CHAPTER IV. THE MAURYA EMPIRE: 
THE ERA OF DIGVIJAYA

SECTION I. THE REIGN OF CHANDRAGUPTA MAURYA

Mlechchhairudvejamanā bhujayugamadhunā
samīśritā rājamūrtteḥ
Sa srīmadbandhubhyāschiramavatu mahāni
pārthivas-Chandraguptaḥ.
—Mudrārākshasa.

In B.C. 326 the flood of Macedonian invasion had overwhelmed the Indian states of the Pañjāb, and was threatening to burst upon the Madhyadeśa. Agrarmes was confronted with a crisis not unlike that which Arminius had to face when Varus carried the Roman Eagle to the Teutoburg Forest, or which Charles Martel had to face when the Saracens carried the Crescent towards the field of Tours. The question whether India was, or was not, to be Hellenized awaited decision.

Agrarmes was fortunate enough to escape the onslaught of Alexander. But it is doubtful whether he had the ability or perhaps the inclination to play the part of an Arminius or a Charles Martel, had the occasion arisen. But there was at this time another Indian who was made of different stuff. This was Chandragupta, the Sandrokoiptos (Sandrokottos, etc.) of the classical writers. The rise of Chandragupta is thus described by Justin:¹

"India after the death of Alexander had shaken, as it were, the yoke of servitude from its neck and put his governors to death. The author of this liberation was

¹ Watson's tr., p. 142 with slight emendations.
Sandrocottus. This man was of humble origin, but was stimulated to aspire to regal power by supernatural encouragement; for, having offended Alexander by his boldness of speech and orders being given to kill him, he saved himself by swiftness of foot; and while he was lying asleep, after his fatigue, a lion of great size having come up to him, licked off with his tongue the sweat that was running from him and after gently waking him, left him. Being first prompted by this prodigy to conceive hopes of royal dignity he drew together a band of robbers, and solicited the Indians to support his new sovereignty. Sometime after, as he was going to war with the generals of Alexander, a wild elephant of great bulk presented itself before him of its own accord and, as if tamed down to gentleness, took him on its back and became his guide in the war and conspicuous in fields of battle. Sandrocootts thus acquired a throne when Seleucus was laying the foundations of his future greatness."

The above account, shorn of its marvellous element, amounts to this, that Chandragupta, a man of non-

---

1 Some modern scholars propose to read 'Nandrum' (Nanda) in place of 'Alexandrum'. Such conjectural emendations by modern editors often mislead students who have no access to original sources and make the confusion regarding the early career of Chandragupta worse confounded (cf. Indian Culture, Vol. II. No. 3, p. 558, for 'boldness of speech', cf. Grote XII. 141, case of Kleitus, and pp. 147 ff, case of Kallisthenes). After his (Sandrocootts') victory he forfeited, by his tyranny, all title to the name of a liberator, for he oppressed with servitude the very people whom he had emancipated from foreign thraldom—Justin. The tyranny of the dushtâmâtyas is known to Indian literature. But the sovereign himself is noted for his justice in early Maurya times.

2 The original expression used by Justin has the sense of 'mercenary soldier' as well as that of 'robber'. And the former sense is in consonance with Indian tradition recorded by Hemachandra in the Parishashtaparvan (VIII, 253-54):

Dhâtuvardhopârvitena draviñena Chandîrasâh
chakrepatiâdi sâmägriñi Nandamuchchheñumudyañah
i.e., Chânâkya gathered for Chandragupta an army with wealth found underground, (lit. 'with the aid of mineralogy') for the purpose of uprooting Nanda.

3 According to the interpretation accepted by Hultzsch—'instigated the Indians to overthrow the existing government'.

---
monarchical rank, placed himself at the head of the Indians who chafed under the Macedonian yoke, and after Alexander's departure defeated his generals and "shook the yoke of servitude from the neck" of India. The verdict of the Hydaspas was thus reversed. 1

The ancestry of Chandragupta is not known for certain. Hindu literary tradition connects him with the Nanda dynasty of Magadha. 2 Tradition recorded in Mediaeval inscriptions, however, represents the Maurya family (from which he sprang) as belonging to the solar race. 3 From Māndhātri, a prince of that race, sprang the Maurya line." In the Rājputāna Gazetteer, 4 the Moris (Mauryas) are described as a Rājput clan. Jaina tradition recorded in the Puris̄hṭapurva 4 represents Chandragupta as the son of a daughter of the chief of a village of peacock-tamers (Mayūraṇa). 5 The Mahāvaṁsa 1 calls

---

1 The anti-Macedonian movement led by Chandragupta, and those who co-operated with him, probably began in Sīnd. The Macedonian Satrap of that province withdrew before 321 B.C. Ambhi and the Pāurava remained in possession of portions of the Western and Central Pañjāb and some adjoining regions till sometime after the Tripārateśaos agreement of 321 B.C.

2 The Mudrārākshasa calls him not only Mauryaputra (Act II, verse 6) but also Nandānaya (Act IV). Kshemendra and Somadeva refer to him as Pūrvañanda-sūta, son of the genuine Nanda, as opposed to Yoga-Nanda. The commentator on the Viṣṇupurāṇa (IV. 24—Wilson IX. 187) says that Chandragupta was the son of Nanda by a wife named Murā, whence he and his descendants were called Mauryas. Dhyuṇdīra, the commentator on the Mudrārākshasa, informs us on the other hand that Chandragupta was the eldest son of Maurya who was the son of the Nanda king Sarvārthasiddhi by Murā, daughter of a Vṛshala (Śūdra?).

3 Ep. Ind., II. 222. The Mahāvaṁsa also connects the Mauryas with the Śākyas who, as is well known, claimed to belong to the race of Āditya (the Sun). Cf. also Avadānakalpatāla, No. 59.

4 II A. the Mewar Residency, compiled by Major K. D. Erskine (p. 14).

5 Page 76; VIII. 229f.

6 Buddhist tradition also testifies to the supposed connection between the expressions Moriya (Maurya) and Mora or Mayūra (peacock)—see Turnour, Mahāvaṁsa (Mahāvasa), xxxix f. Aelian informs us that tame peacocks were kept in the parks of the Maurya Palace at Pāṭaliputra. Sir John Marshall points out that figures of peacocks were employed to decorate some of the projecting ends of the architraves of the east gateway at Sāṅchi (A Guide to Sāṅchi, pp. 44, 64). Fourchier (Monuments of Sanchi, 291) does not regard these birds as a sort of canting badge for the dynasty of the Mauryas. He apparently prefers to imagine them a possible allusion to the Mora Jātaka.

7 Gellert's Translation, p. 27. Moriyaṁnaḥ Khattiyānāṁ vahṣe jāta.
him a scion of the Khattiyā clan styled Moriya (Maurya). In the Divyāvadāna Bindusāra, the son of Chandragupta, claims to be an anointed Khshatriya, Kshatriya Mūrdhābhishiktā. In the same work Aśoka, the son of Bindusāra, calls himself a Kshatriya. In the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta the Moriyas are represented as the ruling clan of Pipphalivana, and as belonging to the Kshatriya caste. As the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta is the most ancient of the works referred to above, and forms part of the early Buddhist canon, its evidence should be preferred to that of later compositions. It is, therefore, practically certain that Chandragupta belonged to a Kshatriya community, viz., the Moriya (Maurya) clan.

In the sixth century B.C. the Moriyas were the ruling clan of the little republic of Pipphalivana which probably lay between Rummindic in the Nepalese Tārai and Kasia in the Gorakhpur district. They must have been absorbed into the Magadhan empire along with the other states of Eastern India. Tradition avers that they were reduced to great straits in the fourth century B.C., and young Chandragupta grew up among peacock-tamers, herdsmen and hunters in the Vindhyān forest. The classical notices of his encounter with a lion and an elephant accord well with his residence amidst the wild denizens of that sequestered region. During the inglorious reign of Agrammes, when there was general disaffection amongst his subjects, the Moriyas evidently came into prominence, probably under the leadership of Chandragupta. These clansmen were no longer rulers and were merely Magadhan subjects. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that Justin calls Chandragupta a man of humble origin. Plutarch, as well as Justin, informs us that Chandragupta paid a visit to Alexander. Plutarch says: "Androkottus himself, who was then a lad, saw Alexander

1 Cowell and Neil's Ed., p. 370.
2 Page 409.
4 Life of Alexander, lxii.
himself and afterwards used to declare that Alexander might easily have conquered the whole country, as the then king was hated by his subjects on account of his mean and wicked disposition." From this passage it is not unreasonable to infer that Chandragupta visited Alexander with the intention of inducing the conqueror to put an end to the rule of the tyrant of Magadha. His conduct may be compared to that of Rānā Saṅgrāma Simha who invited Bābur to put an end to the régime of Ibrāhim Lūdi.1 Apparently Chandragupta found Alexander as stern a ruler as Agrammes, for we learn from Justin that the Macedonian king did not scruple to give orders to kill the intrepid Indian lad for his boldness of speech.2 The young Maurya apparently thought of rid- ding his country of both the oppressors, Macedonian as well as Indian. With the help of Kauṭīlya, also called Chāṇakya or Vīṣṇugupta, son of a Brāhmaṇa of Taxila, he is said to have overthrown the infamous Nanda. Traditional accounts of the conflict between Chandragupta and the last Nanda are preserved in the Milindapañho, the Purāṇas, the Mudrārūkshasa, the Mahāvamsa Tīkā and the Jaina Pariśiṣṭaparvan. The Milindapañho3 tells us that the Nanda army was commanded by Bhaddasāla. The Nanda troops were evidently defeated with great slaughter, an exaggerated account of which is preserved in the Milindapañho.

"Sometime after" his acquisition of sovereignty, Chandragupta went to war with the prefects or generals of Alexander4 and crushed their power.

The overthrow of the Nandas, and the liberation of the Paṇjāb were not the only achievements of the great

---


2 As already stated the substitution of 'Nanda' for Alexander cannot be justified.

3 SBE., Vol. XXXVI. p. 147.

4 Cf. Smith, Aśoka, third edition, p. 140. For the relative date of the assumption of sovereignty and the war with the prefects see Indian Culture, II No. 5, pp. 559ff, Age of the Nandas and Mauryas, p. 197.
Maurya. Plutarch tells us\(^1\) that he overran and subdued the whole of India with an army of 600,000 men. Justin also informs us that he was "in possession of India". In his *Beginnings of South Indian History*,\(^2\) Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar says that Māmulanār, an ancient Tamil author, makes frequent allusions to the Mauryas in the past having penetrated with a great army as far as the Podiyil Hill in the Tinnevelly district. The statements of this author are said to be supported by Paraṇar or Param Koṭṭanār and Kallil Āttiraiyānār. The advanced party of the invasion was composed of a warlike people called Kośar\(^3\). The invaders advanced from the Koṅkaṇ, passing the hills Elilmalai, about sixteen miles north of Cannanore, and entered the Kongu (Coimbatore) district, ultimately going as far as the Podiyil Hill (Malaya?). Unfortunately the name of the Maurya leader is not given. But the expression *Vamba Moriyar*, or Maurya upstarts,\(^4\) would seem to suggest that the first Maurya, *i.e.* Chandragupta, and his adherents were meant.\(^5\)

Certain Mysore inscriptions refer to Chandragupta's rule in North Mysore. Thus one epigraph says that

---

\(^1\) Alex. LXII

\(^2\) Chap. II. *cf.* JRAS., 1924, 666.

\(^3\) For the Kośar see *Indian Culture*, I, pp. 97 ff. *cf.* Kośakāra, ANM., 251 ff

\(^4\) *Beginnings of South Indian History*, p. 89 *cf* Maurya navē rājani (*Mudrārākshasa*, Act IV).

\(^5\) Barnett suggests (*Camb. Hist. Ind.*, I, 596) that the 'Vamba Moriyar' or 'Bastard Mauryas' were possibly a branch of the Konkani Mauryas. But there is hardly any genuine historical record of the penetration of the Mauryas of the Koṅkaṇ deep into the southern part of the Tamil country. For other suggestions, see JRAS., 1925, pp. 93-96. Some Tamil scholars hold that "the Moriyar were not allowed to enter Tamilakam, and the last point they reached was the Venkaṭa hill" (*IHQ.*, 1948, p. 143). They also reject Dr. Aiyangar's statement about the Kośar. But the view that the arms of Chandragupta possibly reached the Pāṇḍya country in the Far South of India which abounded in pearls and gems receives some confirmation from the *Mudrārākshasa*, Act III, verse 19, which suggests that the supremacy of the first Maurya eventually extended "from the lord of mountains (the Himālayas), cooled by showers of the spray of the divine stream (Ganges) playing about among its rocks, to the shores of the southern ocean, (Dakshinārṇava) marked by the brilliance of gems flashing with various colours." The description, however, may be purely conventional. Prof. N. Sastri is critical of the account in the Tamil texts (*ANM.*, p. 359f.).
Nāgarkhaṇḍa in the Shikārpur Tāluq was protected by the wise Chandragupta, “an abode of the usages of eminent Kshatriyas”. This is of the fourteenth century and little reliance can be placed upon it. But when the statements of Plutarch, Justin, Māmulanār, and the Mysore inscriptions referred to by Rice, are read together, they seem to suggest that the first Maurya did conquer a considerable portion of trans-Vindhyan India.

