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The Crown Prince

I

The Crown Prince in the Vedic Period

It is only once that the term rāja-putra is mentioned in the Rgveda in the sense of a prince, although it occurs time and again in later Vedic literature. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa sometimes applies the appellation Rāja-pitr, father of a king, to the reigning monarch, implying thereby the important status that the crown prince enjoyed in the kingdom. The Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa includes the Rājaputra in the list of eight Vīras, heroes, who constituted the supporters and entourage of the king. That the king’s son, possibly the eldest, was entitled to an important constitutional status in the later Vedic period is further borne out by the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, which states that during the sprinkling ceremony the king’s son consecrates the king with the holy water and that, later on, on being anointed, the king hands over a vessel, filled with holy water, to his dearest son, exclaiming, ‘May this son of mine perpetuate the vigour of mine’.

II

The Crown Prince in the Pre-Maurya Period

The Jātakas provide us with useful information about the Uparāja who may be tentatively identified with the crown prince, although there are views identifying him with a deputy king or a provincial administrator. Usually, the eldest son of the king was entitled to this post but there are indications that brothers were occasionally preferred to incompetent sons. Again, in the absence of any male descendant, the eldest among the younger
brothers of the king would have been the natural choice. One of the Jātakas speaks of two brothers, of whom the elder was made Uparāja and the younger Senāpati. The commentary of the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta points out that every matter in the administration of justice must go to the Uparāja before the final judgement is pronounced by the king. The Khaṇḍahāla Jātaka, likewise, speaks of the important role that an Uparāja used to play in the administration of justice.

The crown prince helped the reigning king in the discharge of administrative responsibilities. We see Bimbisāra assuming the charge of the province of Aṅga during the reign of his father, whereas, at a still later date, he nominated his son Ajātashatru as the viceroy of the same province. If the story of malevolence of the last-named king be regarded as authentic, it would follow that occasions were not few and far between when princes misused their position to usurp the throne for themselves. The Jātakas record a few instances of princes being sent to distant places for higher education. In those days Takṣaśilā was a renowned centre of learning, being the resort not only for princes but also for students from other classes and ranks of society. The conventional list of the subjects of study for princes includes, as we learn from some of the Jātakas, the three Vedas and the eighteen or all the arts (tayo Vede atthārasa vijih=āṭṭhānāni).

III

The Crown Prince in the Maurya Period

Literary and epigraphic evidence proves the continuity of the practice of governing provinces with the help of princes in the Maurya period. The Pāli tradition tells that when Bindusāra was on the throne of Pātaliputra, he appointed his two sons, Susūma (or Sumana) and Aśoka, viceroy at Takṣaśilā and Ujjayinī, respectively. Subsequently, Takṣaśilā fell a prey to popular uprising, whence Aśoka was deputed by his father to suppress the revolt. The Divyāvadāna records the incident in the following words:

‘Atha rājñā Bindusārasya Takṣaśilā-nāma-nagaram viruddham/
Tatra rājñā Bindusārēṇ=Aśoka visarjitaḥ . . . yāvat
kumārāṁ=caturaṅgena balakāyena Takṣaśilāṁ gatah, śrutvā
Takṣasila-nivāsinaḥ paurāḥ . . . praty=ud-gamya ca katha-
yanti, 'na vāyaṁ kumārasya viruddhāḥ, n=āpi rājha Bindusārasya
api tu duṣṭ=āmātyā asmākam paribhavami kurvanti'. The passage
has been translated into English thus, 'Now Taxila, a city of
king Bindusāra, revolted. The king Bindusāra despatched Aśoka
there . . . while the prince was nearing Taxila with his four-
fold army, the resident, pauras (citizens of Taxila), on hearing
of it . . . came out to meet him and said, 'We are not opposed
to the prince nor even to king Bindusāra. But these wicked
ministers insult us'.

The following facts emerge from the above accounts:
First, the Maurya princes served as viceroys of provinces;
Second, the posts of the Kumāra-viceroys were subjected to
transfer;
Third, the Kumāras had their own council of ministers who,
if left to themselves, would generally prove to be oppressive.

Leaving aside the Divyāvadāna, we may now turn to the
edicts of Aśoka for fuller information about princes who were
called both Kumāras and Āryaputras. Kaliṅga Edict I refers to a
Kumāra who was entrusted with the administration of Ujjayinī
(Ujenite pi cu kumāle) and a second prince, who was in charge of
Takṣasila (Takhasilāte), the headquarters of Gandhāra, whereas
Kaliṅga Edict II tells us of one such prince placed in charge of
a part of Kaliṅga with its headquarters at Tosaī (Tosaliyam
kumāle). The existence of another prince-vicerey is vouchsafed
by Minor Rock Edict I which refers to an Āryaputra at
Suvarṇagiri (Suvaṁnagirite ayaputasa) which is generally identi-
ied with a locality near Erragudi, where a complete set of the
Rock Edicts has been found, in Kurnool district in Andhra
Pradesh. D.R. Bhandarkar suggests its location in Rājaṅga, the
old capital of Magadha, and points out that this prince, who
was in all likelihood the crown prince, administered the Maurya
empire from Suvarṇagiri in Rājaṅga during Aśoka's temporary
cessation of rule, possibly when the latter went on pilgrimage to
Bodh Gaya. But both the location of Suvarṇagiri and the inter-
pretation of the word āryaputra, as suggested by D.R.
Bhandarkar, are, by no means, certain. Nevertheless, the testi-
mony of the literary evidence about the appointment of the
Maurya princes as viceroys for outlying provinces stands corro-
borated by epigraphic records.
There are reasons for the belief that all the Kumāra-viceroyals did not claim any uniform status and position. The Kumāra-viceroy at Tosali was not empowered to exercise unfettered power which was the prerogative of those stationed at Ujjain and Taxila. This would be evident from the facts enumerated below:

First, the Kumāras of Ujjain and Taxila were to send on tour their own Mahāmātras every three years to ensure the proper administration of justice, whereas in the case of Tosali the Mahāmātras were deputed by Asoka himself.

Second, in connection with the despatch of such an officer, the Kumāras of Ujjayinī and Takṣaśilā are mentioned by themselves and not associated with any state dignitaries, whereas in Separate Kaliṅga Edict II (Dhauli version), where alone the Kumāra of Tosali is referred to, he is mentioned not by himself but associated with the Mahāmātras.

And last, Asoka issued orders to the Nagara Vyāvahārikas and others of Tosali directly, even though the Kumāra was placed in charge of the province, and not through the Kumāra himself.

It would become clear from the foregoing discussion that Asoka hardly empowered the Kumāra of Tosali to enjoy a large measure of freedom in administration which he was pleased to grant to the Kumāras placed at Ujjain and Taxila. This disparity in position among princes justifies the assumption that, although corroborative evidence is lacking, the viceroyalty of Taxila and Ujjain was reserved for the Yuvarāja and other important princes.

A meticulous treatment of princes, not excluding their boyhood days, is found in the Kautiliya Arthaśāstra. We may take into consideration the following observations of Kautilya:

‘... when the chief queen is in her ṛtu(-period), priests should offer a caru-oblation to Indra and Bṛhaspati. When she is pregnant, a children’s specialist should arrange for the nourishment of the foetus and for delivery. When she has given birth, the chaplain should perform the sacraments for the son. When he is ready for it, experts should train him.’

‘One possessed of sagacity, one with intellect requiring to be goaded and one of evil intellect—these are the different kinds of sons. He, who, when taught, understands spiritual.
and material good and practises the same is one possessed of sagacity. He who understands but does not practise (them) is one with intellect requiring to be goaded. He who is even full of harm and hates spiritual and material good is one of evil intellect’ (Buddhimān = āhārya-buddhir = durbuddhir = iti putra-viśeṣāḥ | Śisyaṃśo dharm = ārthāv = upalabhate c = ānu-tiṣṭhati ca buddhimān | Upalabhamāno n = ānutiṣṭhaty = āhārya-buddhiḥ | Apāyanityo dharm = ārtha dvesī c = eti durbuddhiḥ/)).

‘If such be the only son, he should endeavour to get a son born of him. Or, he should get sons begets on an appointed daughter’ (Sa yady = eka-putraḥ putr = otpattavasya viyatet | Putrikā-putrāṇ = utpādayed = vā)/).

‘An old or diseased king, however, should get a child begets on his wife by one of the following (viz.), his mother’s kinsman, a member of his own family, and a virtuous neighbouring prince. But he should not install on the throne an only son, if undisciplined’ (Vṛddhas = tu vyādhito vā rājā maitr-bandhu-tulya guṇavat-sāmantānām = anyatamena kṣetre vijam = utpādayet | Na c = aika putram = avinītaṁ rājye sthāpayet/).  

‘Of many (sons, who are undisciplined) confinement in one place (is best); (however), the father should be beneficently disposed towards the sons. Except in case of a calamity, sovereignty passing on to the eldest son is praised (Bahūnām = eka-samrodhah pīta putra-hito bhavet | Anyatra = āpada aśvār-yam jyeṣṭha-bhāgī tu pūjyate/).  

In referring to the education of princes, Kauṭilya* observes, ‘when the ceremony of tonsure is performed, the prince should learn the use of the alphabet and arithmetic. When the initiation with the preceptor is performed, he should learn the three Vedas and philosophy from the learned, economics from the heads of departments (and) the science of politics from theoretical and practical exponents. And (he should observe) celibacy till the sixteenth year. Thereafter (should follow) the cutting of the hair and marriage for him. And (he should have) constant association with elders in learning for the sake of improving his training, since training has its root in that.’ It would appear from the above remarks of Kauṭilya that first, princes were trained in different branches of learning by different experts, and second, they were given in marriage at the end of their sixteenth year. Even with the completion of their studies, the
princes were not placed in independent situations but were to undergo a period of apprenticeship as subordinates to the administrative heads.\textsuperscript{29} When they proved to be competent and worthy of occupying an independent position, they were appointed to responsible posts like the commander-in-chief of the army, governor of a province or were raised to heir-appar-ency.\textsuperscript{30}

In the \textit{Arthaśāstra}, we meet with a somewhat graphic treatment of the problem pertaining to the king’s relations with his sons. If an honest prince apprehends insecurity from his father, he is advised to take to forest-life,\textsuperscript{31} leave the state and work in gold and ruby mines or, if possible, join hands with his maternal relatives in order to bring about the dethronement of his father.\textsuperscript{32} If, on the contrary, the prince himself misbehaves with his father, he should be conciliated, in the first instance, by diplomacy, and if he does not get rectified, he may be sent on distant expeditions that may spell disaster for him, be imprisoned, or, as the last resort, be put to death.\textsuperscript{33} It is worth noting that whereas Bhāradvāja advocates secret murder of really refractory princes, the sage Viśālākṣa recommends only imprisonment in certain deserted places.\textsuperscript{34} The crown prince, nevertheless, occupied an honoured position in the state, being entitled to a monthly (or annual) allowance of 48,000 \textit{panas}, the highest remuneration, equal to that of the chief priest, commander-in-chief, queen-mother and chief queen, and to the rare privilege of being not watched by the Intelligence Department.

As we compare the accounts of princes, as found in the Pāli texts, epigraphic records and the \textit{Arthaśāstra}, we find that whereas the first two sources are primarily concerned with the princes’ role in administration, the \textit{Arthaśāstra} deals with their upbringing and conduct as well. In all these accounts, the princes are represented as being entrusted with the administration of provinces. The appointment of princes as provincial governors in lieu of those not related to the royal family was, no doubt, in harmony with the interest of the ruling monarch who was always apprehensive of the machinations of his ministers and generals. But the selection of princes for such a prestigious post would sometimes prove detrimental to the state,
for it would lead to the fragmentation of the kingdom, as it did in the later days of the Imperial Guptas.

IV

The Crown Prince in the Epics

The princely curriculum, as prescribed in the Śāntiparvan\textsuperscript{35} of the Mahābhārata, includes a variety of subjects like knowledge of the family laws, the Veda-of-the-bow, the Veda, elephant-riding, horse-riding, chariot-driving, rules of propriety, word-science, music and the fine arts, legends and tales. In the Rāmāyana we, likewise, meet with a detailed list of subjects the king was expected to study, comprising Dhanurveda, Veda, Niti-śāstra, the art of elephants and cars, the art of painting (ālekhya), writing (lekhyā), jumping (laṅghana) and swimming. The Ādiparvan\textsuperscript{36} shows that the Pāṇḍavas had studied all the Vedas and the various treatises (te=dhītya nikhilān vedān śāstrāṇi vividhāni ca). It seems that the royal princes were primarily concerned with the science of arms, which required years of patient study and paid scant attention to the holy writings the mastery of which ‘must have been peculiar to the man of leisure, the priest’, as is implied by a glance at the list of the branches of study pursued by the model prince Abhimanyu. ‘The Veda-of-the-bow, in four divisions and ten branches, he, the Veda-knower, learned complete from Arjuna, both the divine (weapons) and the human. Then Arjuna taught him the special points in the knowledge of different weapons, in dexterity of use, and in all arts; and both in science and practice made him equal unto himself; and he rejoiced as he beheld him.’\textsuperscript{37} In explaining the term Dhanurveda, R.K. Mukherji\textsuperscript{38} observes that the ‘entire military science and art of the age seems to have been comprehended by the generic term Dhanurveda, the dhanu or bow being regarded as the type or symbol of all weapons or methods of warfare’.

The Sabhāparvan mentions the crown prince as one among the eighteen\textsuperscript{39} high functionaries of the state\textsuperscript{40} (Mantrī purohitāś =c=aiva yuvarājaś =cumūpatīkḥ/ pañcama ōvāra-pālāś = ca saṣṭh = ontarvesikās = tathā||). The king is urged to keep these officers watched by spies, except the chief councillor, the high-priest and the crown prince.\textsuperscript{41} If the crown prince happened to be a
minor on the king's death, the kingdom was kept for the prince by an elder relative who governed it as if he were the king, as did Bhīṣma on the death of his brother Citrāṅgada when Vicitravīrya, the real successor to the throne, was still a boy-prince (Hate Citrāṅgade Bhīṣmo bāle bhrātari... pālayāṃśa tad=rājyaṁ Satyavaty=āmate sthitāḥ). The age of sixteen was probably the terminus of boyhood and the princes of that age were looked upon as fully equipped knights.

The Mahābhārata speaks of a few senior princes like Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Devāpi and Yadu whose claims to the throne were passed over in favour of those of younger brothers like Pāṇdu, Śāntanu and Pūru, respectively, the cause of supersession being either their physical defect or the father's disapproval. A prince, selected for heir-apparency, had to go through the whole gamut of ceremonies (abhiśecanam) before he was officially declared the crown prince. A practical instance of the abhiśecanam of the Yuvarāja may be found in the preparations made for Rāma's consecration by king Daśaratha. The princes led an idle life in the time of peace, taking part in tournaments and trials of skill but such intervals, it must be admitted, were, indeed, rare as most of their life was spent in the military camps in response to their commitments to the state.

The Rāmāyaṇa speaks of princes ruling over territorial units over which they were the heads but still answerable to the monarch. Bharata's two sons, Takṣa and Puṣkala, were appointed governors of Takṣaśilā and Puṣkalahavatī (Takṣaṁ Takṣaśilāyām= tu Puṣkalam Puṣkalahavate); Śatrughna's two sons were governors of Mathurā and Vidiśā (Subāhur= Mathurāṁ lebhe Śatrughhāti ca Vidiśāṁ); Lakṣmaṇa's two sons were heads of two cities in the country of Kārupatha and Rāma's two sons ruled over Kośala and the northern region (Kośaleṣu Kuṣaṁ vīram=uttareṣu Lavam tathā) with their head-quarters at Kuśāvatī and Śrāvasti, respectively.

V

The Crown Prince in the Post-Maurya Period

Puṣyamitra, who succeeded the Mauryas on the throne of Pāṭaliputra, followed the Maurya practice of appointing princes as viceroys of provinces. The Mālavikāgnimitram tells us how
the crown prince Agnimitra governed Vidișā, identified with Besnagar in eastern Malwa, as his father's viceroy. It cannot be ascertained whether the example of Pusyamitra was emulated by his successors.

Manu does not refer to the crown prince. Yet as regards the education of the king, he\(^5\) says that 'the king should learn the three Vedas from Brāhmaṇas, versed in those Vedas, should learn politics which is ever useful to him, should also study metaphysics, Upaniṣads and agriculture from experienced men' (Trai-vidyebhyas=trayīṁ vidyāṁ daṇḍanītiṁ ca śāsvatīṁ/ Ānvikṣiktīṁ c=ātma-vidyāṁ vārtarāmbhāṁś=ca lokakāh/). It is quite likely that the proficiency in all these branches of learning was acquired by the king even before his accession to the throne. Manu elsewhere points out that 'devoid of diseases, the lord of the earth will himself do all these duties; but at the time of illness he will entrust all these to fit ministers'\(^6\) (Etad= vidhānam=ātiṣṭhed=araṇgh prthivi-patiḥ/ Asvasthaḥ sarvam= etat= tu bhṛtyeṣu viniyojayet/). It would thus be apparent that Manu has denounced the idea of the crown prince being appointed regent during the life-time of the reigning monarch even in a time of emergency.

The inscriptions of the Indo-Greek, Scytho-Parthian and Kuśāṇa kings do not mention the term yuvarāja, excepting, of course, the Mathura Lion capital inscriptions which apply the designation twice to one Kharaoasta, who is almost unanimously identified by scholars with the Kṣatrapa Kharaoasta of the coins.\(^\)\(^\) The so-called Takht-i-Bahi inscription of the time of Gondophares speaks of one Erjhuna Kapa who is identified by Sten Konow with Kujula Kadphises. The epithet erjhuna is the Prākrit transliteraton of the old Śaka term alysānai which was used as a synonym of the Sanskrit word kumāra. The title also occurs in a Brāhmi record\(^7\) at Mathura, engraved on the pedestal of a Buddha statuette and dated in the year 36. But these epigraphs hardly supply us with any information in regard to the position of the princes in administration.

