devotes a chapter, the last chapter of the 70 constituting the *Poruḷ* (*Artha*) section of the *Kuṛaḷ.* The term, as it is applied in this class of authoritative works of Tamil, designates a class of people who must have been quite barbarian in character, and had not advanced much in culture and the other elements that constitute civilisation. That apparently is not the term as applied to this dominant dynasty of the Tamil land of the age of the Pallavas. The term Pallava, as applied to them, seems merely the Sanskrit word Pallava, meaning the tender twig of any plant or tree. The reason given for this use of the word is that the first man that had acquired this designation for himself was one who had to be recognised by the twig of a Tonḍai creeper (Byronia grandis). Hence the name Tonḍamān for him. Unfortunately for this derivation, however, the term Tonḍamanḍalam seems to be earlier and seems to have earlier use in Tamil literature; at any rate, the term Pallava as a synonym of Tonḍamān is not barred by this incompatability. As applied to this dynasty, therefore, the term is a translation of the word, and Tonḍamān the ruler over Tonḍa-

manḍalam irrespective of the family or the dynasty to which he belonged. Hence Toṇḍaiyar is the people, Toṇḍamanḍalam the land of the Toṇḍaiyar as a region inhabited by them; and Toṇḍamān or Toṇḍaiyarkōn is the chief or ruler among them: All of them alike stand translated by the term Pallava in Sanskrit, and, what perhaps adds to the confusion, is that the term is used in earlier Tamil literature as the synonym of Toṇḍamān, and even in a combination such as this, Toṇḍaip-Pallavan, which could only mean "the Pallava of the Toṇḍai twig", which perhaps indicates that the name Pallava originated as of application to this particular dynasty. Hence the dynastic name Pallava. It has therefore to be actually held as synonymous with the Toṇḍaiyar with this difference that in Tamil Toṇḍaiyaṟ seems primarily intended to denote the inhabitants of the region, the dynasty deriving its name as being the ruler of those inhabitants by the very constitution of the word, Toṇḍaiyarkōn or Toṇḍamān. So far, therefore, it is clear that the name has had nothing whatever to do with the distant Pallavas or the Sanskrit Pahlava of the inscriptions and the Purāṇas, a dynasty of foreigners that settled in the distant north-west, where the Purāṇas speak of them, or in the region of Gujarat and Kathiawad and the north Konkon coast where the inscriptions refer to them. To affiliate the one with the other would require more historical evidence than has been produced, or for the matter of that than we can produce at present, and therefore it would be safer to leave the possibility of any connection between the two aside till we have a more clear indication.

Who were the inhabitants or rulers of Tonḍamanḍalam before these Pallavas came into occupation of Kāñchī? As far as we can trace, the name Tonḍamanḍalam was the region, Tonḍaiyar were the inhabitants. Hence it would be safer to regard the Tonḍaiyar as a tribe of people with a totem in the Tonḍai creeper, and consituting the earlier inhabitants of the locality. In the class of works known as the Śangam collections generally, two rulers come into view in this locality distinctly known by the term Tiraiyan. We have the name of a Tiraiyan in the Ahanānūṛu collection, whose territory comprised the territory round the hill of Tirupati, which was included in the Tonḍamanḍalam, and who had his capital at a place called Pavattiri, Pavattiri that in later inscriptions is described as the Pavattiri in Kākandināḍu, which was swallowed up by the sea (*Kaḍalkonḍa Kākandināḍu*). What is more, this Tiraiyan of Pavattiri is described as possessed of Vēngaḍam as the hill par-excellence in his territory. With the *Nādu,* Tonḍamanḍalam, capital Pavattiri and hill Vēngaḍam, this ruler would be ruler, if not of the whole of Tonḍamanḍalam, at least of the northern part of it. The second name is that of a Tiraiyan associated with Kāñchī, and known to this body of literature as Iḷam Tiraiyan of Kāñchī. Iḷam Tiraiyan or younger Tiraiyan for this particular ruler involves *ipso facto* an elder Tiraiyan, who probably was the other Tiraiyan. This younger Tiraiyan's name is associated with Kāñchī by contemporary writers, and literary tradition gets to regard him as a descendant of a Chola king by a Nāga princess. Nāga tribes were in occupation of at least a part of the territory included in