Whatever we may think of Chandragupta’s connection with Southern India, there can be no doubt that he pushed his conquests as far as Surāśṭra in Western India. The Junāgadhī Rock inscription of the Mahākṣaṭrapa Rudradāman refers to his Rāṣṭriya or High Commissioner, Pushyagupta, the Vaiśya, who constructed the famous Sudarśana Lake.

Reference has already been made to an Aramaic Inscription from Taxila which mentions the form Priyadarśana, a well-known epithet of Aśoka Maurya. But it is well to remember that in the Mudrārākṣhasa Piḍāmśana is used as a designation of Chandasirī or Chandragupta himself. Further, in Rock Edict VIII of Aśoka, his ancestors, equally with himself are styled Devānaṃpiya. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to conclude that, like his famous grandson, Chandragupta, too, was known as ‘Devānaṃpiya Piyadasi’ (or ‘Priyadarśana’), and it is not always safe to ascribe all epigraphs that make mention of Priyadarśana, irrespective of their contents, to Aśoka the Great.

---

1 Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 10. Fleet, however, is sceptical about the Jaina tradition (Ind Ant., 1892, 156 ff.). Cf. also JRAS., 1911, 814-17.
2 The subjugation of the whole of Northern India (Udīchī) from the Himālayas to the sea is probably suggested by the following passage of the Kauṭūmbika Asthāśstra (IX. 1) traditionally ascribed to a minister of Chandragupta “Deśāḥ Pithiśāḥ; tasyāṁ Himavat Samudrāntaram Udichīnam yojanaśasra prayyānam atiryak Chakravartī-Kshetram”. Cf. Mudrārākṣhasa, Act III. Verse 19.
3 Act VI.
The Seleukidan War

We learn from Justin¹ that when Chandragupta acquired his throne in India Seleukos (Seleucus), a general of Alexander, was laying the foundations of his future greatness. Seleukos was the son of Antiochus, a distinguished general of Philip of Macedon, and his wife Laodike. After the division of the Macedonian Empire among the followers of Alexander he carried on several wars in the east. He first took Babylon,² and then his strength being increased by this success, subdued the Bactrians. He next made an expedition into India. Appianus says³ that he crossed the Indus and waged war on Chandragupta, king of the Indians, who dwelt about it, until he made friends and entered into relations of marriage⁴ with him. Justin also observes that after making a league with Chandragupta, and settling his affairs in the east, Seleukos proceeded to join in the war against Antigonus (301 B.C.). Plutarch supplies us with the information that Chandragupta presented 500 elephants to Seleukos. More important details are given by Strabo who says:⁵

"The Indians occupy (in part) some of the countries situated along the Indus, which formerly belonged to the Persians: Alexander deprived the Ariani of them, and established there settlements (or provinces) of his own. But Seleucus Nicator gave them to Sandrocottus in consequence of a marriage contract, and received in turn 500 elephants."  "The Indians occupied a larger portion of Ariana, which they had received from the Macedonians."⁶

¹ Watson’s tr., p. 143.
² Seleukos obtained the satrapy of Babylon first after the agreement of Triparadeisos (321 B.C.) and afterwards in 312 B.C. from which year his era is dated. In 306 B.C., he assumed the title of king (Camb. Anc. Hist., VII, 161; Camb. Hist. Ind., I, 433).
⁴ Appianus uses the clear term kedos (connection by marriage), and Strabo (XV) only an epigamia. The cession of territory in consequence of the marriage contract clearly suggests that the wedding did take place.
⁵ H. & F., III, p. 125.
⁶ Ibid., p. 78. Tarn., Greeks in Bactria and India, p. 100.

O.P.—123—16
It will be seen that the classical writers do not give us any detailed record of the actual conflict between Seleukos and Chandragupta. They merely speak of the results. There can be no doubt that the invader could not make much headway, and concluded an alliance which was cemented by a marriage contract. In his *Āsoka* Dr. Smith observes that the current notion that the Syrian king “gave his daughter in marriage” to Chandragupta is not warranted by the evidence, which testifies merely to a ‘matrimonial alliance’. But the cession of territory “in consequence of the *epigamia*” may rightly be regarded as a dowry given to a bridegroom. The Indian Emperor obtained some of the provinces situated along the Indus which formerly belonged to the Persians. The ceded country comprised a *large portion of Ariana* itself, a fact ignored by Tarn. In exchange the Maurya monarch gave the “comparatively small recompense of 500 elephants”. It is believed that the territory ceded by the Syrian king included the four satrapies: Aria, Arachosia, Gedrosia and the Paropanisadai, *i.e.*, Herat, Kandahār, Makrān and Kābul. Doubts have been entertained about this by several scholars including Tarn. The inclusion of the Kābul valley within the Maurya Empire is, however, proved by the inscriptions of *Āsoka*, the grandson of Chandragupta, which speak of the Yonas and Gandhāras as vassals of the Empire. And the evidence of Strabo probably points to the cession by Seleukos of a large part of the Iranian Tableland besides the riparian provinces on the Indus.

**Megasthenes**

We learn from the classical writers that after the war the Syrian and Indian Emperors lived on friendly

---

1 Third Ed., p. 15.
2 Dr. G. C. Raychaudhuri draws my attention to an Aramaic inscription of Devānampiya found at Laghman (ancient Lampāka, *BSOAS*, Vol. XIII, Pt. I, 1949, 80ff). This confirms the Greek evidence about the inclusion of Kābul and its neighbourhood within the dominions of the early Mauryas.
terms. Athenaios tells us that Chandragupta sent presents including certain powerful aphrodisiacs to the Syrian monarch.\(^1\) Seleukos sent an envoy to the Maurya court, whose name was Megasthenes. Arrian tells us\(^2\) that Megasthenes originally lived with Sibyrtios, the satrap of Arachosia. He was sent from thence to Pāṭaliputra where he often visited the Maurya Emperor, and wrote a history on Indian affairs. The work of Megasthenes has been lost. The fragments that survive in quotations by later authors like Strabo, Arrian, Diodoros and others, have been collected by Schwanbeck, and translated into English by McCrindle. As Professor Rhys Davids observes, Megasthenes possessed very little critical judgment, and was, therefore, often misled by wrong information received from others. But he is a truthful witness concerning matters which came under his personal observation. The most important piece of information supplied by him is, as Rhys Davids pointed out, the description of Pāṭaliputra which Arrian quotes in Chapter X of his *Indica*:

``The largest city in India, named Palimbothra, is in the land of the Prasians, where is the confluence of the river Erannobaos\(^3\) and the Ganges, which is the greatest of rivers. The Erannobaos would be third of the Indian rivers . . . . . Megasthenes says that on the side where it is longest this city extends 80 stades (9½ miles) in length, and that its breadth is fifteen (1½ miles); that the city has been surrounded with a ditch in breadth 6 plethra (606

---

\(^1\) *Inv. Alex.*, p. 405. Cf. Smith, *EHI*, 4th ed., p. 153. The treaty between Chandragupta and Seleukos ushered in a policy of philhellenism which bore fruit in the succeeding reigns. In the days of Bindusāra and Asoka there was not only an exchange of embassies with the Hellenistic powers of the West, but the services of Greek philosophers and administrators were eagerly sought by the imperial government.

\(^2\) Chinnock’s tr., p. 234.

feet), and in depth 30 cubits; and that its wall has 570 towers and 64 gates."

There were many other cities in the empire besides Pātaliputra, Arrian says, "It would not be possible to record with accuracy the number of the cities on account of their multiplicity. Those which are situated near the rivers or the sea are built of wood: for if they were built of brick they could not long endure on account of the rain and because the rivers overflowing their banks fill the plains with water. But those which have been founded in commanding places, lofty and raised above the adjacent country, are built of brick and mortar." The most important cities of Chandragupta's empire besides the metropolis, were Taxila, Ujjain, Kausāmbī and possibly Pundranagara.2

Ælian gives the following account of the palace of Chandragupta: "In the Indian royal palace where the greatest of all the kings of the country resides, besides much else which is calculated to excite admiration, and with which neither Susa, nor Ecbatana can vie (for, methinks, only the well-known vanity of the Persians could prompt such a comparison4), there are other wonders besides. In the parks tame peacocks are kept, and pheasants which have been domesticated;" there

1 Cf. Patañjali, IV. 3.2; "Pātaliputrakāh prāśādāh Pātaliputrakāh prākārā iti."

2 Pundranagara has been identified with Mahāsthānagarh in the Bogra District of Bengal. The identification seems to be confirmed by an inscription, written in early Mauryan Brāhmī character, which has been discovered at Mahāsthāna. The record makes mention of Pundranagala and its storehouse filled with coins styled Gaṅḍakas, Kākanikas, etc. and refers to a people called Sadvargikas (Barua, IHQ, 1934, March, 57 ff; D. R. Bhandarkar, Ep. Ind., April, 1931, 83 ff; P. C. Sen, IHQ, 1933, 722 ff). Dr. Bhandarkar reads Saṅṅiṅga(n)gīya in the place of Sadvargika which is more plausibly suggested by Dr. Barua. If the record really belongs to the early Maurya period the reference to coins is interesting. Dr. K. P. Jayaswal thinks that coins of the Maurya age bear certain symbols that can be recognized (cf. JRAS, 1936, 437 ff.).

3 The "Sugāṅga" palace was the favourite resort of Chandragupta (JRAS, 1923, 587).

4 The statement should be remembered by those modern writers who find traces of Persian influence in Maurya architecture.
are shady groves and pasture ground planted with trees, and branches of trees which the art of the woodsman has deftly interwoven; while some trees are native to the soil, others are brought from other parts, and with their beauty enhance the charms of the landscape. Parrots are natives of the country, and keep hovering about the king and wheeling round him and vast though their numbers be, no Indian ever eats a parrot. The Brachmans honour them highly above all other birds—because the parrot alone can imitate human speech. Within the palace grounds are artificial ponds in which they keep fish of enormous size but quite tame. No one has permission to fish from these except the king's sons while yet in their boyhood. These youngsters amuse themselves while fishing in the unruffled sheet of water and learning how to sail their boats."

The imperial palace probably stood close to the modern village of Kumrahār. The unearthing of the ruins of the Maurya pillar-hall and palace near Kumrahār, said to have been built on the model of the throne-room and palace of Darius at Persepolis, led Dr. Spooner to propound the theory that the Mauryas were Zoroastrians. Dr. Smith observed that the resemblance of the Maurya buildings with the Persian palace at Persepolis was not definitely established. Besides, as Professor Chanda observes, "Ethnologists do not recognize high class architecture as test of race, and in the opinion of experts the buildings of Darius and Xerxes at Persepolis are not Persian in style, but are mainly dependent on Babylonian models and bear traces of the influence of Greece, Egypt and Asia Minor."

We learn from Strabo⁴ that the king usually remained within the palace under the protection of female guards⁵

---

⁴ McRindle, *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature*, pp. 141-42.
⁶ JRAS, 1915, pp. 68 ff, 405 ff.
⁸ The same writer tells us that these women were bought from their parents. In view of this statement it is rather surprising that Megasthenes
(cf. strī迦nāir dhanvibhiḥ of the Arthaśāstra) and appeared in public only on four occasions, viz., in time of war; to sit in his court as a judge; to offer sacrifice and to go on hunting expeditions.

**Chandragupta’s Government**

Chandragupta was not only a great soldier and conqueror, he was a great administrator. Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador at his court, has left detailed accounts of his system of government. The edict of his grandson Asoka, and the Arthaśāstra attributed to his minister, Kautilya, confirm in many respects the particulars of the organisation of the empire given by the distinguished envoy. The Arthaśāstra certainly existed before Bāna (seventh century A.D.) and the Nandisūtra of the Jainas (not later than the fifth century A.D.). But it is doubtful if, in its present shape, it is as old as the time of the first Maurya. Reference to Chinapaṭṭa, China silk, which, be it remembered, occurs frequently in classical Sanskrit literature, points to a later date, as China was clearly outside the horizon of the early Mauryas, and is unknown to Indian epigraphy before the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions. Equally noteworthy is the use of Sanskrit as the official language, a feature not characteristic of the Maurya epoch. A date as late as the Gupta period is, however, precluded by the absence of any reference to the Denarius in the sections dealing with weights and coins. Quite in keeping with this view is the reference to the Arthaśāstra contained in Jaina canonical works that were reduced to writing in the Gupta age. We have already adduced grounds for believing that Arthaśāstra probably existed before the second century A.D.² Though

is quoted as saying that none of the Indians employed slaves. Note also the story narrated by Athenaios that Amītrocēthai, (i.e., Bindusāra) begged Antiochos Soter to buy and send him a professor (Monahan, *The Early History of Bengal*, pp. 164, 176, 179).


² P. 8 f. ante.
a comparatively late work, it may be used, like the Junāgaḍh Inscription of Rudradāman, to confirm and supplement the information gleaned from earlier sources.

