

**Chāṇakya :**  
**Explored in**  
**the Jaina Literature**

**by**  
**Dr. Nalini Joshi**  
 (Professor, Seth H.N. Jain Chair)

**With a Foreword by**  
**Dr.P.G.Lalye**  
 (Retired Professor & Head, Dept. of Sanskrit,  
 Osmania University, Hyderabad)



**Seth H.N.Jain Chair**  
 Firodia Publications  
 University of Pune

\* The correct transliteration of चाणक्य is Cāṇakya.

**May 2014**

## **Chāṇakya : Explored in the Jaina Literature**

***Written by :***

Nalini Joshi

(Professor, Seth H.N.Jain Chair)

***Assistant Editors***

Kaumudi Baldota (Nanawati Fellow, Seth H.N.Jain Chair, UoP)

Anita Bothra (Research Fellow, Seth H.N.Jain Chair, UoP)

***Publisher :***

**Seth H.N.Jain Chair**

**Firodia Publications**

**(University of Pune)**

*Available at :*

**Sanmati-Teerth**

844, Shivajinagar, B.M.C.C. Road

Firodia Hostel, Pune 411004

Phone No. (020) 25671088

***All Rights Reserved***

***First Edition :*** May 2014

***For Private Circulation Only***

***Price :*** Rs. 500/-

***D.T.P. Work :*** Ajay Joshi

***Printed by :***

**Kalyani Corporation,**

1464, Sadashiv Peth,

Phone : 2441405, Pune. 30

## FOREWORD

It is a highly astonishing event in the cultural history of India that the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya has left obvious and indelible impressions on the literary genre of the Jaina works. It's curious to think of polity-leden Arthaśāstra influencing the mythology and the cultural ethos of Ancient India. This view did receive certain adequate attention from the Brahmanic and Jaina scholars. Fortunately Dr. Mrs. Nalini Joshi has undertaken this momentous task of studying the influence of the Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra on many Jaina Narrative works. She has taken laudable efforts for exploring almost all the Jaina works and tried to find out the interaction of both the thought-ferments of India.

With her deep study in Sanskrit works on polity and propound erudition in the Jaina varieties of Prakrit texts, Dr. Joshi has brought out the salient specialities of polity developed in the Arthaśāstra and numerous Jaina Prakrit texts. She has specially considered certain texts like the drama *Mudrārākṣasa*, depicting Kauṭilya as a shrewd strategist. In some of the works, Kauṭilya is

#### IV

referred to as Koṭillaya and it is mentioned that his book (i.e. Arthaśāstra) was a part of a syllabus.

In the works like Nīśītha-cūrṇi and Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi, various incidents in the life of Cāṇakya are described. In the Āvaśyaka-niryukti, Cāṇakya's *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi* is highlighted. Jinadāsagaṇi has given a short life-sketch of Cāṇakya and Candragupta. Similarly there are general observations on different stories dedicated to Cāṇakya. The commentaries written by the Jaina authors exhibit their deep study of the text of the Arthaśāstra. In Haribhadra's Upadeśapada there are certain *dvāragāthās* throwing light on the character of Cāṇakya. Among the eminent Śvetāmbara writers Ratnaprabha, Hemacandra and Municandra are noteworthy.

Hariṣena's Bṛhatkathākośa is specially cited. Some Digambara authors like Somadevasūri in his Nītivākyāmṛta and the other authors like Śrīcandra and Prabhācandra have been cited by Dr. Nalini Joshi. She has quoted the views of some other Jaina scholars also.

From this extensive survey, it becomes amply clear that the learned author has analysed almost all concerned Jaina texts systematically, with a view to gather information about Cāṇakya. Cāṇakya's shrewdness and strategy are particularly focussed by the Brahmanic authors but with a comprehensive look on the Jaina views, Dr. Nalini Joshi rightfully quotes : "A certain respect and honour towards Cāṇakya is seen in the Jaina literature due to his strict governance, selfless service, detached world-views and sublime death."

She has touched new or hitherto untouched points successfully and has opened a new chapter in the Jaina literature. Dr. Nalini Joshi's work is highly commendable for making a study of the unstudied aspects of the Jaina literature and that of Kauṭilya.

I extend my best wishes to Dr. Nalini Joshi for further exploration and systematic study of important Jaina texts.