Princes are known to have played a pivotal role in administration in the Scytho-Parthian kingdoms, as is suggested by the joint issues of coinage by Azes I and Azilises, Azilises and Azes II, Gondophares and Gad, and Gondophares and Aba-gases. The Andhau inscriptions suggest that the Śaka chief
Caṣṭana ruled in the capacity of a Mahākṣatrapa conjointly with his grandson Kṣatrapa Rudradāman. But in these cases, the princes were not heirs-apparent but co-rulers or subordinate colleagues of kings.

There are, however, reasons to believe that the institution of heir-apparenacy was in vogue in the Kuśāna kingdom, at least, in the latter part of the reign of the first Kuśāna monarch, Kujula Kadphises. When one looks at the discovery of Kujula Kadphises’ coins in Taxila in the context of the statement of the Hou-Han shu, crediting Wema with the conquest of India, one has to conclude that Kadphises I associated himself in the latter part of his life with the crown prince Wema Kadphises who conquered India and put in circulation in the newly-annexed territories the currency of the old king who was then leading a retired life.\(^4\) Marshall\(^5\) is of opinion that the coins bearing the legend, Maharayasa Rayatirayasa Kujula Kara Kaphasa Sucadhramāṭhitasa, were plausibly issued by Wema when he was still a crown prince.

VI

*The Crown Prince in the Gupta Period*

Our knowledge about the Yuvarāja during the Gupta period is derived from the combined testimony of the contemporary inscriptions and the Nītisāra of Kāmandaka, which was, in all probability, composed during this epoch. The Allahabad prāsasti probably gives us an account of the selection of Samudragupta, plausibly as a Yuvarāja, by Candragupta I.\(^6\) We are told that Candragupta I selected him for the august post in an open assembly. We are further informed that when this selection was announced, his kinsmen of equal birth (*tulya-kulaja*) became pale-faced with disappointment. This description leaves the impression that for heir-apparenacy the claims of the elder sons were sometimes passed over in silence in favour of those of the younger princes, otherwise the deep disappointment of the kinsmen of equal birth would remain inexplicable. This supposition is corroborated by the fact that Candragupta II, to judge from the expression ‘*tat-parighita*, ‘accepted as his chosen successor’; applied to him, was selected by his father to succeed the latter on the throne, though he was not the eldest son. The
reason behind the selection of a younger prince as Yuvarāja was due not so much to favouritism on the part of the royal father as to the character and ability of the candidate.

It is quite likely that the heir-apparent discharged a great deal of administrative work and even led the imperial army in the face of any external invasion. When the Puṣyamitrās, who "had great resources in men and money", invaded the Gupta dominions in the closing years of Kumāragupta I's reign, Skandagupta fought hard with them "to restore the fallen fortunes of his family"\(^n\) *(Vicalita-kula-lakṣmis = tam = abhandāy = odyatena| Kṣiti-tala-śayaṇiye yena nītā triyāmā| Sam-udita-bala-Kośān Puṣyamitrāṁ = ca jivā kṣitipa-carāṇa-pīhe sthāpiyo vāma- pādah/).

Some welcome light on the office of the crown prince is shed by a few seals from Basarh in which we have the following legends:

(i) Yuvarāja-pādiya-Kumārāmāty = ādhikaraṇasya; and
(ii) Śri-Yuvarāja-bhattraka-pādiyu-Kumārāmāty = ādhi-karaṇasya.

Unfortunately, there is no consensus among scholars on the meaning and interpretation of the above legends. U.N. Ghosal\(^n\) takes the word pādiya as equivalent to pād = ānudhyāta and denoting the relations between father and son. According to this interpretation, the Kumārāṁatyas of the Basarh seals were related as sons to the crown prince, a theory which is hardly conclusive. R.D. Banerji\(^n\) interprets the word pādiya as a synonym of kalpa, meaning 'equal to' and suggests that some of the Kumārāṁatyas were equal in rank to the heir-apparent but this is equally untenable. Fleet has shown that the expression pād = ānudhyāta is used in inscriptions to mean different kinds of relations. The word pādiya in the Basarh seals, which literally means 'belonging to the foot of', implies, in all probability, that the Kumārāṁatyas, in question, were attached to the department of the heirs-apparent. The Yuvarāja had evidently under him a body of officers who helped him to carry on his duties. While dealing with these inscriptions, Dikshitar\(^n\) observes, 'This class of seals betrays clearly that the crown prince was distinguished from other princes of the royal family. While the crown prince was entitled Yuvarāja, Bhattraka, ordinary
princes were merely Yuvarājas and did not have the appellation Bhaṭṭāraka attached to their names. It seems that both ‘Yuvarāja’ and ‘Yuvarāja Bhaṭṭāraka’ have been used indiscriminately in the sense of heir-apparent, and that the expression Bhaṭṭāraka is used in one case and omitted in the other because of the carelessness on the part of the scribes who incised the seals.

From Basarh has been discovered another seal containing the legend, śrī-Yuvarāja-bhaṭṭāraka-pādiya-bal-ādhikaranasya, ‘the (seal) of the office of the army commander, attached to the Yuvarāja’. It is clear that the crown prince, who was sometimes entrusted with the administration of a part of the kingdom, was also responsible for leading the forces to the battle-field, and further that, a contingent was placed at his disposal to assist him in his military operations.

Kāmandaka, who probably flourished in this age, points out that the eldest among the princes should be appointed Yuvarāja (Avinītam kumāram hi kulam-āśu vivasyatī| Viniṭam= aurasam putram yauva-rājye=bhiṣecayet∥). As regards the princely curriculum, Kāmandaka lays down that he is to be well-versed in economics and politics as well as in the Vedas and philosophy. It may be noted that the Bārhaspatya school forbids the king from Vedic study which is supposed to act as a screen to obscure the vision of the person who has to know the hard world around him. That the Gupta princes hardly minimised the cultivation of fine arts is possibly indicated by the statement in the Allahabad inscription that Samudragupta ‘put to shame the preceptor of the lord of gods, Tumburu, Nārada and others by his sharp and polished intellect and choral skill and musical accomplishments (Gāndharva-lalitair-vrīḍita-Tridaśapatiguru-Tumburu-Nārad = āder = vidvaj - jan= opajivy = āneka-kāvyā - vikrayābhiḥ pratiṣṭhita - kavirāja - śab-dasya). That princes had to undergo a period of rigorous training at the hands of experts is also borne out by the Raghuvanśa (Upāta-vidyam vidhivad=guṇubhyas=taṁ).

The Brhatasamhitā, which was probably a work of the Gupta period, preserves some interesting details about the crown prince. It states that the patta of the Yuvarāja contained three crests but the width and length of the queen’s were more than those of the crown prince’s. The rod of the umbrella of the crown prince measured four and a half cubits. Varāhamihira
further says that the Yuvarāja occupied a house which was bigger than that of the queen. The commentator Bhattotpala describes the Yuvarāja as a partner in the enjoyment of the kingdom (Yuvarāj = ardha-rāja-bhūg rājā; Yuvarāj-ordha-bhogi rājā; Yuvarājaḥ prasiddh = ordha = rājya-bhāk).

VII

The Crown Prince in the Puṣyabhūti Kingdom

The heir-apparent was an important member of the administrative machinery of the state in the age of Harṣavardhana. Rājyavardhana was sent by his father Prabhākaravardhana as the leader of the army to fight against the Hūṇas. If literature reflects the picture of contemporary society, then Bāṇa’s account of prince Candrāpīḍa, as found in the chapter entitled Candrāpīḍasya Yuvarājya = ābhiṣekah of the Kādambarī may be taken into consideration for ascertaining the condition of the princes in the seventh century A.D. Bāṇa provides us with the following details about Candrāpīḍa:

First, during the childhood days, various rites such as tonsure, etc., were performed.

Second, the boyhood days of the prince having passed by, king Tārāpīḍa constructed a school-house on the outskirts of the capital city where his son was placed. Professors of every branch of knowledge were appointed to train the prince. The king, along with his queen Vilāsavati, used to go to the school every day in order to acquaint himself with the progress of the prince. Candrāpīḍa gained proficiency in grammar, Mīmāṃsā, logic, politics, use of weapons such as the bow, etc., driving a chariot, riding on elephant’s back, riding horses, instrumental music, works on dancing, various musical treatises, art of training elephants, science of ascertaining the age of a horse and the characteristic marks on the body of a person, fine arts, calligraphy (making clay-dolls), engraving, arts of gambling, various systems of music, interpreting the omens from the cries of birds, astronomy, testing precious stones, carpentry, ivory-carving, art of building, science of medicine, use of the proper yantras, use of antidotes against poison, swimming, rowing, jumping, climbing, erotic arts, magic, study of romances, dramas, tales, poetry, Mahābhārata, Purāṇas, historical works and Rāmāyaṇa,
all the alphabet and dialects of the country, all the mechanical arts, Vedas and many other different accomplishments.

Third, the prince took a period of ten years to complete his course of study, and then he was brought home.

Fourth, he was later on crowned as the heir-apparent. Bāṇa vividly describes how Candrāpiḍā's consecration ceremony as Yuvarāja was observed with grandeur. The king himself, accompanied by his prime minister and a host of subordinate kings, rained water on Candrāpiḍā's head (Rājā svayam=utkṣipta-maṅgala kalaśaḥ saha Śukanāsena puṇy=ehani purodhasā sampādit=āśeṣa - rājy=ābhiseka - maṅgalam=aneka - narapati-sahasra-parivarṇaḥ sarvebhyaḥ sarvābhyaḥ naṅbhīyoh sarvebhyaḥ=ca sūgarebhyaḥ sam=āḥṛtena sarva auṣadhibhīḥ sarva-phalaiḥ sarvam=rddhiḥ sarva-ratnaś=ca pariṅghiten=ānanda vāspa-jala-miśreṇa mantra pūtena vāriṇā sutam=abhiseṣe ca/). Next the queen-mother herself anointed his body from the soles of his feet upwards with fragrant sandal-paste. On his head he wore a chaplet of newly-blossomed white flowers, his body had a sprinkling of the gorocanā paint, he wore ear-ornaments, made of the blades of the durvā grass, he put on a new pair of silken garments, his hand was adorned with a wrist-thread and he had on his chest a pearl necklace, looking as if it were the circle of (the stars of) the seven (heavenly) sages, come there to witness the coronation ceremony.67 Thus being decorated, Candrāpiḍā arrived at the assembly hall and ascended the royal throne of gold (sabhā-maṅḍapam=upagamya kāṅcanamayaṁ śaś=īva meru-śṛṅgam Candrāpiḍāḥ simh=āsanam=āruroha). Just as Kālidāsa has painted the picture of Raghu on the model of Samudragupta, similarly it is not unlikely that Bāṇa has portrayed the crown prince Candrāpiḍā in imitation of either prince Rājyavardhana or a son of Harṣa.

Daṇḍin, who according to some scholars flourished in about the same epoch, speaks in Ucchvāsa I of the Daśakumārarakarita of the princes who acquired proficiency in all scripts (sakalalipi jñānam), languages, Vedas and their six Āṅgas, Purāṇas, Kāvyas, Nāṭakas, Ākhyāṇas, Ākhyāyikās, Itihāsas, Citrakathā (Kāvyanāṭak=ākhyānak=ākhyāvik=etihāsa - citrakathā - sahitapurāṇagaṇa-naipunyaṁ), Dharmaśāstras, Vyākaraṇas, astrology, logic, Mīmāṃsā (Dharma-śabda jyotiṣka-mīmāṁs=ādi-samastā-śastra-nikara cāturyaṁ), treatise on politics by Kauṭilya and
Kāmandaka, musical instruments, music, poetics, magical sciences, riding all vehicles, use of various weapons and different crooked arts such as thieving, gambling, etc. The combined evidence of both Bāna and Daṇḍin would indicate that the princes of their times were not only trained in politics and military science but also they had to be acquainted with other branches of knowledge, not excluding fine arts.

VIII

The Crown Prince in the Pāla-Prañhāra Period

The Yuvarāja finds frequent mention in the Pāla records. The king's eldest son, as usual, was selected as the heir-apparent but in regard to his duties and functions during this period, we do not possess detailed information. Tribhuvanapāla, who served as Yuvarāja under his father Dharmapāla, acted as the Dātaka, messenger, in connection with the Khalimpur grant. Another Pāla crown prince, viz., Rājyapāla (sthira-yauvarājyaṁ) was entrusted with similar business in respect of the Monghyr grant. The advice of the crown prince on important issues was sometimes solicited by the king, as would appear from the fact that Rāmapāla often held consultations with his son Rājyapāla 'in connection with his war-preparations against the Kaivartas'. The history of the Pāla dynasty furnishes us with a few instances to show that the heirs-apparent did not always succeed their fathers on the imperial throne. Tribhuvanapāla, as we have already seen, was the crown prince during the reign of Dharmapāla, but the prince who succeeded Dharmapāla on the throne was his younger brother Devapāla. Are we to suppose that the rightful claims of Tribhuvanapāla were challenged by Devapāla who occupied the throne after defeating his brother in a fratricidal struggle? But the possibility of an internecine war after the death of Dharmapāla is ruled out in the presence of the statement in the Monghyr grant that Devapāla ascended the throne peacefully (nir= upaplavat). Tribhuvanapāla did not ascend the Pāla throne probably because he predeceased his father. Similarly, Devapāla, after his demise, was followed by Śūrapāla, and not by his worthy son Rājyapāla (ātm=ānurūpa-caritam) probably because he outlived the latter. The crown prince normally inherited the
throne after the death of the ruling monarch but Nārāyaṇapāla ascended the throne during the life-time of his father Vigraha-
pāla, who abdicated the throne to lead a life of austerities.²¹

Inscriptions are not of much value in knowing the position of the Yuvarāja in the contemporary Pratihāra kingdom. But the little that we know about him would make it abundantly clear that generally the eldest son was selected for the post. We have, however, a few cases of younger brothers being elevated to the rank of Yuvarāja. The Daulatpura copper plates of Bhoja I mention Nāgabhaṭa as Yuvarāja and Dūtaka of the grant but this Nāgabhaṭa was probably a brother of Bhoja I.²² For our knowledge of the education of the princes of the contemporary period, we may turn to the testimony of the Nītīvākyāṁṛta, composed by Somadeva Sūri, who tells us that they were trained in the four branches of learning²³ (Ānvikṣikī trayī vārtā daṇḍanītir=iti catasro rāja-vidyāḥ), comprising Ānvikṣikī (the knowledge of self), Trayī (three Vedas), Vārtā (the science of agriculture, cattle-breeding and commerce) and Daṇḍanīti (the principles of politics). In emphasising the importance of education for princes, Somadeva²⁴ says that a prince, howsoever well born, should not be selected as the heir-apparent unless he is properly qualified for the great trust. The Agni Purāṇa²⁵ prescribes that the prince should be taught Dharmasāstra, Kāmaśāstra, Arthaśāstra, science of archery and various arts and crafts by competent teachers (Dharm=ārtha-
kāma-śāstrāṇi dhanur=vedaṇ ca śikṣayet/ śilpāni śikṣayec=c= aivom-āptair mithyā-priyaṁvadaiḥ/) and be separated from wrathful, avaricious and ill reputed persons²⁶ (na c=ānya saṅgo dātavyah kruddha-lubdha-vimāṇiḍaiḥ). With the completion of his studies, he would assume charge of different departments but an uneducated prince merits confinement²⁷ (Aśakyaṁ=tu guṇā-
dhānaṁ kartum taṁ bandhayet sukhaiṁ/ Adhikāreṣu sarveṣu vinītaṁ viniyojaye//).

The Yuvarāja finds mention in the inscriptions of the early Gaṅga kings of Kaliṅganagara. One such prince, Rājendra-
varman II,²⁸ is known to have issued the Pattali and Nampali grants from the city of Kaliṅganagara, although the circum-
stances leading to the issue of these charters in the name of the crown prince instead of the reigning king himself cannot be determined.
IX

The Crown Prince in the Post-Pāla-Pratihāra Period

Generally speaking, during the period, following the decline of the Pāla and Pratihāra kingdoms, the crown prince assumed a position of greater importance in administration, as compared to his predecessor in the earlier kingdoms. A perusal of the Gāhaḍavāla epigraphs reveals that the Gāhaḍavāla crown princes, called Yuvarājas and Mahārājaputras, enjoyed the special prerogative of making grants of land, no doubt, with the approval of the ruling monarch, and issuing records of such gifts. When the Yuvarāja Jayacandra,⁷⁹ for example, made a grant, he did so with the consent of king Vijayacandra. They announced their grants in their own names unlike the queens whose gifts were to be announced by kings.⁸⁰ The seals of these princes contain their own insignia (lāṅchana) which consists of a conch-shell and an arrow below with the name of the Yuvarāja across the centre, as distinct from the royal seal which shows Garuḍa above, a conch-shell below and the name of the king, written across the centre.⁸¹ Sometimes the crown prince seems to have enjoyed a position of extraordinary importance and influence in administration, as did Govindacandra during the reign of his father Madanapāla, as may be guessed, in the first instance, from the use of the royal seal in his own name in the inscriptions which he issued during the reign of his father, and secondly, from the occurrence of extravagant praise for his military achievements which we hardly come across in the grants of the other princes of the dynasty. The Yuvarāja Āśphoṭacandra⁸² issued a copper plate in A.D. 1134, bearing his father Govindacandra’s seal. The younger princes, likewise, appear to have held important administrative posts in the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom, as was the case with Rājyapāla,⁸³ a younger son of Govindacandra, who is described as being endowed with all the royal prerogatives (śrī-maḍ = Govinda-candra-deva-pāda-padma-saṁmatyā samasta-rāja-prakriy = opeta-mahārāja-putra-śrī-maḍ Rājyapāla-devo). Rājyapāla is known to have issued an inscription, using his own seal, containing the legend, mahārāja-putra-śrīmaḍ-Rājyapāla-devaḥ, and recording the king’s consent to his grant of a piece of land in favour of a Brahmin scholar named Dāmodaraśarman.⁸⁴
The Sena inscriptions take notice of the princes some of whom gave a good account of themselves by participating in the reigning kings’ military campaigns. The Madhainagar grant seems to imply that Lakṣmaṇasena, while he was still a Kumāra, took part in some victorious expeditions. In his two extant grants, viz., the Sahitya Parisat and Madhainagar grants, Viśvarūpasena is described as being ‘engaged in wars since the days of his viceroyalty’ (ā-kaumāram = apāra-saṅgar ... a-hara-vyāpāra-trṣnā). The Sahitya Parisat grant discloses the names of two princes, Sūryasena and Puruṣottamasena, who are said to have made a gift of two plots of land to Halāyudha.