The Supreme Government consisted of two main parts:

1. The Rājā and
2. The "Councillors" and "Assessors" (Mahāmātras, and Amātyas or Sachivas).

The Rājā or sovereign was the head of the state. He was considered to be a mere mortal, though a favoured mortal, the beloved of the deities. The possession of the material resources of a great empire and control over a vast standing army gave him real power. But there was a body of ancient rules, Porāṇā pakitī, which even the most masterful despot viewed with respect. The people were an important element of the state. They were looked upon as children for whose welfare the head of the state was responsible, and to whom he owed a debt which could only be discharged by good government. There was a certain amount of decentralisation, notably in the sphere of local government, and there was usually at the imperial headquarters, and also at the chief centres of provincial government, a body of ministers who had a right to be consulted specially in times of emergency. Nevertheless the powers of the king were extensive. He had military, judicial, legislative, as well as executive functions. We have already seen that one of the occasions when he left his palace was war. He considered plans of military operations with his Senāpati or Commander-in-Chief.

He also sat in his court to administer justice. "He remains there all day thus occupied, not suffering himself to be interrupted even though the time arrives for attend-

---

1. Cf. ante 198 n. 10.
2. Cf. Strabo, XV. i; and Kauṭilya, Bk. X.
3. Kauṭ., p. 98. In the last days of the Maurya empire we find the Senāpati overshadowing the king and transferring to himself the allegiance of the troops.
ing to his person. This attention to his person consists of friction with pieces of wood, and he continues to listen to the cause, while the friction is performed by four attendants who surround him."¹ The Kautiliya Arthaśāstra says,² "when in the court, he (the king) shall never cause his petitioners to wait at the door, for when a king makes himself inaccessible to his people and entrusts his work to his immediate officers, he may be sure to engender confusion in business, and to cause thereby public disaffection, and himself a prey to his enemies. He shall, therefore, personally attend to the business of gods, of heretics, of Brahmans learned in the Vedas, of cattle, of sacred places, of minors, the aged, the afflicted, the helpless and of women;—all this in order (of enumeration) or according to the urgency or pressure of those works. All urgent calls he shall hear at once."

As to the king's legislative function we should note that the Kautiliya Arthaśāstra³ calls him "dharma-pravartaka", and includes Rājasāsana among the sources of law. As instances of royal "Śāsanas" or rescripts may be mentioned the Edicts of Aśoka, the famous grandson of Chandragupta.

Among executive functions of the king, our authorities mention the posting of watchmen, attending to the accounts of receipts and expenditure, appointment of ministers, priests and superintendents, correspondence with the Mantriparishad or Council of Ministers, collection of the secret information gathered by spies, reception of envoys, etc.⁴

It was the king who laid down the broad lines of policy and issued rescripts for the guidance of his officers and the people. Control was maintained over the most

² Shamsastry's translation, p. 43.
³ Bk. III, Chap. 1.
⁴ Kautilya, Bk. I, Chs. xvi; xvii; Bk. VIII, Ch. i. Cf. Aśoka's Rock Edicts III (regulation about alpa vrayati and alpa bhāndati), V (appointment of high officials). VI (relations with the Parishad, and collection of information from the Pañjivedaka), and XIII (diplomatic relations with foreign powers).
distant officials by an army of secret reporters and overseers and, in the days of Chandragupta's grandson, by itinerant judges. Communication with them was kept up by a network of roads, and garrisons were posted at strategic points.

Kauṭilya holds that Rājatva (sovereignty) is possible only with assistance.¹ A single wheel can never move. Hence the king shall employ Sachivas and hear their opinion. The Sachivas or Amātyas of Kauṭilya correspond to the "seventh caste" of Megasthenes which assisted the king in deliberating on public affairs. This class was small in number, but in wisdom and justice excelled all the others.²

1 The most important amongst the Sachivas or Amātyas were undoubtedly the Mantrins or High Ministers, probably corresponding to the Mahāmātras of Aśoka's Rock Edict VI and the "advisers of the king" referred to by Diodoros.³ They were selected from those Amātyas whose character had been tested under all kinds of allurements.⁴ They were given the highest salary, viz., 48,000 paṇas per annum.⁵ They assisted the king in examining the character of the Amātyas who were employed in ordinary department.⁶ All kinds of administrative measures were preceded by consultation with three or four of them.⁷ In works of emergency (ātyayike kārye) they were summoned along with the Mantri-parishad.⁸ They exercised a certain amount of control over the Imperial Princes.⁹ They accompanied the king to the battle-field, and gave encouragement to the troops.¹⁰

¹ Cf. Manu, VII. 55.
² Chinnock, Arrian, p. 413.
³ II. 41.
⁴ Sarvopadā-dutyān Mantriṇaḥ kuryāt.—Arthaśāstra, 1919, p. 17. For upadā see also the Jūnāgadh Rock Inscription of Skanda Gupta.
⁵ Kauṭilya, p. 247. According to Smith (EH1, 4th ed., p. 149) the value of a silver paṇa may be taken as not far from a shilling.
⁶ Ibid., p. 16.
⁷ Ibid., pp. 26, 28.
⁸ Ibid., p. 29. Cf. Aśoka's Rock Edict VI.
⁹ Ibid., p. 333.
¹⁰ Ibid., p. 303. Cf. the Udayagiri Inscription of Śāba.
Kauṭilya was evidently one of those Mantrins. Another minister (or Pradeshtri?) was apparently Maniyatappo, a Jaṭilian, who helped the king to “confer the blessings of peace on the country by extirpating marauders who were like unto thorns.”¹ That there were at times more than one Manrin is proved by the use of the plural Mantrinaḥ.

In addition to the Mantrins there was the Mantriparishad, i.e., Assembly of Counsellors or Council of Ministers. The existence of the Parishad as an important element of the Mautrya constitution is proved by the third and sixth Rock Edicts of Aśoka.² The members of the Mantriparishad were not identical with the Mantrins. In several passages of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra the Mantrins are sharply distinguished from the Mantriparishad.³ The latter evidently occupied an inferior position. Their salary was only 12,000 paṇas, whereas the salary of a Manrin was 48,000. They do not appear to have been consulted on ordinary occasions, but were summoned along with the Mantrins when Ātyayika kārya,⁴ i.e., works of emergency had to be transacted. The king was to be guided by the decision of the majority (Bhūyishṭḥāḥ). They also attended the king at the time of the reception of envoys.⁵ From the passage “Mantriparishadānī dvādaśā-mātyān kurvita”—“the Council of Ministers should consist of twelve Amātyas,” it appears that the Parishad used to be recruited from all kinds of Amātyas (not necessarily from Mantrins alone). From Kauṭilya's denunciation of a king with a “Kshudraparishad,”⁶ a small council, his rejection of the views of the Mānavas, Bārhaspatyas and the Auśanasas, his preference for an

¹ Turnour's Mahāvaṁśa, p. xlii. The evidence is late.
² Note also Pliny's reference to noble and rich Indians who sit in council with the king (Monahan, The Early History of Bengal, 148); cf. Mbh. iii, 127.
³ Amātyaparishad; xii, 320, 199 Amāṭya Samītī.
⁴ Cf. pp. 20, 29, 247.
⁶ Arthaśāstra, p. 45.
“Akshudra-parishad”, a council that is not small, and his reference to Indra’s Parishad of a thousand Rishis, it may be presumed that he wanted to provide for the needs of a growing empire. Such an empire was undoubtedly that of Chandragupta who may have been prevailed upon by his advisers to constitute a fairly big assembly.¹

Besides the Mantrins and the Mantriparishad, there was another class of Amātyas who filled the great administrative and judicial appointments.² The Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra says³ that the “dharmopadhāsuddha” Amātyas, officers purified by religious test, should be employed in civil⁴ and criminal⁵ courts, the “arthopadhāsuddha” Amātyas, officers purified by money-test, should be employed as Samāhartṛi (“Chancellor of the Exchequer and Minister of the Interior”) and Sannidhātṛi (High Treasurer and Keeper of Stores);⁶ the “kāmopadhāsuddha” Amātyas, officials purified by love-test, should be appointed to superintend the pleasure grounds, the “bhayopadhā-śuddha” Amātyas, officers purified by fear-test, should be appointed to do work requiring immediate attention (āsanna-kārya), while those who are proved to be impure should be employed in mines, timber and elephant forests,⁷

¹ The Divyāsoudāna (p. 372) refers to the five hundred councillors (Panchāmātyyādānī) of Bindusāra, son and successor of Chandragupta Maurya. Patañjali refers to Chandragupta Sabha. But we have no indication as to its constitution.

² Cf. the Karma-Sachivas of the Junāgaḍh Rock Inscription of Rudradāman I.


⁴ Civil (Dharmasthīya) Courts were established “in the cities of Saṅgraḥaṇa (in the midst of a collection of ten villages), Droṇamukha (in the centre of four hundred villages), Sthāniya (in the centre of eight hundred villages), and at places where districts met (Janapa-sandhi; union of districts)”, and consisted of three Dharmasthas (judges versed in the sacred law) and three Amātyas.

⁵ A Criminal (Kaṇṭakhaśodhana) Court consisted of 3 Amātyas, or 3 Pradesṭhītras. The functions of the latter will be described later on.

⁶ For the duties of these officers see Kauṭiliya’s Arthāśāstra, Bk. II, 5-6, 35; Bk. IV, 4; Bk. V, 8. For the revenue system under the Mauryas, see Ghoshal, Hindu Revenue System, pp. 165 ff.

⁷ Cf. Nāgavana of Pillar Edict V.
and manufactories. Untried Amātyas were to be employed in ordinary or insignificant departments (sāmānya adhikaraṇa). Persons endowed with the qualifications required in an Amātya (Amātyasampadopeta) were appointed Nisṛishtārthāḥ or Ministers Plenipotentiary, Lekhakas or Ministers of Correspondence, and Adhyakshas or Superintendents.

The statements of the Kauṭiliya Arthasastra regarding the employment of Amātyas as the chief executive and judicial officers of the realm, are confirmed by the classical writers. Strabo, for example, observes,1 "the seventh caste consists of counsellors and assessors (Symbouloi and Synedroi) of the king. To these persons belong the offices of state, tribunals of justice, and the whole administration of affairs." Arrian also says, "from them are chosen their rulers, governors of provinces, deputies, treasurers, generals, admirals, controllers of expenditure and superintendents of agriculture."

The adhyakshas who formed the pivot of the Kauṭiliyan administration, are evidently referred to by Strabo's translators as "Magistrates" in the following passage:2

"Of the Magistrates, some have the charges of the market,3 others of the city, others of the soldiery.4 Some5 have the care of the rivers, measure the land, as in Egypt, and inspect the closed reservoirs from which water is distributed by canals, so that all may have an equal use of it. These persons have charge also of the hunters, and have the power of rewarding or punishing those who merit either. They collect the taxes, and superintend the occupations connected with land, as wood-cutters, carpenters, workers in brass, and miners. They superintend the public roads, and place a pillar at every ten stadia to

---

2 One class of Adhyakshas, those in charge of women, are referred to in the Asokan inscriptions as Mahāmātras.
3 "District" according to the Cambridge History of India, I. 417.
4 Cf. the Durga-rāṣṭra-daṇḍa-mukhyas of Kauṭiliya, Bk. XIII, Chs. III and V.
5 I.e., the district officials (Agronomol.)
indicate the byways and distances. Those who have charge of the city (astynomoi) are divided into six bodies of five each.¹ Next to the Magistrates of the city is a third body of governors, who have the care of military affairs. This class also consists of six divisions each composed of five persons.²

The Magistrates in charge of the city and those in charge of military affairs are evidently the same as the Nagarādhyakshas and Balādhyakshas of the Arthaśāstra.³ Dr. Smith remarks,⁴ “the Boards described by Megasthenes as in charge of the business of the capital and the army are unknown to the author (Kauṭilya), who contemplated each such charge as the duty of a single officer. The creation of the Boards may have been an innovation effected by Chandragupta personally.” But the historian overlooks the fact that Kauṭilya distinctly says: “Bahu-mukhyam anityam chādhikaraṇam sthāpayet,” “each department shall be officered by several temporary heads;”⁵ “Adhyakshāḥ Saṅkhyaḥ - Lekha - Rūpadarśaka - Nīv-

¹ Each body was responsible for one of the following departments, viz., (1) the mechanical arts, (2) foreign residents, (3) registration of births and deaths, (4) trade, commerce, weights and measures, (5) supervision and sale of manufactured articles and (6) collection of tithes on sales. In their collective capacity they looked after public buildings, markets, harbours and temples. Prices were regulated by them.

² Each division or Board was responsible for one of the following departments, viz., the navy, transport and commissariat (cf. Vīṣṭī-karmāṇī of Kauṭilya, Bk. X, Ch. iv), the infantry, the cavalry, the chariots and the elephants. In the Sāntiparva of the Mahābhārata the divisions are stated to be six (CIII. 98) or eight (LIX. 41-42):

   Raithā Nāgā Haryāchaiva Pādātāśchaiva Pāṇḍavaa
   Vīṣṭīra Nāvaś Charāśchaiva Deśikā iti chāśṭhamām
   Āṅgānyetāni Kauravya prakāśāni balasya tu

   “Chariots, elephants, horses, infantry, burden-carriers, ships, spies with local guides as the eighth—these are the open “limbs” of a fighting force. O descendant of Kuru.”