Dr.P.G. Lalye

March 2014

Pune

## PUBLISHER'S NOTE & PREFACE

‘Seth Hirachand Nemchand Chair in Jain Philosophy, Literature, Logic and Culture’, was established on 17/07/1976 in the University of Pune. Late Prof. S.S.Barlingay exerted a lot for establishing the Chair and naturally it was attached to the Department of Philosophy. Due to various reasons the Chair was defunct and produced only two-three small publications over the years. The Chair was revived in 2007 under the Vice-Chancellor of Shri Ratnakar Gaikwad and Dr. Narendra Jadhav. The concerned University authorities continued the same policy about the Chair and helped a lot to fulfil the aim of the Chair viz. “To promote and spread the Jainological Studies by Research, Popular Activities and Publications.”

‘Firodia Publications’ is a wing of Seth H.N.Jain Chair which was specifically created to publish books on various Jainological topics. We are very much glad to publish the 11<sup>th</sup> book under Firodia Publications titled - “Chāṇakya : Explored in the Jaina Literature” which is the outcome of a research project

undertaken by the Jain Chair.

When we cast a glance on the list of publications given on the back-page of this book, we immediately come to know that almost equal importance is given to the academic work and the popular writings. The research-oriented publications are in English and the Jainological writings for a novice are purposefully written in Marathi and Hindi. The two post-doctoral research assistants of the Jain Chair, viz. Dr. Anita Bothara and Dr. Kaumudi Baldota had presented their research papers in Marathi and Hindi in various prestigious conferences. We are planning to publish the collection of the research-papers in Hindi, in the near future.

It is noteworthy that four of our publications are available on the website viz. “jainaedu@gmail.com” and we are getting world-wide encouraging response of the concerned viewers. The work of uploading the rest of the publications is persued by our experts.

The present book is dedicated to the thorough quest of Cāṇakya in the whole Jaina literature. The seed of the subject was sown in my mind before nearly ten years ago, when I was engaged in preparing word-slips for the comprehensive dictionary of Prakrits. The seed of the subject germinated when we undertook the project under the auspices of the Jain Chair in 2011. Literally hundreds of references were gathered, scrutinized, debated, discussed and translated by our research team. Final plan of the book was made in August 2013. The finished product is presented in the form of

## VIII

this book - “Chāṇakya : Explored in the Jaina Literature”.

It is our solemn duty to provide the rationale for a reader to go through this book.

The distinctive features of this book can be enumerated as-

\* Cāṇakya alias Kauṭilya is an interesting personality for any educated and cultured Indian.

\* Kauṭilya and his Arthaśāstra is studied worldwide by the Orientalists, Sanskritists, Historians and experts in the science of Polity.

\* Hindu Purāṇas and ancient Pāli texts have preserved very little personal data of Cāṇakya's life while the Jaina literature is really flooded with stories, narratives, legends and myths about Cāṇakya.

\* The biography of Cāṇakya from his birth to death is documented in the Jaina texts.

\* Some of the scholars have opined that, ‘The Buddhas and Jainas generally despise Cāṇakya’. This opinion is totally wrong in the case of Jainas because the sense of awe and regard about Cāṇakya is seen in the Jaina literature from the 3rd century A.D. upto 15th century A.D.

\* Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra is a part of Magadhan literature and the authentic history of the Jaina canons is closely connected with Magadha.

\* The Jaina connections of the famous Sanskrit political drama Mudrārākṣasa are explored and exploited in one of the

chapters of this book.

\* The Śvetāmbara and Digambara biographies of Cāṇakya are compared with critical remarks.

\* Each and every Jaina reference is originally documented, translated and brought under proper scrutiny.

\* The Jaina code of conduct for monks and householders are revisited from the viewpoint of Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra.

We can increase the list of the salient features in various ways but in nutshell, we can say that, the legendary history of Cāṇakya preserved by the Jainas will open up new vistas for the scholars of Kauṭīlyan Studies.

**NALINI JOSHI**

May 2014

Pune

## Contents

	Page No.
Chapter 1 : <b>Introduction</b>	1
Chapter 2 : <b>Cāṇakya : Reflected in the Brahmanic Sources</b>	15
Chapter 3 : <b>Interpretation of the Mudrārākṣasa     from the Jaina Perspective</b>	27
Chapter 4 : <b>Cāṇakya : Revealed through the Jaina Literature</b>	47
Chapter 5 : <b>From the window of Arthaśāstra</b>	171
Chapter 6 : <b>Concluding Remarks</b>	227
Bibliography	241

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

- [1] How my attention was drawn towards this subject ?
- [2] The rationale behind the present exploration
- [3] The starting-point of the authentic history of India
- [4] Travel-accounts of the foreigners and the discovery of the Arthaśāstra
- [4] Whether Kauṭilya is the author of the Arthaśāstra or not ?
- [5] Decreasing popularity of the Arthaśāstra in the *brahmanic* literature

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### [1] How my attention was drawn towards this subject ?