As was the case with their Gāhāvāla brethren, the Cāhamāna princes were frequently appointed to some important posts in administration. The Jalor stone inscription of Samaraśimhadeva refers to prince Jojala as looking after the administration of the kingdom (rājya-cintaka) and successfully dealing with the unsettled tribes (taskara) of the whole district of Pīlvāhikā, the Kiradu stone inscription informs us how the kingĀlhaṇadeva used to take help from his two sons, Gajasimha and Kelhaṇadeva, in important administrative matters (śrī-mahārāja-putra-śrī-Kelhaṇadeva - matam = etat mahārāja - putra-Gajasimhasya matam); the prince Cāmūḍarāja was appointed governor of Māṇḍyavapura by his father Gajasimha in A.D. 1170; the two sons of the king Kelhaṇa, Vikramasiṃha and Soṭala, were appointed to the same post in A.D. 1180 and 1185, respectively. The example of the prince Sallakṣaṇapāla, who was appointed a senior minister by his father Visaladeva, shows that the younger princes were sometimes inducted in the ministry. P.B. Udgaonkar has shown that for their personal enjoyment and expenses, the Cāhamāna princes were usually given fiefs, known as Sejā, their size being dependent ‘upon the extent and resources of the kingdom and the importance of the grantee’. Thus whereas, the prince Kīrtipāla, for instance, enjoyed twelve villages as his fief, the princes Lākhāṇapāla and Abhayapāla, as known from the Lalrai stone inscription, simultaneously enjoyed one and the same village as a fief in A.D. 1177. The princes’ appointment being temporary, they did hardly enjoy the proprietary right over their fiefs, and the central government reserved its power to assign revenues out of these lands.
Some records of the Cāhamānas of Nadol refer to the rule of both the king and the crown prince at the beginning as in the case of the Sevadi stone inscription^97 which refers both to Maharājādhirāja Aśvarāja and the Yuvarāja Kaṭukarāja (Mahārāj = ādhirāja-śrī-Aśvarāja rājye śrī-Kaṭukarāja-yyuvarājye) and of another inscription^98 from the same place, referring to the king Kaṭukadeva along with the heir-apparent Jayatasihā (mahārāj = ādhirāja-śrī-Kaṭukadeva-vijay = odayīta - sat - suta-Jayatasihā-yyuvarāja-bhujyamāna-samipātyāni).

The title Mahākumāra is known to have been borne by some later princes of the Paramāra dynasty like Lakṣmīvarman, Hariścandra and Udayavarman. While confirming a grant in V.S. 1200, originally made by his father Yaśovarmadeva, Lakṣmīvarman describes himself in his Ujjain inscription^99 as a Mahākumāra who owed sovereignty to his own valour (nijakara-kṛta-kaṇvāla-prasād = āvāpta-nij = ādhipatyā . . . Mahākumāra-śrimad = Lakṣmīvarmadevaḥ) and was entitled to the five great sounds (sam = adhigata-pañca-mahā-śabd = ālaṅkāra-virājamāna). The Pipalianagar grant^100 speaks of his son Hariścandra, also called a Mahākumāra, as obtaining sovereignty of his own through the grace of the illustrious Jayavarmadeva (śrī-Jayavarmadeva ity = etasmāt prṛṣṭhatama-prabho prasād = āvāpta-nij = ādhipatyāḥ . . . mahākumāra-śrī - Hariścandra-devaḥ), earning the status of a Pañca-mahāśabda Sāmanta and making a gift of land in favour of a scholar named Daśarathaśarman. Hariścandra’s son Udayavarman is, likewise, described as a Mahākumāra in his Bhopal inscription which records the grant of a village by him in favour of a Brahmin named Mūlaśarman.^101 The reason why these de facto independent chiefs claimed for themselves the title of Mahākumāra for generations is not definitely known. It might be, as suggested by Kielhorn, that they looked upon the deposed Paramāra king Jayavarman as the rightful ruler of Malwa or the threat of a Caulukya invasion might have forced them to assume a subordinate title in their own official records.

Some of the records^102 from Bangla near Narwar in Madhya Pradesh speak of a Mahākumāra named Jaitravarmadeva who seems to have been the eldest son of the Yajvapāla king Gopāla who flourished in the thirteenth century A.D. This crown prince was the de facto ruler^103 of the Yajvapāla kingdom during the
later years of his father's reign and the Mahāpradhāna Rāuta Dejai served directly under him. Jaitravarmadeva appears to have predeceased his father as the latter was succeeded by his younger son Gaṇapati.\footnote{104}

X

The Crown Prince in the Śukra-nīti

In the Śukra-nīti, we have the following details about the crown prince:

'The crown prince and the body of councillors are the hands of a monarch. They are also known to be his eyes and ears, in each case right and left, respectively\footnote{105} (Yuvarāj = omātya-gaṇ = obhuj = āvetau mahībhujah/ Tāv = eva-nayana-karno dakṣasavyau kramāt smrtau//). Without these two, the ruler would be deprived of his arms, eyes and ears (i.e., without any means of action). Hence he should appoint them on careful considerations. Otherwise there would be great calamity\footnote{106} (Bāhu-karṇ = ākṣi-hīnāh syād = vinā tābhyaṃ = ato nṛpah/ Yojayet = cintayitvā tau mahān = āśāya c = ānyathā). The ruler should select as crown prince the offspring of the legally married wife who can perform the tasks of the state without idleness\footnote{107} (Mudrām vin = ākhyām rāj-kṛtyām kartum kṣamaṁ sadā/ Kalpayet Yuvarāj = ārtham = aurasām dharmapatījam//).

'He may select as crown prince his uncle younger than himself or younger brother or son of his elder brother, his own son or one treated as son or an adopted child or daughter's son or sister's son, successively according to failure.' The Śukra-nīti\footnote{108} further says that the king 'should keep the royal children very near to himself and always know their minds by employing craft through good servants. He should make the children of his family well up in the Nīti Śāstras, proficient in archery, capable of undergoing strains, and of bearing harsh words and punishments, habituated to the seats of arms, master of all arts and sciences, upright in morals as well as well-disciplined through his ministers and councillors. He should appoint them to crown-princeship after having brought them up with good dolls, clothed them in good dress, respected them with good seats, nourished them with good food and thus made them worthy of being crown princes.'
The following facts emerge from the above accounts of Śukra:

First, the crown prince was an important administrative machinery in the state, rendering the same, if not more useful, service as the body of councillors.

Second, he had to undergo a period of training in the Nītīśāstras as well as in statecraft at the hands of ministers and councillors.

Third, he lived with the reigning king who was thus well informed of his activities. Śukra evidently decries the idea of deputing the Yuvrajā and other princes as governors of administrative divisions.

XI

The Crown Prince in the Pre-Cāluṣka-Pallava Period

An attempt may now be made to ascertain, with the help of the available material, the position of the crown prince in the South Indian kingdoms.

R.G. Bhandarkar and D.R. Bhandarkar110 are of opinion that the Śātavāhana kings followed the practice of conjoint rule by the reigning king and the heir-apparent. According to them, Gautamiputra Śatakarni reigned simultaneously with his son Pulumāyi. This theory is mainly based on the argument that if at the time of issue of Gautami’s Nasik inscription Pulumāyi alone was reigning, the exploits of the latter would have been eulogised in the record. But H.C. Raychaudhuri111 points out that ‘although it is not customary for an ordinary subject to extol a dead king and pass over a reigning monarch in silence, still it is perfectly natural for a queen-mother in her old age to recount the glories of a son who was associated with her in a previous gift. That Gautamiputra and Pulumāyi did not rule conjointly appears abundantly clear when it is remembered that, in the first instance, the former is described in an inscription as the lord of Beṇākaṭaka, located in Govardhana in Nasīk district, secondly, he addressed the official at Govardhana directly, and finally, the ‘inscription of Gautami Balaśrī was recorded in the year of Pulumāyi’s reign, and not in that of his father who is supposed to have been the senior partner.’

The Hathigumpha inscription112 gives us an interesting
insight into the education and responsibilities of the crown prince in the Cedi kingdom of Kaliṅga in the first century B.C. Referring to the accomplishment of prince Khāravela, the epigraph says, ‘Pañḍarasa-vasāni siri-kaḍāra-sarira-vatā kiḍitā kumāra-kidikā/ Tato lekha-rūpa-gaṇanā-vyayahāra-vidhi-visāras-dena suva-vij= āvadātena navā-vasāni yovarajam va sāsitam’. This passage has been translated by B.M. Barua as follows: ‘... were played for fifteen years the sports befitting the young age of the prince with a handsome body of fair-brown complexion. Thereafter, for nine years, just the office of a Crown Prince was administered by (His Royal Highness) who was well-versed in (matters relating to) writing, coinage, accounting, procedure, and approved principle of action, whose self was purified by proficiency in all (Indian) polite learning.’ We thus see that serious attention was paid to the training of the crown prince in order that, on accession to the throne, he would be able to discharge the duties of kingship efficiently.

XII

The Crown Prince in the Cālukya-Pallava Kingdoms

When we come to the time of the Cālukya kings of Badami, we see that the princes held an important position in the kingdom. The Nerur grant creates the impression that the education and training of princes were carefully attended to, for Pulakeśin I is described in that record as an expert in the Manusamhitā, Purāṇas, Mahābhārata, Rāmāyaṇa as well as the art of politics. The crown prince took an active part in administration and often led the royal army against enemies. The Yuvarāja Vijayāditya is said to have defeated the hostile forces and acquired the Gaṅgā and Yamunā symbols, along with the Pālidhvaja standard during the reign of his father Vinayāditya. Again, we come to learn from the Ulchala stone inscription that the Yuvarāja Vikramāditya conquered Kāñci and levied tribute on the Pallava king Parameśvaravarman II. The Yuvarāja Śrayāśraya Śilāditya issued an inscription from Navasārikā in Surat district, recording the donation of the village of Āṣatṭi in favour of a Brahmin named Bhogikkasvāmin. The Yuvarāja Śrayāśraya also issued the Surat plates, making a grant of a plot of land on behalf of his father during the
reign of king Vinayāditya. But Śrīyāśraya Śilāditya was the son of Dhārāśraya Jayasimha who was placed by Vikramāditya I in charge of South Gujarat. This would only show that the sons of provincial governors sometimes assumed the title of Yuvarāja.

We, however, possess much more information about the crown princes in the Pallava kingdom who were generally called Yuvalahāra. They were sometimes entrusted with provincial administration and enjoyed the privilege of issuing records in their own names, as was the case with Śivaskandavaranman who issued an order, as is known from the Mayidavolu grant,119 to his officers at Dhānyaakaṭa. Viṣṇugopa, another Pallava crown prince, issued a grant,120 but the record is dated in the regnal year of the ruling monarch Sinhavarman. Śivaskandavaranman, no doubt, enjoyed a greater amount of freedom as compared with Viṣṇugopa but still it may be admitted that generally speaking, the Pallava princes more actively participated in administration than the princes of the Cālukya dynasty.

XIII

*The Crown Prince in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kingdom*

That the crown prince held a high position in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa realm is indisputably proved by the epigraphic records of the family.121 The eldest son was usually appointed the crown prince. Govinda II, for example, succeeded his father Kṛṣṇa I to the throne after the latter’s death. If the father was sceptical about his abilities or was ill-disposed, a young son was chosen for the post. Stambha Rāṇavāloka was the eldest son of king Dhrūva but his claims for heir-apparency were brushed aside in favour of those of his second or third brother Govinda III.122 The Western Gaṅga king Avanī Gaṅgāni Mahārāja-dhirāja,123 likewise, set aside the claims of his son Durvinīta by his first wife in favour of a younger prince, very probably by a different queen. But unlike Stambha Rāṇavāloka, Durvinīta rose equal to the occasion and succeeded in occupying the throne by dragging to himself ‘the Lakṣmī of sovereignty by her hair’. It is worth noting that the practice of selecting a younger person in place of the legitimate claimant was at times fraught with grave danger, encouraging ‘palace feuds and court
intrigues among the members of the royal family and their partisans. The selection of his younger son Govinda by Dhruva as the Yuvarāja in preference to Stambha led to the outbreak of a civil war in the Rāṣṭrakūta realm after the father’s demise. In the Talegaon plates of Kṛṣṇa I Govindarāja is simply mentioned by his name only, whereas the same prince is described as a Yuvarāja in the Alas plates which were issued two years later. This would reasonably point to the fact that the position of the crown prince was to be legalised by a consecration ceremony and that he was not recognised as a Yuvarāja until the ceremony was observed.

The Yuvarāja generally ascended the throne after the death of the ruling king, but sometimes the latter would abdicate the throne to make room for him.

The testimony of the Radhanpur plates of Govinda III implies that at the time of consecration the Yuvarāja was invested with a necklace (kaṇṭhikā) which was presumably the insignia of his office. As regards the prerogatives of princes, it may be pointed out on the evidence of the Alas plates that they sometimes exercised the right of granting villages. They normally did not actively participate in administration during the reign of their fathers but assumed the reins of administration when the ruling kings were old or of a retiring or religious disposition, as it happened in the reign of Amoghavarṣa I and Amoghavarṣa III. The Yuvarāja usually stayed in the capital. We hardly come across a Rāṣṭrakūta heir-apparent being deputed as a governor of an outlying province, the administration of which was generally entrusted to the younger princes and cousins. The Rāṣṭrakūta practice of stationing the crown prince in the capital was, no doubt, in harmony with the interest of the Yuvarāja himself whose constant presence in the capital helped him to safeguard successfully his prospect of succession by nipping palace feuds and court intrigues of other aspirants to the throne in the bud. The Rāṣṭrakūta inscriptions suggest that the Yuvarāja was sometimes entitled to the status of a Pañca-mahāśabda Sāmanta.

XIV

The Crown Prince in Other South Indian Kingdoms

The copper plate grants of the Kadamba kings would
indicate that the *Yuvarāja* enjoyed a high status in the kingdom, enjoying the right of making important appointments. He carried the main bulk of administrative burden during the old age of the ruling monarch, as was the case in the closing years of the reign of Kṛṣṇavarman.\(^{129}\)

The *Yuvarāja* in the kingdom of the Cālukya kings of Kalyāṇī was called *Irivabedaṅga*. The *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* tells us that the prince had to learn the *Vedas*, Āgamas, *Itihāsas*, different scripts (*sarvāsū lipiṣu*), composition of poems and oratory. The choice for such an exalted post generally fell upon the eldest son, and in case of absence of any direct descendant, one amongst the brothers was nominated as *Yuvarāja*. The *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*\(^{130}\) states that when Vikramāditya VI was crowned king in A.D. 1076, his younger brother Jayasimha was appointed the *Yuvarāja*.\(^{131}\) When there was no properly qualified prince in the royal family, the heir-apparency was temporarily conferred on a trusted official.\(^{132}\) As was the custom in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom, the *Yuvarāja* of the Western Cālukya kingdom was invested with a *kaṇṭhikā* or necklace at the time of his coronation, but unlike the Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince, he generally stayed outside the capital and was charged with the administration of a part of the kingdom. Taila's son and successor Irivavedaṅga Satyāśraya governed the province of Raṭṭapāḍi, as suggested by the Kharepatan grant.\(^{133}\) Jayasimha, who became the *Yuvarāja* during the reign of his brother Vikramāditya VI, was appointed the governor of Banavase.\(^{134}\) The crown prince was usually placed in charge of the administration of the two central divisions of Belvola Three Hundred and Purigere Three Hundred.\(^{135}\)

As proved by the testimony of inscriptions, the practice of investing the crown prince with a *kaṇṭhikā* was likewise in vogue in the Eastern Cālukya kingdom of Veṅgi, but it is interesting to note that some of the Cālukya crown princes were at the same time adorned with a *pattabandha*, i.e., diadem. A copper plate grant\(^{136}\) of Bhīma II Viṣṇuvardhana, for example, mentions that Vijayāditya, the eldest son of Ammarāja, was invested with a necklace and a diadem (*pattabandha*). Such was, however, not the case with the *Yuvarāja* Vikramāditya I, the younger brother of Vijayāditya III, who was adorned with a glittering necklace (*kaṇṭhikā*)
round his throat.\textsuperscript{137} The case of Vikramāditya I may further be cited to illustrate how the younger brothers were sometimes chosen for heir-apparency, presumably to ensure the continual good governance of the kingdom under a strong person. The case of Vijayāditya, the younger son of Vimalāditya, who usurped the throne by setting aside the claim of his elder brother Rājarāja, shows that the succession of a legitimate heir-apparent to the throne was sometimes challenged by ambitious claimants. The selection of a younger son for the throne in preference to the elder one often led to the outbreak of a civil war. Thus when the claim of Dānārṇava\textsuperscript{128} was superseded in favour of his twelve-year-old brother Amma II, Dānārṇava acquiesced in this arrangement of his father Blīma II for the time being but finally took possession of the kingdom by slaying Amma. D.P. Karmarkar\textsuperscript{139} opines that the title Yuvarāja was bestowed even on persons outside the royal family in the Cālukya kingdom of Veṅgi. He refers in this connection to the Yuvarāja Ballāladeva Velābhaṭa, the son of Pammavā of the Paṭṭavardhini family, who is known to have been granted a plot of land by Ammarāja II Vijayāditya.\textsuperscript{140} But Ballāladeva appears to have been a subordinate ally under Ammarāja II rather than a proud crown prince in the Cālukya territory.