The Raṭhuvaṁśa (IV, 26) refers to Shādvidham balam. Cf. Mbh, V. 96. 16.


⁵ Arthaśāstra, 1919, p. 60. On page 57 we have the following passage—Hasty-āsya-ratha-padgum-aneka-mukhyam-avasthāpayet, i.e., elephants, cavalry, chariots, and infantry shall each be placed under many chiefs.
gravahak-Ottarādhyaksha-sakhāḥ karmāni kuryuḥ", "the Superintendents shall carry on their duties with the assistance of accountants, scribes, coin-examiners, stock-takers and additional secret overseers." Evidently Dr. Smith notices only the Adhyakshas but ignores the existence of the Uttarādhyakshas and others. As in regard to the Arthaśāstra Smith notices only the Adhyakshas, so in regard to the classical accounts he takes note only of the Boards, but ignores the chiefs who are expressly mentioned in two passages,¹ viz.—

"One division is associated with the Chief Naval Superintendent," "another (division) is associated with the person who has the charge of the bullock-teams." The Chief Naval Superintendent and the Person-in-Charge of the Bullock-teams, doubtless, correspond to the Nāvadhyaksha and the Go'dhyaksha of the Arthaśāstra. It is a mistake to think that the Nāvadhyaksha of the early Hindu period was a purely civil official, for he was responsible for the destruction of Himsrikās (pirate ships?) and the Mahābhārata² clearly refers to the navy as one of the aṅgas or limbs of the Royal Forces. The civil duties of the Nāvadhyaksha have their counterpart in those of Megasthenes' Admiral relating to the "letting out of ships on hire for the transport both of passengers and merchandise."³

Central popular assemblies like those that existed among the Lichchhavis, Mallas, Śākyas and other Saṅghas had no place in the Maurya constitution. The custom of summoning a great assembly of Grāmikas or Village Headmen seems also to have fallen into disuse. The royal council gradually became an aristocratic body attended only by nobles and rich men.⁴

Administration of Justice

At the head of the judiciary stood the king himself.

¹ H. & F., Strabo, III, p. 104.
² XII. lxx, 41-42.
³ Strabo, XV. 1. 46.
⁴ Pliny quoted in Monahan's Early History of Bengal, 148.
Besides the royal court there were special tribunals of justice both in cities (nagara) and country parts (janapada) presided over by Vyāvahārika Mahāmātras and Rājūkas respectively. Greek writers refer to judges who listened to cases of foreigners. Petty cases in villages were doubtless decided by the headmen and the village elders. All our authorities testify to the severity of the penal code. But the rigours of judicial administration were sought to be mitigated by Aśoka, grandson of Chandragupta, who meted out equal justice to all and instituted the system of itinerant Mahāmātras to check maladministration in the outlying provinces. Considerable discretion was, however, allowed to the Rājūkas. We are informed by Greek writers that “theft was a thing of very rare occurrence” among Indians. They express their surprise at this for they go on to observe that the people “have no written laws but are ignorant of writing, and conduct all matters by memory.” The assertion about the Indians’ ignorance of writing is hardly correct. Nearchus and Curtius record that Indians use pieces of closely woven linen and the tender bark of trees for writing on. Strabo tells us that a philosopher who has any useful suggestion to offer, commits it to writing. Attention may also be invited to the marks on Mauryan pillars intended to show the by-roads and distances.¹

Provincial Government

The Empire was divided into a number of provinces which were subdivided into āhāras or vishayas (districts), because “no single administration could support the Atlantean load.” The exact number of provinces in Chandragupta’s time is unknown. In the time of his grandson, Aśoka, there were at least five, viz.:

1. Uttarāpatha² ... ... capital, Taxila

² *Pitṛyāvadāna*, p. 407.
2. Avantirāṭha¹ . . . Capital Ujjayinī
4. Kaliṅga . . . . . . Tosali
5. Prāchya, Prāchīna (Prasū)² . . . Pāṭaliputra

Of these only the first two and the last one can be said, with any amount of certainty, to have formed parts of Chandragupta’s Empire. But it is not altogether improbable that Dakšināpatha, too, was one of Chandragupta’s provinces. The outlying provinces were ruled by princes of the blood royal who were usually styled Kumāras. We learn from the Kautiliya Arthasastra³ that the salary of a Kumāra was 12,000 paṇas per annum.

The Home Provinces, i.e., Prāchya and the Madhya-deśa (Eastern India and Mid-India), were directly ruled by the Emperor himself with the assistance of Mahāmātras or High Officers stationed in important cities like Pāṭaliputra, Kauśāmbī, etc.

Besides the Imperial Provinces, Maurya India included a number of territories which enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy. Arrian refers to peoples who were autonomous and cities which enjoyed a democratic Government.⁴ The Kautiliya Arthasastra⁵ refers to a number of Saṅghas, i.e., economic, military or political corporations or confederations evidently enjoying autonomy in certain matters, e.g., Kamboja, Surāśṭra, etc. The Kambojas find prominent mention as a unit in the Thirteenth Rock Edict of Aśoka. R. E. V. alludes to various nations or peoples on the western border (Aparātā) in addition to those named specifically.⁶ It is not improbable that Surāśṭra was included among these nations which, judged by the title of its local rulers, enjoyed a considerable amount of autonomy. The commentary on

¹ The Questions of King Milinda, pt. II, p. 250 n. Mahāvaṃsa, Ch. XIII; MahābodhiVaṃsa, p. 98.
² Cf. the Questions of Milinda, II. 250 n.
³ P. 247.
⁴ Monahan, The Early History of Bengal, 150; Chinnock, Arrian, 413.
⁵ P. 378.
⁶ IHQ, 1931, 631.
the Petavatthu refers to one of the local Rājās named Piṅgala,\(^1\) the contemporary of Aśoka. Another contemporary,\(^2\) the Yavana-rāja Tushāspha finds mention in Rudradāman’s inscription at Junāgaḍh. The Yavana-rāja was probably a Greek chief of the North-West who was appointed to look after the affairs of Surāśṭra by Aśoka, just as Rājā Mān Singh of Amber was appointed Subadār of Bengal by Akbar. His relations with Aśoka may also be compared to that subsisting between the Rājā of the Śākya state and Pasenadi. In the time of the first Maurya Surāśṭra had an officer named Pushyagupta, the Vaiśya who is described as a Rāṣṭriya of Chandragupta. In the Bombay Gazetteer,\(^3\) the word Rāṣṭriya was taken to mean a brother-in-law. Kielhorn, however, in the Epigraphiq Indica,\(^4\) took the term to mean a provincial Governor. This rendering does not seem to be quite adequate because we have already seen that Surāśṭra had possibly its group of Rājās in the Maurya Age and could not be regarded as an Imperial Province under a bureaucratic governor of the ordinary type. The Rāṣṭriya of the inscription seems to have been a sort of Imperial High Commissioner,\(^5\) and the position of Pushyagupta in Surāśṭra was probably like that of Lord Cromer in Egypt. Neither the Arthaśāstra nor the edicts of Aśoka mention clearly any class of officials called Rāsh-

\(^{1}\) Law, Buddhist Conception of Spirits, 47 ff.
\(^{2}\) Attempts in recent times to assign Tushāspha to the post-Aśokan period lack plausibility. In the Junāgaḍh epigraph the name of the suzerain invariably accompanies that of the local ruler or officer. There is no reason to think that the relationship between Aśoka and Tushāspha was different from that between Chandragupta and Pushyagupta or between Rudradāman and Suviśākha.
\(^{4}\) Vol. VIII. p. 46.
\(^{5}\) Cf. the type met with in the Near East after the First World War. The High Commissioner acted for the de facto paramount power. His office does not preclude the possibility of the existence of a local potentate or potentates. Note also Wendel Wilkie’s observation (One World, p. 13) on the British “ambassador” to Egypt, who is “for all practical purposes its actual ruler”.

O.P. 133—17
It is, however, probable, that the Rāṣṭriya was identical with the Rāṣṭrapāla whose salary was equal to that of a Kumāra or Prince. A hereditary bureaucracy does not seem to have come to existence in the early Maurya period at least in the territory of Surāṣṭra. The assumption of the title of Rājā by local rulers and the grant of autonomy to the Rājūkas in the days of Aśoka ultimately let loose centrifugal forces which must have helped in the dismemberment of the empire.

**Overseers and Spies**

The classical writers refer to a class of men called Overseers (Ephiskopoi) who “overlook what is done throughout the country and in the cities, and make report to the king where the Indians are ruled by a king, or the magistrates where the people have a democratic Government.” Strabo calls this class of men the Ephori or Inspectors. "They are," says he, "intrusted with the superintendence of all that is going on, and it is their duty to report pri-

---

1 The Aśokan inscriptions, however, mention the Rathikas and the Pāli English Dictionary, edited by Rhys Davids and Stede compares Raṭṭhika with Rāṣṭriya.

2 *Arthasastra*, p. 247. For Rāṣṭriya see also *Mbh.*, XII. 85. 12; 87. 9. According to Amara (V. 14) a Rāṣṭriya is a rājasyāla (brother-in-law of the king). But Kshīrasvāmin says in his commentary that except in a play a Rāṣṭriya is a Rāṣṭrādhyānta, i.e. an officer appointed to look after or supervise the affairs of a rāṣṭra, state or province. Cf., the Macedonian episkopos. Note the position of Eudamos in relation to the Indian Rājās of the Pañjab, and that of Pratihāra Tantrapālas of the tenth century A.D. Dr. Barua draws attention (in *IC*, X. 1944, pp. 88ff.) to several texts including Buddhaghosa’s statement that during a royal state-drive the place assigned to the Rāṣṭriyas was just between the Mahāmātras and Brahmīnsh shouting the joy of victory. They themselves were gorgeously dressed holding swords and the like in their hands. This may well be true. But the texts cited by him are not adequate enough to prove that in the days of Chandragupta Maurya the Rāṣṭriya or Rāṣṭriya was nothing more than the foremost among the bankers, business magnates, etc., who functioned as Mayors, Sheriffs and Justices of the Peace. The analogy of Tushāśpaka and Suviśākha mentioned in the same epigraph suggests that the Rāṣṭriya here was a more exalted functionary, and that the evidence of Kshīrasvāmin cannot be lightly brushed aside.

vately to the king... The best and the most faithful persons are appointed to the office of Inspectors." The Overseer of Arrian and the Inspector of Strabo may correspond to the Rāṣṭriya of the Junāgadh Inscription or to the Pradeshtṛi or the Gūḍha-Purushas (secret emissaries) of the Arthaśāstra. Pradeshtṛi may be derived from Pradiś which means 'to point, 'to communicate'.

Strabo speaks of different classes of Inspectors. He tells us that the City Inspectors employed as their co-adjutors the city courtesans; and the Inspectors of the Camp, the women who followed it. The employment of women of easy virtue as spies is also alluded to by the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra. According to that work there were two groups of spies, viz.:

1. Saṁisthāḥ, or stationary spies, consisting of secret agents styled Kāpaṭika, Udāsthita, GṛihapatiKa, VaiDehaka and Tāpasa, i.e., fraudulent disciples, recluses, householders, merchants and ascetics.

2. Saṁchārāḥ or wandering spies, including emissaries termed Satri, Tikṣṇa and Rashada, i.e., class-mates, firebrands and poisoners and certain women described as Bhikshukis (mendicants), Pariṇājakās (wandering nuns), Munḍas (shavelings) and Vṛishalīs. It is to the last class, viz., the Vṛishalīs that Strabo evidently refers. We have also explicit references to courtesan (puṁśchali, veśyā, rūpājīvā) spies in the Arthaśāstra.

Care of Foreigners

It is clear from the accounts of Diodorus and Strabo that the Maurya government took special care of foreigners.

---

1 H. and F., Strabo, III, p. 103.
4 A Vṛishalī is taken to mean a gaṇikā or courtesan by the author of the Bhagavadajjukhyam (p. 94).
5 Pp. 224, 316 of the Arthaśāstra (1919).
6 II. 42.
7 XV. I. 50.
"Among the Indians officers are appointed even for foreigners, whose duty is to see that no foreigner is wronged. Should any one of them lose his health, they send physicians to attend him, and take care of him otherwise, and if he dies they bury him, and deliver over such property as he leaves to his relatives. The judges also decide cases in which foreigners are concerned with the greatest care and come down sharply on those who take unfair advantage of them."

