

now considering arrived at the familiar doctrine of the two powers, not as in the Dharmasūtras by making these the source of the other classes, but by adopting the plea of Divine ordination. As regards the mutual relations of these powers, we may first mention the view attributed by Bhīṣma to the sage Kaśyapa. Where the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya quarrel with each other, says the sage, the kingdom perishes. He concludes by saying that the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya powers are constantly joined together for mutual support. "The Kṣatriya power is the source of the Brāhmaṇa, and the Brāhmaṇas are the source of the Kṣatriya power. When these two powers constantly help each other, they attain high prosperity; but if their primeval alliance is broken, everything is plunged into confusion."* In this passage it will be observed, not only are the interests of the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya held to be interdependent, but their origin is said, however illogically, to be inter-connected.

The view stated above, namely that relating to the interdependence of the two powers, represents one aspect of the Arthaśāstra thought. We may approach the other aspect through some remarkable pretensions which the priestly pride of the authors led them to advance on behalf of the Brāhmaṇas. In the first of the three verses quoted above from the address of the Wind-god, it will be noticed that the Brāhmaṇa's lordship is made to vest in him by birth-right. The contrast between this verse and the following one which charges the Kṣatriya with the

* Śāntiparvan LXXIII 8, 11, 12.

divinely ordained duty of protection is significant. In the following lines the Brāhmaṇa's pretension is pushed further so as to involve his ownership of all things, the king's sovereignty not excluded. There the Wind-god states, "Whatever exists in the world is the property of the Brāhmaṇa on account of the excellence of his origin—this is declared by those that are versed in the Sacred Law. The Brāhmaṇa eats but his own food, wears but his own apparel, bestows but his own in alms, for the Brāhmaṇa is the chief of all castes and the greatest and the best. As a woman in the absence of her husband accepts the hand of his younger brother, so this earth makes the king her lord after the Brāhmaṇa." * As the first two verses of this extract are nearly identical with Manusamhitā (I 100-101), we have a corroborative evidence of their antiquity. In a similar manner the reference to the custom of 'niyoga' in the third verse stamps it as belonging to the early times. According to the above view, then, the Brāhmaṇa is the universal owner, and the king rules by his sufferance. The spirit of priestly arrogance which breathes through the above manifests itself in another series of verses attributing divinity to the Brāhmaṇa irrespectively of his merits. "A Brāhmaṇa," says Manu in one place, "be he ignorant or learned, is a great divinity, just as the fire, whether carried forth (for the performance of a burnt-oblation) or not carried forth, is a great divinity." And again, "Thus, though Brāhmaṇas employ themselves in all (sorts of) mean occupations, they must

* Ibid LXXII 9.2.

be honoured in every way ; for (each of) them is a very great deity." * As these verses occur with very slight changes in the Anuśāsanaparvan CLI 21-23, they are evidently derived in both cases from an earlier and common source. It is in relation to these extraordinary pretensions laid down by our present authors that we have to consider their final view of the mutual relations of the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya. In two verses which are practically common to the Manusamhitā and the Mahābhārata we read, "When the Kṣatriyas become in any way overbearing towards the Brāhmaṇas, the Brāhmaṇas themselves shall duly restrain them ; for the Kṣatriyas sprang from the Brāhmaṇas. Fire sprang from water, Kṣatriyas from Brāhmaṇas, iron from stone, the all-penetrating force of those (three) has no effect on that whence they were produced." † In this passage, it will be observed, not only does the author revert to the extreme view of the Brāhmaṇa texts, but he connects therewith the Brāhmaṇa's right of punishing the king for misconduct.

Let us conclude this section with a general account of the leading tendencies of the early Arthaśāstra thought, and its place in the history of Hindu political theory. The number and variety of these authors have, it is hoped, been sufficiently demonstrated in the course of the foregoing pages. Nevertheless it is possible, we think, to discover some uniform characteristics transcending this undeniable diversity. It thus appears that these authors, much as they were

* Manu IX 317, 319, S.B.E., Vol. XXV. pp. 398-399.

† Manu IX 320-321, S.B.E. Vol. XXV, p. 399. Cf. Sānti-parvan LXXVIII 21-22.

restricted by the strict definition of their science to the domain of practical politics alone, contrived to incorporate a mass of abstract speculations in their teaching. In judging the attributes of the early Arthaśāstra thought, we cannot but mention, at the very start, its striking originality. Not to speak of its categories, the Arthaśāstra in some of its branches such as those dealing with the administrative organisation and statecraft, virtually broke new ground. Nor must we omit to mention the new light that the authors who are quoted in the Śāntiparvan threw upon questions which were debated by the contemporary canonical writers, the questions, for example, relating to the nature of the king's office and the Brāhmaṇa's position in the society and in the State. Originality in respect of political ideas however, is a quality shared by the Arthaśāstra with the Dharmasūtras as well as the Buddhist canon. The distinctive merit of the Arthaśāstra, it seems to us, is to be sought in its fearless freedom of thought. We thus find, in the list of these secular teachers and schools, those that did not hesitate to exclude the Vedas from the category of sciences on the ground of their uselessness in practical life, and those who set up the gospel of naked self-interest of the king or even of the individual minister as the grand canon of statecraft.* With this boldness of speculation is allied a spirit of boundless enthusiasm which makes

* It is instructive to consider in this connection a remarkable dictum attributed to Brihaspati by Bhīṣma in Chapter OXLII verse 17 of the Śāntiparvan. This is to the effect that the rules of duty should be understood neither by means of the sacred text alone, nor by reason alone.

the teaching of the authors quoted by Kautilya vibrate with the animation of personal rivalry even at this distance of time. While such may be held to be the merits of the Arthaśāstra, the candid critic must not ignore its blemishes and defects. The authors cited by Kautilya often betray some degree of want of balance* or else of stiffness and formalism of thought.† These authors, in short, had many of the defects of youth and inexperience. Yet even this was not without some compensating advantages. There had not, so far as we can judge, yet appeared on the scene a commanding personality whose voice might hush the rest into silence and impose a common standard upon the whole science. Hence the writers of this period were free to indulge their convictions or even idiosyncracies without let or hindrance. Thus they bear in most cases the stamp of a richly diversified individuality, such as is rare in the subsequent periods of our history.

What, then, are the services rendered by the early Arthaśāstra to the cause of Hindu political ideas? We think that the Arthaśāstra represents the grand formative stage in the evolution of these ideas. To the authors of the Arthaśāstra works belongs the credit of emancipating politics from the tutelage of theology and raising it to the dignity of an independ-

* Cf., e.g., the views of the schools of Mañu Brihaspati and Śukra regarding the classification of the sciences, and that of the 'masters' about the rule of punishment. *Supra*, pp. 79-80, 106.

† Vide the mechanical rules laid down by the above three schools for the selection of the council of ministers (*Kauṭ.* p. 29), and the punishment of criminals (*Ibid.* p. 192).

dent science. ✓ They made political speculation occupy itself, for the first time so far as we are aware, with the phenomena of abnormal States as well as the normal monarchic State. The criterion which they applied to their rules of public policy was, as we have seen, the interest of the king and in one case even that of the individual minister. This led them often to sacrifice the cherished principles of morality with an almost callous indifference. All these ideas and notions were bequeathed by the authors to the later times and built up, as we hope to show presently, first by Kauṭilya and afterwards by the Brāhminical canonists into a system.*

—:O:—

Note on the 'Brihaspatisūtras' :—We have endeavoured to describe in the above pages what we conceive to be the leading political ideas of the early schools and teachers of the Arthaśāstra, in so far as these have been preserved for us by the citations of Kauṭilya and of the Brāhmaṇa canonists. While on this subject, we may consider a short collection of aphorisms on nīti (general morality) that is attributed to Brihaspati and purports to embody the sage's address to Indra, the king of the gods. The 'Brihaspatisūtras', as this work is called, has been edited with an accompanying English translation by Dr. F. W. Thomas in *Le Museon*, 1916. In its existing form it undoubtedly belongs to a somewhat later period—its learned editor brings down its date 'at least to the twelfth century A.D., on the strength of an apparent allusion to the Yādavas of Deogiri in the sūtra III 105. Nevertheless, as the same authority remarks, "The tone and style and even the disjointed and miscellaneous character of the work produce a sense of antiquity: it is hard

It is worthy of remark that the early Arthaśāstra was nurtured in a country of small states, not in a unified empire. As in Ancient Greece and in Mediaeval Italy, a system of small States became in Ancient India the nursery of original ideas.

to conceive of such a work being deliberately compiled by persons acquainted with the Nitisāra of Kāmandaki and the Śukranīti." On the other hand, there is little reason to doubt that the 'Brihaspatisūtras' does not represent the lost Arthasāstra work of the school which is so often quoted and criticised by Kauṭilya. As the editor has rightly pointed out, it does not contain the matter indicated by the citations of Kauṭilya: on one point, indeed, namely that relating to the number of the sciences, ~~we differ~~, as we shall presently observe, from the view attributed by Kauṭilya to the school of Brihaspati. Furthermore, while the latter school, as we learn from Kauṭilya's quotations, treated the branches of civil law and warfare as well as public administration, the author with whom we are now concerned confines himself to the subject of general morality, of which public policy is conceived to be a branch.

Turning to the political ideas of our author, it will, we think, be enough to mention two examples to illustrate their nature. Daṇḍanīti, he says at the beginning of his book (I 3),¹ is the only science (viçyā). Elsewhere (III 75-78) he observes that Daṇḍanīti should be studied by the people of India (Bhāratas) past present and future, as well as by the four castes. By virtue of Daṇḍanīti, he goes on, the holy Sun is king, and Wind and all the gods, and all creatures. The main idea embodied in the latter passage is, we think, that Daṇḍanīti is the basis of authority and the security of universal existence—a conception which might be properly matched with the description of the function of punishment (daṇḍa) that occurs in the early Arthasāstra. The former passage, by excluding all sciences other than Daṇḍanīti, would seem to bring the author into line with the extreme school of Śukra of which we have spoken in the early part of this section.

The rules of statecraft laid down by the author reflect at least in one place the genuine spirit of the Arthasāstra, in as much as these involve the subordination of morality to expediency. He writes (I 4-5), "Even right he (viz. the king) should not practise when disapproved by the world. Should he practise it, it should be after recommending it by persons of intelligence." (Dr. Thomas's translation).

III.

We have endeavoured in the early part of this chapter to describe the two groups of political ideas that derived their origin from as many independent fountain-heads. ✓ These ideas, as we have seen, are associated, in the case of the Dharmasūtras with the first ordered presentation of the sum of the king's duties, and in that of the Arthaśāstra with the first systematic exposition of the rules of public administration in a monarchic State. The Buddhist canonical works with which we are concerned in the present place, mostly came into being at a somewhat later period than either of the above, and they deal incidentally with a markedly limited range of topics of the State such as principally, the origin of the king's office and the conditions of success in republics. ✓ And yet the Buddhist thinkers open, we think, new vistas of thought which justly entitle them to rank with the authors of the Dharmasūtras and the Arthaśāstra as the makers of Hindu political theory.