It may not be out of place here to mention that the absence of any direct heir had often induced the Cola kings to nominate their younger brothers for heir-apparency. When Rājādhirāja, the eldest son of Rājendra Gaṅgaikoṇḍa Cola, ascended the throne, he, being childless, appointed his younger brother Rājendra II the crown prince and associated him with administration. Rājendra II, likewise, selected his younger brother Vīra Rājendra for heir-apparency which fell vacant in consequence of the death of his own son Rājamahendrā Rājakesarī,\textsuperscript{141} the original incumbent of the post.

When we turn to the Hoysala kings, we find that they usually nominated the Yuvarāja during their own lifetime. The Hoysala Narasiṁha III\textsuperscript{142} was made the crown prince during the reign of his father. As would appear from the testimony of the inscriptions of the family, there was no lower age-limit for the appointment of a prince as a Yuvarāja. Narasiṁhadeva,\textsuperscript{143} the son of Viṣṇuvardhana, was crowned Yuvarāja even on the very day of his birth. The reason why a prince at his
infancy was declared to be the Yuvarāja might be that the reigning king feared some trouble over the question of succession to the throne after his death. It cannot escape notice that Tirumala was appointed Yuvarāja in A.D. 1524 by his father king Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya when he was but six years old. ¹⁴⁴

The Yuvarāja finds prominent mention in the Kākatīya inscriptions. During the rule of the later kings of the dynasty we find that the crown prince was often taken by the ruling monarch into partnership in the governance of the kingdom. Gaṇapati appointed his daughter Rudramadevī his co-regent during the closing years of his reign and Rudramadevī, in her turn, emulated her father by associating the Yuvarāja Pratāparūdra with herself in the administration of the kingdom. ¹⁴⁵
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The Royal Chaplain

I

The Priest in the Pre-Rgvedic Period

The frequent mention of the Purohita\textsuperscript{1} in Rgvedic passages indubitably proves the wide popularity of the institution in the early Vedic period. The distinguished German Indologist Zimmer\textsuperscript{2} is of opinion that this office came into vogue after the establishment of the caste system which is generally believed to have taken place in the latter part of the early Vedic period. It is needless to emphasise that the origin of priesthood goes back to much remoter days; the first indications of a priest’s office may be traced back almost to the very origin of religious and magical practices. But in the beginning the religious rites were very simple in character and consequently almost everybody was competent to undertake the priestly functions. “But as ritual observances and magical practices gradually became too complicated for the average man to master, a professional priesthood became necessary.”\textsuperscript{3} The transformation of the simple ritual and magical practices into complicated systems had already taken place in India in pre-historic times, long before the advent of the Aryans in the subcontinent. Some scholars have propounded the theory that the Brāhmaṇaṇa were the pre-Aryan priests. The acceptance of this view would give rise to the surmise that the Brāhmaṇaṇa Purohitas possessed uncommon cleverness and intelligence to win the encomium of their Aryan conquerors and an enviable position in Aryan society. But while on the one hand it is unhistorical to brand the Brāhmaṇaṇas as non-Aryans in origin, it is, on the other hand, difficult to deny the existence of the institution of priesthood in the Aryan community of pre-Rgvedic times.
Interesting details about the Purohita are preserved in the Rgveda which represents him as an important personage, offering sacrifices, on behalf of kings and people, to gods. But his entire energy was not devoted to the cultivation of religious pursuits; he was an active participant in wars also. Whenever the king went to the battle-field to fight with his adversaries, the priest accompanied him and rendered help to the army by the 'spiritual force of his prayers and the mystic powers of his charms'. In this respect he compared well with the clergy of mediaeval Europe. At the time of the battle of the ten kings, Vasiṣṭha joined hands with his royal patron Sudās, whereas Viśvāmitra sided with the opposite camp. The story of the battle of the ten kings shows that the priests remained in office as long as they enjoyed the confidence of their patron-kings. Notwithstanding the insecurity of their service, they succeeded in exercising tremendous influence in the contemporary royal courts, as instanced by the success of Viśvāmitra, the deposed priest of Sudās, in organising a coalition of ten kings against his erstwhile master. The importance of the office of Purohita in this period is further emphasised by a passage in the Rgveda which says, 'That king alone in front of whom the Brahman walks (pårvaṁ = eti) lives well established in his house; for him there is ever abundance of food; before him the people bow of their own accord.' There is another verse wherein Agni is described as the divine ministrant of the sacrifice, the Hotṛ priest and the greatest bestower of treasures. From this it is obvious that Agni does not hold the position of a private chaplain in the kingdom of gods, but he is the 'divine ministrant' and the 'king of all worship'. It is, therefore, evident that the vast majority of the Rgvedic kings needed the service of their domestic priests who functioned as chief adviser in matters, both temporal and spiritual. Even by the time of the Rgveda, the Purohita then raised himself to a much higher position than that of a private chaplain. A.B. Keith rightly observes, 'The Vedic Purohita was the forerunner of the Brāhmaṇa statesmen who from time to time in India have shown conspicuous ability in the management of affairs and
there is no reason to doubt that a Viśvāmitra or Vasiṣṭha was a more important element of government of the early Vedic realm.' In return for his service to the king and the state, he was entitled to rewards which were doubtlessly large. As pointed out by A.B. Keith, 'the dānastutis of the Ṛgveda speak of generous gifts of patrons to the poets and we may safely assume that the largest donations were those of kings to the purohita'.

III

The Priest in the Later Vedic Period

The august position which the priesthood had attained in the period of the Ṛgveda was maintained unabated in the succeeding age when he was alternatively designated as Brahman. This is evidenced, in the first place, by some of the Vedic texts which include him in the list of the Ratnins. In the Taittirīya Samhitā, Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā, Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa and Kāṭhaka Samhitā, he is assigned the first position among the Ratnins, whereas in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa he occupies the second position. The status of the Ratnins was exceedingly high as they formed the king’s council. The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa describes them in explicit terms as bestowers of the kingdom upon the king (ete vai rāṣṭrasya pradātāraḥ). The lofty position of the priest is further attested by the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which states that the Purohita surrounds and protects the king with his power like the sea, girdling the earth (Purohitas = tābhīth rājānām parigṛhya tiṣṭhati samudra eva bhūmīṁ). We are further told that the subjects of such a king enjoy the blessings of perpetual happiness and are ever devoted to him as he is guided by a wise priest. Some Brāhmaṇa texts like the Taittirīya and Pañcaviṃśa show that his installation in the office was legalised by the performance of the Brhaspatisava sacrifice.

The observance of rituals for the royal family and the state continued to be one of the chief concerns of the Purohita in this age. The belief that gods would not accept the oblations of the king provided they were offered through his priest gained momentum during this period. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, for instance, lays down, ‘Verily gods do not eat the food offered by
the king who is without a Purohitā. Therefore let the king, who wishes to sacrifice, place a Brāhmaṇa at the head.’ He was, however, not personally concerned with all the minute details of the rituals, which were entrusted to the subordinate priests, called Rtvikṣ, but participated in the more important details. In addition to his sacrificial duty, he used to guide the king in all religious matters. In this age also we find him accompanying the king to the battle-field. The Atharvaveda states that by performing the various rituals, the Purohitā not only thwarts the magical charm of the enemies, but also contributes greatly to the development of his own kingdom. It is but fitting that he was looked upon as the guardian of the realm (rāṣṭra-gopa).

But what were the actual functions of the Purohitā at the sacrifice? A passage of the Rgveda18 indicates that for performing a sacrifice was necessary a body of seven priests, comprising the Hotṛ, Potṛ, Neṣṭṛ, Agnīdhra, Praśastṛ, Adhvaryu and Brahman. The chief amongst them was the Hotṛ who recited verses from the Rgveda. The Adhvaryu, with the assistance of the Agnīdhra, undertook the practical work of the sacrifice like preparing the altar, digging the fire-pits, cooking the oblations, etc. Macdonell and Keith19 describe the functions of other priests as follows: ‘The Praśastṛ, Upavaktṛ or Maitrāvaruṇa, as he was variously called, appeared only in the greater sacrifices as giving instructions to the Hotṛ, and was entrusted with certain litanies. The Potṛ, Neṣṭṛ and Brahman belonged to the ritual of the Soma sacrifice, the latter being later styled Brāhmaṇācchamsin to distinguish him from the priest who in the later ritual acted as supervisor. Other priests referred to in the Rgveda are the singers of Sāmans or chants, the Udgātṛ and his assistant the Prastotṛ, while the Pratihartṛ, another assistant, though not mentioned, may quite well have been known. Their functions undoubtedly represent a later stage of the ritual, the development of the elaborate series of sacrificial calls on the one hand, and on the other the use of long hymns addressed to the Soma plant. Other priests, such as the Achāvāka, the Grāvastut, the Unnetṛ and the Subrahmanya, were known later in the developed ritual of the Brāhmaṇas, making in all sixteen priests, who were technically and artificially classed in four groups: Hotṛ, Maitrāvaruṇa, Achāvāka, and Grāvastut; Udgātṛ, Prastotṛ, Pratihartṛ, and Subrahmanya; Adhvaryu, Pratisthātṛ, Neṣṭṛ, and
Unnetr; Brahman, Brāhmaṇācchamsin, Agnīdhra, and Potr.' Geldner believes that whenever the Purohita actually participated in a sacrifice, he played the role of the Brahman. Geldner has cited in support of his contention a number of passages of the Rgveda and the later literature where the Purohita and the Brahman are identified. But Oldenberg is probably more correct when he points out that 'in the earlier period this was not the case; the Purohita was then normally the Hotr, the singer of the most important of the songs; it was only later that the Brahman, who in the capacity of overseer of the rite is not known to the Rgveda, acquired the function of general supervision hitherto exercised by the Purohita, who was ex officio skilled in the use of magic and in guarding the king by spells which could also be applied to guarding the sacrifice from evil demons.'

Normally, there was one Purohita for one kingdom. But there are instances in Vedic literature to show that sometimes they combined in themselves the office of the house-priest of a number of kingdoms simultaneously. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, for instance, mentions that Devabhāga Śrutarṣa was the priest of both the Kuru and the Śṛṇjaya kingdoms. The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa states, 'Devabhāga Śrutarṣa is the priest of both the Kurus and the Śṛṇjayas. Now, a high position is held by him who is the priest of one state; how much greater, then, is the status of one who is the Purohita of two kingdoms?' The instance of a highly efficient Brāhmaṇa holding the office of the priest of even three states is, likewise, known. The Sāṅkhāyana Śruta Sūtra alludes to the fact that Jāla Jātukarṇya acted as the priest for the kings of Kāśi, Kosala and Videha (Jālo Jātukarnyah... trayāṇāṁ rājyaṁ... prāpa... Kāśyā Vaidehayoh purohito bhahūva| Kauśalasya ca rājñah!). 'This fact', as J. Basu rightly points out, 'proves the close connection and alliance of these three states and the extraordinary administrative ability of the Brāhmaṇa priest as well.'

In the Vedic period the Purohita was the kingpin among the state functionaries. This is quite in line with the spirit of the age which believed that success in the realms of peace and war was largely dependent on divine favour to be secured through priests. A well-known passage in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa tells us that the king who is weaker than his Brāhmaṇa priest is
stronger than his foes. This is, however, hardly in agreement with the statement of the Vājasaneyī Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad that 'since there is none above the ruler, the Brāhmaṇa sits under the Kṣatriya in Rājasūya' (Tasmāt kṣatrād=paraṁ n=āstil tasmād=brāhmaṇāh kṣatriyam=adhas=tu upāste rājasūye). Notwithstanding the great importance that was attached to the post, its incumbent was never considered above the law of the land. ‘Like any other citizen, he was punished whenever there was a departure from his svadharma or loyalty to the king.’ The Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa tells us that a Purohita might be punished with death in cases of treason. It cannot escape notice that we do not find in the Aryan kingdoms of Vedic India that strange combination of priestly functions with royal authority, instances of which are met with in ancient Europe and many an Asiatic and African country. In Egypt, for example, at the time of Menes and his immediate successors, all the religious and political functions were united in one person, the king. Thus the king became, in theory, the high priest of the state. But no king in Vedic India is known to have played the role of a king-priest.

IV
The Priest in the Dharmasūtra and Jātaka Literature

The Dharmasūtras and the Buddhist Jātakas throw a flood of light upon the position of the royal chaplain in the post-Vedic period. In referring to the office of the priest, the Dharmasūtra of Gautama observes, ‘And he shall select as his domestic priest (Purohita) a Brāhmaṇa who is learned in the Vedas, of noble family, eloquent, handsome, of a suitable age, and of a virtuous disposition, who lives righteously and who is austere. With his assistance, he shall fulfil his religious duties’ (Brāhmaṇaḥ=ca purodadhīta vidy=ābhijana-vāg-rūpa-vayah śīlasampannaṁ nyāyavṛttam tapasvīnaṁ tatprasūtāḥ karmāṇi kurvīta). The commentator Haradatta, however, has interpreted some of the terms differently. He takes vāksampannaḥ to mean ‘one who knows Sanskrit’, vayah to denote the prime of life when men are neither too young nor too old, and tapasvin to signify ‘not given to sensual enjoyments’. We thus see that Gautama not only enumerates the qualifications of the Purohita but also urges
the king to be guided by his advice in religious matters. In defining the functions of the priest, Gautama\textsuperscript{\text{28}} says: Šānti-
pūṇyā-ha-svastya-āyuṣya-maṅgala-saṁyukt-ānyāḥ-abhyudayik-
āni vidveśiṇāṁ sambalanaḥ-abhicārad-viṣad-avyāḍhi-saṁyuktāni
ta śālānau kuryād yathā-okaṁ-ṛtvijāḥ-aṁyāṁ. G. Bühlert\textsuperscript{\text{29}} translates the passage thus, 'He shall perform in the fire of the hall the rites ensuring prosperity which are connected with expiations, festivals, a prosperous march, long life, and auspiciousness; as well as those that are intended to cause enmity, to subdue (enemies), to destroy (them) by incantations, and to cause their misfortune. Officiating priests shall perform the other sacrifices according to the precepts (of the Vedas).’ It is therefore evident that the Purohita did not perform all the rites, some other priests were entrusted with the performance of other sacrifices, which, as Haradatta would have us believe, comprised the Gṛhya and Śrauta rites.

Baudhāyana,\textsuperscript{\text{30}} likewise, enjoins the king to choose a Purohita who should be proficient in all transactions (sarvato dhūram). The king should act, of course, in spiritual matters, according to his instructions. Āpastamba\textsuperscript{\text{31}} maintains a liberal view about the qualifications of the Purohita and lays down that the priest need be proficient only in sacred and political knowledge. Nevertheless, the power of the Purohita, as depicted by Āpa-
stamba, was enormous, he being empowered not only to protect a criminal from punishment by his intercession,\textsuperscript{\text{32}} excepting in the case of a capital offence, but also to try cases concerning transgression of order. The Āśvalāyana Gṛhyaśūtra\textsuperscript{\text{33}} states that the priest has to discharge some military functions. Āśvalāyana lays down that before the king commences his journey to the battle-field, the priest stands to the west of the king’s chariot, chants mantras from the Rgveda, arms the king with various weapons. recites mantras over the horse and accompanies him as the king advances to the battle-field. Vasiṣṭha\textsuperscript{\text{34}} lays down that it is obligatory on the part of the king to appoint a Purohita since it is the Brāhmaṇa priest who is capable of protecting the kingdom (Vijñāya Brāhmaṇaḥ Purohito rāṣṭram
dadhāt=īti) and that the king should reward him with various gifts on different occasions (gārhasṭha-naiyamikeṣu Purohite
dadyāt). Besides, we have the following account about the priest in the Dharmasūtra of Vasiṣṭha:\textsuperscript{\text{35}} ‘In case (a criminal)
worthy of punishment is allowed to go free, the king shall fast during one (day and one) night; and his domestic priest during three days and nights. If an innocent man is punished, the domestic priest shall perform a Karikkhara penance.'