Village Administration

The administrative and judicial business of villages was, in Ancient India, carried on by the Grāmikas, Grāmabhajakas or Ayuktas who were, no doubt, assisted by the village elders. The omission of the Grāmika from the list of salaried officials given in the Arthaśāstra is significant. It probably indicates that in the days of the author of the treatise the Grāmika was not a salaried servant of the crown, but possibly an elected official of the villagers. The king’s servant in the village was the Grāma-bhritaka or Grāma-bhojaka. Above the Grāmika the Arthaśāstra places the Gopa, who looked after 5 or 10 villages, and the Sthānika who controlled one quarter of a janapada or district. The work of these officers was super-

---

1 McCrindle, Megasthenes and Arrian, 1926, p. 42.
2 Fick, Social Organization, 162; Arthaśāstra, pp. 157, 172. Cf. Lüders, Ins. Nos. 48, 69a. The Kalinga Edicts refer to Ayuktas who helped the princely viceroys and Mahāmātras in carrying out Imperial Policy. In the early Post-Mauryan and Scythian Age they are distinctly referred to as village officials (Lüders’ List, No. 1347). In the Gupta Age the designation is applied to various functionaries including district officers.
4 Bk. V, Ch. III.
5 There is, however, evidence to show that in early times adhikrītas were appointed for villages by the paramount ruler (Praśna Upanishad, III. 4).
6 Artha., pp. 175, 248.
7 The Grāmabhajaka of the Jātakas was an amātya of the king (Fick, Social Organization in N. E. Ind., p. 160).
8 The Gopas proper do not find mention in early epigraphs, but Lüders’ Ins., No. 1366, mentions “Senā-gopas”.
vised, according to that treatise by the Samāhartyī with the help of the Pradeshrīs.¹ Rural administration must have been highly efficient. We are told by Greek observers that the tillers of the soil received adequate protection from all injury and would devote the whole of their time to cultivation.

Revenue and Expenditure

The cost of civil and military administration even at the centre must have been enormous. The chief sources of revenue from villages were the Bhāga and the Bali. The Bhāga was the king’s share of the produce of the soil which was normally fixed at one-sixth, though in special cases it was raised to one-fourth or reduced to one-eighth. Bali seems to have been an extra impost from the payment of which certain tracts were exempted. According to Greek writers husbandmen paid, in addition to a fourth part of the produce of the soil, a land tribute because, according to their belief, “all India is the property of the crown and no private person is permitted to own land.” Taxes on land were collected by the Agronomoi who measured the land and superintended the irrigation works. Other state dues included tribute and prescribed services from those who worked at trades, and cattle from herdsmen. In urban areas the main sources of revenue included birth and death taxes, fines and tithes on sales. The Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali has an interesting reference to the Mauryas’ love of gold which led them to deal in images of deities. The distinction between taxes levied in rural and in fortified areas respectively is known to the Arthashastra which refers to certain high revenue functionaries styled the Samāhartyī and the Sannidhātri. No such

¹ Artha., pp. 142, 217. We do not know how far the system described in the treatise on polity applies to the early Maurya period. In the days of Asoka the work of supervision was done largely by special classes of Mahāmātras (cf. R.E.V. and the Kāliṅga Edicts), Pulisā (agents) and Rājukas (Pillar Edict IV).
officials are, however, mentioned in Maurya inscriptions. Greek writers, on the other hand, refer to 'treasurers of the state' or 'superintendents of the treasury'.

A considerable part of the revenue was spent on the army. The artisans, too, received maintenance from the Imperial exchequer. Herdsmen and hunters received an allowance of grain in return for clearing the land of wild beasts and fowls. Another class which benefited from royal bounty were the philosophers among whom were included Brāhmaṇas as well as Śramaṇas or ascetics. Vast sums were also spent for irrigation, construction of roads, erection of buildings and fortifications, and establishment of hospitals in the days of Chandragupta's grandson.

The last Days of Chandragupta

Jaina tradition recorded in the Rājāvalīkatthe' avers that Chandragupta was a Jaina and that, when a great famine occurred, he abdicated in favour of his son Simhasena and repaired to Mysore where he died. Two inscriptions on the north bank of the Kāverī near Seringapatam of about 900 A.D., describe the summit of the Kalbappu Hill, i.e., Chandragiri, as marked by the footprints of Bhadrabāhu and Chandragupta Munipati. Dr. Smith observes: "The Jain tradition holds the field, and no alternative account exists." Chandragupta died about 300 B.C., after a reign of 24 years.

1 Ind. Ant., 1892, 157.
2 Rice, Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, pp. 3-4.
3 The Oxford History of India, p. 76. As already stated, Fleet is sceptical about the Jaina tradition (Ind. Ant., 1892, 156f). According to Greek evidence Chandragupta was a follower of the sacrificial religion (see p. 246 ante). The epithet Prishala applied to him in the Mudrārākshasa suggests that in regard to certain matters he did deviate from strict orthodoxy (Indian Culture, II, No. 3, pp. 558 ff. See also C. J. Shah, Jainism in Northern India, 135n, 138).
4 For the date of Chandragupta Maurya see Indian Culture, Vol. II, No. 3, pp. 560ff. Buddhist tradition of Ceylon puts the date 162 years after the parinirvāṇa of the Buddha, i.e., in 382 B.C., if we take 544 B.C., to be the year of the Great Decease; and 324 B.C., if we prefer the Cantonese date 486 B.C., for the death of the Buddha. The earlier date is opposed to Greek evidence. The date 324 B.C. accords with the testimony of Greek writers.
If the Pariśīṣṭaparvan of Hemachandra is to be believed Chandragupta had a queen named Durdharā who became the mother of Bindusāra, the son who succeeded him on the throne. In the absence of corroborative evidence, however, the name of the queen cannot be accepted as genuine.

SECTION II. THE REIGN OF BINDUSĀRA

Chandragupta Maurya was succeeded in or about the year 300 B.C. by his son Bindusāra Amitraghātā. The name or title Amitraghātā (slayer of foes) is a restoration in Sanskrit of the Amitrachates of Athenaios, and Allitrokades of Strabo, who is stated to have been the son of Sandrocottus. Flett prefers the rendering Amitrakhāḍā or devourer of enemies, which is said to occur as an epithet of Indra. In the Rājāvalikatthe the name of Chandragupta’s son and successor is given as Simhasena. From Aśoka’s Rock Edict VIII (e.g. the Kālīśi Text) it appears probable that Bindusāra, as well as other predecessors of Aśoka, used the style Devānampiśa.

The Jain date, 313 B.C., for Chandragupta’s accession, if it is based on a correct tradition, may refer to his acquisition of Avanti in Malwa, as the chronological datum is found in a verse where the Maurya king finds mention in a list of successors of Pālaka, king of Avanti. Cf. IHQ, 1929, p. 402. Filliozat (Manuel des études indiennes, I, 212-19) and others who prefer the late Jaina evidence, ignore the much earlier Ceylonese testimony, see Raychaudhuri, HCIP, A1U, Vol. II, 94ff; ANM, 136ff; the date 313 B.C. moreover does not accord well with what is known about the synchronism of Aśoka with some of the Hellenistic kings mentioned in Edict XIII, notably Magas of Cyrene whom a contemporary poet, Callimachus seems to place long before the Syrian War of Ptolemy III (c. 247-6 B.C.). Tarn in Cary, Greek World, 393 f.

1 VIII 459-443. For another tradition see Bigandet, II. 128.
2 Cf. Weber, IA, ii (1873), p. 148, Lassen and Cunningham (Bhilsa Topes, p. 94). The term Amitraghātā occurs in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya III. 2. 2. Cf., also Mbh, 90. 19; 62. 8; VII. 22.16, where Amitraghātin occurs as an epithet of princes and warriors. Dr. Jarl Charpentier observes (in Le Monde Oriental, quoted in Calcutta Review, May-June, 1926, p. 399), “that the Greek word Amitrachates as a synonym of Bindusāra, should be rendered Amitraghātā seems clear not only from the Mahābhāṣya but also from the royal title amitrānāṁ hanā in Ait. Br., VIII. 17.” In JRAS, 1928, January, however, he prefers to restore Amitrachates as Amitrakhāḍā (p. 155). Cf. Rig-veda, X. 152. 1.
If the author of the  przegląd Mūla Kalpa, Hemachandra and Tāranātha are to be believed, Kauṭilya or Chāṇakya continued to serve as minister for some time after the accession of Bindusāra. "Chāṇakya" says Tāranātha, "one of his (Bindusāra's) great lords, procured the destruction of the nobles and kings of sixteen towns, and made the king master of all the territory between the eastern and western seas." The conquest of the territory between the eastern and western seas has been taken by some scholars to refer to the annexation of the Deccan. But we should not forget that already in the time of Chandragupta the Maurya Empire extended from Surāshṭra to Bengal (Gangaridae), i.e., from the western to the eastern sea. Tāranātha's statement need mean nothing more than the suppression of a general revolt. No early tradition expressly connects the name of Bindusāra with the conquest of the Deccan. The story of the subjugation of sixteen towns may or may not be true, but we are told in the Divyāvadāna that at least one town of note, viz., Taxila, revolted during the reign of Bindusāra. The king is said to have despatched Aśoka there. While the prince was nearing Taxila with his troops, the people came out to meet him, and said, "We are not opposed to the prince nor even to king Bindusāra, but the wicked ministers (Dushṭāmātyāh) insult us." The high-handedness of the Maurya officials in the outlying provinces is alluded to by Aśoka himself in his Kāliṅga Edict. Addressing his Mahāmātras the Emperor says:

1 Jacobi, Parishātarpāvan, p. 62; VIII. 446ff; Ind. Ant., 1875, etc. For the alleged connection of Bindusāra and Chāṇakya with another minister named Subandhu, the author of the Vāsavadattā Nāyadharā, see Proceedings of the Second Oriental Conference, pp. 208-11 and Parishāt, VIII. 447. The Divyāvadāna (p. 372) mentions Khallāțaka as Bindusāra's agrāmātya or chief minister.

2 Were these the capitals of the sixteen mahājanapadas?


4 See, however, Subramaniam, JRAS, 1923, p. 96. "My Guru's Guru had written in his commentary on a Sangam work that the Tulu-nāda was established by the son of Chandragupta," perhaps Tuliyan (Tuli=Bindu).


FOREIGN RELATIONS

“All men are my children: and, just as I desire for my children that they may enjoy every kind of prosperity and happiness both in this world and in the next, so also I desire the same for all men. You, however, do not grasp this truth to its full extent.\(^1\) Some individual, perchance, pays heed, but to a part only, not the whole. See then to this, for the principle of government is well established. Again, it happens that some individual incurs imprisonment or torture, and when the result is his imprisonment without due cause, many other people are deeply grieved. In such a case you must desire to do justice\(^2\) . . . . and for this purpose, in accordance with the Law of Piety, I shall send forth in rotation every five years such persons (Mahāmātras) as are of mild and temperate disposition, and regardful of the sanctity of life, who knowing\(^3\) this my purpose will comply with my instructions. From Ujjain, however, the Prince for this purpose will send out a similar body of officials and will not over-pass three years. In the same way from Taxila.”

Taxila made its submission to Aśoka. The Maurya prince is further represented as entering the “Svaśa rājya” (Khaṣa according to Burnouf).\(^4\)

Foreign Relations

In his relations with the Hellenistic powers Bindusāra

---

\(^1\) “You do not learn how far this (my) object reaches.” (Hultzsch, Inscriptions of Aśoka, p. 95).

\(^2\) “It happens in the administration (of justice) that a single person suffers either imprisonment or harsh treatment. In this case (an order) cancelling the imprisonment is (obtained) by him accidentally, while (many) other people continue to suffer. In this case you must strive to deal (with all of them) impartially.” (Hultzsch, p. 96).

\(^3\) “I shall send out every five years (a Mahāmātra) who will be neither harsh nor fierce, (but) of gentle actions (viz., in order to ascertain) whether (the judicial officers) paying attention to this object...are acting thus, as my instruction (implies)”. (Hultzsch, p. 97).