While preparing the articles for Prakrit-English-Comprehensive-Dictionary, a joint and giant project was undertaken by Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute and Sanmati-Teerth a Research Institute, it came to my notice that in ancient and medieval literature of the Jainas, copious references about Cāṇakya are found in the form of stories, incidents, parables, analogies, narratives, examples and biographies. The number of references was really overwhelming. I felt it necessary to go deeper in the subject for bringing out the exact connection between the Jaina tales of Cāṇakya and traditional *brahmanical* tales in the broader light of the present version of Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra.

Though Cāṇakya is famous as Kauṭīliya and Viṣṇugupta, the Jaina authors have mostly preferred the name 'Cāṇakya'. At three to four places it is suggested clearly that these three names identify the one and same personality.

The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is a science of polity. It is of course a excellent blend of Politics, Economics, Ethics as well as History. This world-famous treatise is extensively studied by Orientalists, Indologists and Sanskritists all over the world. The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra contains 15 *adhikaraṇas* and 150 *adhyāyas*. It is a practical guidebook for a sovereign king. There is no need to describe the greatness and all-time-relevance of the Arthaśāstra. It is noticed that almost each finance budget of India, when tabled into

the parliament, necessarily contains suitable quotations from the Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra.

It is really a paradox that very little information about the personality of Cāṇakya is found in the Hindu and Buddhist sources. Exactly opposite is the position in the Jaina literature. It is full of stories, narratives, examples and illustrations of Cāṇakya.

## **[2] The rationale behind the present exploration :**

When we fathomed the whole Jaina literature and explored each and every reference to Cāṇakya, one fact become crystal-clear to us that the Jainas tell many new things about Cāṇakya which are not told in the Brahmanic and Buddhist literature. Generally a high regard, praise and honour about Cāṇakya is seen in the Jaina literature.

In the meantime, a sentence written in the introduction of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra by B.R.Hivargaonkar startled me. He says, "It is noted in the Brahmanic, Buddhist and Jaina literature that Kauṭīliya was the *amatya* of the king Candragupta. A sense of disregard and reproach towards Cāṇakya is seen in the Buddhist and Jaina literature, while the Brahmanic sources praise Cāṇakya."

Further on, Mr. Hivargaonkar defends his view as follows :

"He himself being a *brahmin*, possesses very staunch and strict views against *pāṣaṇḍins*. Naturally the Bauddhas and Jainas despise Cāṇakya and Brahmanic texts praise Cāṇakya." (Introduction p.22)

We can't say anything about the Buddhist texts at this juncture but it is really surprising and amuzing that a reputed scholar like Hivargaonkar had passed a remark about the Jainas without going into the scruting of the Jaina references. In the same introduc-

tion he says that, the Nandīsūtra mentions the text of Kauṭilya as a '*kuṭīla-nītiśāstra*' in which the negative attitude of the Jainas towards Cāṇakya is reflected. (Introduction p.4)

The other reputed scholar Durga Bhagvat has tried to bring out the Buddhist connections with the Arthaśāstra but has totally neglected the Jaina references which are enormous in number.

The same attitude of negligence about the Jaina sources is seen in the introduction of the Mudrārākṣasa written by Dr.R.D.Karmarkar (Introduction p.13-14). He has mentioned the Buddhist sources of Mudrārākṣasa in a bit detailed manner but had said nothing what the Jainas have documented. In his mind, he might have thought that the Jainas repeat the same things what the Buddhists say.

Thus an upright attempt has been made in this book to underline and examine all the Jaina sources of Cāṇakya and the Arthaśāstra with the hope to remove away the previous misconceptions.