The Buddhist Jātakas afford us an interesting insight into the office of the priest. The office was generally hereditary and held by the same family for generations. Once some Brāhmanas opposed the installation of a young son of the deceased Purohita. But the mother of the boy argued, 'For seven generations we have managed the elephant festivals from father to son. The old custom will pass from us, and our wealth will melt away.' Sometimes, of course, new men were appointed to the post, presumably in place of the old ones. The supervision of the domestic sacrifices of the king constituted the most important function of the priest. Time and again we find him acting as the preceptor of the king and instructing him in the various branches of learning in his youthful days. The Jātakas tell us very little about his political activities and we fully agree with the view of Fick that 'the political power of the Purohita was purely individual and had its source wholly and solely in the personal influence which he obtained over the king through his function as sacrificer and magician.' The Kimchanda and Dhammadhaja Jātakas mention the Purohita as participating in the administration of justice and helping the rightful claimant to regain his property. It is thus evident that the Purohita sometimes discharged judicial functions. His connection with the royal treasury is clearly borne out by the Bandhanamokkha Jātaka, where a priest is found saying, 'I am the officer of the king (āhaṁ rāja-kammiko) and have rendered him much service and I know where great treasures are hidden. The treasures of the king, I have guarded; if you don't take me to the king, much wealth will be lost.' We do not know whether the Purohita actually went to the battle-field in this age, but the Susīma Jātaka tells us that he consecrated the war-horses and elephants in order to increase their efficiency. Sometimes the Purohita is described as a Sabbatthaka, which suggests that he advised the king in all matters, spiritual as well as temporal. As regards his qualifications, the Jātakas tell us that he was to be a master in Vedic lore and other sciences. The Jātaka stories sometimes bear testimony to the
degradation of the priest. His greed of wealth carried him to the depth of moral degeneration which was unbecoming of such a man. But it would be wrong to disparage the whole community of priests since quite a good many of them were held in high esteem by virtue of their righteousness and wisdom. It is difficult, in the circumstances, to agree with R.N. Mehta when, in referring to the priest as depicted in the Jātaka texts, he observes, 'Wealth, and not power, seems to have been his innermost desire, and the ultimate goal.'

Some of the Jātakas mention the term *attha-dhammānu-sāsaka-amacca* which Fick translates as the 'guide of the king in worldly and spiritual matters'. This officer, if the interpretation of Fick be accepted, then took over some of the functions of the Purohita. It cannot be known definitely whether the post of the *Attha-dhammānu-sāsaka Amacca* was created in most of the kingdoms or was confined to a few states only.

V

*The Priest in the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra*

The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭiliya provides us useful information about the Purohita who is distinguished from the Rtvij, 'sacred priest', Ācārya, 'spiritual preceptor', Kārttiṅikī, 'interpreter of omens', Mauhūrttika, 'astrologer' and the like. Kauṭiliya thus advocates the idea of decentralisation of priestly functions and is opposed to the concentration of all power in the hands of one man. Speaking of his qualifications, Kauṭiliya points out that the Purohita should be a man of noble descent, a man of stainless character (*udita-kula-śīle*), well-versed in the Vedas and the sixfold Aṅga (*Ṣaḍāṅge Vede*), skilful in reading portents, providential as well as accidental (*daive nimitte*), well-grounded in the science of government (*daṇḍani-tyār = ca*), obedient (*abhivinītām*) and capable of warding off calamities, divine or human, by performing such expiatory rites as are prescribed in the Atharvaveda (*Daiva-mānuṣīnām = Atharvābhir = upāyaiś = ca prātikartārām kurvīta*). It appears from the above and several other passages of the Arthaśāstra that the Kauṭiliya Purohita was entrusted with the following functions:

First, he accompanied the king at specific hours.
Second, he warded off divine and human calamities like flood, fire, epidemic, famine, wild elephants, snakes, evil spirits, etc., by employing certain means, as enumerated in the Atharvaveda.

Third, he encouraged the soldiers to fight against the enemies by promising them great rewards in the next world in the event of their death on the battle-field. In this respect, his work was similar to that of the poet-bards called Pānar who are mentioned in the Tamil texts of the Śaṅgam epoch as following the king to the theatre of war and infusing ‘fresh spirit into the minds of the soldiers during the encounter’.

Fourth, when the chief queen was in the period of menstruation, the priest had to offer a caru-oblation to Indra and Bṛhaspati. He performed the sacraments for the newly-born prince.\textsuperscript{48}

The high position of the Purohiṭa\textsuperscript{49} in the Kauṭiliyaṇ state is indicated by the fact that he was to get 48,000 paṇas\textsuperscript{50} as his emolument and was grouped in the same category of such high functionaries as the Mantrin, the Senāpati, the crown prince, the queen-mother and the queen consort. Kauṭiliya\textsuperscript{51} further states that the king should make grants of revenue-free lands to the sacrificial priest, the spiritual guide, the domestic chaplain and the learned Brāhmaṇas (Ṛtvik=ācārya purohiṭa-śrotiyobhyo brahmadevāni adāṇḍakarāṇi abhirūpadāya kāṇāi prayacchet). The Purohiṭa thus enjoyed the special privilege of mixed remuneration in both cash and kind. That the Purohiṭa exerted a great influence over the king is apparent from Kauṭiliya’s statement\textsuperscript{52} that ‘as a student his teacher, a son his father and a servant his master, the king shall follow him’ (tam=ācāryāṁ śīyaḥ pitaram putro bhṛtyah svāminam=iva c=ānuvarteta). Kauṭiliya is at the same time aware of the evils emanating from the priestly class and recommends their imprisonment and even banishment in the case of their committing a great offence. The king is even advised to employ spies on his priest to ascertain the activities of the latter.\textsuperscript{53} Even then Kauṭiliya admits that the king cannot prosper unless he is aided by the chaplain. He\textsuperscript{54} says, ‘Kṣatriya power, made to prosper by the Brahmin (chaplain), sanctified by spells in the form of the counsel of ministers, (and) possessed of arms in the form of compliance with the science of politics), triumphs, remaining ever unconquered.’
It has to be admitted that the Kauṭiliyaṇa Purohita was a shādowy figure as compared with his forerunners of the Vedic and post-Vedic periods. The functions, which in the earlier epochs were concentrated in his hands, came to be distributed among several officials. As a natural corollary of the decentralisation of his power and functions, there was a decline of his position. Even he was not entrusted with the temple administration for which a special officer called Devatādhyakṣa, was appointed. It may be mentioned in this connection that the latter officer was required to realise revenue for the king at a time of emergency by appropriating the wealth of temples and exploiting popular superstitions.

We are unfortunately unable to decide with certainty how far the Kauṭiliyaṇa system was executed in practice in the Maurya period. That the post of the royal chaplain was in abeyance in the courts of most of the Maurya kings, who were staunch Buddhists, appears to be fairly certain. The Dharma-mahāmātras of the Aśokan edicts were in no way connected with the office of the Purohita.

VI

The Priest in the Epics

The two epics, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, show that the Purohita wielded enormous influence in the kingdom during the contemporary period. The Ayodhyākāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa tells us how the chief priest Vasiṣṭha carried on the administration of the Ikṣvāku kingdom with the help of the council of ministers during the interregnum between the death of Dāsaratha and the assumption of power by Bharata. The epics generally depict the priests as advising the king in all matters, not excluding political. In the Śāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata, we have the following passage: Ātmā ityātmano ca koṣās ca daṇḍo mitrāni ca aiva hi. This means that a kingdom is an amalgam of seven elements like Ātmā or Svāmī, friends, treasury, rāṣṭra, fort and daṇḍa. Now, the commentator Nilakaṇṭha explains the term Svāmī as follows: Svāmīrūpā prakṛtiḥ Rtvika-Purohita-nṛpa-bhedena trividhāḥ. If this interpretation is accepted, it would follow that the priest was considered to be one of the lords of the realm. The role of the Purohita
as a political adviser of the king did not meet with universal approval and is denounced by the Mahābhārata in the following words: ‘The place for priests is in the hall of debate; good are they as inspectors; they can oversee elephants, horses and war-cars; they are learned in detecting the faults of food; but let not the (priestly) teachers be asked for advice when emergencies arise.’ We may probably be justified in assuming that some of the Purohitas, endowed as they were with uncommon ability and experience, guided kings in both religious and political matters, while others, who were of lesser merit, concentrated their attention on ecclesiastical matters alone.

As regards the qualities of the Purohita, the Mahābhārata points out that he should be well-versed in the Vedas and be endowed with such noble virtues as purity, truthfulness and piety (Vede Śaṅgīge niratāḥ śucayaḥ satyavādinaḥ Dharmātmānāḥ kṛtātmānāḥ syur—nṛpānāṁ purohitāḥ//). The Mahābhārata elsewhere lays down that modesty, learning, noble descent, devotion, etc., are some of the virtues befitting a Purohita.

An interesting insight into the problem whether the epic Purohita was immune from punishment in the eyes of law is afforded by the following passage of the Mahābhārata. Guror =apy=avaliptasya kārya=ākāryam=ajānataḥ/ Utpatha-pratipannasya nyāyaṁ bhavati śasanam/. A controversy has cropped up on the meaning of this passage. E.W. Hopkins interprets it to mean that the advice of a sinful priest is commendable. But more convincing is the explanation of N.N. Law that ‘even a preceptor, if he be vain, ignorant of what should be done and what left undone, and vicious in his ways, should be chastised’. We may accordingly suggest that the priests, if proved to be guilty or unworthy of their position, were subjected to punishment by the king. The relations between the king and his priest were normally cordial, but that at times they were involved in animosity is illustrated by the disputes between Janamejaya and the Kāśyapas, and between Kutsa Aurava and his priest Upagū Saūravasa.

In the epics there are a few passages which suggest that the priestly profession did not always occupy a prestigious position. Thus in the Ādīparvan we find that Śarmiṣṭhā compares the position of Śukra, the royal chaplain, with that of a flatterer, extolling his master (Āśinaḥ = ca śayānaḥ = ca pīṭa te pitarım...
mama/ Stauti band=viva c=ābhikṣanāṁ nīcaīḥ sthitvā vinītavat//). Again, there is a statement in the Anuśāsanaparvan\textsuperscript{64} to the effect that one has to accept the post of the priest in consequence of the sin committed in the previous life (*Etena karma-dōṣena purodhās=tvam=aṁyathāḥ//). A similar tradition is recorded in the Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa\textsuperscript{65} where Vasiṣṭha\textsuperscript{66} says to Rāma. 'Sir, I know that priesthood is a despised profession. Still I have accepted it for the reason that I shall be your preceptor' (*Paurohityam=aham jāne vigarhyam dūṣya-jīvanam*).

E.W. Hopkins\textsuperscript{67} observes that the royal chaplain was an ordinary figure in the early heroic age but he gained an extraordinary position in the latest period of the epics when he ruled his master. It is difficult to agree with the above two contentions of Hopkins. The *Purohita* had already emerged as a powerful figure in the kingdom by the early Vedic period. The early part of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, likewise, alludes to the pivotal role that Vasiṣṭha played in the administration of the Ikṣvāku kingdom. Secondly, Hopkins appears to have magnified the importance of the priest. There are, no doubt, some passages\textsuperscript{68} in the didactic portions of the *Mahābhārata* which refer to the superiority of priests to royal personages but they are of doubtful value. The priest depended for his livelihood on the patronage of the king, who possessed vast economic resources; he failed to promote himself to the rank of the head of the priestly class by organising it into a well-knit body, and proved incapable of posing a serious threat to the king, who could call upon his militiamen for help in times of emergency, and, furthermore, no *Purohita* would have dared to risk the displeasure of his royal employer, who alone would decide his appointment and the length of his service. Placed in such adverse circumstances, he was hardly empowered to rule the master he liked. It is a truism that some of the royal chaplains triumphed over all obstacles and claimed control of the sceptre but such cases, it must be admitted, were rather the exceptions to the rule. The keynote of all the activities and policies of the royal *Purohita*, who could not afford to be indifferent to the consequences of the displeasure and favour of his master, was to keep the latter well-disposed towards him at any price.
VII

The Priest in Early and Later Dharmaśāstra Texts

The Manusāṁhitā\(^{69}\) says, 'Let him (the king) appoint a domestic priest (Purohīta) and choose an officiating priest (Ṛtvig); they shall perform his domestic rites and the (sacrifices) for which three fires are required.' We thus see that the Purohīta, according to Manu, was concerned with the performance of the domestic and other sacrifices of the king. But this is not all. Manu\(^{70}\) insists that the monarch must act in all matters, not excluding his foreign policy, in line with the instructions of the Purohīta (Śarveṣāṁ tu viśiṣṭena brāhmaṇena vipakṣitāḥ/ Mantrayet =paramaṁ mantraiṁ rājā śāṅguneṣa-saṁyutam!/ Nityam tasmaṁ sam =āśvastāḥ sarva-kāryāṇi nihkṣipet/ Tena sārdham viniścītya tataḥ karma sam =ārabhet/). In this connection, we may note the account of the qualifications and functions of the Purohīta in the later Dharmaśāstras and see how far they differ from one another. A later writer like Yājñavalkya\(^{71}\) lays down that the Purohīta, besides being born of a high family, was to be well-versed in astrology, portents, propitiatory rites, different branches of learning, good acts, as prescribed in the Śāstras, the science of politics and economics (Purohitāṇa = ca kuruṇa daivajñaṁ = udit = oditam/ Daṅgāṇiḥyāṇa = ca kuśalam = Atharv = aṅgirase tathā/). The above qualities, as enumerated by Yājñavalkya, leave no room for doubt that the Purohīta was more than a mere religious teacher. Verse 312 of the Rājadharmaprakaraṇaṁ may be quoted in this context—Sa mantrināḥ prakurūpā prajñāṁ maulān sthirān śucin/ Taṁ sārdham cintayed = rājyaṁ vipraṁ = atha tataḥ svayāṁ/ The passage proves that the royal priest, though he was not included in the council of ministers, was to be consulted by the king, after his deliberation with ministers, in all secular and religious affairs.

Another later text, i.e., the Viṣṇusāṁhitā\(^{72}\) states that only such a person as is thoroughly conversant with the Vedas, Itihāsa and Dharmaśāstras, is free from any physical disability and is a mendicant and high-born should be made the Purohīta (Ved = etihāsa-dharmaśāstr = ārihakuśalam kulīnam = ayaṅgam/ Tapasvināṁ purohitāṇa = ca varayet/). But unlike Yājñavalkya, Viṣṇu does not assign any worthwhile functions to the Purohīta,
and advises the king to rely more on the Sāṁvatsara than on the priest. The king is enjoined to be guided by the Sāṁvatsara, or, astrologer, in all matters (Rājā ca sarva-kāryeṣu sāṁvatsara = ādhīnāḥ syāt). It is clear then that Yājñavalkya and Viṣṇu hold different views in regard to the constitutional position of the royal chaplain.

Kātyāyana appears to be in favour of associating the Purohita with the administration of justice, as he enjoins the king to enter the court of justice in the company of learned Brāhmaṇas, ministers, the chief justice, the Purohita and other persons.

VIII

The Priest in the Gupta and Post-Gupta Period

The Gupta inscriptions do not take any notice of the Purohita but mention a class of officers called Vinayastihitāpākas who might have taken over some of the priestly functions. But they cannot be regarded, by any stretch of imagination, as identical with the royal chaplain. The absence of any reference to them in the Gupta inscriptions does not necessarily prove the abeyance of the post. If any credence is to be placed in the evidence of the Kāmandakīya Nītisāra and the Mālavikāgnimitram by Kālidāsa, it may be justifiably concluded that the post of the royal Purohita existed in the Gupta kingdom.

Kāmandaka says that the Purohita should be thoroughly conversant with the three Vedas, the science of politics and the Atharvan lore (Trayaṁ ca daṇḍanītyāṁ ca kuśalāḥ syāt Purohitaḥ). He is required to perform the daily propitiatory ceremonies for the welfare of the state (artha-vihitaṁ nityaṁ kuryāc = chāntika-pauṣṭikāṁ). Ramachandra Dikshitar would have us believe that the Gupta Purohita was even empowered to influence the decision of the council of ministers. ‘Whenever a decision was taken,’ says he, ‘it was the Purohita who was to certify whether such a decision fell within the bounds of the Śāstra injunctions. He would set his seal of approval before it was actually adopted by the council. He was apparently the Buddhi-sāciva.’ There is no evidence, either in inscriptions or in the Nītisāra, which is in agreement with this contention. Similarly untenable is his suggestion that the ‘Rājaguru, of whom
so much is said in the opening pages of the *Nitisāra*, was the *Rājapurohita* also. It seems more reasonable to suggest that the Kāmandakiya Rā jaguru, who was to instruct the king in humility and self-control, corresponds to the Kauṭilīya Ācārya. Inscriptional records show that in later days the two functions were sometimes united in one person, the royal chaplain.

The office of the royal priest finds mention in the *Mālavikāgnimitram*, wherein there is an indication that the *Purohita* received a monthly salary (*dakṣiṇām māsikīṁ purohitasya*). Thus, the system of making monthly payment to the *Purohita*, which was so popular in the Kauṭilīya state, continued even in the days of Kālidāsa. In the *Abhijñānaśakuntalam*, mention is made of an officer entitled *Dharmādhikārī*. The king Duṣyanta therein represents himself to Śakuntalā and her associates as an officer ‘who was employed by the king, the descendant of Puru, in the *dharmādhikāra* and visited the sacred grove in order to ascertain if the religious rites of the sages were being performed without obstacles’ (*Yāḥ Pauraveṇa rājā dharmādhikāre nīyuktaḥ so = ṣaṁ = a-vighnakriy = opalambhāya dharm = āranyam = idam = āyātaḥ*). This would bear witness to the existence of the department of religious affairs over which the royal chaplain did seldom exercise any authority. But there also might have been kingdoms where this department was placed in charge of the royal priest and not under a different functionary styled *Dharmādhikārī*.