\(^4\) Divyāvadāna, p. 372. The emendation Khaṣa is supported by the testimony of Tāranātha (IHQ, 1930, 334). For the Khaṣas see JASB, (Extra No. 2, 1899).
pursued a pacific policy. We learn from the classical writers\(^1\) that the king of Syria despatched to his court an ambassador named Deímachos. Pliny\(^2\) tells us that (Ptolemy II) Philadelphos King of Egypt (B.C. 285-247), sent an envoy named Dionysios. Dr. Smith points out that it is uncertain whether Dionysios presented his credentials to Bindusāra or to his son and successor, Aśoka. It is, however, significant that while Greek and Latin writers refer to Chandragupta and Amitraghāta they do not mention Aśoka. This is rather inexplicable if an envoy whose writings were utilized by later authors, really visited the third of the great Mauryas. Patrokles,\(^3\) an officer who served under both Seleukos and his son, sailed in the Indian seas and collected much geographical information which Strabo and Pliny were glad to utilize. Athenaios tells an anecdote of private friendly correspondence between Antiochos (I, Soter), king of Syria, and Bindusāra which indicates that the Indian monarch communicated with his Hellenistic contemporaries on terms of equality and friendliness. We are told on the authority of Hege- sander that Amitrochates (Bindusāra), the king of the Indians, wrote to Antiochos asking that king to buy and send him sweet wine, dried figs, and a sophist, and Antiochos replied: We shall send you the figs and the wine, but in Greece the laws forbid a sophist to be sold.\(^4\) In connection with the demand for a Greek sophist it is interesting to recall the statement of Diodoros that one Iamboulos was carried to the king of Palibothra (Pāṭali-putra) who had a great love for the Graecians. Dion Chrysostom asserts that the poetry of Homer is sung by the Indians who had translated it into their own language and modes of expression.\(^5\) Garga and Varāhamihira in a

---

\(^1\) E.g., Strabo.
\(^2\) McCrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p. 108.
\(^3\) Smith, Aśoka, third edition, p. 19.
\(^4\) McCrindle, Inv. Alex., p. 409. Hultsch, Aśoka, p. xxxv. Bindusāra's interest in philosophy is also proved by his association with Ajīva-parivṛṭakas, Dvīpavīdāna, 370ff. Cf., also the first lines of Pillar Edict VII.
later age testify to the honour that was paid to Greeks for their knowledge of astronomy.¹

**Bindusāra's Family**

Bindusāra had many children besides Aśoka, the son who succeeded him on the throne. We learn from a passage of the Fifth Rock Edict in which the duties of the Dharma-mahāmātrās² are described, that Aśoka had many brothers and sisters. The Divyāvadāna mentions two of these brothers, namely, Susīma and Vigataśoka.³ The Ceylonese Chronicles seem also to refer to these two princes though under different names, calling the former Sumana and the latter Tishya. Susīma-Sumana is said to have been the eldest son of Bindusāra and a step-brother of Aśoka, while Vigataśoka-Tishya is reputed to have been the youngest son of Bindusāra and a co-uterine brother of Aśoka, born of a Brāhmaṇa girl from Champā.⁴ Hsiuen Tsang mentions a brother of Aśoka named Mahendra. Ceylonese tradition, however, represents the latter as a son of Aśoka. It is possible that the Chinese pilgrim has confounded the story of Vigataśoka with that of Mahendra.⁵

Bindusāra died after a reign of 25 years according to the Purāṇas and 27 or 28 years according to Buddhist tradition.⁶ According to the chronology adopted in these pages his reign terminated about 273 B.C.⁷

¹ *Bṛhat Samhitā*. II, 14. Aristoxenus and Eusebius refer to the presence in Athens, as early as the fourth century B.C., of Indians who discussed philosophy with Socrates. (A note by Rawlinson quoted in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 22.11.36, p. 17).
⁴ According to R. L. Mitra (*Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*, 8) and Smith the name of Aśoka's mother was Subhadrāngī. Bigandet II, 128, mentions Dhammā as the mother of Aśoka and Tissa.
⁶ Hultzsch points out (p. xxxii) that Burmese tradition assigns 27 years to Bindusāra, while Buddhaghosha's *Samanta-pāsādikā* agrees with the *Mahāvamsa* in allotting 28 years to that king.
Both the Divyāvadāna and the Ceylonese Chronicles agree that there was a **fratricidal struggle** after the death of Bindusāra. Aśoka is said to have overthrown his eldest step-brother with the help of Rādhagupta whom he made his Agrāmātya (Chief Minister). Dr. Smith observes,\(^1\) "the fact that his formal consecration or coronation (abhishēka) was delayed for some four years\(^2\) until 269 B.C.,\(^3\) confirms the tradition that his succession was contested, and it may be true that his rival was an elder brother named Susīma." In his Aśoka\(^4\) published a few months later, he says, "it is possible that the long delay may have been due to a disputed succession involving much bloodshed, but there is no independent evidence of such a struggle." Dr. Jayaswal\(^5\) gave the following explanation for the delay in Aśoka’s coronation: "it seems that in those days for obtaining royal abhishēka\(^6\) the age of 25 was a condition precedent. This seems to explain why Aśoka was not crowned for three or four years after accession". The contention can hardly be accepted. The Mahābhārata, for instance, informs us that the abhishēka of king Vichitravīrya took place when he was a mere child who had not yet reached the period of youth:

\(^1\) The Oxford History of India, p. 93.
\(^2\) Mahāvaṃsa, Geiger’s translation, p. 28.
\(^3\) For the date of Aśoka, see in the History and Culture of Indian People, Vol. II. 92ff; for the views of Eggerment, Acta Orientalia (1940), 103ff. For the views of Filliozat, see Manuel des études indiennes, Vol. I, pp. 212-19. Filliozat prefers the Jaina date 313 B.C. for the accession of Chandragupta, ignoring not only the evidence of the Ceylonese Chronicles but also the fact that the Jaina verses refer to the commencement of Maurya rule in Avanti, not in Magadha or the Indus Valley. For the date of Magas, see also Cary, A History of the Greek World, 993ff.
\(^4\) Third edition
\(^5\) JBORS, 1917, p. 438.
\(^6\) There were other kinds of abhishēka also, e.g., those of Yuvarāja, Kumāra, and Senāpati, as we learn from the epics and the Kauṭīliya (trans., pp. 277, 391).
Vichitra-vīryaṁcha tadā
bālam aprāptayauvanam
Kururājye mahābāhur
abhyaśiṁchadantanantaram.\(^1\)

Dr. Smith characterises\(^2\) the Ceylonese tales which relate that Aśoka slew many of his brothers as silly because Aśoka certainly had brothers and sisters alive in the seventeenth and eighteenth years of his reign whose households were objects of his anxious care. But we should remember that the Fifth Rock Edict refers only to the family establishments of his brothers (ōlodhanesu bhātināṁ) as existing. This does not necessarily imply that the brothers themselves were alive. We should however, admit that there is nothing to show, on the contrary, that the brothers were dead. The Fifth Rock Edict, in our opinion, proves nothing regarding the authenticity or untrustworthiness of the Ceylonese tradition. In the Fourth Rock Edict Aśoka himself testifies to the growth of unseemly behaviour to kinsfolk and slaughter of living creatures.

The first four years of Aśoka’s reign is, to quote the words which Dr. Smith uses in another connection, “one of the dark spaces in the spectrum of Indian history; vague speculation, unchecked by the salutary limitations of verified fact, is at the best, unprofitable”.

Like his predecessors\(^3\) Aśoka assumed the title of Devānāṃpiya. He generally described himself as Devānāṃpiya Piyadosi.\(^4\) The name Aśoka is found only in

\(^1\) _Mbh_. I. 101. 12. As the _Adśaparva_ refers to Dattāmitra and _Yavana_ rule in the lower Indus valley its date cannot be far remoived from that of Aśoka and Khaṟavela. Cf. also the cases of _Samprati_ _Parśva_ _parvan_, IX. 52, who was anointed king though a baby in arms, and of _Amma II_, Eastern Chalukya.


\(^3\) Cf. Rock Edicts VII, Kālī, Shāhābzāghi and _Mānsahra_ Texts.

\(^4\) We have already seen that the epithet “Piadānīsana” is sometimes applied to Chandragupta also (Bhandarkar, _Aśoka_, p. 5; Hultzsch, _CII_, Vol. I, p. xxx).
literature, and in two ancient inscriptions, viz., the Māski Edict of Aśoka himself, and the Junāgaḍh inscription of the Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman I. The name Dharmāśoka is found in one Mediaeval epigraph, viz., the Sārnāth inscription of Kumāradevī.¹

During the first thirteen years of his reign Aśoka seems to have carried on the traditional Maurya policy of expansion within India, and of friendly co-operation with the foreign powers, which was in vogue after the Seleukidan war. Like Chandragupta and Bindusāra he was aggressive at home but pacific abroad. The friendly attitude towards non-Indian powers is proved by the exchange of embassies and the employment of Yavana officials like Tushāspha.² In India, however, he played the part of a conqueror. The Divyāvedāna credits him, while yet a prince with the suppression of a revolt in Taxila and the conquest of the Svaśa (Khaśa?) country. In the thirteenth year of his reign (eight years after consecration), he effected the conquest of Kaliṅga. We do not know the exact limits of this kingdom in the days of Aśoka. But if the Sanskrit epics and Purāṇas are to be believed, it extended to the river Vaitaraṇī in the north,³ the Amarakaṭṭaka Hills in the west⁴ and Mahendragiri in the south.⁵

An account of the Kaliṅga war and its effects is given in Rock Edict XIII. We have already seen that certain places in Kaliṅga formed parts of the Magadhan dominions in the time of the Nandas. Why was it necessary for Aśoka to reconquer the country? The question admits of only one answer, viz., that it severed its connection with Magadha after the fall of the Nandas. If the story of a general revolt in the time of Bindusāra be correct then it is not unlikely that Kaliṅga, like Taxila, threw

¹ Dharmāśoka-narāḍhīpasya samaye Śri Dharmachakrō Jīno yādṛik tannayarakshitāh punarayaṅchakre tatopayādbhutam.
² Note also the part played by the Yona named Dhammarakkhita (Mahāvaṃsa, trans., p. 82).
³ Mbh, III. 114. 4.
⁵ Raghuvamśa, IV, 38-43; VI, 53-54.
off the allegiance of Magadha during the reign of that monarch. It appears, however, from Pliny, who probably based his account on the Indika of Megasthenes, that Kaliṅga was already an independent kingdom in the time of Chandragupta. In that case there can be no question of a revolt in the time of Bindusāra. Pliny says,1 "the tribes called Calingae are nearest the sea...the royal city of the Calingae is called Parthalis. Over their king 60,000 foot soldiers, 1,000 horsemen, 700 elephants keep watch and ward in 'procinct of war'."

The Kaliṅga kings probably increased their army considerably during the period which elapsed from the time of Megasthenes to that of Aśoka, because during the war with Aśoka the casualties exceeded 2,50,000. It is, however, possible that the huge total included not only combatants but also non-combatants. The existence of a powerful kingdom so near their borders, with a big army 'in procinct of war,' could not be a matter of indifference to the kings of Magadha. Magadha learnt to her cost what a powerful Kaliṅga meant, in the time of Khāravela.

We learn from the Thirteenth Rock Edict that Aśoka made war on the Kaliṅga country and annexed it to his empire. "One hundred and fifty thousand persons were carried away captive, one hundred thousand were slain, and many times that number died." Violence, slaughter,

---
1 Ind. Ant., 1877, p. 598.
2 If, as is probable, Kaliṅga included at this time the neighbouring country of Aśmaka, then Parthalis may be the same as "Potali". For an interesting account of Kaliṅga and its early capitals Dantakūra and Tosali, see Sylvain Lévi, "Pré-Aryen et Pré-Draïdien dans l'Inde," J. A., Juillet-Septembre, 1913; and Indian Antiquary, 1916 (May), pp. 94, 98. "The appellation of Kaliṅga, applied to Indians throughout the Malay world, attests the brilliant rôle of the men of Kaliṅga in the diffusion of Hindu civilisation." Not far from the earliest capital (Paloura-Dantapura-Dantakūra) lay the ἀπηθερίον, "where vessels bound for the Golden Peninsula ceased to hug the shore and sailed for the open sea." Note, in this connection, the name Ho-ling (Po-ling, Kaliṅga) applied by the Chinese to Java (Takakusu, I-tsing, p. xlvii) an island which was known by its Sanskrit name to Ptolemy (150 A.D.) and even to the Rāmāyana (Kishk. 40, 50). For the connection of early Kaliṅga with Ceylon, see IA, VIII. 2, 225.
and separation from their beloved ones befell not only to combatants, but also to the Brāhmaṇas, ascetics, and householders.

The conquered territory was constituted a viceroyalty under a prince of the royal family stationed at Tosali, apparently situated in the Purī district. The Emperor issued two special edicts prescribing the principles on which both the settled inhabitants and the border tribes should be treated. These two edicts are preserved at two sites, now called Dhauli and Jaugada. They are addressed to the Mahāmātras or High Officers at Tosali and Samāpā. In these documents the Emperor makes the famous declaration “all men are my children”, and charges his officers to see that justice is done to the people.

The conquest of Kaliṅga was a great landmark in the history of Magadha, and of India. It marks the close of that career of conquest and aggrandisement which was ushered in by Bimbisāra’s annexation of Aṅga. It opens a new era—an era of peace, of social progress, of religious propaganda and at the same time of political stagnation and, perhaps, of military inefficiency during which the martial spirit of imperial Magadha was dying out for want of exercise. The era of military conquest or Digvijaya was over, the era of spiritual conquest or Dhamma-vijaya was about to begin.

We should pause here to give an account of the extent of Aśoka’s dominions and the manner in which they

---

1 Tosali (variant Tosala) was the name of a country as well as a city. Levi points out that the Gandavīkā, refers to the country (Janapada) of Aṃita-Tosala in the Dakshinapatha, “where stands a city named Tosala”. In Brāhmaṇical literature Tosala is constantly associated with (South) Kosala and is sometimes distinguished from Kaliṅga. The form Tosalei occurs in the Geography of Ptolemy. Some mediaeval inscriptions (Ep. Ind., IX. 286; XV. 3) refer to Dakshina (South) Tosala and Uttara (North) Tosala.

2 In Purī.

3 In Gaṅjām.

4 For the identification of Samāpā, see Ind. Ant., 1923, pp. 66 ff.

5 Cf. sara-sāke vijaye (Bühler, cited in Hultzsch’s Inscriptions of Aśoka, p. 25).
were administered before the Emperor embarked on a
new policy.