The view of the origin of kingship in the Buddhist canon is beyond doubt one of its most notable contributions to Hindu political thought. In saying this we are not unmindful of the remarkable anticipations of this theory in some of the Brāhmaṇa texts. But while the Vedic author sets forth what he conceives to be the source of the divine sovereignty of Indra, the Buddhist canonist attempts in the following passages to trace the origin of the human kingship, for the first time so far as we are aware, to its roots in a hypothetical State of Nature. The Buddhist

author moreover introduces, apparently for the first time, the notion of an original compact as forming the foundation of the political order. In its fuller form, as an incident, that is, in the evolution of man and of society, the theory occurs in a well-known passage of the Dighanikāya. There the Brāhmaṇa Vaseṭṭha (Vasiṣṭha), is introduced as asking Buddha whether the Brāhmaṇa's claim of precedence over the other classes was justified or not. In refuting this claim, the Master traces the history of creation since the end of the period of dissolution of the world. At first the people were altogether perfect—having no corporeal body, living in satisfaction, resplendent, capable of traversing the air, and long-living. As they declined more and more from their original state of purity, there gradually appeared among them the differences of colour and of sex, while the institutions of family and property, punishment and the division of the four classes, were introduced into their midst by a series of mutual agreements. The origin of kingship is described in this connection in the following way. When it was found that theft had appeared in the society, the people assembled together, and agreed to choose as king one who would punish those deserving punishment, blame those deserving blame, banish those deserving banishment and in return would get a share of paddy from the people. Then they selected the most beautiful gracious and powerful individual among themselves and made a contract with him on the above terms. He was called Great Elect (Mahāsammata) for being chosen by a great multitude of men (mahājana-sammata), Kṣatriya as he was

lord of the fields (khattānam pati), and king (rājan) as he delighted (rañjēti) the others in accordance with the law.*) A shorter version of the above theory, which concerns itself exclusively with the origin of monarchy and treats even this somewhat perfunctorily, since it does not mention the original state of nature at all, may be found in a passage of the Sanskrit Buddhist canonical work, the Mahāvastu Avadānam. There the Buddha is represented as recounting to the assembled monks the story of the origin of kingship. The creatures, so runs the story in substance, assembled together and agreed among themselves to choose one that was the most gracious and mighty of them all, for the purpose that the latter might punish those deserving punishment and cherish those deserving to be cherished. Then the creatures fixed their choice upon an individual of the above type and induced him, in return for their own payment of one-sixth of the produce of the paddy fields, to undertake the task of punishing the wicked and favouring the good. This person was called Mahāsammata, as he was chosen by a large mass of people (mahājana-sammata).†

Such is the famous theory of the origin of kingship framed by the Buddhist canonists, which for its striking analogy to the Western theories of Social Contract has sometimes been called by the same designation.‡ We shall examine in a later chapter

* Aggañña—suttanta, Dīgha Nikāya, Vol. 3, section 27, P. T. S. edition.

† Mahāvastu, Serapart's edition, Vol. I, pp. 347-348.

‡ Cf. D. R. Bhandarkar, op. cit., p. 119 ff.

how far the title is justified. Meanwhile we shall try to analyse the component elements of the above theory, our remarks being mainly confined to its fuller version alone. ✓The Buddhist theory, it will appear from the above, starts with the conception of a mythical perfect age when men were not subject to the ills of the flesh and the frailties of human nature. This was followed by a period of growing degeneracy and accumulating evil which in the canonical story furnished the occasion for the creation of organised society. Thus the Buddhist state of nature, as it might be called, has its basis in mythology: it purports to be a historical fact and is certainly not a mere philosophical concept. From this condition the transition was effected to the next, according to the author, by a series of agreements involving the creation of kingship as well as of the institutions of family and property. Thus (the Buddhist theory seems to involve two sets of contracts which, translated into the language of Western political philosophy, would be called the Social and the Governmental contracts respectively. With the first which implies the creation of an organised society we have no concern. The second, resulting in the creation of the State, implies two contracting parties, namely on the one hand the people, and on the other the king whose very title indicates his elective origin. The terms of the contract, lastly, involve merely the exchange of the just exercise of the sovereign power on the king's part for the payment of the specified taxes by the people.) The contract, in other words, gives a historical basis in the past to that view of the relation of taxation

to protection which we have found to occur in one of the Dharmasūtras and which, we think, is one of the root ideas of Hindu political philosophy. ✓

Great as is the interest attaching to the Buddhist theory of the origin of kingship, (it unfortunately does not stand correlated to any system of rights and duties on the part of the king and his subjects. In his insistence upon contract as the foundation of the political order and above all in the terms of the contract itself, the Buddhist canonist had evidently discovered a weapon which might be used to justify almost any degree of popular control over the king, and in particular to counter the contemporary doctrines of the respect and obedience of the subjects. Nevertheless, as will appear from the above, no single claim is advanced on behalf of the people in the above passages, the first of which mentions the theory as it were incidentally in an attempt to refute the Brāhmanas' claim of social precedence. Nor, so far as we are aware, was the hidden significance of the theory brought out in any other work except apparently in a passage of the Chatuhśatikā to which we shall return in a later chapter.* Thus the Buddhist theory of contract virtually exists as an isolated phenomenon in the history of Hindu political thought.

We may next consider two other passages of the Buddhist canon which are chiefly important as bringing, for the first time, so far as we are aware, a new type of constitution within the ken of Hindu political theory. The theories of the State with which we have been occupied so long are, it will be

* Chapter IV, section 2, *infra*.

seen from the above, the theories of the monarchic State. The two passages, however, which we propose to take up here deal with the phenomena of republics, since they give identical lists of seven conditions that are thought to be necessary for ensuring the prosperity of one of the most famous republican communities of Ancient India, namely the Lichchhavi-Vajjis. They are thus summarised by Mr. Ramaprasad Chanda. "In a short dialogue of the Anguttara Nikāya [VII 19] we are told, when Buddha was staying at Sārāṇḍada-cetiya (caitya) at Vaisali, a very large party of the Lichchhavis came to him. Buddha explained to them the seven conditions of welfare (satta aparihāniye dhamme). These are (1) holding meetings of the clan regularly, (2) concord, (3) observance of the time-honoured customs and usages, (4) obedience to the elders, (5) abstinence from detaining by force or kidnapping women and maidens of the clan. The two other conditions relate to the religious practices and may be translated in full: (6) so long as the Lichchhavi-Vajjis honour and esteem and revere and support the Vajjian chetiyas in the city or outside it and allow not proper offerings and rites as formerly given and performed to fall into desuetude, so long may the Lichchhavi-Vajjis be expected not to decline but to prosper, (7) so long as the rightful protection defence and support shall be provided for the Arahants of the Lichchhavi-Vajjis, so that Arahants from a distance may enter the realm and the Arahants therein may live at ease, so long may etc. In the Mahāparinibbānasuttanta of the Dīgha Nikāya Buddha is made to repeat the seven conditions of

welfare of the Vajjis when addressing Vassakāra the Brāhmaṇa, the prime minister of king Ajātaśatru of Magadha.”* Two important points at once suggest themselves in this most interesting analysis. It is, in the first place, intensely practical in form as well as in substance: it deals with the case of a specific republican community and it gives but a bare list of what the author conceives to be the conditions necessary for ensuring the success of the community. On the other hand, the author is completely silent about the inherent tendencies and characteristics of the republics, which doubtless furnish the basis of his practical precepts. In the second place, the above extracts involve a moralist’s analysis of republican conditions, not that of a political philosopher strictly so called, for in the list of qualifications mentioned therein are included not only the qualities of public spirit, harmony, and conformity to the established usages, but also those of obedience to the elders, protection of women, performance of religious rites, and honour to the saints.

* *Calcutta University Journal of the Department of Letters*, Vol. IV, p. 34.

CHAPTER III.

THE ARTHAŚĀSTRA OF KAUTILYA AND THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SCIENCE.

Kauṭilya's work involves a virtual reconstruction of the Arthaśāstra, but confines itself exclusively to the Art of Government and kindred topics—Theories of Professors H. Jacobi and D. R. Bhandarkar considered—Kauṭilya's rehabilitation of the four traditional sciences is based upon a just appreciation of the ends and purposes of each science in relation to the needs of human existence—His view of the end of Politics (Arthaśāstra), and the extent of its application—Doctrine of the king's headship of the seven constituent elements of sovereignty (prakritis)—Kauṭilya's theory of kingship combines in furtherance of the principle of authority the idea of the king's divine nature and the theory of his elective origin—G. B. Bottazzi's view considered—Kauṭilya on the preservation of dominion—His rules on the acquisition of dominion—His attitude towards morality and religion—Kauṭilya and Machiavelli—Kauṭilya's influence upon the subsequent development of political theory.

In the course of our survey of Hindu political ideas in the preceding period, we have endeavoured to describe the surviving fragments of the lost literature of Arthaśāstra. The great work which shall occupy our attention in this chapter belongs, as its title indicates, to the same branch of literature as these forgotten treatises. But it is conspicuously

distinguished from the rest from the point of view of its general plan and purpose. In the very opening lines the author seems to strike his distinctive note, for he says, "This single Arthaśāstra (work) has been prepared mostly by summarising whatever Arthaśāstra (treatises) were prepared by the early masters regarding the acquisition and the preservation of dominion." The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya thus announces itself as an abstract of the earlier literature on the subject. It might appear from the above that Kauṭilya drew the diversified and often conflicting views of his predecessors into a common synthesis. This description, we think, corresponds at the best to one aspect of this author's performance. The other and the more important aspect is hinted at in the concluding verse which states, "This manual (śāstram) has been written by the person who quickly and angrily rescued (uddhriṭāni) at once the science (śāstram), the Art of War, and the earth that had passed to the Nanda king." * In so far as the obvious reference to the science of Arthaśāstra in the above passage is concerned, we may perhaps explain it in some such manner as the following. In Kauṭilya's time the literature of Arthaśāstra had grown to be a tangled maze of divergent views. This condition of the science provoked the indignation of Kauṭilya, an intensely practical teacher if ever there was one, and he undertook at once to sweep away those doubts and difficulties that clogged its progress.

* Kauṭ. p. 431, Prof. Jacobi's translation, quoted, *Indian Antiquary*, 1918, p. 193. Throughout this work the references to Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra are to the revised edition of Dr. R. Shamasastry (Mysore, 1919).

If our explanation is correct, it follows that the treatise of Kauṭilya involved some degree of overhauling of the science. This interpretation, we think, is supported by the internal evidence. For we find the author frequently contesting the views of the early schools and teachers whom he quotes, and offering his own solutions of the points at issue—solutions bearing invariably the mark of his superior political insight and practical wisdom.