In the *Daśakumāra-carita*, composed by Daṇḍin, mention is made of a *Purohita* who was employed by a king to instruct his son in statecraft. The same text also gives us a pitable picture of some priests, connected with the royal palace, in these words: ‘During the eight and half hours, those led by the priests would approach the king and say, “The dream you dreamt just now is inauspicious. Planets are in unfortunate positions. Omens are foreboding evil. Let expiatory rites be done. Sacrificial utensils must all be made of gold. Then alone the rite will be efficacious. These Brāhmaṇas are equal to Brahmā and the auspicious rites conducted by them would become doubly auspicious. Suffering from intolerable poverty and burdened with too many children, these conductors of sacrifices are yet characterised with such firmness that till now they have never received donations. Gifts given to them promote our life, confer heavenly
happiness on us, and destroy all that is inauspicious.” Thus they make the king give gifts to Brāhmaṇas and through those Brāhmaṇas they swallow their share secretly.’

IX

The Priest in the Later North Indian Kingdoms

The testimony of inscriptions and literary texts implies that the Purohita occupied an important place in the court of the Pratihāra kings. The Pratihāra kingdom, as a reviviscent state, witnessed the revival of so many ancient ceremonies, sacrifices and dānas and the Purohita was required to preside over such religious functions. The inscriptions of the Pratihāra kings frequently mention the Purohita, Mahāpurohita and other allied officials like the Daivajña, Daivagārika and Śāṅkhadhārī. The Partapgarh inscription,\(^{84}\) which was composed by the Purohita Trivikramānātha, of the Pratihāra king Mahendrapāla II, shows that he was sometimes entrusted with the ‘work of composing the text of the royal charters’. The selection of the royal priest for this work does not sound strange as he was usually a scholar, while the charters were mainly religious in character.

For a detailed knowledge of the Pratihāra Purohita, we turn to the testimony of the contemporary writer Somadeva Sūri, for the details supplied by inscriptions are far from adequate. The Kathāsaritsāgara\(^{85}\) speaks of a royal priest enjoying a thousand villages and the privilege of chattrā and vāhana just like a Sāmanta (sāmanta tulya). Somadeva Sūri\(^{86}\) points out that the Purohita should be educated in the Vedas, sixfold Āṅga and the science of government; he should claim noble descent and character; he should be obedient and skilful in reading portents and capable of preventing calamities, providential or human. One of the principal duties of the Purohita, as Somadeva\(^{87}\) points out, was the training of princes. This, no doubt, contributed to the augmentation of his power in the royal court. Somadeva’s statement that the advice of the priest is inviolable and the chief minister and the Purohita are mother and father of the king (Samau maṭr-pitṛḥyāṁ rājyo maṃstri-purohitau atas=tau vānihitār-thair=na kathaṇcid=vistarayet/) testifies to the great influence that the royal priest was destined to exert in the Pratihāra court.
The copper plate grants of the Kalacuri-Cedi kings speak of the Mahāpurohita as one of the state functionaries who were kept abreast of the royal order about a land-grant. It seems that the royal priest in the Kalacuri kingdom was not entrusted with the education of princes. The Jabalpur plates of king Jayasimha, for example, distinguish the royal priest Rāghava, designated as a Mahāpurohita, from the royal preceptor Vimalaśīva (śrīmad=rājaguru-vimalaśivah). The Kumbhi plates of Vijayasimha, likewise, refer to Vidyādeva and Yajñadhara as being the Rājaguru and the Mahāpurohita, respectively. That the royal priest was sometimes called upon to look after the department of religion is vouchedsafed by the Jabalpur plates, for Rāghava is called both Mahāpurohita and Dharmapradhāna. But since in most of the Cedi records the posts of the Dharmapradhāna and Mahāpurohita are said to be held by different persons, it seems that, generally speaking, the Purohita was not chosen to be the head of the department of religion. The Kharod inscription of Ratnadeva III, dated in the Cedi year 933, refers to one Śreṣṭhin Ralhaṇa who was appointed to the exalted post of the Dharma-karmādhikārī, i.e., Dharmapradhāna. The evidence of the Kharod inscription may be regarded as highly important for providing us with one of the rare instances of a non-Brahmin official being preferred for the chiefship of the department of religion. The Khajuraho record of V.S. 1059 tells us that a royal priest was placed in charge of the judiciary by the Candella king Dhanğa. Notwithstanding the absence of any corroborative evidence, it is not unlikely that in the Kalacuri kingdom the royal chaplain was a member of the king's council of ministers.

The Rājadharmakāṇḍa of the Kṛtyakalpataru by the statesman-poet Lakṣmīdhara enables us to get a glimpse into the office of Purohita in the Gāhāḍavāla kingdom. Lakṣmīdhara, who wrote his work at the command of king Govindacandra, lays down that a Brāhmaṇa coming of a good family, observing penance, well-versed in the Vedas, Itihāsa, Dharmaśāstras and astrology and skillful in performing various sacrifices and religious ceremonies, should be chosen as a priest. A study of the Kṛtyakalpataru would make it clear that the Gāhāḍavāla priest worked on the same lines as the Prathhāra Purohita, their duties including, among other things, education of princes. That the Purohita discharged the duties of the royal preceptor under the
Gāhaḍavālas is further corroborated by a Gāhaḍavāla record\textsuperscript{64} which speaks of Prahlādaśarman as being the Mahāpuṟohita and Mahārājaguru of king Jayacandra.

The Purohitā finds prominent mention in the inscriptions of the Kāmboja, Varman and Sena kings of Bengal but the Pāla records hardly take any notice of him. This office could not have been popular in the Buddhist Pāla kingdom but existed in the Kāmboja, Varman and Sena kingdoms, the rulers of which were all followers of orthodox Hinduism. It is noteworthy that in the inscriptions of the Candra, Varman and the later Sena kings, we often come across the term Mahāpuṟohita. 'The prefix 'Mahā' probably indicates the great importance attached to religious and social aspects of administration during the rule of the orthodox Hindu kings.'\textsuperscript{65} But generally speaking, during those early mediaeval days, the Purohitā 'became associated more with the rituals of the royal household than with the details of administration; he, therefore, gradually lost his seat in the ministry, though he was honoured even more highly than a minister.'\textsuperscript{66}

The contemporary inscriptions also speak of the following religious functionaries:

1. The Śāntivārika. He was the priest in charge of propitiatory rites.

2. The Śāntyāgārika (also called Śāntyāgārādhikṛta). He was the priest in charge of the room where propitiatory rites were performed.

X

The Priest in the Śukrāṇīti

In the Śukrāṇīti, the priest, or Purodhā, as he is called, is included in the council of ministers\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{67}} (Purodhā ca Pratinidhitā Prādhāna-Sacivas = tathā/ Mantrī ca Prādvivākaś = ca Paṇḍitaś = ca Sumantrakah/ Amātya Dūta ity = etā rājāḥ prakṛtaya daśa[\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{68}}]). But of all the ministers, the priest is the foremost and the mainstay of the king and the kingdom (Purodhāḥ prathamam śreṣṭhaḥ sarvebhya rāja-rāṣṭrabhir). He is entitled to the highest emoluments, getting one-tenth greater than the Pratinidhi.\textsuperscript{80} The Purohitā is, however, not allowed to discharge the functions of the king during the latter's illness or absence from the capital. That
function devolves upon the Pratinidhi. In referring to his qualifications, Šukra\textsuperscript{100} says, ‘One who is versed in maniras and rituals, master of the three sciences, skilful at work, conqueror of the senses, subduer of anger, devoid of greed and passions, equipped with the knowledge of six Aṅgas (Vedāṅgas) and of the science of archery with all its branches, one who knows the science of moral as well as religious interests, one fearing whose anger even the king takes to virtuous ways of life, one who is well up in Nīti Śāstra and master of military implements and tactics is the priest.’ We thus see that apart from the ethical and physical training, the priestly curriculum, according to Šukra, includes the study of economics, theology, sociology and military science.

Šukra does not specifically mention the functions of the Purohita and it seems that his functions and responsibilities do not extend beyond the fringe of sacrificial ceremonies.\textsuperscript{101} He is not authorised to advise the king in matters relating to religion and morality which become the prerogative of the Pandita. It is the Pandita who ‘has to study the rules of moral life obtaining in society in ancient and modern times, which have been maintained in the codes, which are now opposed, and which militate against the customs of the folk, and to advise the king by those which are efficacious both for his life and hereafter’.\textsuperscript{102} Yet it is interesting to note that Šukra invests the royal chaplain with the power to remove a tyrant. ‘If the king is an enemy of virtue, morality and strength,’ says he, ‘people should desert him as the ruiner of the state. In his place for the maintenance of the state, the priest with the consent of the Prakṛti, i.e., ministers, should install one who belongs to his family and is qualified.’\textsuperscript{103} Šukra enjoins the king to take at the time of coronation the following oath at the hands of the consecrating priest: ‘From the night of my birth to that of my death, for the space between these two, my sacrifice and my gifts, my place and good deeds, my life, and my offspring mayest thou take if I play thee false.’ Since this coronation oath was administered by the priest, it has been suggested that the priest was authorised to remove an unrighteous monarch from the throne. But the competence of the priest to punish the king with the removal of his position has been questioned on valid grounds. Indeed, it is difficult to
ascertain how far the picture of the Purohita, as portrayed by Sukra, is realistic.

XI

*The Priest in the South Indian Kingdoms*

V.R. Ramachandra Dikshitar observes that the institution of the Purohita was not alien to Dravidian polity. The commentator of the *Silappadhiyakaram*, a classic of the period of the Tamil *Saṅgam*, includes the Purohita in the list of ministers, the other members being the commander-in-chief, the ambassador and the Director of Public Information. Similar references to the Purohita occur in other ancient Tamil treatises.

As we come to the time of the Pallava kings, we meet with one Brahma Śṛiṅāja, who combined in himself the offices of chief minister and royal priest. He is described in one of the Pallava grants as both the Potra and the Mukhyamantri of king Nandivarman II.

We hardly get any account about the Purohita in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions. But it is not improbable that in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom ‘he may have been an officer of the royal household rather than a member of the ministry’. It is worth noting that the Mangallu plates of the Eastern Cālukya king Amma II Vijayāditya VI (A.D. 945-A.D. 970) include the Purohita in the list of the eighteen tirthas.

The inscriptions of the Cālukya kings of Kalyāṇi mention a number of Rāja-gurus who were mostly Śaiva in their religious persuasion. But we are at present unable to decide whether they were appointed to the office of the Purohita or were merely the preceptors of kings. Someśvara has referred to the office of the royal priest in his work entitled *Mānasolāsa* and pointed out that such persons as were well-grounded in the threefold Veda, politics, expiatory rites and Atharvavedic lore should be selected for the post (*Trayaṇam ca daṇḍanītyāṁ ca śānti-karmaṇī paustike/ Atharvaṇe ca kuśalaḥ sa syād rāja-purohitaḥ*). The priest is regarded as the principal guardian of the kingdom, being superior to the Pratinidhi and the Pradhāna (*Purodhāḥ praśāmah śresṭhāḥ sarvebhyo rāja-rāṣṭrabhṛt| Tad = anu syāt = pratinidhiḥ pradhānas = tad = anantaram|)

XII

Some Observations on the Institution of Priesthood

Every living institution, worth the name, must undergo a process of evolution; it must pass through the stages of rise and decadence. There seems to be little room for doubt that from the 'comparatively modest position of a private chaplain who had to attend to the sacrificial obligations to his master, he appears to have gradually raised himself to the dignity of so to say a minister of public worship and confidential adviser of the king'. The influence of the royal chaplain was again on the wane in the Gupta and post-Gupta periods when he was mostly a mere ministrant to the personal spiritual needs of his master. But V.R. Ramachandra Dikshitar maintains that 'from the earliest known literature, the *Rg Veda Samhita*, down to the later treatises on the *Arthaśāstra*, the *purohita* maintained one and the same position in the state, at least in every Kṣatriya-rulled state'. Indian literature, which is generally the product of the priestly class and sacerdotal in character, does not help us at all in tracing the evolution of the institution of the *Purohita* as its account is more exaggerated than real. It is not unoften that the later writers have copied their predecessors of earlier epochs. When we speak of the priest of *Rgvedic* times, we always think of him as he is painted in the *Rgveda* and not of an actual figure in a real *Rgvedic* state. Kauṭilya attaches a high degree of importance to the office of the priest but it is difficult to believe that the Maurya kings like Aśoka and his successors, who were Buddhists, and Candragupta, especially in his later days after his conversion to Jainism, would have held this sacerdotal order in the same esteem as the writer of the *Arthaśāstra*. The discovery of archaeological material can only dispel the pall of dense darkness that enshrouds the problem.
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The Minister

I

The Importance of Ministers

As in modern times, in early days also, ministers constituted an important wheel of the administrative machinery of the state; they played a decisive role in the formulation as well as in the implementation of the policy of the government and not unoften enjoyed a position of extraordinary importance and influence. The works and responsibilities of the state being manifold and diverse, it was wellnigh impossible for the king to perform them single-handed; he required the services of ministers and other functionaries for their successful accomplishment.

The importance of ministers for the proper upkeep of the state was never lost sight of in ancient India. In emphasising the importance of ministers, Kautilya\(^1\) observes, ‘Sovereignty is possible only with assistance. A single wheel can never move. Hence he shall employ ministers and hear their opinion’ (Sahāya-sādhyam rājatvam cakram = ekam na vartate/ kurvita sacivāṁs = tasmāt teśāṁ ca śrūṇuyāṁ = matam). There arise occasions with respect to affairs of state, when a king has to perceive the unknown, to corroborate the known, to clear dubious issues, to guess the whole from the knowledge of a part (Pratyakṣa-parokṣ = ānumeyāḥ hi rāja vyttih) but all these are only possible with external assistance from able and accomplished advisers and assistants (ity = Amātya-karma). Kautilya\(^2\) elsewhere compares the king without his ministers with a bird deprived of its feathers (chinna-pakṣasya = eva rājhaś = cestā-nāsāḥ = ca), for, as he further emphasises, a minister is the mainstay of the security of the king’s life. The
Śāntiparvan,³ likewise, points out that it is physically impracticable for a king to perform all the affairs of state single-handed; he cannot run the administrative machinery for three days even without the assistance of ministers. The Adiparvan⁴ lays down that the king is entirely dependent upon ministers as animals upon clouds, the Brāhmaṇas upon the Vedas and women upon their husbands. Manu⁵ echoes a similar sentiment when he says, ‘Even a single piece of work appears difficult if one is to do it unaided; why is then the attempt to rule over a prosperous kingdom without the assistance of ministers?’ Bhāravi,⁶ who flourished in the sixth century A.D., observes, ‘That servant is a bad counsellor who does not give salutary advice to his sovereign, and that sovereign is a bad master who does not pay heed to the advice of a well-wisher. For, all kinds of prosperity delight to live there where the king and his ministers act in concert’ (Sa kīṁśakhā sādhu na śāsti y=cī’dhipaṁ hītāṁ=na yah sam-śṛnte sa kīṁprabhuḥ// Sad=āṇukūleṣu hi kurtate ratim/ nṛpeṣv=amātyeṣu ca sarva-sampadaḥ//). Kāmanda,⁷ likewise, has recognised the importance of ministers. He describes them as the hands or eyes of the king and compares the king, without his ministers, to a wingless bird. ‘A king,’ says Somadeva⁸ in highlighting the importance of ministers, ‘who is assisted by his ministers, Purohita and Senāpati, is generally victorious and successful’ (Mantri-Purohita-Senāpatināṁ ye yuktāṁ muktāṁ karoti sa ahāryabuddhīḥ). All these references in early Indian texts of different ages and regions would indubitably point to the great importance that was attached to ministerial posts in ancient India.

II

The Interpretation of Mantri, Amātya and Saciva

The terms that were generally employed in Indian literature in the sense of a minister are mantri, amātyah and sacivah. Etymologically speaking, the word manrin means one who is concerned with mantra, secret counsel. The term amātyah, which is based on amā, meaning near, close to, etc., denotes a companion or follower of the king. Sacivah, likewise, means a friend, companion, etc. The commentator Kullūka has taken the term in the sense of a helper, sahāya (Nityam=eva rājñāḥ
Notwithstanding this marked difference in meaning, these three terms are often used in Indian literature as synonyms. Thus, the Rāmāyaṇa, for instance, refers to Sumantra as an Amātya in one place and a Mantrin in another, implying thereby the interchangeability of the two words. The Āranyakaparvan, likewise, applies the designations Sacīva and Mantrin to the same ministers of an Orissan king and the titles Amātya and Mantrin to one and the same minister of a ruler, indicating the synonymity of the terms amātya, sacīva and mantrī. The testimony of the epics in regard to the identification of the three terms receives confirmation from the Kautala inscription of Arjunadeva wherein one Sāmantasimha is described as a Sacīva in verse nine and called a Mantrin in the verse, following, as well as from a Kākatiya epigraph which applies the designations amātya, sacīva and mantrī to Vaija, the minister of king Beṣa, at different places. Manu seems to have used the words sacīva and mantrī as synonyms.

It cannot escape notice that these terms are sometimes treated as quite distinct from each other. In the Rāmāyaṇa a distinction is made between a Mantrin and a Sacīva. As is evident from the facts noted below, the Arthaśāstra, too, distinguishes the Mantrin from the Amātya:

1. The Arthaśāstra states, 'Having divided the spheres of their powers and having taken into consideration the time, place and the work to be accomplished, such persons shall be employed as Amātyas but not as Mantrins' (Vibhajya = Amātya-vibhavam deśa-kāla ca karma ca/ amātyāḥ sarva ev = aite kāryāḥ syur = na tu mantrīnaḥ //). The distinction between Mantrins and Amātyas is amply brought to light by this statement of Kauṭilya.

2. A Mantrin, according to Kauṭilya, had a salary of 48,000 pānas per annum, while an Amātya was entitled to an emolument of 12,000 pānas.

3. The Arthaśāstra lays down that a king should appoint three or four Mantrins but as many Amātyas as he deemed necessary.