Aśoka mentions Magadha, Pātaliputra, Khalatikapa-
vata (Barābar Hills), Kosambi, Luṇḍini-gāma, Kaliṅga
(including Tosali, Samāpā and Khepiṅgalapavata or the
Jauḍāda Rock), Aṭavi (the forest tract of Mid-India
perhaps identical with Ālavi of the Buddhist texts),
Suvarṇagiri, Isila, Ujjainī and Takshaśila expressly as
being among those places which were under his rule.

Beyond Takshaśila the empire stretched as far as the
confines of the realm of "Aṃtiyako Yonarāja", usually
identified with Antiochus II Theos of Syria (261-246 B.C.),
and included the wide territory round Shāhbāzgarhi1
and Mānsahra2 inhabited by the Yonas, Kambojas and the
Gaudhāras. The exact situation of this Yona territory has
not yet been determined. The Mahāvamsa evidently
refers to it and its chief city Alasanda which Cunningham
and Geiger identify with the town of Alexandria (Be gram,
west of Kāpiśa) founded by the Macedonian conqueror
near Kābul.3 Kamboja, as we have already seen, cor-responds to Rā japura or Rajaur near Punch in Kaś mīra and
some neighbouring tracts including Kāfiristān. The tribal
territory of the Gandhāras at this time probably lay to the
west of the Indus, and did not apparently include
Takshaśila which was ruled by a princely Viceroy, and
was the capital of the province of Uttarāpatha.4 The
capital of Trans-Indian Gandhāra was Pushkaravati,
identified by Coomaraswamy with the site known as
Mīr Ziyārat or Balā Hisār at the junction of the Swāt and
Kābul rivers.5

The inclusion of Kaś mīra within Aśoka’s empire is

---

1 In the Peshawar District.
2 In the Harāra District.
3 Ann. AGT 18. Geiger, Mahāvamsa, 194. The Yona territory probably corresponds to the whole or a part of the Province of the Parapumadāra.
4 Cf. Kaliṅga Edict: Devāvadāna, p. 407. Rājaṅiṅkaṇya-uttarāpathē Takshaśila vāgarah, etc.
5 Cf. Carm. Lec., 1918, p. 54. Indian and Indonesian Art, 55.
proved by the testimony of Hiuen Tsang’s *Records*¹ and Kalhaṇa’s *Rājatarāṅgini.*² Kalhaṇa says: “The faithful Aśoka reigned over the earth. This king who had freed himself from sins and had embraced the doctrine of the *Jina* covered Sushkaletra and Vītastātra with numerous stūpas. At the town of Vītastātra there stood within the precincts of the Dharmāranya Vihāra a Chaitya built by him, the height of which could not be reached by the eye. That illustrious king built the town of Śrīnagarī. This sinless prince after removing the old stuccoed enclosure of the shrine of Vījayeśvara built in its stead a new one of stone. He . . . erected within the enclosure of Vījayeśa, and near it, two temples which were called Aśokeśvara.” The description of Aśoka as a follower of the *Jina*, i.e., Buddha, and the builder of numerous stūpas leaves no room for doubt that the great Maurya monarch is meant. We are told by Kalhaṇa himself that he is indebted for much of the above account to an earlier chronicler named Chhavillākara.

The inscriptions near Kālsī and those on the Rummindeī and the Nigāli Sāgar pillars prove the inclusion of the Dehra-Dūn District and the Tarāī within the limits of Aśoka’s Empire, while the monuments at Lalitapātan and Rāmpurwā attest his possession of the valley of Nepāl and the district of Champāran. Further evidence of the inclusion of the Himalayan region within Aśoka’s empire is possibly furnished by Rock Edict XIII which refers to the Nabhapainitis of Nabhaka, probably identical with Na-pei-kea of Fa Hien,³ the birthplace of Krakuchchhandha Buddha, about 10 miles south or southwest of Kapilavastu.⁴

² I. 102-06.
³ Legge, 64.
⁴ "The *Brahma (varvarta?) Purāṇa* assigns Nabhikapura to the territory of the Uttara-Kurus" (Hultsch, CII, Vol. I, p. xxxix n). Mr. M. Govinda Pai (Aivangar Com., Vol. 36), however, invites attention to the Nabhakānanaṇa, apparently a southern people, mentioned in the *Mbh.* vi. 9, 59. In connection with the northern limits of the Maurya empire attention may also be invited to the statement in the *Divyāvadāna* (p. 372) about Aśoka’s subjuga-
According to Bühler, Rock Edict XIII also mentions two vassal tribes Viśa (Besatae of the Periplus?) and Vajri (Vṛijikas?). More recent writers do not accept Bühler’s reading and substitute (Rāja) Visayamhi, ‘in the (king’s) territory’, in its place. There is, thus no indubitable reference either to the Vṛijikas or the ‘Besatae’ in the inscriptions of Aśoka.

We learn from the classical writers that the country of the Gangaridae, i.e., Bengal, formed a part of the dominions of the king of the Prasii, i.e., Magadha, as early as the time of Agrammes, i.e., the last Nanda king. A passage of Pliny clearly suggests that the “Palibothri,” i.e., the rulers of Pātaliputra, dominated the whole tract along the Ganges. That the Magadhan kings retained their hold on Bengal as late as the time of Aśoka is suggested by the testimony of the Divyāvadāna and of Hiuen Tsang who saw Stūpas of that monarch near Tāmrālīpita and Kāṇasuvāra (in West Bengal), in Samatāta (East Bengal) as well as in Puṇḍravardhana (North Bengal). Kāmarūpa (Assam) seems to have lain outside the empire. The Chinese pilgrim saw no monument of Aśoka in that country.

We have seen that in the south the Maurya power at one time, had probably penetrated as far as the Podiyil
Hill in the Tinnevelly district. In the time of Aśoka the Maurya frontier had receded probably to the Pennār river near Nellore as the Tamil Kingdoms are referred to as “Prachārīta” or border states and are clearly distinguished from the imperial dominions (Vijita or Rāja-vishaya), which stretched only as far south as the Chitaldrug District of Mysore. The major part of the Deccan was ruled by the viceregal princes of Suvamāttra of Isila and Samāpā and the officers in charge of the Atavi or Forest Country. But in the belt of land on either side of the Nerbudda, the Godāvarī and the upper Mahānadi there were, in all probability, certain areas that were technically outside the limits of the empire proper. Aśoka evidently draws a distinction between the forests and the inhabiting tribes which are in the dominions (vijita) and peoples on the border (antā avijitā) for whose benefit some of the special edicts were issued. Certain vassal tribes are specifically mentioned, e.g., the Andhras, Palidas (Pāladas, Pārīmadas), Bhojas and Raṭhkas (Riṣṭikas, Raśṭrikas?). They enjoyed a status midway between the Provincials proper and the unsubdued borderers. The word Petenika or Pitinika mentioned in Rock Edicts V and XIII should not, according to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar and some other writers, be read as a separate name but as an adjective qualifying Rishṭika (Edict V) and Bhoja (Edict XIII). They draw our attention to certain

1 Mr. S. S. Desikar thinks that the last point reached by the Mauryas was the Veṅkaṭa hill (IHQ, 1958, p. 154). Prof. N. Sastri lays stress (ANM, pp. 253ff.) on the legendary features of the account in Tamil texts.

2 A clue to the location of this city is probably given by the inscriptions of the later Mauryas of the Koṅkan and Khāndesh, apparently the descendants of the Southern Viceroy (Ep. Ind., III. 196). As these later Maurya inscriptions have been found at Vāda in the north of the Thāna district (Bomb. Gaz., Vol. I, Part II, p. 14) and at Wāghi in Khāndesh (ibid., 284), it is not unlikely that Suvamāttra was situated in that neighbourhood. Curiously enough, there is actually in Khāndesh a place called Songir. According to Hultzsch, (CII. p. xxxviii) Suvamāttra is perhaps identical with Kanakagiri in the Hyderabad State, south of Maski, and north of the ruins of Vijayanagara. Isila may have been the ancient name of Siddāpurā.

3 Edict XIII.
passages in the Aṅguttara Nikāya\(^1\) where the term Pettanika occurs in the sense of one who enjoys property given by his father.\(^3\) The view that Pitinika is merely an adjective of Raṭhika (Risṭika) or Bhoja is not, however, accepted by Dr. Barua who remarks that “it is clear from the Pāli passage, as well as from Buddhaghosha's explanations, that Raṭṭhika and Pettanika were two different designations.”

- The Andhras are, as we have already seen, mentioned in a passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. The Bhojas are also mentioned in that work as rulers of the south.\(^3\) Pliny, quoting probably from Megasthenes says that the Andarae (Andhras) possessed numerous villages, thirty towns defended by walls and towers, and supplied their king with an army of 100,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 elephants.\(^4\) The earliest Andhra capital (Andhapura) was situated on the Telavāha river which, according to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, is either the modern Tel or Telingiri, both flowing near the confines of the Madras Presidency and the Central Provinces. But the identification is by no means certain.\(^5\) The Palidas

\(^1\) III. 76, 78 and 300 (P.T.S.).

\(^2\) Ind. Ant., 1919, p. 80. Cf. Hultsch, Aśoka, 10; IHQ, 1925, 387. Other scholars, however, identify the Pitinikas with the Paṭhanakas or natives of Paṭhaṇ, and some go so far as to suggest that they are the ancestors of the Sātavāhana rulers of Paṭhaṇ. See Woolner, Aśoka Text and Glossary, II, 113; also JRAS, 1923, 92. Cf. Barua, Old Brāhmī Ins., p. 211.

\(^3\) For other meanings of Bhoja, see Mbh., Ādī., 84, 22; IA, V. 177; VI. 25-28; VII. 36, 254.

\(^4\) Ind. Ant., 1877, p. 339.

\(^5\) P. 92 ante. In historical times the Andhras are found in possession of the Kṛṣṇa and Gauḍy districts as we learn from the Mayadavolu plates and other records. The earliest capital of the Andhra-country or "Andhrā-puṭha" known from the inscriptions is apparently Dhamiṇakaḍa at or near Amarāvati (or Bevāḍa). Kubiraka of the Bhaṭṭiprolu inscription (c. 300 B.C.) is the earliest known ruler. One recension, in the Brāhmī script, of the Rock Edicts of Aśoka, has recently been discovered in the Kurnool District (IHQ, 1928, 791; 1931, 817f.; 1933, 113f.; IA, Feb., 1933, p. 39) which falls within the "Andhra" area of the Madras Presidency. Recent discoveries of the Aśokan epigraphs include, besides the Yerragudi inscriptions (Kurnool District) two new Rock Edicts at Kopbal in the South-West corner of the Hyderabad State. The Kopbal inscriptions are found on the Gavīmāṭh and the Pālkipuṇḍa Hills. They belong to the class of Minor Rock Edicts.
were identified by Bühler with the **Pulindas** who are invariably associated with the Nerudda (Revā) and the Vindhyā region:

*Pulinda-rāja sundarī nābhimaṇḍala nipīta salilā (Revā).*

*Pulindā Vindhya Pushkā(? Vaidarbhā Dandakabhā saha; Pulindā Vindhya Mūlikā Vaidarbhā Dandakahā saha*

Their capital Pulinda-nagara lay not far from Bhilsā and may have been identical with Rūpnāth, the find-spot of one recension of Minor Rock Edict I.

Hultsch, however, doubts the identification of the “Palidas” of Shahbāzgarhi with the Pulindas, for the Kālṣi and Gīrṇār texts have the variants Pālāda and Pārīndā—names that remind us of the **Pāradas** of the Vyū Purāṇa, the Harvanīśā and the Bṛihat Samhīta. In those texts the people in question are mentioned in a list of barbarous tribes along with the Śakas, Yavanas, Kambojas, Pahlavas, Khaṣas, Māhishikas, Cholas, Keralas, etc. They are described as muktakesā (“having dishevelled hair”). Some of the tribes mentioned in the list belong to the north, others to the south. The association with the Andhras in Aśokan inscriptions suggests that in the Maurya period they may have been in the Deccan. But the matter must be regarded as not definitely settled. It is interesting to note in this connection that a river Pāradā (identified with the Paradi or Par river in the Surat District) is mentioned in a Nāsik inscription.

---

1 Hultsch, Aśoka, 48 (n. 14).
2 Subandhu’s Vāsavadattā.
3 Mārtiya, p. 114, 48.
4 Vyū, 55, 126.
5 The Navagrāma grant of the Mahārāja Hastin of the year 198 (A.D. 517) refers to a Pulinda-rāja-rāṣṭra which lay in the territory of the Pārivṛājaka kings, i.e., in the Dabbāl region in the northern part of the present Madhya Pradesh (Ep. Ind., xxi, 126).
6 Ch. 88, 128. Cf. Paradene in Gedolii (McGrindle, Ptolemy, 1927), 320.
7 I, 14.
8 XIII, 9.
The Bhojas and the Rathikas (Riṣṭikas) were evidently the ancestors of the Mahābhhojas and the Mahārāṭhis of the Śātavāhana period. The Bhojas apparently dwelt in Berar, and the Ṛṭhikas or Riṣṭikas possibly in Mahārāṣṭra or certain adjoining tracts. The former were, in later ages, connected by matrimonial alliances with chieftains of the Kanarese country.