Thus the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya is much more than a summary of the earlier literature on the subject: it involves, in the form of a closer analysis of the earlier ideas and notions, a virtual reconstruction of the science. We may Kāmandaka, himself an enthusiastic disciple of Kauṭilya, acclaim his master as the maker of a new science.* But much as Kauṭilya stands high above his fellows, there is one respect, we think, in which he fails. The most obvious attribute of his genius which stamps itself almost upon every page of his work is its intensely practical nature. The same bent of mind which apparently made the author impatient of the conflicting views of the older Arthaśāstra manifested itself in a studied neglect of abstract speculation. Thus Kauṭilya's work strictly corresponds to the definition of Arthaśāstra—it deals not with the theory of the State, but with the Art of Government and kindred topics.†

* Kāmandaka (I 6) applies the term *vedhas* (creator) to Kauṭilya,—a term justified by the commentator on the ground that Kauṭilya created a new science (*prithakśāstrapraṇayanāt*).

† The above view of Kauṭilya's place in relation to the early Arthaśāstra is at variance with two theories that have

The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya opens with a remarkable rehabilitation of the four traditional branches

been advanced on the point in recent times. The crux of the problem lies in this case in the meaning of the word 'uddhri-tāni' with reference to its application to the science of Arthaśāstra in the concluding verse of Kauṭilya which has been quoted above. Prof. Jacobi (loc. cit.) explains the term in the sense of 'reformed,' and he describes the purport to be that Kauṭilya contemptuously brushed aside the dogmatic views of his *doctrinaire* predecessors. This explanation is evidently a forced one, and we agree with Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar (op. cit., p. 109, footnote 1) in rejecting it. Judging indeed from the meagre extracts cited by Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka, the views of the early teachers of the Arthaśāstra may often appear to be crude and one-sided, but they cannot, we think, be justly charged with being unpractical.

The second theory bearing on the above point is that of Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, who explains (op. cit. pp. 108-109) the concluding verse of Kauṭilya to mean that the Arthaśāstra was falling into desuetude in that author's time and was rescued from oblivion by him. We are not quite sure whether this interpretation conveys the true meaning of the author. It fails, we think, to account for the word 'amarṣeṇa' in the text, since it is inconceivable that the mere neglect of the science by his contemporaries roused Kauṭilya's indignation. It may further be observed that apart from the doubtful testimony of the above verse, Dr. Bhandarkar adduces no evidence in support of his contention. While the case for Kauṭilya's recovery of the Arthaśāstra from oblivion thus seems to rest on very slender foundations, the theory of his partial reconstruction of the science can, it seems to us, be supported on valid grounds. For besides the internal evidence which we have mentioned above, there is the testimony of literary tradition in our favour. An anonymous verse tagged on to the end of Kauṭilya's work runs as follows: "Observing the discrepancies in many ways among the commentators of the science (śāstra), Viṣṇugupta (Kauṭilya) himself composed the Aphorism (Sūtra) and its commentary." Whatever might be the degree of weight attaching to this verse, it at any rate points to the confused condition of the Arthaśāstra in Kauṭilya's time and mentions that author's effort to end this confusion. Another point that may be mentioned in this connection is that Kāmandaka who was

of knowledge (vidyās). As we have seen elsewhere, the three preceding schools of Manu Brihaspati and Śukra limited the number of these sciences to three, two, and one, respectively.* Kauṭilya, while yielding to none of these in his love of realism, emphatically rejects their views †, and he justifies the traditional list of sciences by pointing out the ends and purposes of each in relation to the needs of human existence.‡ Beginning with philosophy (ānvīkṣakī), he writes, "Philosophy viewing the other sciences in the light of reason does good to the world, keeps the mind steady in weal and woe, and bestows skill in knowledge, speech and action. Philosophy is ever declared to be the lamp of all the sciences, the means of accomplishing all deeds and the support of all duties." The triple Veda, he goes on, is useful (aupakārikah) because it establishes the four classes (varṇas) and the four orders (āśramas) in their respective duties: the fulfilment of these duties, Kauṭilya adds, leads to heaven and

doubtless in a position to know the nature of Kauṭilya's services describes (I 6) his master as having extracted the nectar of nītiśāstra out of the ocean of Arthaśāstra. This remarkable description, we think, can be justified not on the assumption of Kauṭilya's rescue of the science from oblivion, but only on the basis of his reconstruction of the same upon the old foundations.

* Supra, pp. 79-80.

† Cf. Kauṭ. p. 6: chatasra eva vidyā iti Kauṭilyah.

‡ Cf. Kāmandaka (III 6) who, after quoting the above view of Kauṭilya as to the number of the sciences, observes that the people depend upon the four sciences for attaining different kinds of results. In this as in other cases, Kāmandaka's text may be safely used as a kind of running commentary upon that of Kauṭilya.

salvation, while their violation brings about intermixture of the castes and consequent destruction. Vārttā, in its turn, is useful (aupakārikī) because it confers grain, cattle, gold, base metals and forced labour, and because by its means one is able to bring under his control through the instrumentality of the treasury and the army his own and his enemy's partizans.* Lastly, punishment (daṇḍa) which is the subject-matter of Daṇḍanīti, Kauṭilya states, promotes the security and the prosperity of the three other sciences, and in fact is their root.†

In the above it will be observed, a place is found for each of the four traditional sciences. Philosophy, instead of being merged, as by the school of Maṇu, in the triple Veda, is lifted to the position of the foremost science, and declared to be the guide philosopher and friend of men. The triple Veda, instead of being looked upon, as it was by the school of Brihaspati, as a superfluity from the point of view of material existence, is observed to embody the essential duties of the castes and the orders. Vārttā, instead of being ruled out from the list of sciences as was done by the school of Śukra, is discovered

* Kāmandaka expresses the idea more emphatically by saying in the corresponding passage (III 14) that vārttā is life.

† Kāṇḍ. pp. 9-10. In translating the above extract we have adopted the version of Mr. Ramaprasad Chanda (*Indo-Aryan Races*, p. 228), which commences with the words '(Philosophy) viewing the other sciences in the light of reason.' He rightly rejects Dr. R. Shamaśāstry's translation of the above passage ('when seen in the light of reason, the science of ānvīkṣakī' etc.) on the ground of its inconsistency with the following verse in which ānvīkṣakī is said to be the lamp of all the sciences.

to be the means of ensuring livelihood and supplying the sinews of the State's existence. On the other hand, Daṇḍanīti is held through punishment which is its essence to be the ultimate condition of the functioning of the other sciences.*

We are thus able to form some idea of the high function assigned by Kauṭilya to what may be called the science of politics. An equally advanced idea relating to the end of the science is conveyed by the author in two of his concluding verses, where he declares Arthaśāstra to be the means of acquiring and preserving both this and the next world, and states that it promotes and secures the threefold end of life (namely, virtue, wealth

* Kāmandaka expresses the last idea in the following way. "Philosophy, the triple Veda and Vārtā are called the manifest sciences, but if Daṇḍanīti were to be disturbed they would be evil, even if they could exist" (Ibid III 8).

A word may be added here as to the meaning of the term ānvīkṣiki which is grammatically more regular than Kauṭilya's ānvīkṣaki. Kauṭilya defines the term to consist of Sāmkhya, Yoga, and Materialism (Lokāyata). Later writers, however, use it in a more restricted sense. Vātsyāyana (commentary on Gautama's Nyāyasūtras (I 1, 1) takes ānvīkṣiki and nyāyavidyā or nyāyāśāstra to be synonymous terms. Medhātithi and Sarvajñanārāyaṇa commenting on Manusamhitā VII 43 interprets the expression 'ānvīkṣikim chātmaavidyām' as the science of dialectics which gives self-knowledge (cf. S. B. E., Vol. XXV, Introduction, p. xxxvii). Kāmandaka (III 11) renders ānvīkṣiki as 'ātmaavidyā' which means, according to the commentator, the science of the nature of categories, i.e. the science of dialectics. The author of the Śukranīti declares (I 153) ānvīkṣiki to involve the science of Logic like the Vedānta and the rest. It has been justly remarked by a recent writer that Kauṭilya's description of the characteristics of ānvīkṣaki better suits the nyāya philosophy than the Sāmkhya and the Yoga as we have them (vide Ramaprasad Chanda, op. cit., p. 229).

and desire), and destroys what is opposed to these. Politics, as thus conceived, is the source of fulfilment of almost the whole life of the individual. We are however bound to state in this place that there are grave doubts as to the degree to which the conception of politics as above described had a practical application in Kautilya's system. The passage bearing on this point which has been just quoted is evidently put in at the end to magnify the importance of the science. Further, and above all, the rules of policy laid down by the author are, as we hope to show presently, dominated by the idea that the State is virtually an end in itself.

Kautilya's theories relating to the category of the seven elements of sovereignty follow on the whole the lines laid down by his predecessors. Thus he arranges the 'calamities' of these elements in a graded scale, reverting to the order of an unnamed authority whom he quotes. * Kautilya, however, applies in one place † the phrase limb-like (*pratyaṅgabhūtaḥ*) to the seven elements indicating, we think, in however rudimentary a form, the conception of organic unity of the factors of government.

The theories of kingship in Kautilya occur characteristically enough as an incident in the discussion of concrete problems of statecraft. Thus in the first place, he cites in one passage a discussion of the earlier authors relating to the comparative

* Pp. 322-324. In the same connexion, it may be noted, Kautilya (p. 324) contemplates the possibility of the 'calamities' of one or two elements being counteracted by the 'healthy' elements.

† P. 259.

seriousness of the 'calamities' befalling the factors of government (prakritis). Rejecting the view of Bhāradvāja, he states in this passage that the king's 'calamity' is more serious than that of the minister (amātya). The king alone, he argues, appoints the ministers, the domestic priest and the servants; he employs the superintendents; he applies remedies against troubles; as is his conduct, so is that of the other factors of government (prakritis): the king stands at the head of these factors (tatkūṭasthāniyo hi svāmī).* In this important passage is evidently involved the doctrine of the king's headship of the elements of sovereignty.† This view reaches its climax in a later passage of the Arthaśāstra, where Kauṭilya sums up the constituent elements of government (prakritis) by declaring that the king is the government (raja rajyamiti prakritisamkṣepah).‡ Government, then, while involving the seven constituent factors, is according to this view, ultimately resolvable into one element, namely the king, that absorbs all the rest.

From this view of the king's relations with the other factors of sovereignty, let us turn to the broader theory of his relations with his subjects. It is characteristic of the intensely practical nature of the author that for the most part one looks in vain for such a theory in his work. Nevertheless there is at least one remarkable passage which, however, much

* Kauṭ. p. 322.