4. Kauṭilya says that those who were found honest after one of the four tests of dharma, artha, kāma and bhaya, were employed as Amātyas, whereas Mantrins were appointed after they had proved their integrity and loyalty by successfully
undergoing the fourfold test (saryôpepadhã-suddhã mantriñakã kuryât).

5. Kautilya observes that Mantrins and the Mantri-pariṣad were summoned for consultation on grave occasions (âtyayikakârya). The passage Mantri-pariṣadam dvâdasām anãtyân kurvita would imply that the council of ministers used to be recruited from Amãtyas. The separate mention of Mantrins and Amãtyas (though the reference to the latter is an indirect one) in one and the same passage is a clear indication of distinction in the denotation of the two terms.

The distinction between the terms manrin and amãtya is also maintained by Kãmandaka who, however, seems to have used the words saciva and amãtya as synonyms. This is evident first from his comparison of Mantrins and Amãtyas with the eyes and arms of the king, respectively, as well as from his statement that the king should think of the welfare of his kingdom along with his Mantrins and Amãtyas. A Saindhava grant17 of the time of Agguka II of the Gupta year 513 from Ghumli in Kãthiawar includes the Manrin and Amãtya in its list of royal officers, indicating their separate identity. The terms amãtya, saciva and manrin are employed in the Agni Purãna in diverse senses. The Agni Purãna18 observes that the king gives audience to Amãtyas and Mantrins in the royal court. The separate use of the two terms clearly emphasises the difference between the two groups of functionaries. Again, we are told that after the coronation ceremony, the Pratîhãra comes along with Amãtyas and Sacivas to introduce them to the newly consecrated king.19

The simultaneous use of these words shows their difference which is further brought to light by the separate mention of the limitations and qualifications of Amãtyas and Sacivas which we meet with in the Agni Purãna. In the Abhilaśitârtha-cintãmani,20 a work of the twelfth century A.D., Mantrins, Amãtyas and Sacivas are represented as distinct functionaries. The Mantrins, Amãtyas and Sacivas are asked to take their respective seats in the court and to occupy their respective residences in different quarters of the city. The difference in the denotation of these three terms is further brought to light by another passage of the text which urges the king to patronise the angry and disillusioned Mantrins, Amãtyas and Sacivas of the enemy-kingdom.
The reason why there has been so much controversy amongst early Indian writers over the use of these three terms is, however, difficult to explain and whatever suggestion may be offered in this regard will always be regarded as tentative. Ministerial functions in ancient India seem to have comprised the formulation and implementation of governmental policies and programmes. Whereas in some kingdoms there were two separate bodies for these two different kinds of works, in other kingdoms one and the same body was concerned with both. The ministers entrusted with the implementation of state policies were generally known as Amātyas or Sacivas, while those, in charge of counsels, were called Mantrins. When the Junagadh rock inscription speaks of Matisacivas and Karmasacivas, it merely refers to the existence of two separate bodies of ministers in charge of the formulation and execution of governmental policies. The commentator Rāmavarman speaks of Mantrins as policy-makers or counsellors and of Amātyas as executive officers (Amātya dei = ādi kārya-nirvāhakā mantrino vyavahāra-drāṣṭāra iti bhedah!). The Amarakośa states that the Amātya who is a Dhīsaciva is called a Mantrin, while other Amātyas are known as Karmasacivas (Mantri dhī-saciva = ‘mātyo = ‘nye karma-sacivās = tatah!). Therefore, when a literary text or an inscription speaks of the identity of Mantrins, Amātyas and Sacivas, it only implies that these ministers had combined in themselves the functions of the formulation and implementation of state policies and programmes. That a Mantrin was not always a mere counsellor but was sometimes charged with the function of execution is borne out by the evidence of the Mahābhārata and other texts.

III

The Ministers in the Vedic Period

In Vedic literature, barring, of course, the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, we do not come across such terms as amātya, saciva and mantrin but meet with the word ratnin which means a jewel. The Ratnings were in fact some high functionaries, including the Mahiṣī, crowned queen. Vāvātā, favourite queen, Yuvarāja, heir-apparent, Purohitā, royal chaplain, Senāni, commander-in-chief, Sūta, commander of the chariot corps of the royal army,
Grāmaṇī, village-headman, Sarīgrahītā, treasurer, Bhāgadugha, tax-collector, Kṣattā, royal chamberlain, Aksavāpa, the keeper of dice and Pālagala, king's bosom companion. Sometimes the Govikartana, officer in charge of the royal store of cattle, Takṣā, carpenter and Rathakāra, chariot-maker are also found included in the list of the Ratnins. That they were not inconsequential persons becomes clear from the fact that they are described as bestowers of the kingdom upon the king²³ (Ete vai rāṣṭrasya pradātāraḥ) and they, in all probability, discharged the functions of the Mantrins and Amātyas of later days.

IV

The Ministers in the Post-Vedic Period

The Buddhist texts refer to Mahāmattas and Amaccas who have usually been identified with chief ministers and ministers, respectively. But since there are references to several Mahāmattas, holding responsible positions in the different departments of administration under a king, it seems that the term mahāmatta, as used in these texts, denotes a senior minister as opposed to the word amacca which, in all probability, means a junior member. Such a contention is further supported by the etymology of the terms, for, the word mahāmatta is formed of the components mahān and amatya or amātya, the latter being comparable to amacca. The close correspondence between their designations would tend to suggest that Mahāmattas and Amaccas belonged to two different tiers of the same hierarchy of officers.

The senior ministers, referred to in the Buddhist texts, were of the following types:

1. The Sabbatthaka Mahāmatta.²⁴ He was the minister in charge of the general affairs of the kingdom.

2. The Vohārika Mahāmatta. He was the minister of law. The Mahāvagga²⁸ mentions them as being consulted by king Bimbisāra in connection with the award of punishment to those who initiated hired soldiers into religious order. In the Culla-
vagga⁶ they are the subject of a discussion between Anātha-
piṇḍika and prince Jeta.

3. The Senānāyaka Mahāmatta. He was the minister of defence.
The senior ministers enjoyed an enormously high position in administration. The Pādañjali Jātaka\textsuperscript{27} recognises their right of accession to the throne in the event of absence of a suitable heir of the deceased king, while in another Jātaka\textsuperscript{28} they are represented as selecting a suitable successor from amongst the relations of a previous ruler. The Mahāvaṁsa\textsuperscript{29} refers to some Ceylonese ministers who took over administration in their own hands consequent upon the death of king Vijaya but transferred power subsequently to the king’s nephew when he returned from India after one year. There are also other references to ministers exercising sovereign power.\textsuperscript{30} Two senior ministers of the Magadhan king Ajātaśatru were Sunīdha and Vassakāra, who, built, at the command of their king, a fort at Pātaligrāma to repel the Vṛjis. Vassakāra was a Brāhmaṇa.

Of the junior ministers, as enumerated in the Buddhist texts, mention may be made of the following:

1. The Vinicchayāmacca. This minister, who finds mention in several Jātakas, is identified by Fick with the minister of justice. The Rathalattih Jātaka\textsuperscript{31} tells us how a Vinicchayāmacca had once induced king Brahmadatta to revise an unjust judgement which was made without proper investigation. Such an incident, however, should not be interpreted to mean that this minister was empowered to pronounce an opinion upon the king’s judgement but may be taken to imply that he ‘advised the king and in some cases, had some influence upon his judgement’.\textsuperscript{32} It is not possible to draw a line between cases which the king alone decided and those which were judged by these ministers. It is conceivable that the legal life of the people generally passed into the hands of these ministers and the king as the highest authority intervened only in those cases where appeals were made to him against the judgement of these officers. The Kurudhamma Jātaka\textsuperscript{33} records how a prostitute, on receiving 1,000 gold pieces from a youth, promised not to receive the least thing from any person but having waited in vain for three years for his return and being relegated to extreme poverty, she went to the court and was advised by the Vinicchayāmaccas to return to her former profession. This story would clearly indicate that the Vinicchayāmaccas not only discharged judicial functions but also advised the people on matters of law and morality.
2. The *Rajjugāhaka-amacca* He was connected with land revenue and, if the view of R.S. Sharma be accepted, he might have been primarily an assessor of taxes rather than a collector. Büscher compares him with the Land Revenue Settlement Officer of British India, and suggests that the measurement was made for the purpose of assessing ground rent. Büscher's identification of this officer with the *Rājuka* or *Lajuka*, mentioned in Āsokan edicts, does not receive any countenance. The way this officer worked can best be described in the words of Fick, 'He fastens a rope to a stick, and whilst he gives one end of the rope to the owner of the land, he himself holds the other end (and wants to put the stick on the ground). In this way the stick got into the hole of a crab. He reflects, 'If I push the stick into the hole, the crab will perish; if I place the stick in front, the king will suffer loss; if I place it behind, the farmer will be injured; what is then to be done?' It is evident from the above citation that the *Rajjugāhaka-amacca* himself measured fields whereas some other Pāli texts imply that measurement was actually made by his assistants.

3. The *Attha-dhammānusāsaka-amacca*. The minister, who is repeatedly mentioned in the *Jātakas*, is identified by Fick with the guide of the king in worldly and spiritual matters. It is rather unfortunate that our sources do not provide us with any worthwhile information about his work or position.

The Buddhist texts do not throw any light on the system of remuneration of ministers, although we hear of bad ministers who were either dismissed or degraded and of good ones who were promoted for their services.

V

The Ministers in the Maurya Period

An elaborate account of ministers of ancient India, particularly of the Maurya period, is met with in the *Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra* which divides them into two principal classes—*Mantrins*, Counsellors and *Amātyas*, executive ministers. The *Mantrins*, who were superior in rank to *Amātyas*, were not large in number inasmuch as Kauṭiliya fears that the constitution of a large body of *Mantrins* would lead to the disclosure of state secrets and indecision in the formulation of policies and
programmes. He would recommend the appointment of three or four Mantrins only (Mantribhis = tribhiș = caturbhir = vā sa mantrayet). He is of opinion that in complicated state affairs, consultation with a single Mantrin may not lead to any definite conclusion (Mantrayamāṇo hy = eken = ārtha-kṛcchreṣu niścayamī n = ādhi-gacchet) as the minister may prove to be an autocrat (Ekaś = ca mantri yath = eṣṭam-anavagrahaś = carati). In the case of the king having two Mantrins, they may both join hands with each other to overpower the sovereign or may differ, thus bringing about a deadlock or even ruin to the state (Dvābhyāṃ mantrayamāṇo dvābhyāṃ samhatabhhyāṃ = avaghraye vigrhitābhhyāṃ vināśyate). According to the exigencies of time, place and the nature of the work to be done, the king could exercise his option of consulting one or two Mantrins or of overlooking them altogether (Deśa-kāla-kārya-vaśena tv = ekena saha dvābhyāṃ = eko vā yathā-sāmarthaṇān mantrayet).

What were the functions of a Mantrin? In Chapter XV of Book I of the Arthaśāstra we have the statement, Mantra-pūrvāḥ sarv = ārambhāḥ, which R. Shamasastry translates thus, ‘All kinds of administrative measures are preceded by deliberations in a well-formed council.’ This translation, unfortunately, is not a happy one, and the real implication of the passage would be that all kinds of administrative measures were preceded by deliberations with Mantrins, who alone were connected with counsels, mantra. If our interpretation be accepted, Mantrins advised the king on all matters, concerning administration, no doubt, at the instance of the king himself. Secondly, Mantrins along with the royal chaplain helped the king in examining the character of Amāṭyas who were in charge of different departments of the government (Mantri-purohitasakhaḥ sāmānyes = adhikaraṇeṣu sthāpayitr = amāṭyāṇ = upadhābhīḥ sodhayet). Another function of these ministers was to accompany the king to the battle-field and give encouragement to the troops.

In referring to the executive ministers, Amāṭyas, Kauṭilya observes that they should be natives of the king’s own kingdom (jānapada), born of a high family (abhijāṭaḥ), influential (svavagrahaḥ), well-versed in all arts (kṛtaśilpa), possessed of foresight (cakṣusmān), wise (prājīko), possessed of a retentive memory (dhārayāśṇur), quick in action (dakṣo), eloquent (vāgni), skilful (pragalbhāḥ), intelligent (pratipattimān), possessed of
enthusiasm, dignity and endurance (utsāha-prabhāva-yuktāh kleśasahaḥ), pure in character (sucih), affable (maitro), firm in loyal devotion (dr̥habhaktiḥ), endowed with excellent conduct, strength, health and bravery (śīla-bal=ārogya-sattva-saṃyuktāh), free from procrastination and fickleness (stambha-cāpala-hīnah), affectionate (saṃpriyo), and free from such qualities as excite hatred and enmity (vairāṇām=akarṭā). Thus high birth and theoretical knowledge were not the sole basis for the appointment of Amātyas; their practical efficiency and personal merits were also taken into consideration. The qualifications of Amātyas (amātya-sampat) are to be ascertained by the king directly from personal experience, indirectly from the report of reliable persons and also inferentially from the course of conduct adopted by them.

Besides being possessed of the qualifications noted above, the Amātyas had to undergo successfully any of the four allurements (upadhā) of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Bhaya. Of these tried persons, those whose character had been tested under religious allurements were employed in Dharmasthīya and Kaṇṭakaśodhana courts (Tatra dharm=opadhā-śuddhān dharmasthīya-kaṇṭakaśodhanaṃ karmasū sthāpayet); those whose purity had been verified under monetary allurements were employed in the department of revenue (arth=opadhā-śuddhān Samāhārīr-Sannidhātra-nicayakarmasu); those who had been tried under love allurements were appointed as superintendents of pleasure grounds (kām=opadhā-śuddhān bāhy=ābhyantara-vihaara-rakkāsaṇa) and those who had been tested by allurements under fear were appointed to immediate services (bhaya=opadhā-śuddhān āśaṇā-kāryeṣu rājñāh).

The Amātyas, to judge from the nature of their work, as enumerated by Kauṭilya, may be classified into the following groups:

1. Those who were the members of the council, Mantri-pariṣad.

2. Those who were employed as judges in Dharmasthīya and Kaṇṭakaśodhana courts and were styled Dharmasthas and Pradeṣṭs.

3. Those who were appointed as superintendents of departments, including the collector-general of revenue (Samāhāra), chamberlain (Sannidhāra), superintendent of store-house
(Koṣṭh = āgār = adhyakṣa), superintendent of commerce (Paṇy =
adhyakṣa), superintendent of forest produce (Kupyādhyakṣa) and
the like.

4. Those who were employed to look after immediate
matters (āsanna-kāryeṣu), the exact nature of which is not
explained by Kauṭilya.

Besides the aforesaid fourfold category of Amātyas, there
were also others who were in charge of the colonization and
improvement of wild tracts of land, recruitment of the army
(danda-praṇayanam), installation of the heir-apparent (Kumāra-
rakṣanam = abhiśekaṇ-ca) and protection of princes49 (Kumāra-
ṇām = āyattvam = amātyeṣu).

Kauṭilya also refers to a council of ministers, called Mantri-
pariṣad. From the different views that he quotes on the com-
position of the council, we come to learn that the Mānava,
Bārhaspatya and Auṣānasva schools were in favour of a council
of 1250 (Mantri-pariṣadaman dvādaś = āmātyān kurvīta iti Mānavāḥ),
1651 (Śodasa iti Bārhaspatyāḥ) and 2032 (vimśatim ity = auṣāna-
sāḥ). Kauṭilya, on the other hand, maintains that the council
should consist of as many members as the need of the business
of administration demands53 (yathā-sāmarthyaṃ = iti Kauṭilyaḥ).
It cannot escape notice that Kauṭilya’s Mantri-pariṣad was com-
posed of those who were not Mantrins but Amātyas, and as
such a designation like Amātya-pariṣad would have been a more
suitable description of the council. R.G. Basak54 observes that
the council of Amātyas was not a deliberative body but an
executive one, forming as it were, an outer council of executive
ministers.

In referring to the functions of the Mantri-pariṣad, Kauṭilya
says, ‘In works of emergency (ātyayike kārye), he (the king)
shall call both his Mantrins and the council of ministers
(mantriniṃ mantri-pariṣadam ca) and tell them of the same ((āhūya
bruyāt). The king shall accept what is settled by the majority
(Tatra yad bhūyishṭā bruyuḥ . . . tāt kuryāt) or do what appears
to him to be beneficial to the state’ (kārya-siddhikaraṁ vā).
The second alternative, kārya-siddhikaraṁ vā, as stated by
Kauṭilya, appears to imply that the king was empowered to
accept the opinion of the minority in the interest of the state.
It is further clear that the Pariṣad was not consulted on all
occasions but was summoned when the works of emergency had
to be transacted. The other function of the *Pariṣad* was to *attend on the king at the time of the reception of envoys*.

Kauṭilya says that while holding consultations with the *Mantrins* or members of the *Mantri-pariṣad*, the king should take sufficient precautionary measures against the disclosure of counsels. 'The subject matter of a council,' says Kauṭilya,55 'shall be entirely secret, and deliberations in it shall be so carried on that even birds cannot see them; for it is said that the secrecy of counsels was divulged by parrots, minas, dogs and other low creatures of mean birth. Hence without providing himself with sufficient safeguards against disclosure, he shall never enter into deliberations in a council.' This account of Kauṭilya may be an exaggeration but still it demonstrates the extreme need of secrecy in the council.