### **[3] The starting-point of the authentic history of India :**

It is a known fact that the authentic history of India is reconstructed by the historians from Alexander's invasion to India. Though the antiquity of Magadha is traced by the Indologists right from the Ṛgveda, the Śiśunāgas, Nandas and Mauryas are the hallmark dynasties noted in the authentic history. Yuan Chwang's travel-accounts (629 A.D.) display a picture of Mauryan empire and particularly mentions Chandragupta (II), as a great emporor. Nothing is written about Cāṇakya by Yuan Chwang, a politician of prevading genius who was the prime-minister of the great empire. When Yuan Chwang's book was translated, it was read, studied and almost devoured by all the students and scholars of Indian History.

#### **[4] Travel-accounts of the foreigners and discovery of the Arthaśāstra :**

The discovery of Cāṇakya's Arthaśāstra is a great event much greater than the discovery of Yuan Chwang's travel-accounts in western countries. Shamshastry discovered a manuscript of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra in 1909 and he published it in the same year. Shamshastry, T.Ganapatishastri, Dr. Jolly Meyor, Dr. Winternitz, Father Zimmerman, Mr. B.R.Hivargaonkar, Dr. R.P.Kangle, Dr. D.R.Bhandarkar were the great pioneers of the Kauṭīliyan studies.

Dr.Jolly and Dr.Winternitz claimed that the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is not authored by Kauṭīliya, the prime-minister of Candragupta. According to them, 'Kauṭīliya' is an imaginary personality and not an actual master in polity. Sombody collected all ancient thoughts on polity and wrote down the treatise using the pen-name of Kauṭīliya in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D. However, Dr. Jolly admitted that there are some legends about the fabulous minister who was looked upon as the master and creator of the art of polity.

The above-mentioned inference was based on the travel-accounts of Megasthenese, who was a Greek ambassador in the court of Candragupta and who actually resided at Pāṭaliputra. The absense of Kauṭīliya's name in his travel-accounts actually led Dr. Jolly to the conclusion that Kauṭīliya was an imaginary personality. Mr. B.R.Hivargaonkar and some other scholars have criticized this view. This is not a place to note down all the arguments in the debate. But in nutshell, we can say that ultimately the Indian Indologists have established that the main core of Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is written by Kauṭīliya (Cāṇakya/Viṣṇugupta) approximately in the fourth century before the Christian Era.

Several reasons can be enumerated why Megasthenese might not have mentioned Kauṭilya and his Arthaśāstra. His travel-accounts are not available in lucid, homogenous form. At many places the text is corrupt as well as concise and scattered. After all his writings are not historical books and are based on inadequate information. Dr. Shwanbek, the editor of 'Megasthenis Indika' specifically says that, "Though some portions of his accounts might have been written on the basis of first-hand information, but many of the accounts seem to have been documented by using secondary sources and are not totally acceptable on its face-value." (कौटिलीय अर्थशास्त्र, हिवरगावकर, प्रस्तावना, p.23-24)

Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasad Sastry was a well-known Indologist and a scholar of great repute. He wrote an extremely important book entitled 'Magadhan Literature' in 1923. At that time, an enthusiastic team of Indologists was working on the Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra with full vigour. Sastry had noted down the comparison between Yuan Chwang's India and the India reflected in the Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra. It will not be out of place to quote the full passage from Sastry's book. The passage is as follows -

Yuan Chwang came to India in 629 A.D. and remained here for sixteen years. Kauṭilya was a native of India, bred up and born here ; and he flourished about a thousand years before Yuan Chwang. Yuan Chwang was a mere traveller, at best a devout pilgrim. But Kauṭilya was a politician of prevailing genius and he was the prime-minister of a great empire. Yuan Chwang was interested in Buddhism only and that in its higher phases. But Kauṭilya was interested in everything Indian. Yuan Chwang was a religious man and looked at Indian society from the religious point of view. Kauṭilya

was an administrator and a man of the world. His interest in India was that of an administrator and a patriot. Yuan Chwang's account of India was partial and one-sided, that of Kauṭilya thorough and many-sided. (Magadhan Literature, Lecture III, p.49)

**[5] Whether Kauṭilya is the author of the Arthaśāstra or not ? :**

The authorship of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra can be confirmed from the text itself. It is noted in the beginning, in the middle and at the end of the book that Kauṭilya alias Viṣṇugupta has composed this *śāstric* text. There is no valid reason for disbelieving the textual reference about its authorship.