† Other illustrations of this view may be cited. Kauṭilya (p. 259) declares that the self-controlled king can make even the imperfect elements of sovereignty whole, while the king who is not self-controlled destroys even the progressive and loyal elements of sovereignty.

‡ Kauṭ. p. 325.

it might be pointed to the practical end of ensuring the internal security of the State, embodies a view of the source and nature of the king's authority. Even this, it seems to us, represents what may be called the current theory of the times rather than an original contribution of Kauṭilya's genius. For it is addressed, as it is hoped to show presently, to the man in the street, as it were.* In the chapter in which the above passage occurs Kauṭilya describes the measures that the king should adopt for winning over the friendly as well as the hostile factions within his kingdom. In the course of this description he states that a specific class of spies called the satrins should divide themselves into contending parties and carry on disputations in places of pilgrimage, in assemblies, in residences, in corporate bodies and amid congregations of people. One spy should speak, "This kingly class is heard to be endowed with all qualities, but no quality of it is seen which causes the folk in country and town to be burdened with fines and punishments." Another spy should contradict the first and those who concur with the latter by speaking in the following way. People overcome by anarchy (*mātsyanyāyābhibhūtāh*) selected Manu, the son of the Sun, as their king and they fixed one-sixth of the grain, one-tenth of the merchandise as well as gold, to be the king's due (*bhāga-dheya*). Supported by this, the kings become capable of

* An analogous case is presented by a passage of Kauṭilya (p. 367) where he asks the king engaged in a fair fight to address his troops on the eve of battle with the words, "I am a paid servant like yourselves." This shows in our view that the idea of the king being an official was very much 'in the air' in Kauṭilya's time.

promoting the security and prosperity of their subjects, so that they take away the sins of the latter in the event of their failure to inflict just punishments and levy just taxes. Kings in fact promote the security and prosperity of their subjects. Hence even the hermits living in the forest offer the king one-sixth of the grain gleaned by them, stating that it is a tax payable to the person who protects them. The kings who are the visible dispensers of slights and favours occupy the position of the gods Indra and Yama. He who slights them is afflicted with divine punishment. Therefore the kings should not be slighted. Thus the lowly persons should be contradicted.* This extract, we think, is an important landmark in the evolution of the Hindu theories of

* Ibid pp. 22-23. In the above extract the portion relating to the address of the first spy is translated by Dr. Shamastry as follows :—“ This king is said to be endowed with all desirable qualities ; he seems to be a stranger to such tendencies as would lead him to oppress citizens and country people by levying heavy fines and taxes.” We hold this version to be hardly satisfactory. ‘Ayam rāja,’ we think, should be interpreted as ‘ayam rājapadavāchyo janah’ and translated as ‘this class of kings,’ otherwise the following lines which evidently are of the nature of a contradiction (pratishedhana) would be pointless. We are also of opinion that in the words ‘yah piḍayati,’ ‘yah’ stands not for ‘ayam,’ this class of kings, but for ‘guṇah’ quality, and that the verb ‘piḍayati’ is used in a causative sense.

In the latter part of the foregoing extract the term ‘bhāgadheya’ is translated by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar (op. cit. p. 119) as share. We think that the term as here used is the technical designation of a specific kind of taxes, such as the sixth part of the agricultural produce. Cf. the following quotation from an unknown Arthasāstra in Kṣīrasvāmin’s commentary on the Amarakoṣa II 8. 27 : *rajaḡrāhyah ṣaḍbhāgādih bhāgah pratyekam sthāvarajaṅgamādādeyah karah niyojyopajīvyo balih.*

kingship. Kauṭilya here evidently starts with the idea of justifying the king's authority,—the idea, that inspired in part the theories of kingship in the canonical Dharmasūtras and the secular Arthaśāstra. For the whole point of his story consists in its answering the apparent anomaly involved in the statement of the first spy quoted above, namely that the kingly class is heard to be endowed with all good qualities, but no quality of it is seen which causes the people in country and town to be burdened with fines and punishments. With the above object, then, Kauṭilya invokes the doctrine of the king's divine nature, interpreting it like the earlier writers in the sense that the dignity pertains to the king's office. From this follows, as in the earlier examples, the corollary that the subjects are bound to abstain from slighting the king—an obligation which, as before, is sought to be supported by spiritual sanctions. Along with this familiar notion of the king's divinity is conjoined in the above extract in a kind of incongruous union a remarkable and, as it seems to us, original application of the theory of elective origin of the king. This virtually involves a Brāhmanised adaptation of the Buddhist theory of contract. Like the latter it starts with the conception of an original state of nature. While the canonist, however, conceives it to be initially a perfect state, the secular writer considers it to be wholly evil from the first*.

* Mātsyanyāya which is mentioned in the above and in another (Kaut. p. 9) extract as the technical designation of the evil state of nature preceding the creation of kingship is, we think, as here used, a new importation into the vocabulary of Hindu political thought. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar (op. cit., pp. 116, 119) translates it as the proverb (or the practice) of

This anarchical condition forms in Kautilya, as in the Buddhist theory, the immediate prelude to the creation of kingship by popular election. While however this involves in the latter case the formulation of an express contract, in Kautilya the contract is tacit and has to be understood from the manner of the king's selection. We may note in passing that the designation of the first king in the Kautilyan theory is the surest index of its distinctly Brahminical character, since this is held to be no other than Manu, the son of the Sun, the individual so well known in the Brahminical mythology as the progenitor of the present race of human beings. The last point that has to be mentioned in this connection is that while the Buddhist author is wholly silent about the implications of his theory as fixing the respective rights and duties of the king and his subjects, Kautilya suffers from no such omissions. Yet Kautilya, while committed to the view of justifying the king's authority, brings out with great clearness the principle involved in one of the Dharmasūtra texts,* namely that the king is an official receiving the revenue as his

the greater fish swallowing the smaller—an interpretation that conveys the literal meaning of the term in question. In its figurative sense it refers to the anarchic condition in which Might counts for Right. We quote the following extracts to throw light upon the meaning of the term: *yathā prabalā matsyāḥ nirbalānṣṭān nāśayanti tatha arājake amukadeśe prabalā janāḥ nirbalān janān nāśayanti nyāyārthah* (Raghunāthavarman, quoted, Col. G. A. Jacob, *Laukika—nyāyāñjali*, Part II pp. 57-58); *atra balavantah durbalān hinsyuriti mātsyanyāya eva syādityuktam* (Kulluka's commentary on *Manusamhitā* VII 20); *mātsyo nyāyah balavatā yadabalagrasanam* (Śaṅkarāryya's commentary on *Kāmandaka* V 40).

* *Supra*, p. 65.

fee for the service of protection, and he carries the idea to the point that the king is spiritually responsible for the faithful discharge of his functions. It is the necessary condition of this relation consisting in the payment of the stipulated taxes by the people, which Kautilya boldly forges in the above passage into a weapon in support of the king's jurisdiction over his subjects.*

* The view of the origin of monarchy embodied in the above extract has been characterised by some scholars (e.g. Dr. Shamasastri, English translation of Kautilya's *Arthashastra*, p. 26, footnote; G. B. Bottazzi, *Precursori di Niccolò Machiavelli in Grecia ad in India, Kautilya ad Thuciddide*, pp. 98-99; and Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, op. cit. p. 119) as a theory of Social Contract. For the reasons mentioned in the text, namely that Kautilya has in view what may be called a governmental contract which again is not expressed but tacit, the above title hardly seems to be apposite. A safer designation probably would be the theory of the human or the elective origin of kingship. This point it is hoped, will be, again considered in connection with our discussion in a later chapter of the alleged resemblances and contrasts between the Hobbesian theory and that of Kautilya. We may consider in this place some other remarks relating to the general nature of Kautilya's theory as above described. According to Bottazzi (loc. cit) the whole extract that we have just cited from Kautilya (pp. 22-23) embodies a complete theory of Social Contract. The king, he further holds, is here declared to be invested with a sacred character solely by virtue of the authority which the people conferred upon him on the ground of his being the only defence of their existence. On the basis of this interpretation he considers the above passage to be completely free from the influence of the Brahminical theory in which, he thinks, the king is held to be a divine emanation. For the reasons that are stated below, the above judgment does not commend itself to our approval. The belief that Kautilya propounded a peculiar theory of the king's sanctity is, we think, based upon a mere assumption, namely that the whole extract which we are now considering represents a complete theory of kingship. This assumption is hardly likely to correspond with the facts, since Kautilya's

From the meagre record of political theory that has been presented above, let us turn to consider what forms in Kauṭilya the essence of his philosophy, we mean the branch relating specifically to the art of government. There is little reason to doubt that this is largely based upon the ideas of the older masters of the Arthaśāstra, although only such fragments of those ideas have survived as were quoted by Kauṭilya for the purpose of refutation. However that may be, we may, we think, consider this branch of our subject in its two natural divisions of the acquisition and the preservation of dominion, which

object in the present case is evidently not to lay down a philosophical theory of kingship, but to justify on as broad a basis as possible the king's jurisdiction over his subjects. It would seem to follow from this that the idea of the king's divine nature is more likely to occur in Kauṭilya as an appendage of the theory of the king's origin than as an integral feature thereof. Nor are we left to depend upon mere surmise in support of our criticism. Doctrines essentially similar to that of Kauṭilya, involving in other words the equivalence of the king's functions and attributes to those of the deities are not unknown to the other teachers of the Arthaśāstra whose views are quoted in the Śāntiparvan. In none of these cases is the king held to be invested with a sacred character by virtue of the popular authority. The authors indeed are completely silent about the theory of the king's elective origin. In these circumstances it seems more reasonable to hold that Kauṭilya adopted the current idea of the king's divine nature than attribute to him an altogether unique interpretation of the same. Regarding the alleged contrast between Kauṭilya's theory and that of the Brahminical canon we agree with the Italian scholar in holding that the king is often conceived by the Brāhmaṇa canonists to be a divine emanation. This idea occurs, for instance, in the Manusamhitā, the Mahābhārata, the later Smritis and the Purāṇas (Chapters IV-V, *infra*). Along with this notion, however, there occurs in these works, as we hope to show later on, the notion of Kauṭilya, namely that the king is a god by virtue of his functions. -

are embodied in the standard definition of Arthasāstra. It is under the second head that most of Kauṭilya's rules on the subject of home and foreign policy may be ranged. An examination of the most typical of these rules which is all that can be attempted here exhibits, we think, some remarkable traits of the author's nature. Such are the qualities of profound insight into human nature and into the essential character of government, amazing resourcefulness and ingenuity, and intelligent appreciation of the factors making for the advantage of the State combined with a more or less studied disregard of morality and religion. Kauṭilya begins by urging upon the prince a thorough course of intellectual training and moral discipline, the former involving the study of the four traditional sciences under the guidance of specialised teachers, and the latter centering round the control of the senses which are branded by the author as the six enemies. Kauṭilya sums up his view on this point by saying that the king should avoid injuring the women and the property of others and should shun falsehood, haughtiness, and evil proclivities: he should enjoy pleasure without disregarding virtue and wealth, or else enjoy this in an equal measure with the last.* In thus making the king's education and self-control the first requisite of successful government, Kauṭilya or rather the earlier authors whose ideas he is echoing, made, it seems to us, a notable advance in political theory. For the similar, although much shorter, rule in Gautama's

* Kauṭ. pp. 10-12.