the term Tonḍamanḍalam, and a substantial part of the inhabitants of that territory seem to describe themselves as Nāgas even in later inscriptions; and the names of several Nāgas are found in inscriptions in Mahābalipuram even of a later date. Whatever be the value of the story, his descending from the Chola dynasty is acknowledged even in contemporary writings and a poem[1] composed in his honour, states in one place that he was called a Tiraiyan as having been brought first of all by the *Tirai* or *Kaḍal* (the waves or the sea used synonymously) referring, of course, to a part of the story, that when the mother sent him to the Chola monarch with the Tonḍai creeper to distinguish him, the ship carrying him suffered shipwreck near the coast, and, while the baby was given up as lost by the merchant who had charge of him, the baby was lashed ashore and was discovered alive, and ultimately presented to the Chola ruler. In another context of the same poem, he is described as coming of the family of Rama of Ayodhya, and the passage may be interpreted as of the royal family of Ayodhya generally also. In later copper plate and other inscriptions which give long genealogies of the Chola family, a certain number of names of the dynasty of Ikshvakus is made to figure, among them the ruler Śibi, who cut off his flesh from his body and gave it to the hunter-bird to save a dove. The value of these traditions and contemporary references apart, Iḷam Tiraiyan of Kāñchī was a Tiraiyan just as much as his predecessor of this name, and his association with the contemporary Chola family is stated in terms that admit of no doubt. He was a

1. Perumbāṇarṟuppaiḍai in the collection Pattupāṭṭu.

Chola prince, a prince-viceroy of Kāñchī. It is in that capacity that all the poems that refer to him in Tamil actually describe him. All the Śangam poems that refer to Kāñchī, and poems that are capable of being brought into association with them referring to Kāñchī, do not make mention of the Pallavas, any of them, whom we find mentioned in, and whose succession can more or less be satisfactorily arranged on the basis of, the inscriptions, Prakrit, Sanskrit and Tamil. So the ruler Iḷam Tiraiyan has to be associated necessarily with the period to which these works relate, and must be regarded as a ruler anterior to the period of the inscriptions of the Pallavas of Kāñchī. Any assertion to the contrary involves the responsibility of proof that the time to which this body of literature is ascribed was a time during which the actual Pallava that ruled at Kāñchī was Toṇḍamān Iḷam Tiraiyan himself, or identifiable with him on satisfactory grounds. Such satisfactory evidence has not been forthcoming during the last quarter of a century and may not be forthcoming at all. The Pallavas of Kāñchī, therefore, to whom inscriptions refer, have to be held as rulers of Kāñchī undoubtedly, but rulers that came after the age of Iḷam Tiraiyan.

Among the inscriptions of the Pallavas so far made accessible to us, the oldest inscriptions are the so-called Prakrit inscriptions. These refer all of them to the territory north, or to the north-west of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam proper. The language in which these inscriptions are recorded is Prakrit, and the way that the dates are defined follow the system adopted by the

Āndhras in their inscriptions. This would naturally presume association with the Āndhras and contact with their territory, if not, the character of having been constituent parts of their territory so far as the localities to which these inscriptions refer are concerned. As a matter of fact, the more important of these inscriptions are all of them on the frontier of the Āndhra dominions, and certain parts, at any rate, must be held to have constituted a definite part of the Āndhra territory as such. Among the most important of these, the Maidavolu plates have reference to the territory quite close to the Krishna. The Hirahadagalli plates refer to the Bellary district probably, and the stone inscription of Khandanaga, of a time somewhat earlier than these, is on a rock near Adoni. These refer distinctly to the Sātāhani Āhāra and Sātāhani Raṭṭa, the Āhāra or the portion allotted to the Sātāvahana or Sātāhani Raṭṭa, a division belonging to the Sātavāhanas. In either case, it would mean the territory was the part of the country peculiarly associated with the Sātavāhanas. These inscriptions are not in the territory that is included in the Tamil division Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, but immediately to the north of it, just outside the territory coming within the definition of the term Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, in its widest extent. The Toṇḍamaṇḍalam frontier on the north could be taken only up to Gudur or the northern shores of the Pulikat Lake. A line drawn from there across into the interior would be bounded on the western side by the territory of the Bāṇas, and would not come very far from the Cuddapah District. But with the Pallavas of the inscriptions who issued their charters from Kāñchī as their

capital, their territory distinctly included a wider stretch on the north extending from the frontiers of the Bellary District, perhaps including a part of it, along the line of Tungabhadra down to the Krishna and thence to its mouth roughly. So from the beginning of Pallava rule, we find them associated with a wider stretch of territory. It was pointed out already that in early Tamil literature Vēngaḍam marked the northern boundary roughly; the frontier itself was described as the Vaḍuha frontier, and the territory on the other side of the frontier was territory where language changed, sometimes described specifically as Vaḍuha territory. Among those conquered by Karikāla,[1] we find the Aruvāḷar, the inhabitants of Aruvānāḍ and Aruvā Vaḍatalai, and on the farther north of them, the Vaḍavar which perhaps was only another form of the name Vaḍuhar. Therefore then, unlike the

[1]Paṭṭinappālai: ll. 272—92.