It cannot escape notice that the *Mantrins* and *Amātyas*, of which Kauṭilya speaks so much, do not figure at all in the edicts of Aśoka or in any Maurya inscription. But the Pāli text *Divyāvadāna*, which is, no doubt, a work of a much later date, refers to the *Amātyas* as being employed by Maurya kings and princes. The *Divyāvadāna*56 states that it was the ministerial oppression that had goaded the people of Taxila to rise in revolt (api tu duṣṭa=āmātyā asmākāṁ paribhavāṁ kurvanti). The same text further states that Taxila again revolted during the reign of Aśoka and the cause was once more the tyranny of ministers57 (duṣṭa=rāmano=’mātyā āgaty=āsmākam=apamānaṁ kurvanti). Here we possibly get an allusion to illegal methods adopted by corrupt ministers to amass a fortune, leading to enormous hardships to the people.

The important role played by a *Manrin* in the Maurya court, as testified by the *Arthaśāstra*, stands corroborated by the *Mudrārākṣasa*58 of Viśākhadatta, where king Candragupta is depicted as a mere puppet in the hands of minister Cāṇakya. The king does not take any measures without the advice of Cāṇakya; whenever the two meet, Candragupta greets Cāṇakya by touching the latter's feet. The following passage,59 quoted from the *Mudrārākṣasa*, admirably reflects their position:

*Rājā—(āsanād=utthāya) Ārya, Candraguptaḥ praṇamati (iti pādayoḥ patati)*

*Cāṇakya—(pāṇau grhītyā) uttīṣṭh=ottīṣṭha vatsa.*
In the absence of any corroboration evidence, it is difficult to determine the authenticity of the account.

The Mantrins of the Arthaśāstra may be identified with the members of the seventh caste, as mentioned by the Greek writers. They observe, 'The seventh caste consists of the councillors of state who advise the king or the magistrates of self-governed cities in the management of public affairs. In point of numbers, this is a small class, but it is distinguished by superior wisdom and justice (and hence enjoys the prerogative of choosing governors), chiefs of provinces, deputy governors, superintendents of the treasury, (generals of the army, admirals of the navy, controllers) and commissioners who superintend agriculture.'\textsuperscript{60} The functions of the councillors, as described by the Greek writers, are exactly those of the Mantrins in a Kautiliya state.

Rock Edicts III and VI refer to a Palisā. The term palisā in Prākrit corresponds to Sanskrit Pariṣad. D.R. Bhandarkar has identified the Pariṣad of Aśokan edicts with the Mantri-pariṣad of the Arthaśāstra, although R.G. Basak\textsuperscript{61} would interpret the Pariṣad in the sense of an assembly of Buddhists or the audience. It is, however, difficult to believe that the audience or the assembly of religious devotees functioned as an intermediate administrative body between the king and the Mahāmātras. If the view of D.R. Bhandarkar, equating the Palisā with the Mantri pariṣad of the Arthaśāstra, be accepted, the existence of a ministerial council, as known from the Arthaśāstra, under the Mauryas, stands corroborated by the epigraphic source.\textsuperscript{62} The functions of the Pariṣad, as outlined in the edicts, were the following:

First, to scrutinise any oral orders, issued by the king;
Second, to meet and discuss whenever any emergent matter devolved upon a Mahāmātra;
Third, to direct the Yuktas to calculate the expenses of the touring officials.

It appears that the king did not always preside over the deliberations in the council and that occasions were not few and far between when its members were divided in their judgement. It is equally clear that the king was very keen to keep himself abreast of deliberations in the council with the help of spies called Prativedakas.
VI

The Ministers in the Epics

It is rather unfortunate that the observation of the *Mahābhārata on the composition of the ministry is varied and contradictory. The Śāntiparvan states that the Mantrins should be eight in number (Aṣṭānāṁ mantriṇāṁ madhye mantram rāj = opadhārayet), comprising four Brāhmaṇas, three loyal, disciplined and obedient Śūdras and one Sūta. It is worth observing that this list of eight Mantrins includes three Śūdras but passes over the claim of the Kṣatriyas in silence. It is difficult to ascertain how far this list is realistic. There are reasons to believe that in actual practice the Śūdras were not appointed as ministers and the field was dominated by the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas. The recommendation of the Śāntiparvan about the formation of a body of eight Mantrins is fortunately corroborated by the Bālakanda of the Rāmāyana which, likewise, refers to eight ministers of king Daśaratha. But the Śāntiparvan elsewhere lays down that the Mantrins should not be less than three in number. With this may be compared the statement of Rāma, entreating Bharata to consult three or four Mantrins in connection with the fixation of his policy. There is, likewise, a verse in the Śāntiparvan which may be quoted here:

Parikṣya ca guṇān = nityam praudhahāvān dhurandharān/
Paṅca = opadhā- vyaśtiṁs = ca kuryād = rāj = arthakārīṇah||

In commenting on this verse, the Bhārata-Kaumudi observes: Upadhā-vyaśtiṁ chalarahitin, paṅca arthakārīṇah mantrīṁ = ādikārya-kārikān mantriṇāḥ kuryāt. Now, if the expression paṅca be treated as being applied to arthakārīṇah, as is done by the commentator, it will legitimately follow that the verse, in question, recommends a ministry of five members only.

The Śāntiparvan also speaks of a larger ministry of thirty-eight members. But these ministers, who are called Amātyas, were, in all probability, junior ones, corresponding to their namesakes of the Arthasastra. Of these thirty-eight junior ministers, four were learned Brāhmaṇas, eight brave Kṣatriyas, twenty-one prosperous Vaiśyas, three Śūdras, one Sūta and one Paurāṇika. If the word paurāṇikaṁ of the original passage be taken as a descriptive epithet of the term sūtam, the number of
junior ministers would be reduced to 37. This passage, which
gives weightage to the Vaiśyas, no doubt, in consonance with
the great influence of the community, does not occur in the
Poona critical edition of the Mahābhārata.

In referring to the qualifications of ministers, the Śāntipar-
van⁶⁹ states: ‘Those who are of good birth and good behaviour,
who can read all signs and gestures, who are destitute of
cruelty, who know the requirements of place and time, and who
always seek the good of their master in all acts, should be
appointed as ministers by the king in all his affairs’ (Kulīnān
śīla-sampānnaṁ = ingerajānaṁ = a - niṣṭhurān/ deśa-kāla-vidhānajānām
bhārtr-kārya-hitaisināh/ Nityam = artheṣu sarveṣu rājā kurvaṁ
mantriṇāḥ/). Another passage of the Śāntiparvan⁷⁰ points out
that the king ‘should have for ministers persons, connected
with his trusted friends, possessed of high birth, born in his
own kingdom, incapable of being corrupted, unstained by
adultery and similar vices, well-tested, belonging to good families,
possessed of learning, sprung from sires and grandsires that
held similar offices and adorned with humility’. There is strik-
ing disagreement between the above two passages of the
Śāntiparvan on ministerial qualifications, for, whereas according
to the latter, descent from a family of ministers and birth in
the same kingdom are two essential qualifications of a minister,
the former does not take any notice of them. The Śāntiparvan⁷¹
further says that ministers should possess eight cardinal virtues
but be free from sevenfold vice (Varjitaṁ = ca = aiva vyasanāṁ
sughoraiṁ saptabhir = vrśam aṣṭābhis = ca guṇāṁ = yuktam). The
virtues include (i) fifty years of age (pañcāsaṁ = varṣa-vayasanāṁ),
(ii) sense of dignity (pragabhām), (iii) absence of envy (anasaṁ-
yakaṁ), (iv) knowledge of the Śrutis and Smṛtis (Śṛuti-Smṛti-
samāyuktam), (v) modesty (vinītāṁ), (vi) impartiality (samadarśi-
nam), (vii) competence to decide readily in the midst of
disputants urging different courses of action (kārya vivadamanā-
nāṁ saktāṁ) and (viii) uncovetousness⁷² (artheṣu alohupam).

Similar details of ministerial qualifications are also furnished
by the Rāmāyana. The Bālakānda⁷³ refers to the ministers of
king Daśaratha as virtuous, scorning to do wrong, benevolent,
versed in moral law, of wide experience, disinterested, magna-
nimous, acquainted with the spirit of scriptures, forbearing,
patient, loyal, truthful, cheerful, free from avarice and well-
acquainted with the affairs of their subjects and with those of the subjects of other monarchs. They were efficient, firm in friendship and they even passed judgement on their own sons, if they transgressed the law. In the Ayodhyākāṇḍa, Rāma calls upon Bharata who meets him in his exile to employ ministers who are of pure heart, full of integrity and of a noble disposition and whose ancestors have served the crown in positions of authority. We thus see that heredity is upheld in the epics as an essential qualification of a minister; the reason was to eliminate the possibility of an inexperienced man being appointed as a minister.

The Mahābhārata refers to the practice of the trial of ministers by means of upadās but, unlike the Arthaśāstra it does not specify them. The Ayodhyākāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa refers to similar tests which ministers were required to undergo before they were appointed to their posts. There are indications in the Śāntiparvan that ministers at large were corrupt and irreligious (Kevalā pumān=ānāt karmānī n=opapadyate/Parā-marśo viśeṣānām=asrutasya=eha durmatehi/); they were guided by self-interest and formed cliques. The ministers of the Kosalan monarch Kṣemadarśin, for instance, were divided into several groups. If a minister proved to be a traitor, he was either removed from his office (svāmī sthānāc=c=aiv=āpakarṣati) or was punished (paścād=daṇḍam). The occurrence of such terms as pradhānāmātya and mantri-mukhya may prove the existence of the post of the chief minister in the cabinet.

Some of the important functions of ministers, as gleaned from the epics, may be stated below:

1. The most essential duty of a minister was to advise the king in regard to the formulation of the state’s policies and programmes (mantragūḍho hi rājyasya mantrino ye maṇiṣṭaḥ).

2. They acted as checks upon the autocracy of kings. The ministers of king Nala warned him against playing dice but the unfortunate king did not pay any heed to their advice. Vidura had advised the Kauravas to follow the just path by offering to the Pāṇḍavas their due share. The Mahābhārata expressly demonstrates that it was not obligatory on the king to accept the advice of his ministers.

3. They participated in military operations and helped the king in the task of defence. Duryodhana is known to have
invaded the Trigartas in the company of his ministers; Jayadratha⁸² is found to have consulted his ministers in the battle-field of Kurukṣetra; Vṛṣavarmā,⁸³ the Saciva of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, lost his life while fighting with the Pāṇḍavas. The Śāntiparvan⁸⁴ refers to the appointment of ministers as in charge of military affairs.

4. Ministers were sometimes employed as governors of territories. The Sabhāparvan refers to some such ministers who had oppressed the subjects by their tyranny (rāṣṭram tava=ānuśāsanti mantriṇo).

5. They sometimes acted as the guardians of the royal family with a high sense of loyalty. After the sudden death of Parikṣit, his ministers held the reins of government, enthroned the infant prince Janamejaya and looked after his proper education.⁸⁵ The ministers of king Nala during the period of his exile protected his son and daughter by sending them to the abode of their maternal grandfather.⁸⁶

6. Occasions were not altogether rare when ministers carried on the administrative affairs of the kingdom. Thus the ministers of Bhagiratha and Yuvanāśva looked after the administration of the kingdom. Parikṣit, while going on a hunting expedition, had entrusted the affairs of state to his ministers. King Sambaraṇa had urged his ministers to look after the state during his absence. Mahākarna, the minister of the Magadhan king Ambuvic, was in charge of the kingdom for a long time.

7. They were expected to supervise watchfully the activities and mutual relations of district and provincial officers⁸⁷ (Dharma-maṇḍala sacivaḥ kaś=cit=tath=āpaśyed=atandritaḥ).

VII

The Ministers in the Post-Maurya Period

As we approach the post-Maurya period, we find ministers being prominently mentioned in Chapter VII of the Manu-samhita,⁸⁸ wherein the king is advised to consult his ministers on such matters as those pertaining to peace and war, sthāna (army, treasury, capital and the country), sources of revenue, protection (of himself and of the country) and the disbursement of wealth (Taṅk sārdham cintayen=nityam sāmānyam sandhi-vigraham| Sthānam samudayam guptin labdha-praśamanāni ca|).
In defining the sphere of the jurisdiction of a minister, Manu is evidently as specific as Kautilya. He further points out that ministers are to look after the affairs of the kingdom at the time of the illness of the king—a prerogative which a Kautilya minister could hardly enjoy. Again, when Manu says, ‘Having first ascertained the opinion of each minister separately and then the views of all [of them] together, let him do what is most beneficial in his affairs,’ he may be said to have departed from Kautilya who is loath to recognise the importance of individual consultation. Both of them, however, concur in granting the king the power to annul the decisions of his ministers. Manu holds that the ministry should consist of seven or eight members (Sarcivān saṁta c=āṣṭau vā prakurvīta parikṣitān).

Referring to the qualifications of these ministers, Manu says that they must be those whose ancestors have been loyal servants (maulān), who are versed in the sciences (ṣāstra vidā), heroes (sūrān), skilled in the use of weapons (labdha-lakṣān), descendants of noble families (kul odgatān) and who have been tried (parikṣitān). It appears from the narrative of Manu that one Brahmin minister was superior in status to all other ministers; it was he who guided the king in external affairs as well as in all other official business (sarva-kārīṇān).

Manu also refers to junior ministers, described as Amātyas, who were to be honest (sucīn), wise (prājñān), firm (avasthitān), able to collect revenue (samyaṅ = artha-samāhaṁ) and well-tried (suparikṣitān). Kullūka regards them as executive ministers (karma-sacivaḥ). Manu does not delimit their number but points out that it should be in consonance with the requirements of the state. They were employed in the offices for the collection of revenue (arthe) as well as in the interior of the palace (antar = niveśane).

A wealth of information about ministers is, likewise, provided by other contemporary or near contemporary works. The Milindapañcha describes them as royal employees who were exempted from taxation. Kātyāyana refers to the Amātyas as belonging to the Brāhmaṇa caste and says that the king should not decide even a lawsuit without their assistance. The Mālavikāgnimitra informs us that the crown prince Agnimitra, who was appointed as governor of Malwa by his father Puṣyamitra, had a council of ministers. The council would discuss the
decisions of the king and communicate its opinion to the latter through its president or chief minister.

Tiruvalluvar in his Tirukkural discusses at length the qualifications and functions of a minister, called an *Amaiccar*. ‘The first essential quality in a minister is an ability to judge aright ways and means of achieving great things, timeliness of action and enterprise and initiative. Along with these the minister must have resolution, interest in the welfare of the people, constant study and drive to get things done. The affairs of the State are not simple things fit only for philosophers as many difficult situations have to be faced. Tiruvalluvar says that he is an able minister who possesses the capacity to disunite allies, cherish and keep friendship and bring back people who have (been) estranged. This is paying attention to both *sandhi* and *vigraha* aspects in relations within the State and outside. The minister should not waver in his advice and must possess penetrating insight and comprehension and clear-headedness in decision and action.’100 He points out that ‘the minister should dare to speak out and give correct advice even if the king is unwise and might throw away his advice. Duty must be performed at all costs and not burked to retain his position or the king’s favour.’101 Tiruvalluvar further lays down that both learning and eloquence are necessary for a minister. ‘The importance of persuasion and of public communications, now so much valued in modern governments, is also valued by Tiruvalluvar.’102 Decision should be reached only after a thorough deliberation and in the execution of such decisions, there should be no delay.103 In dealing with a matter, five things should be taken into consideration, viz., the resources at disposal, instruments, time, nature of the action and the proper place for its execution.104

What is known of ministers from literature is fortunately corroborated and supplemented by archaeological evidence. The inscriptions of the Śatāvāhanas speak of *Amātyas* who were not counsellors, *Mantrins*, but were executive ministers, being employed as district officers and as heads of departments. The *Amātyas* Viṣṇupālita, Śyāmaka and Śivaskandadatta successively governed the district of Govardhana, identified with Nasik, at the time of Gautamiputra Śatakarni and Pulumāyi. The *Āhāra* of Māmala, located in Poona district, was under an
Amātya whose name ended in-gupta. It is not clear whether all the districts of the Śatavāhana kingdom were placed under charge of the Amātyas or they were entrusted with the administration of those districts that lay close to the Kṣatrapa dominions, although the latter suggestion appears to be more reasonable. The royal donor of the gift of a tank and monastery at Banabasi had entrusted the work of the execution of her project to Amātya Khadasati, described in the record as head of the department of works (Karmmāntika). It seems that in the Śatavāhana kingdom important districts and departments were placed in charge of executive ministers, styled Amātyas, who maintained close contact with the central government. Such an assumption does not appear to be unlikely as there are numerous references to ministers in charge of territorial units in inscriptive and literary records, both earlier and later.

References to the Amātyas are found in a few seals of the Kuśāna period. A seal in the Bharat Kala Bhavan bears in Kuśāna characters the legend, Amaca Hatthikasa. A seal from Basar in Muzaffarpur district, Bihar, bears in Brāhmī script the legend, Amātya Bhadrika-putrasya Amātya Hastabala, ‘a seal of Amātya Hastabala, son of Amātya Bhadrika’. A seal from Bhita bears the legend, Amātya Nāgadāma in characters of the second or third century A.D. A seal from Sirkap contains the legend, Sihasa(madri)na-putasa Virabāhusa, ‘a seal of Virabāhu, son of Mantrin Simha’. As one studies critically the above seals, mentioning Amātyas, one finds with dismay the dearth of information about the nature and importance of the work they discharged in these records. The seals guaranteed in the names of these persons the genuineness of some documents which must have carried royal orders, contracts between parties or their own instructions. This may indicate that they were either heads of departments or placed in charge of territorial units. That the Amātyas were generally connected with the administration of territorial units is confirmed by the Junagadh rock inscription of Rudradāman which speaks of the Amātyas Kulaipa and Suviśākha as governors of provinces under the Mahākṣatrapa. An interesting glimpse into the qualities of head and heart of the Amātyas is also provided by the Junagadh inscription which describes Suviśākha as being endowed with ability, patience, resoluteness, uprightness, incor-