Dharmaśāstra* is laid down merely as part of the general duty (dharma) of the king.

With all his anxious care to fit the prince by education and discipline for the discharge of his office, Kauṭilya insists that the king should rule with the help of the State officials (amātyas) and consult the ministers (mantrins). In one of his early chapters he specifies the qualifications of the amātyas—a point that was already discussed by the early masters—and he mentions four tests (namely, those of fear, virtue, wealth and love) by which the fitness of the amātyas is to be detected. Kauṭilya discovers the necessity of the Civil Service in the very nature of government, and he fortifies his conclusion by a homely analogy, for he writes, "Sovereignty can be carried on only with assistance. A single wheel does not move; hence the king shall employ the ministers and hear their advice."† In the same connexion Kauṭilya analyses the king's function as being of a threefold nature, namely the visible, the invisible and the inferential, and he declares the amātya's business to consist in carrying out the invisible work.‡ In a later chapter Kauṭilya considers the ways and means of ensuring proper deliberation,—here again he merely continues a discussion started by the early teachers,—and he mentions what, according to him, should be the composition of the council of ministers. It is noticeable in this connection that Kauṭilya exhibits a just appreciation of the function of delibera-

* Gaut. XI 2-4.

† Kauṭ. p. 13.

‡ Ibid p. 15.

tion by saying at the outset that all undertakings depend upon it.*

Kauṭilya urges upon the king as one of his first tasks the necessity of securing to his side, by various methods of diplomacy and force, the friendly and hostile factions within as well as outside his kingdom. In this connection he mentions four classes of people, (namely, the angry, the greedy, the timorous, and the haughty), as being the instruments of the king's enemies, and he states how spies with shaven head or braided hair may win over these classes to the king's side by appealing to that quality which is the leading characteristic of each class.† In another place Kauṭilya urges the king to protect his own person, especially from his sons and wives.‡ The rules under this head, however tedious they might appear, are justified by the author on the very intelligible ground that the king, by protecting his own person, becomes capable of saving the State from those near him as well as from foreign kings.§

In another part of his book bearing the apt title of the suppression of disturbers of the public peace (kaṅṭhakaśodhanam), Kauṭilya enjoins the king to avert eight specific kinds of providential visitations, namely, fire, flood, pestilence, famine, rats, snakes, tigers and demons,—a list which exhibits the author as sharing in the popular superstitions of his time. || One short precept which he lays down in this connection aptly expresses the spirit of this part of his

* Ibid, p. 26.

† Ibid, pp. 22-26.

‡ Ibid, p. 32.

‡ Ibid, pp. 32-45.

|| Ibid, pp. 207-210.

teaching. The king, he says, should always propitiate the afflicted as the father does his son.* In the following chapters Kauṭilya mentions various methods of entraping by the agency of spies the people of criminal tendencies—methods, which, while doing credit to the author's ingenuity, betray in some measure his moral obliquity.† Rules of a more unscrupulous nature to which we shall presently return, are laid down in the later chapters for the purpose of dealing with those whom Kauṭilya calls the disturbers of the king as well as the kingdom.‡

It is, above all, in his application of foreign policy that Kauṭilya discovers the fullest means for ensuring the interest of the State, and finds ample scope for the display of his peculiar genius. The author, it appears, has a just appreciation of the advantages of foreign policy, for he says in introducing the subject that the traditional sixfold policy is the source of enjoyment (śama) and effort (vyāyāma) which in their turn are the sources of the acquisition (yoga) and security (kṣema)§. In the same connexion he analyses what he considers to be the threefold status of a kingdom, namely, decline, stationary condition, and progress. || Moreover, he mentions those factors which in his view determine the relative position of two kings, namely their possession, in a greater or a less or the same measure, of the threefold strength (śakti) and its threefold fruition (siddhi). ¶

* Ibid, p. 210.

§ Ibid, p. 259.

† Ibid, pp. 210-217.

|| Ibid, p. 260

‡ Ibid, pp. 237-242, 245-246. ¶ Ibid, p. 261.

Running all through the mass of Kauṭilya's rules of foreign policy may be detected the influence of the notion that expediency is the golden rule of politics. This idea is reflected, for instance, in the short list of fundamental rules with which Kauṭilya opens his description. He who is losing strength in comparison with another shall make peace : he who is growing strong shall make war : he who thinks that neither can the enemy hurt him nor he the enemy, shall observe neutrality : he who has an excess of advantages shall march : he who is wanting in strength shall seek protection : he who undertakes work requiring assistance shall adopt the dual policy.* In chapter after chapter in the course of the following pages Kauṭilya indulges in a delicate balancing of the circumstances of two or more States so as to discover the exact policy that should be followed. Politics, as thus treated, rises almost to the level of a fine art. The key to this eminently intellectual character of the Kauṭilyan statecraft is to be found, we think, in the author's remarkable appraisal of the three traditional powers (śaktis) of the king. Differing from his unnamed predecessor whom he quotes, Kauṭilya declares the power of deliberation (mantraśakti) to be superior to that of the army and the treasury (prabhuśakti), and the latter to be more important than energy (utsāhaśakti). Regarding the second point Kauṭilya argues with characteristic contempt for the impotent exhibition of energy, "He who has power overreaches by virtue of his strength the king possessing mere

* Kauṭ. p. 263.

energy," and again, "Rulers possessing power (even those that we) women, minors, lame and blind, conquered the earth by defeating or buying up those who had mere energy." As regards the first point, to which reference has been made above, Kauṭilya exhibits his sense of the supreme excellence of intellect by saying that the king who is intelligent and versed in the sciences can apply his skill in deliberation with little effort and can overreach even those enemies who are endowed with energy and power.*

While on the subject of foreign policy Kauṭilya makes some very sensible remarks regarding the manner in which the evil condition of the subjects renders the king open to attack from outside, and he advises how this should be remedied. In the chapter in which he develops this point, he first discusses in a series of pairs the question as to which one of two kings is to be marched against in preference to the other. The alternatives that he considers in this connection are *inter alia* an enemy of virtuous character but under grave troubles and one having a vicious character and disaffected subjects but suffering from less trouble, an enemy whose subjects are impoverished and greedy and another whose subjects are oppressed, and lastly, an enemy that is powerful but of wicked disposition and one who is weak but righteous. After giving his opinion on these cases Kauṭilya launches into a minute analysis of those faults on the king's part that create impoverishment, greed and disaffection, among the subjects. When the people become impoverished, Kauṭilya goes on, they become greedy; when greedy, they become disaffected; and

* Kauṭ. pp. 339-340.

when disaffected, they either go over to the enemy's camp or themselves slay their master. Hence the king, Kauṭilya concludes, should avoid those causes that produce impoverishment, greed and disaffection among his people. Continuing the discussion about the remedies in the following lines, the author considers that the loss of gold and grain on the part of the subjects imperils the whole kingdom and is hard to be remedied, while the loss of efficient men can be made up for by means of gold and grain. The greed of the subjects, Kauṭilya thinks, can be removed by allowing them to plunder the enemy's wealth. Lastly, disaffection can be got rid of by putting down the leaders, for the people deprived of their leaders are easy to be governed, and are incapable of being seduced by the intrigues of the enemy.*

(The end to which the application of all his extensive rules of foreign policy is directed by the author is not, it appears, territorial aggrandisement.) In one place Kauṭilya cautions the king against coveting the territory, wealth, sons and wives of one who is slain, and (he urges that the king should restore to their own position the relatives of the slain prince, and instal on the throne the son of one who has died while helping him. Thus, Kauṭilya argues, would the dependent princes obey even the sons and grandsons of the conqueror. On the other hand, if the conqueror were to slay or bind the dependent prince and covet his territory, property sons and wives, his circle of states (maṇḍala) would become agitated and would rise against him, and even

* Kauṭ. pp. 276-277.

his own ministers would either take refuge with the circle of states or themselves threaten their master's life and throne.* While Kauṭilya thus deprecates territorial annexations in the most express terms, it appears from the general tenour of his thought that his ideal is, next to security, the achievement of political influence over the neighbouring kings comprised in the circle of states.†)

Although the rules for the preservation of dominion form in Kauṭilya's work the most important branch of his philosophy, he mentions in one short section ‡ his ideas relating to the acquisition of territory. The territory, Kauṭilya thinks, may be either newly acquired, or recovered from a usurper, or, lastly, inherited from an ancestor. It is most important to note that in all these cases the author urges kind and considerate treatment of the subjects. The king who acquires new territory, we are told, should put to the shade the enemy's vices by means of his own virtues, and the latter's virtues by doubling his own. He should bestow rewards according to his promise upon those who deserted the enemy's side for his own. For, says Kauṭilya with true insight into human nature, he who fails to fulfil his promise forfeits the confidence of his own and his enemy's people. The king should follow the friends and leaders of the people, for, as Kauṭilya urges in a later passage, he who acts against the will of the people becomes unreliable. The king, moreover, is asked to favour learned men and orators as well as the charitable and the brave, to release all prisoners, and to relieve

* Kauṭ. p. 313. † Cf. Ibid. p. 262: *nemimekānta radrājñah* etc. ‡ Ch. XIII 5.

the miserable, the helpless and the diseased. In the same spirit Kauṭilya advises that the king who recovers a lost territory should give up those faults of his which caused him to lose the throne and increase those virtues through which he regained it. Of the king who inherits a kingdom Kauṭilya likewise says that he should put to the shade his father's vices and display his own virtues.