In the west Asoka's Empire extended to the Arabian Sea, and embraced all the Aparāntas including no doubt the vassal state (or confederation of states) of Surēśṭhra; the affairs of which were looked after by the Yavana-rāja Tushāspha with Giri-nagara (Girnar) as his capital. Dr. Smith says that the form of the name shows that the Yavana-rāja must have been a Persian. But according to this interpretation, the Yavana Dhamadeva, the Śaka Ushavadāta (Risahabha-datta), the Parthian Siwūsākha and the Kushān Vāsudeva must have been all native Hindus of India. If Greeks and other foreigners adopted Hindu names there is no wonder that some of them assumed Irānic appellations. There is, then, no good ground for assuming that Tushāspha was not a Greek, but a Persian.

Rapson seems to think that the Gandhāras, Kambojas, Yavanas, Rishṭikas, Bhojas, Petenikas, Pāladas and Andhras lay beyond Asoka's dominions, and were not his subjects, though regarded as coming within his sphere of influence. But this surmise can hardly be accepted in view of the fact that Asoka's Dharmna-mahāmātras were employed amongst them "on the revision of (sentences of) imprisonment or execution, in the reduction of penalties, or (the grant of)
release” (Rock Edict V). In the Rock Edict XIII, they seem to be included within the Rāja-Vishaya or the King's territory, and are distinguished from the real border peoples (Anita, Prachanta), viz., the Greeks of the realm of Antiochos and the Tamil peoples of the south (Nīcha). But while we are unable to accept the views of Rapson, we find it equally difficult to agree with Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar who denies the existence of Yonas and others as feudatory chief-tains in Aśoka’s dominions. The case of the Yavana-rāja Tushāspha clearly establishes the existence of such vassal chiefs whose peoples undoubtedly enjoyed partial autonomy though subject to the jurisdiction of special Imperial officers like the Dharma-mahā-mātras.

Having described the extent of Aśoka’s empire we now proceed to give a brief account of its administration. Aśoka continued the Council government of his predecessors. There are references to the Emperor’s dealings with the Parishā or Purisha in Rock Edicts III and VI. Senart took Parushad to mean Sāṅgha and Bühler understood it by the Committee of caste or sect. But Dr. K. P. Jayaswal pointed out that the Parishā of the Edicts is Mantriparishad of the Arthasastra. The inscriptions prove that Aśoka retained also the system of Provincial Government existing under his forefathers. Tosali, Suvarṇagiri, Ujjayini and Takshasilā were each under a prince of the blood (Kumāla or Ayaputa)."
The Empire and the Princes were helped by bodies (Nikāyā) of officials who fell under the following classes:—

1. The Māhāmātras\(^1\) and other Mukhyas.
4. The Pradeśikas or Prādeśikas.
5. The Yutas.\(^2\)
6. Pulisā.
7. Pañvedakā.
8. Vachabhūmiṅkā.
9. The Litikaras.
10. The Dūtas.
11-12. The Ayuktas and Kāranakas.

There was a body of Mahāmātras in each great city and district of the empire.\(^3\) The inscriptions mention the Mahāmātras of Pāṭaliputra, Kauśāmbi, Tosaṅi, Samāpā, Suvarṇagiri and Isila.\(^4\) In the Kaliṅga Edicts we have certain Mahāmātras distinguished by the terms Nagulaka and Nagala-Viyahālaka. The Nagulaka and Nagala-Viyahālaka of the Edicts correspond to the Nāgaraka and Paura-vaṅghārika of the Arthaśāstra\(^5\) and no doubt governor or episkopos in one territory to which reference has already been made.

\(^1\) Cf. also Arthaśāstra, pp. 16, 20, 58, 64, 215. 237-39; Rājaśekhara, KM, XLV, 53.

\(^2\) The Yuktas of the Arthaśāstra, pp. 59, 65, 199. Rāmāyana, VI, 217, 34; Mahābhārata, II, 56, 18; Manu, VIII. 34; cf. the Rāja-yuktas of the Sāntiparva, 82. 9-15.

\(^3\) The empire, as already stated, was divided into a number of provinces (diśā, deśa, etc.). Each province seems to have been further subdivided into āhālas or districts under regular civil administration, and koṭṭa-vishayas or territories surrounding forts (Hultsch, p. xl). Each civil administrative division had a pura or nagara (city) and a rural part called janapada which consisted of grāmas or villages. An important official in each janapada was the Rājūka. The designations Pradeśika and Raṭhika possibly suggest the existence of territorial units styled pradeśa and raṭṭha or raṣṭra.

\(^4\) Mahāmātras of Śrāvastī are according to certain scholars, mentioned in the Sohagra copperplate inscription found in a village on the Rāpīṭi, not far from Gorakhpur. But the exact date of the record is not known (Hoernle, JASB, 1894; 84; Fleet, JRAS, 1907, 52ff.; Barua, Ann. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst., xi, i (1930), 52ff.; IHQ, 1934, 54ff.; Jayawal, Ep. Ind., xxii, 2).

\(^5\) P. 29, 14ff. Cf. the royal epistates or city governor in the Antigonid realm (Tarn., GBI, 24).
administered justice in cities. In Pillar Edict I mention is made of the Amta Mahamātras or the Wardens of the Marches, who correspond to the Antapālas of the Arthaśāstra and the Gopūris of the age of Skanda Gupta. The Kauṭiliya tells us that the salary of an Antapāla was equal to that of a Kumāra, a Paura-vyāvahārika, a member of the Mantriqarṇa or a Rāṣṭrapāla. In Edict XII mention is made of the Ithiḥhaka Mahāmātras who, doubtless, correspond to the Stry-adhyakshas (the Guards of the Ladies) of the epics.

As to the Rājūkas, Dr. Smith takes the word to mean a governor next below a Kumāra. Bühler identifies the Rājuka of the Aśokan inscriptions with the Rajjūka or the Rajjugāhaka Anuṇchha (Rope-holder, Field-measurer or Surveyor) of the Jātakas. Pillar Edict IV refers to the Rājūkas as officers "set over many hundred thousands of people," and charged with the duty of promoting the welfare of the Jānapadas to whom Aśoka granted independence in the award of honours and penalties. The reference to the award of penalities (Daṇḍa) probably indicates that the Rājūkas had judicial duties. In the Rock Edict III as well as in Pillar Edict IV they are associated with the Vutas, and in the Yerragudi inscriptions with the Rathikas. Strabo refers to a class of Magistrates (Agronomoi) who "have the care of the rivers, measure the land, as in Egypt, have charge also of hunters

1 Cf. also Nagarā-dhā́yta Vaśyavāhārka, p. 55. The Nagarālaka may have had executive functions as well, as is suggested by the evidence of the Arthaśāstra (II. Ch. 36).
2 Pp. 20, 247.
3 Rām., II. 16. 3, Vṛddhāna veśārāpanī...stṛyadhyaśāhā; Mbh, IX. 29. 68, 90; XV. 22. 20; 25. 12. Cf. the Antarvaniśika of the Arthasastra.
4 Aśoka, 3rd ed., p. 94.
6 IHQ, 1933, 117; Barua takes the expressions Jānapada and Rathika of the Yerragudi copy of the Minor Rock Edict to mean 'people of the district' and 'citizens of the hereditary tribal states' respectively. But Rathika of the record probably corresponds to Rāṣṭriya of the Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman so that the expressions Jānapadas and Rathikas mean 'people of the country parts,' and 'officials of the district.' Cf. Rathika Mahāmātra of Brīhat Saṁh., XV. 11.
and have the power of rewarding or punishing those who merit either." The measuring of the land connects those Magistrates with the Rajjugāhaka Amachcha of the Jātakas; while the power of rewarding and punishing people connects them with the Rājūkas of Aśoka. It is probable, therefore, that the Agronomoi referred to by Strabo were identical with the Rājūkas and the Rajjugāhaka Amachchas. The Arthaśāstra refers to a class of officials called "Chora Rajjukas," but there is no reference to the Rajjukas proper although on p. 60 "Rajju" is mentioned in conjunction with "Chora Rajju."

As regards the Pradeśikas or Prādeśikas, Senart, Kern and Bühler understood the term to denote local governors or local chiefs. Smith took it to mean District Officers. Hultsch compares it with Prādeśikeśvara of Kallana's Rājataraṅgiṇī. The word occurs only in the Third Rock Edict where the functionaries in question are included with the Rājūkas and the Yutas in the ordinance of the Anusaṁyāna or circuit. Thomas derives the word from pradeśa which means report and identifies the Pradeśikas or Pradeśikas of the Edict with the Pradeshṭris of the Arthaśāstra. The most important functions of the Pradeshṭris were Bahl-pragaha (collection of taxes or suppression of recalcitrant chiefs), Kañṭakasodhana (administration of criminal justice), Choramārgaṇa, (tracking of thieves) and Adhyakshāṇam adhyaksha purushānām cha niyamanam (checking superintendents and their men). They acted as intermediaries between the Samāhartrī on the one hand and the Gopas,

---

2 P. 234.
3 IV. 126.
4 JRAS, 1915, p. 97, Arthaśāstra, p. 111. In the Vishṇu Purāṇa, V, 26 3, Pradeśa has apparently the sense of counsel, instruction. S. Mitra suggests (Indian Culture, I, p. 310) that the Pradeśikas were Mahāmātras of the Provincial governments, while the Rājūkas were Mahāmātras of the central government.
5 Cf. The Irdā grant where Pradeshṭris find mention along with Sanghamukhyas and others.
Sthānikas and Adhyakshas on the other. It is, however, doubtful if the Praśāśnikas can really be equated with Reporters. The more probable view is that they correspond to the subordinate governors, the nomarchs, hyparchs and meridarchs of the Hellenistic kingdoms.

As to the Yutas or Yuktas, they are described by Manu as the custodians of Praṇashtādhigata dravya (lost property which was recovered). In the Arthasaśāstra too, they are mentioned in connection with Samudraya or state funds which they are represented as misappropriating. Hultsch suggests that they were 'secretaries' employed for codifying royal orders in the office of the Mahāmātras. The Pulivā or Agents are apparently identical with the Purushas or Rāja Purushas of the Arthasaśāstra. Hultsch prefers to equate them with the Gūḍha-purushas and points out that they were graded into high ones, low ones, and those of middle rank. They were placed in charge of many people and controlled the Rājūkas. The Paṭivedahā or Reporters are doubtless the Chāras mentioned in Chapter 16 of the Arthasaśāstra, while the Vachabhūmikas or "Inspectors of cowpens" were evidently charged with the superintendence of "Vraja" referred to in Chapter 24. The Liṭikaras are the royal scribes one of whom, Chapaḍa, is mentioned by name in Minor Rock Edict II. Dūtas or envoys are referred to in Rock Edict XIII. If the Kauṭiliya is to be believed, they were divided into three classes, viz., Nisṛṣṭārthāḥ or Plenipotentiaries, Parimitarthaḥ or Charges d'Affaires and Śāsanaharas or con-

1 Cf. Arthasaśāstra, pp. 142, 200, 217, 222, as stated above Pradeshtris also occur in the Irda grant, Ep. Ind., XXII, 150f.
2 VIII. 34.
3 Cf. also Mbh., ii. 5. 72. Kachchichchāya vyāye yuktakā sarve gaṇaka lekhakāḥ.
4 Pp. 59, 75.
5 The three classes of Purushas are also known to the Great epic (Mbh., ii. 5. 74).
6 Pillar Edict VII.
7 P. 38.
8 Pp. 59-60.
veyers of royal writ. The Āyuktas possibly find mention in the Kaliṅga Edicts. In the early Post-Mauryan and Scythian Age Āyuttas appear as village officials. In the Gupta Age they figure as officers in charge of Vishayas or districts, and also as functionaries employed in restoring the wealth of conquered kings. The full designation of the officers in question was Āyukta-Purusha. They may have been included under the generic name of Pulisā referred to above. The Kāranakus who appear to be mentioned in the Yerragudi copy of Asoka’s Minor Rock Edict, probably refer to judicial officers, teachers, or scribes.

1 With the Śāsunaharas may be compared the Lekha-hāraka, of the Harshacharita, Uchchhāsa, II, p. 52.
2 Lüders’ List, No. 1347.
4 Fleet, CII, pp. 8, 14.
5 Cf. Kāraṇika, Officer-in-Charge of Documents or Accounts (IHO, 1935, 586). In inscriptions of the seventh century A.D. the word Kāraṇa stood for Adhi-karaṇa (Departmental or District Secretariat), Prabāsi, 1350 B.S. Śrāvaṇa, 894. In Mhb., ii. 5, 34. Kāraṇika has, according to the commentary, the sense of a teacher. In the text itself the officers in question instruct the Kumāras and have to be dharme sarvasāstreshu kovidāh, implying that their duties included among other things, those relating to Dharma (law, justice?).