பெரும்பாழ் செய்து மலையான் மருங்கற
மலியகழ்க்குவனே கடறூர்க்கு வனே
வான்வீழ்க்குவனே வளி மாற்று வனெனத்
தான்முன்னிய துறை போகலிற்
பல்லொளியர் பணிபொடுங்கத்
தொல்லருவாளர் தொழில் கேட்ப
வடவர் வாடக் குடவர் கூம்பத்
தென்னவன்மிறல் கெடசிறி மன்னர்
மன்னெயில் கதவு மதனுடை நோன்முண்
மாத்தாணை மறமொய்ம்பிற்
செங்கண்ணூற்செயிர்த்துநோக்கி
புன்பொதுவர் வழிபொன்ற
விருங்கோவேண் மருங்குசாயக்
காடுகொன்று நாடாக்கிக்
குளந்தொட்டு வளம் பெருக்கிப்
பிறங்குநிலை மாடத்துறந்தை போக்கிக்
கோயிலொடு குடிநிறீஇ
வாயிலொடு புழையமைத்து
ஞாயிறொறும் புதைநிறீ இப்
பொருவேமெனப் பெயர்கொடித்
தொருவேமெனப் புறக்கொடாது
திருநிலையிய பெருமன்னெயின்
மின்னெளியெறிப்பத் தம்மொளி மழுங்கி

Toṇḍamāns of Kānchī, the Pallavas of the charters ruled over an extent of territory, which, while it came to be known as Toṇḍamaṇḍalam in an extended sense, constituted two distinct parts, the Toṇḍamaṇḍalam proper belonging, as it were, to the Tamil country and a stretch of country outside the region of the Tamil country and described perhaps as peculiar to the fief of the Sātavāhanas, and therefore belonging to territory outside the limits of the Tamil land and Toṇḍamaṇḍalam alike, and perhaps included, before this period, in the territory of the Āndhras. The passing out of existence of the Āndhra power it is that brings the Pallavas to notice on this side of their frontier, as in fact it brings the Chūṭunāgas into prominence on the south-western side of the Āndhra country proper. That being the character of the Pallava rulers of the south according to their earliest charters, and the prevalence of their authority over a region outside the strict frontiers of the Tamil land, such institutions as the charters indicate of a political character may be regarded as institutions belonging to a land outside the Tamil country proper. We shall proceed to a consideration of these and describe them as clearly as we can, before we make any effort to trace their influence upon such institutions as must have existed, purely of a Tamil character in the times before them, to estimate such influence as these may have exercised in modifying the character of the latter.

The most important of these inscriptions from our point of view are the Hirahadagalli plates conveying a grant of Pallava Śiva Skanda Varman. The grant is

issued by Śivaskandavarma, Dharma-Mahārājādhirāja Śiva Skandavarman, of the Bhāradvāja Gotra and of the Pallava family, who had celebrated *Agnishṭoma, Vājapēya,* and *Aśvamēdha* sacrifices. The charter was issued from Kānchī. The following points deserve notice. The capital of the Mahārāja is Kānchī. He takes credit for having celebrated Brahmanical sacrifices. He gives himself the *gotra* Bhāradvāja, and describes himself as belonging to the dynasty of the Pallavas. He further gives himself the special title "*Dharma*" before the royal designation Mahārāja, a term affected by Asoka. This *Dharma* in the Asokan inscriptions has always been interpreted as involving Buddhism as the religion of the person who so described himself. It is hardly justified, as the maintenance of the *Dharma* was the first duty of all Indian rulers, Brahman, Jain or Buddhist, and *Dharma* has there its own particular application in political science, *dharma* that actually regulated life in society, and therefore based on the Hindu conception of society as such; or, to be more specific the Brahman conception of society as such which finds definition in the law books. We pass from that to the next section that is really what concerns us most. The charter conveys the grant of certain bits of land of a village already gifted away to a Brahman Golaśarman of the *Ātrēya gōtra,* to whom the Mahārāja Bappasāmi had already granted the free gift village *Chillarēka.* Bappasāmi here stands for the ruler whom we know only by this designation, which simply means the Lord Bappa, or My revered father (*Bappa*). In this case it merely refers to the father, and the term