Next to the considerate treatment of the subjects Kauṭilya urges in the first case respect for the established customs. The king who acquires a new territory, the author declares, should adopt the same mode of living, the same dress, and the same language and manners as those of his subjects, and should participate in their congregational festivals and amusements. Not that all customs are to be enforced, for the king is asked to abolish those customs which he considers to be injurious to the revenue and the army, or holds to be unrighteous. Along with these wise and beneficent counsels Kauṭilya exhibits in the first case an example of that intellectual cunning which is so characteristic of him. A member of the enemy's family who can wrest the conquered territory, Kauṭilya says, should be provided with a sterile tract or else with a fourth part of a fertile tract on condition of his supplying a fixed sum of money and a fixed number of troops: in raising these he would incur the displeasure of the people and be destroyed by them.*

When we turn from the above survey of the Kauṭilyan statecraft to consider a point involved

* Kauṭ. p.409.

therein, namely the author's attitude towards religion and morality, we find him following, as might be expected, in the footsteps of the early masters. We find him, in other words, frequently inculcating rules of a grossly unscrupulous nature on the plea of public interest and without the least pretence of moral disapproval. Thus Politics, distinguished as it is in the system of the Arthaśāstra as a separate science is, as before, further separated from the science of Ethics. Let us quote a few typical examples from Kauṭilya in support of our statement. Speaking of the conduct of a prince who is kept under restraint, Kauṭilya suggests among a number of harmless measures that the prince, having acquired a close intimacy with heretics, rich widows or merchants engaged in ocean traffic, may poison them and rob them of their wealth.* Speaking in the same connection with reference to the treatment of a prince kept under restraint, Kauṭilya coolly suggests in one place that secret emissaries may kill the abandoned prince with weapons or with poison. In another part of his book dealing with the suppression of disturbers of the public peace, Kauṭilya states that spies in disguise may mix with thievish foresters, and instigate them to attack companies of merchants and villagers and may contrive the assassination of those people with weapons or with poison.† In a later chapter where the author describes the measures ensuring what he calls the extirpation of disturbers of the king as well as the kingdom, he says that the king may for the sake of

* Kauṭ. p. 36. I follow the version of R. Shamasastry which, however, is not free from difficulties.

† Ibid p. 214.

righteousness inflict secret punishment upon those wicked persons (dūṣyas), consisting of the royal favourites singly or collectively injuring the kingdom, who cannot be put down openly.* This form of punishment comprises, as the immediately following samples show, various methods of compassing the assassination of the culprit by the direct agency of spies as well as by the seduction of the culprits' brothers, sons and wives.† In another place where he speaks of corporate bodies (saṅghas) Kauṭilya, while conceding that the well-disposed among these should be treated with conciliation and gifts, advises without even the pretence of an apology that the methods of dissension and secret punishment should be applied against those that are ill-disposed, and he proceeds to enumerate various concrete measures suggested to this effect by his remarkably fertile and resourceful intellect. • Among these measures assassination in different forms plays an important part.‡ In the following section Kauṭilya declares that a weak king, when he is attacked by a powerful enemy, should avert the invasion either by making an alliance, or by means of the battle of intrigue (mantrayuddha) or treacherous fight (kūṭayuddha).

* Kauṭ p. 237. In our translation of the above we have used the parallel passage of Kāmandaka (IX 9) which may, we think, be safely utilised to throw light on the difficult text of Kauṭilya. •

† Ibid pp. 237-241. Some further rules of the same type are mentioned by Kauṭilya in another place (pp. 245-246) as being applicable to the wicked persons (dūṣyas). Kauṭilya concludes this portion of his subject with the warning that the king should adopt the above line of policy towards the wicked and sinful persons, and none else.

‡ Ibid, pp. 378-381.

These last comprise, as we learn from the numerous examples given immediately afterwards, sundry methods of sowing dissensions and of secret assassination.* Finally we may mention a long and curious list of drugs and tricks of black magic said to ensure in various ways the destruction of the enemy and the immunity of the king's own troops, which is compiled by the author in the penultimate chapter of his work.† In introducing these rules Kauṭilya justifies them on the plea of welfare of the four castes and confines their application to the sinful persons alone.‡

Thus Kauṭilya would seem to betray in his rules of policy a more or less complete indifference towards morality. His attitude towards religion is more complex. As we have seen in another place, Kauṭilya deliberately dissociates himself from those radical schools that eliminated the Vedas from the list of sciences.§ In the same connection he urges the king not to upset the canonical scheme of duties relating to the castes and the orders, on the ground that the performance of these leads to heaven and salvation, while their violation would result in intermixture and destruction of the people. And yet it would seem as if Kauṭilya, in framing his actual system of statecraft could not resist the temptation of turning religion into an instrument of State policy. In the list of spies mentioned by Kauṭilya, for instance, no less than three out of nine specified classes belong

* Kauṭ. p. 382 ff.

† Ibid ch. XIV.

‡ Ibid p. 410.

§ Supra p. 128.

to pseudo-religious orders, no doubt because the cloak of religion was held best to ensure the success of espionage.* This tendency of the author to indulge in the political exploitation of religion is more clearly exhibited in his section on the replenishment of the treasury.† There Kauṭilya suggests among a number of other measures that the Superintendent of religious institutions (devatādhyakṣa) may set up at night a shrine of the gods or a place sacred to the pious ascetics, and earn his subsistence by holding processions and congregations. Or else, Kauṭilya goes on, he may proclaim the arrival of the gods by pointing to a tree in the temple garden, that has borne untimely fruits and flowers. These suggestions are followed by other rules to the same effect, but we need not concern ourselves with them.‡ As another illustration of the author's attitude towards religion it may be mentioned that he advises the would-be conqueror to afflict the enemy and hearten his friends by proclaiming, through various methods of religious deception which he specifies, the conqueror's association with the gods.§

It would seem from the above that morality

* Kauṭ. pp. 18-20. The three kinds of spies alluded to in the text are the religious mendicant renouncing his order (udāsthī), the ascetic (tāpasa) and the mendicant woman (bhikṣuki). It may be noted in this connection that Kauṭilya (p. 19) urges the ascetic spy deliberately to delude the people into a belief in his own extreme asceticism and gift of prophecy.

† Ibid V. 2.

‡ Ibid p. 244. The translation of this part is incomplete because of the exceptional difficulty of the text.

§ Ibid pp. 394-395.

and to a less extent religion had no place in Kauṭilya's politics. Nevertheless there are some passages in the Arthaśāstra which exhibit the author as deliberately parting company with the extreme exponents; among his predecessors, of an immoral statecraft. Even in these cases, however, we feel that the author is impressed not with the inherent worth of morality, but with the belief that honesty is the best policy. Thus in his chapter relating to the safeguarding of the princes he indignantly and emphatically rejects two extreme views which he quotes. The first is that of Vātavyādhi who advised that the princes might be lured to sensual indulgence, for in that case they would never hate their father. "This," Kauṭilya retorts, "is death in life. Like a piece of wood eaten by worms, the royal family in which the princes are lacking in discipline perishes as soon as it is touched." With this rebuke he proceeds to mention what steps, according to him, the king should take for ensuring the prince's safe birth and training in discipline. The second view criticised by Kauṭilya is that of the Ambhīyas who advised that while one spy should tempt the prince, another should restrain him. Kauṭilya solemnly replies in language indicating a true insight into the principles of child-training, "(It is) a great sin to excite an unawakened (mind), for a free object sucks whatever class of things it is smeared with," and he goes on to recommend that the prince should be instructed in virtue and wealth, not in their opposites.* In another passage, rejecting a charac-

* Kauṭ., pp. 33-34.

teristic suggestion of Bhāradvāja, namely that the minister (amātya) should usurp the vacant throne on the death of his master, Kauṭilya argues that this would be an act causing provocation to the people, as well as very unrighteous and uncertain. Hence he recommends that the minister should set up a prince who is possessed of self-control.* In a third passage Kauṭilya, rejecting the opinion of one of his unnamed predecessors, declares that a peace or alliance depending merely upon promise or upon oath is immutable in this world and in the next.†

Somewhat apart from the other rules of statecraft and deserving to be studied by itself is Kauṭilya's short discussion relating to the rule of punishment (daṇḍa). In this case, we think, the author introduces, in place of the one-sided view of the earlier period, a more balanced judgment based upon a true insight into the possible consequences of different forms of punishment. In the passage bearing on this point Kauṭilya, rejecting the suggestion that the king should be ever ready to strike, says, "He who inflicts severe punishment becomes oppressive to all creatures: he who inflicts mild punishment is overpowered: he who inflicts just punishment is respected." Tracing this dictum to its ultimate cause, Kauṭilya states, "For, punishment when directed with consideration unites the people with virtue, wealth and desire, but when it is misapplied under the influence of greed and anger through ignorance, it irritates even the hermits and the ascetics, not to speak of the

* Kauṭ., p. 256.

† Ibid p. 313.

householders."* While thus distinguishing between the different shades of punishment, Kauṭilya agrees with the older teachers on the fundamental point relating to the conception of punishment as the guarantee of social order. For he writes, in the lines immediately following those we have quoted, "When indeed (punishment is) not applied (at all), it produces (the state of anarchy known as) the mātsyanyāya, for in the absence of one who wields the sceptre the strong man devours the weak, (but the weak man) being protected by the king prevails (over the strong)." †

Turning to another aspect of the Kauṭilyan art of government, it has to be observed that the outstanding feature of the author's thought is his preference for the monarchic State. Nevertheless there is at least one passage in which he treats parenthetically the conditions of clan-republics (kulas) and predicates of them the twofold merit of invincibility and permanence. There, after mentioning the dangers threatening the king from the royal princes and the measures to be adopted against these, Kauṭilya says, "Sovereignty may likewise belong to a clan, for a republic consisting of clans [as the political unit] (kulasāṅgha) is hard to conquer, and being free from the danger of anarchy enjoys a permanent existence on earth." ‡ This tribute, coming as it does from the arch-apostle of the monarchic cult that Kauṭilya is, shows him not to be a blind advocate of monarchical rule.

* Kauṭ. p. 9.

† Ibid p. 9.

‡ Ibid p. 35.

If now in the light of the above survey, we consider the fashionable comparison between Kautilya and Machiavelli,* we think our answer must indicate some remarkable coincidences as well as contrasts. While Machiavelli occupies as the "first modern political philosopher" a unique position in European history,† Kautilya was preceded in Ancient India by a long line of teachers of the Arthasāstra whose works he claims to have summarised in his own. The work of Kautilya embracing within its fold the branches of civil law and military science as well as that of public administration, had evidently a wider scope than the treatises of Machiavelli who confines his attention to the art of government alone. Within the limits common to both thinkers, however, the Italian covers a wider field, for he studies the conditions of republics as well as monarchies, while Kautilya's gaze is fixed on the problems of the monarchic State alone. On the other hand the empirical method of Machiavelli, supported as it is by frequent references to the history of classical antiquity, has some resemblance to the empiricism of Kautilya which is fortified by occasional references to the Indian traditional history. Turning from the scope and method to the subject-matter, we may perhaps draw a parallel between the heads of the

* Cf. the significant title of G. B. Bottazzi's work, *Pre-cursori di Niccolò Machiavelli in India ad in Grecia, Kautilya ad Thucidide*. Bottazzi indeed directly styles Kautilya "il Machiavelli dell' India" (Ibid p. 21).

† Cf. Dunning, *A History of Political Theories, Ancient and Mediaeval*, p. 324.

discussion followed by Machiavelli in his "*Prince*," and those involved in Kauṭilya's definition of the Arthaśāstra and implicitly adopted by him in his work. This comparison however serves to emphasize an essential difference between the ideas of the two masters. To Machiavelli politics is informed with the ideal of territorial aggrandisement, while Kauṭilya's goal as we have said in another place is, next to the security of the State, its achievement of political influence over the circle of States. Finally, as regards the attitude of these authors towards religion and morality, it appears at first sight that Kauṭilya rivals and even surpasses Machiavelli in his sacrifice of these principles to the end of public welfare. Nevertheless it has to be remembered that Kauṭilya reserves his immoral statecraft in general for extreme cases, and he advocates, as in his rules relating to the acquisition of territory, the kind and even benign treatment of the subjects. Kauṭilya's politics, we cannot help thinking, is based upon a deeper knowledge of human nature than that of his European counterpart.

Let us try, in conclusion, to form an estimate of Kauṭilya's influence in moulding the subsequent development of political theory. We have already endeavoured to show what in our view was the true nature of Kauṭilya's achievement, namely that he carried into effect a virtual reconstruction of the science of Arthaśāstra. Keeping this point in our mind we may perhaps trace Kauṭilya's influence in three principal directions. In his own field he became the founder of a tradition of statecraft which earned for its author some amount of oppo-

brum at a later period,* but was nevertheless adopted by enthusiastic disciples like Kāmandaka and the Jaina Somadevasūri. In the second place Kauṭilya by retouching a number of categories and concepts discussed by his predecessors, gave them such a stamp of finality that his conclusions were accepted without a demur in the later canonical as well as Nītiśāstra literatures.† Finally, we are of opinion, although we are here treading on a slippery ground, that Kauṭilya's remarkable reconstruction of the Arthaśāstra may have prepared the way for, if not stimulated, that wholesale incorporation of the Arthaśāstra material into the system of the Brahminical canon, which, it seems to us, is the dominant note of the rājadharmā sections of the Manusamhitā and the Mahābhārata.

* The reference is to the oft-quoted attack of Bāṇa who says in his Kādambārī (Peterson's edition, Vol. 1, p. 109) "Is there anything that is righteous to those for whom the science of Kauṭilya, merciless in its precepts, rich in cruelty, is an authority; whose teachers are priests habitually hard-hearted with practice of witchcraft; to whom ministers always inclined to deceive others are councillors, whose desire is always for the goddess of wealth that has been cast away by thousands of kings; who are devoted to the application of destructive sciences; and to whom, brothers affectionate with natural cordial love, are fit victims to be murdered?" (Shamasastri's translation, English translation of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, Introduction, p. ix). The Jaina Nandisūtras (quoted *Ibid* p. xxii) include the Kauṭilya in the list of false sciences.

† Examples of this nature are Kauṭilya's list of the four sciences (p. 6), his rule of punishment (p. 9), his inclusion of the four sciences in the curriculum of the king's studies (p. 10), his arrangement of the elements of sovereignty in the order of their descending importance (pp. 322-324), and his comparative estimate of the king's vices (vyasanas) in which anger is held to be a more serious evil than love of pleasure (p. 327).

Note on the Chāṇakya-sūtras :—While on the subject of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra we may properly consider a short collection of aphorisms which is attributed to Chāṇakya (Kauṭilya), although it appears on examination to bear little or no resemblance to the first-named work. The Chāṇakya-sūtras, as this collection is called, deals with general morality (nīti) in which is comprised the branch of public policy. The only important contribution that the author makes to political theory is, we think, concerned with his idea of kingship. He lays down, to begin with, the doctrine of the king's divinity, for he says (sūtra 372) that the king is the chief god. With this may be connected his inculcation in repeated passages of the duties of the subjects with reference to their ruler. The subjects are not to act against the king's interests (sūtra 65), not to slight him even if he were devoid of strength (Ibid 87), not even to look at him (Ibid 380), not to speak evil of him (Ibid 445), not to disregard his orders (Ibid 532), and they are to carry out what he commands (Ibid 533). While thus justifying the principle of monarchical authority, the author insists with Kauṭilya upon the qualities of self-control, humility and association with the aged as being essential requisites of the king's successful government. The root of happiness, he says at the beginning of his work, is righteousness, that of righteousness is wealth, that of wealth is the kingdom (or sovereignty), that of the kingdom is the control of the senses, that of the control of the senses is humility and that of humility is the honouring of aged persons. Elsewhere (sūtra 14) the author stresses the importance of discipline on the king's part by saying, "It is better not to have a king than have one who is wanting in discipline."

* Published as an appendix to R. Shamasastry's revised edition of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra (Mysore, 1910).

CHAPTER IV.

THE MAHĀBHĀRATA AND THE MANUSAMHITĀ AND THE SYNTHESIS OF THE ARTHASĀSTRA AND THE DHARMASŪTRA MATERIAL (CIRCA 200 B.C.—200 A.D.)—THE CHATUHŚATIKĀ OF ĀRYA- DEVA (CIRCA 200 A.D.).

I

The 'rajadharmā' sections of the Mahābhārata and the Manusamhitā involve the grafting of the Arthasāstra stock upon a canonical stem—The blending of the king's public and his domestic functions—The approximation of the concepts of rājadharmā and danḍanīti—The end of these sciences—The conception of organic unity of the factors of government—The king's fulfilment of the essential needs of the people—The theories of the divine creation of the king—The doctrine of the king's divine nature—The theories of submission and obedience of the subjects—The king's reciprocal duty of protection and its relation to the collection of taxes—The king's divinely ordained duty of protecting his subjects—Protection is the sole justification of the king's office—The right of tyrannicide—The joint authority of the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya and the mutual relations of these powers—The rules of statecraft in the Mahābhārata and the Manusamhitā—The attitude of the authors towards religion and morality—The conditions of success in republican communities (gaṇas).

II

The Chatuhśatikā represents in part an independent tradition of political thinking—The king is the servant of the body politic—Politics is completely subservient to morality.

I

In the two preceding chapters we have endeavoured to describe as completely as the surviving materials at our disposal would permit, the exuberant growth of political ideas in the literature of Arthaśāstra. We have seen how the teachers of this science not only explored the region of practical politics which was their special province, but also made important and original contributions to the theory of the State. In the two canonical works of this period, especially in their sections and chapters relating to the branch of kingly duties (rājadharmā)* an attempt seems to have been made to graft a more, or less considerable Arthaśāstra stock upon a slender canonical stem derived from the Dharmasūtras.† To the stimulus derived from contact with the predominant Arthaśāstra element it is, we think, mainly owing that the Manusamhitā and still more the Mahābhārata make, as we hope to show presently, some of the most important contributions to political theory.

* These are chap. VII of the Manusamhitā and the first two parts (especially chaps. LVÍ—CLXXIII) of the twelfth book (called the Śāntiparvan) of the Mahābhārata. The latter chapters, besides being greater in bulk and more comprehensive than the former, are distinguished by their dramatic character inasmuch as they take the form of a series of addresses delivered to king Yudhiṣṭhira by the dying Kṣatriya hero Bhiṣma, the *doyen* of the royal house of Kuru.

† In this connection it should be especially noticed that the Mahābhārata in the course of its introductory chapters twice (I 2, 383; Ibid 62, 23) announces itself to be, *inter alia*, an Arthaśāstra work.

The above characteristic of the works that we are now considering, involving, that is, a synthesis of ideas is, we think, closely connected with the circumstances of their origin and their essential nature. The Manusamhitā, while based upon a lost Dharmasūtra work of the school of Manu, is distinguished from the latter by the fact that it is the product not of a Vedic school, but of one of the special law schools which took over at an early period the complete teaching of the Sacred Law*. Hence it is able to develop in fuller detail those rules of civil law and public administration to which the authors of the Dharmasūtras had given the most perfunctory attention. The Mahābhārata, again, is unconnected with any school, and while belonging in form to the literature of heroic history (Itihāsa), it claimed and obtained early recognition as a work on the Sacred Law (Smṛiti or Dharmaśāstra) such as the Manusamhitā was†.

* Cf. Bühler, S. B. E. Vol. XXV, Introduction, pp. li—lvi.

† For the evidence, vide Bühler and Kirste, *Indian Studies*, Vol. 2 pp. 4-27 (especially pp. 24-26). With regard to the Śāntiparvan with which we are specially concerned it may be added that Bhīṣma's discourse on 'rājadharma' is introduced in such a fashion as to suggest that it was meant by the author to embody the standard list of the king's duties. Consider for example the historical setting of the scene in which Bhīṣma, stretched upon his bed of arrows, is made to utter these discourses as his parting message to the assembled princes headed by Yudhiṣṭhira. Consider again how Bhīṣma is singled out in the immediately preceding chapters by the sages Vyāsa (Śāntiparvan XXXVII 1-16) and Nārada (Ibid LIV 7-10) and above all by the lord Kṛiṣṇa (Ibid LIV 34-35) as the fittest person to communicate this message on the ground of his unrivalled knowledge of the whole circle of

We have noticed above, as the leading characteristic of the canonical works of this period in so far as

human duties. Add to these points the fact that Kṛiṣṇa Himself (Ibid LIV 28-31) inspired the hero with His own divine wisdom (divyā matih) to qualify him for his task and blessed his speech beforehand by prophesying that it would last on the face of the earth as though it were a Vedic discourse (Vedapravāda).

Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, while rightly emphasising the debt of the 'rājadharmā' section of the Mahābhārata to the early authors of the Arthasāstra, has, we think, ignored the real character of this section as involving a synthesis of Arthasāstra and Dharmasūtra thought. This omission, it appears to us, has prevented him from indicating the true relation of the rājadharmā section to the older Arthasāstra works. He writes (op. cit. pp. 110-111), "To the same period (viz. 600-325 B. C.) seem to belong the chapters from the Mahābhārata, especially from the Śāntiparvan, which deal with rājadharmānūsāsana; and it is not at all improbable that this section represents in the main the work of the pre-Kauṭilyan political philosopher Kauṇapadanta as this is but another name for Bhīṣma. The account of polity which they contain seems to have been drawn principally from the systems of Brihaspati, Uśanas and Manu." Now this pronouncement is, we think, open to exception on the following grounds:—(1) Dr. Bhandarkar's date for the rājadharmā section of the Mahābhārata apparently rests upon his view of the priority of the Śāntiparvan to Kauṭilya's Arthasāstra—a view which, as we have shown elsewhere (supra pp. 72-73 footnote) not only runs counter to the general trend of authoritative opinion on the point, but is unsupported by valid evidence. Furthermore, it is directly contradicted by a historical allusion occurring in one of the chapters of the above section. In chapter LXV (13-15) Māndhātā is quoted as asking the god Indra, "How should all these folk living in kingdoms, the Yavanas, the Kirātas, the, Gāndhāras, the Chīnas, the Śavaras, the Barbaras, the Śakas, the Tuṣāras, the Kaṅkas, the Pahlavas, the Andhras, the Madrakas, the Puṇḍras, the Pulindas, the Ramaṭhas, the Kāmbojas, the castes which sprang from the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣātriyas, the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras live?" The same passage occurs in the South Indian recension (Ch. LXIV 13-15) with

our point of view is concerned, their blending of materials derived from the Arthaśāstra and the Dharmasūtras. One important consequence of this connection with the earlier canon is, we think, that the authors present their extensive rules of

some minor changes. The mention of the Sakas and the Pahlavas in both the above lists precludes the possibility of an interpolation in later times and it shows the second century B. C. to be the upper limit of the composition of the Śāntiparvan. This date, it may be added here, has been arrived at independently by the best authorities. (Cf. E. W. Hopkins, *The Great Epic of India* pp. 397-398). (2) The rājadharma section of the Śāntiparvan, although professing to embody the teaching of Bhīṣma, reveals no especial connection with the views, few and fragmentary as they are, that are attributed to Kauṇapadanta by Kauṭilya. In the parallel example of the Manusamhitā, Manu often flatly contradicts the view of the school of Arthaśāstra called by that name. Thus while the latter (Kauṭ. p. 6) declares the sciences to be three in number, the former (VII 43) includes all the four traditional sciences in the curriculum of the king's studies. Again, while the Mānavas (Kauṭ. p. 29) make the mantripariṣat consist of twelve members, Manu (VII 54) gives the number of councillors (sachivas) as seven or eight. A more general basis of difference between the two sets of works that we are now considering is that while the Arthaśāstra authors known to Kauṭilya are distinguished by their controversial spirit, the canonical authors of this period are principally concerned in their rājadharma sections to lay down the approved rules of kingly conduct. These discrepancies can, we think, be satisfactorily explained on our hypothesis of the synthesis of the Arthaśāstra and early canonical ideas in the later works. (3) Much as the rājadharma sections of the Śāntiparvan are indebted to the Arthaśāstra it is not difficult to detect in them some instances of original contribution to political theory. Such, for example, are the theories of the origin of monarchy which, as we hope to show later on, are so advanced in character in comparison with the earlier ideas on the subject that they may be safely assigned on the ground of internal evidence alone to the present period.

public administration in the setting of the Whole Duty of the King. Thus Manu has no hesitation in mentioning in the course of his chapter on kingly duties that the king should worship the learned Brāhmaṇas, should marry a queen of equal caste and should appoint a domestic priest as well as other officiating priests for the performance of sacrifices*. Similarly Bhīṣma in chapter LVI of the Śāntiparvan opens his address by observing that the king's foremost duty is to behave towards the gods and the Brāhmaṇas according to the prescribed rule, for, he explains, it is by worshipping these that the king repays his debt to virtue and is respected by his subjects.† The same mingling of functions is observable in the frequent and characteristic summaries of kingly duties that occur in these works. Manu, for example, says in one place, "Not to turn back in battle, to protect the people, to honour the Brāhmaṇas is the best means for a king to secure happiness"‡.

Besides involving the fusion of the king's public and his domestic functions, the synthesis of the secular and canonical material in the works we are

* VII 37; Ibid 77, Ibid 78-79.

† Śāntiparvan LVI 2-13.

‡ VII 88, S. B. E. Vol. XXV, p. 230. It may be noticed here that the commentators of the Smṛiti works, while treating the concept of rājadharmā, introduce a twofold distinction which, we think, virtually corresponds to the difference between the king's public and his domestic functions. For they conceive the rājadharmā to be of two kinds, namely those bearing visible fruit (driṣṭārtha) and those producing invisible fruit (adriṣṭārtha). The former are illustrated by the sixfold policy and the latter by the Agnihotra sacrifice. Cf. Medhātithi's commentary on Manusmṛitī VII. 1.

now considering tended, we think, to bring about a close approximation of the concepts of rājadharmā and daṇḍanīti, which, as we have seen in another place, were at first associated respectively with the literature of the Dharmasūtras and of the Arthaśāstra. Rājadharmā, to begin with, as conceived by the canonical authors of this period consists, in an overwhelming measure, of the rules of internal administration and external policy. Thus its scope is virtually co-extensive with that of daṇḍanīti, involving in either case the conception of an Art of Government. Furthermore it appears that the canonical writers magnified the antiquity and sanctity of daṇḍanīti with the result that the concept of this science was brought into line with that of rājadharmā. Manu, for example, applies to it* the epithet eternal (śāśvatī) which is usually applied to the holy Vedas alone, while Bhīṣma in chapter LIX of the Śānti-parvan declares it to have been created by the god Brahmā along with the institution of kingship by Viṣṇu.†

What, then, in the opinion of these thinkers, is the end of the Art of Government, as we may render more or less roughly the concepts of rājadharmā and daṇḍanīti. It is, we think, a striking illustration of the importance of the intrusive Arthaśāstra element in their thought that the authors take over and amplify the necessarily one-sided estimate of the science furnished

* VII 43.

† It may be here remarked that Bhīṣma, while describing the merits of rājadharmā, implies in one passage (LXIII 28) daṇḍanīti and rājadharmā to be synonymous terms.

by the secular teachers. As we have seen in another place, Kauṭilya conceives the Arthaśāstra to fulfil the threefold end of human existence.* Now Bhīṣma in chapter LIX of the Śāntiparvan sums up his elaborate description of Brahmā's original work on daṇḍanīti by saying that it treated the four ends of life, namely, virtue, wealth, desire and salvation.† In another place, speaking on the great benefit accruing from daṇḍanīti, Bhīṣma says that this science, when properly applied by the king, directs the four classes towards righteousness and weans them from unrighteousness. When the four classes observe their respective duties, Bhīṣma goes on, and the established usage is not violated, when security springs from daṇḍanīti and the people are free from fear, the three (sic) classes seek their welfare according to the prescribed rule, and thence ensues the happiness of the people. Continuing his argument, the hero states in language of bold hyperbole, that the four ages of the world arise according as the king exercises daṇḍanīti in a full or more or less partial measure or finally abandons it altogether. Daṇḍanīti, he says in conclusion, fixes the limits of duties and is the established usage that has for its end the welfare of the people; when properly applied, it is, as it were, the mother and the father.‡

In the above extracts, it will be noticed, the canonical author develops, however unconsciously, the idea expressed by Kauṭilya with reference to the

* Supra, pp. 130-131.

† Śāntiparvan LIX 79.

‡ Ibid LXIX 76-103.

end of the Arthaśāstra. The view of the author of the Śāntiparvan relating to the nature of rājadharmā is similarly connected with that of an earlier teacher, Indra, who held, as we have seen in another place, that the Kṣatriya's duty was the foremost of all.* Its keynote is struck in the very first question addressed by Yudhiṣṭhira to Bhīṣma. Rājadharmā, says the king in introducing his question, is declared by those versed in the sacred law to be the foremost of all duties : it is the refuge of the whole world : virtue, wealth and desire, nay, salvation itself depend upon it : like the rein unto the steed and the goad to the elephant is the rājadharmā unto the people. If the king were to err with respect to that duty which is followed by the royal sages, the stability of the world would cease and everything would be thrown into confusion. Rājadharmā does away with the evil condition which fails to secure heaven, just as the rise of the sun dispels darkness.† This point is treated in fuller detail in some later chapters where Bhīṣma, after describing the duties of the four castes and the four orders, winds up with a comparative estimate of the merits of rājadharmā and other duties. All the duties of the three classes, he says, together with their minor duties, are settled out of the king's duties by the Kṣatriyas who follow the highest duty among man. All duties are swallowed up in those of the king, just as the foot-prints of all

* Supra p. 82.

† Śāntiparvan LVI 2-7. In verse 5 of the above we adopt the reading 'narendradharmo lokasya' of the South Indian recension instead of 'narendro dharmalokasya' (Calcutta edition).

other creatures sink in those of the elephant. The other duties are the refuge of the few and bear little fruit, while the duty of the Kṣatriyas is the refuge of many people and produces many blessings. If daṇḍanīti were to perish, the triple Veda would disappear and all duties would decline : if the primeval rājadharmā of the Kṣatriyas were to be given up, all duties of the orders would come to an end*. The address is continued in the same strain through the two following chapters, but these do not add anything to the force of the argument. The panegyric reaches, we think, its climax in some earlier verses of the same address. There Bhīṣma says that all duties have rājadharmā at their head, and all kinds of renunciation are comprised therein. Further he states that every enjoyment, all religious ceremonies, all learning, and all worlds are included in rājadharmā†. The gist of the above passages may perhaps be expressed by saying that rājadharmā comprehends all other classes of duties and is the mainspring as well as guarantee thereof ‡.

The authors of the Śāntiparvan and the Manusamhitā characteristically take over from the Arthasāstra the category of the seven elements of sovereign-

* Śāntiparvan LXIII 24-27.

† Ibid LXIII 27-30. In verse 29 we read 'bhogāh' of the South Indian recension instead of 'tyāgāh' of the Calcutta edition.

‡ That this does not represent the considered view of the author appears, among other things, from the fact that the rājadharmā and the āpaddharmā sections of the Śāntiparvan lead up to the disquisition on mokṣadharmā which Yudhiṣṭhira introduces by saying (CLXXIV 1) that it is the foremost of the duties pertaining to the orders.

ty.* This of course involves the exclusion, as before, of the 'purohita' or the royal chaplain.† In this connection it ought to be particularly noticed that Manu develops an idea that is at best latent in the system of the Arthaśāstra, for while arranging the 'calamities' of the 'limbs' in an order of descending importance, he immediately qualifies its effect by saying, "Yet in a kingdom containing seven constituent parts, which is upheld like the triple staff (of an ascetic), there is no (single part) more important (than the others), by reason of the importance of the qualities of each for the others. For each part is particularly qualified for (the accomplishment of) certain objects, (and thus) each is declared to be the most important for that particular purpose

* Vide Manusamhitā IX 294; Śāntiparvan LXIX 64-66. Cf. Yājñavalkya I 353. Some slight verbal changes are observable in these works in the designation of the component factors of sovereignty. For Kautīlya's 'durga,' fort, Manu and the author of the Śāntiparvan (loc. cit.) substitute 'pura,' city,—a change which was doubtless suggested by the antithesis between 'pura' and 'janapada.' Furthermore, Manu (loc. cit.) has 'rāṣṭra' instead of 'janapada,' while Yājñavalkya (loc. cit.) uses the term 'jana,' people.

† This personage, however, was too important to be ignored for long in the standard list of the seven 'elements.' In the Nītisāra of Kāmandaka (VII 31) the purohita's good qualities are described under the heading of the excellent qualities of the minister (sachiva). Vijñāneśvara (commentary on Yājñavalkya (I 353) similarly includes the 'purohita' along with the 'mantrin' in the list of amātyas. Nilakanṭha goes a step further and finds (commentary on Śāntiparvan LXXIX 1) a place for the 'purohita' as well as the sacrificial priest (ritvij) in the category of svāmin by making the latter consist of these two persons along with the king.