At the end of the first *adhyāya* of the first *adhikaraṇa* it is told that -

सुखग्रहणविज्ञेयं तत्त्वार्थपदनिश्चितम् ।  
कौटिल्येन कृतं शास्त्रं विमुक्तग्रन्थविस्तरम् ॥

“Kauṭilya prepared this *śāstric* treatise which is easy to understand, in which technical words are used with specific meanings and the lengthy details are avoided to make it concise.”

At the end of the tenth *adhyāya* of the second *adhikaraṇa* Kauṭilya says -

सर्वशास्त्राण्यनुक्रम्य प्रयोगमुपलभ्य च ।  
कौटिल्येन नरेन्द्रार्थे शासनस्य विधिः कृतः ॥

“Having followed all sciences and having observed practice also, the rules of drawing up writs are framed by Kauṭilya for the benefit of the king.”

This ascribes the authorship to Kauṭilya but it does not name the king for whom it was intended. The remark of Kauṭilya suggests that this science of polity is useful for any king as such. The piece of information is given by Daṇḍin (approximately the 6<sup>th</sup> century

A.D.) in the eighth chapter of his famous work Daśakumāracarita in the following words - अधीष्वा तावत् दण्डनीतिम् । इयमिदानीम् आचार्यविष्णुगुप्तेन मौर्यार्थे षड्भिः श्लोकसहस्रैः संक्षिप्ता ।

‘Read *daṇḍanīti*. This has just now been presented in an abridged form extending to 6000 *ślokas* by *ācārya* Viṣṇugupta for the benefit of Maurya.’

According to the Arthaśāstra, the author is Kauṭilya, but in the Daśakumāracarita, it is mentioned that the Arthaśāstra was written by Viṣṇugupta. But they were not two different persons. Because at the end of the fifteenth *adhikaraṇa* of Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra, the author himself says -

दृष्ट्वा विप्रतिपत्तिं बहुधा शास्त्रेषु भाष्यकाराणाम् ।  
स्वयमेव विष्णुगुप्तश्चकार सूत्रं च भाष्यं च ॥

“Having seen discrepancies in many ways on the part of the writers of *bhāṣyas* on the *śāstras*, Viṣṇugupta has himself written both the *sūtra* and *bhāṣya*.”

Thus with the help of all these references we can conclude that kauṭilya and Viṣṇugupta must be the one and the same person. But was the author really the prime-minister of Candragupta in the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C. ? This doubt is cleared with the help of the verse noted down in the tenth *adhyāya* of the second *adhikaraṇa* of Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra. It runs thus -

येन शास्त्रं च शस्त्रं च नन्दराजगता च भूः ।  
अमर्षेणोद्धृतान्याशु तेन शास्त्रमिदं कृतम् ॥

“This *śāstra* has been made by him who, under provocation, quickly rescued from chaos the science of polity and of war, as well as the earth from the hands of the Nandas.”

While searching the legacy of Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra in the

*brahmanic* sources, the landmark-treatise of Kāmandaka i.e. the Kāmandakīya Nītisāra carries utmost importance. From the traditional information about Kāmandaka, we know that he was the disciple of Cāṇakya and presented a short version of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra in poetrical form. Putting aside the controversy of Kāmandaka's date we have to admit that he is an ancient authority on polity and is more explicit in giving us an account of the Arthaśāstra and its author. He says -

यस्याभिचारवज्रेण वज्रज्वलनचेतसः ।

पपात मूलतः श्रीमान् सुपर्वा नन्दपर्वतः ॥ 1.4 ॥

एकाकी मन्त्रशक्त्या यः शक्त्या शक्तिधरोपमः ।

आजहार नृचन्द्राय चन्द्रगुप्ताय मेदिनीम् ॥ 1.5 ॥

नीतिशास्त्रामृतं धीमानर्थशास्त्रमहोदधेः ।

समुदध्रे नमस्तस्मै विष्णुगुप्ताय वेधसे ॥ 1.6 ॥

“Salutation to Viṣṇugupta, the veritable providence, powerful like thunderous fire, by whose thunder-like rites, fell root and branch the mountain like Nanda dynasty firm in all its political strata ; who like Kārttikeya in valour, single-handed, procured by dint of his statesmanship the whole earth for Candragupta ; who from the ocean-like science of polity churned out, so to say, the nectar of polity.”

When we observe the legacy of Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra we find a compact and neat version of the Arthaśāstra i.e. the Nītivākyaṃṛta of Somadevasūri, a Digambara Jaina monk of the 10<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The details are given in a separate chapter of the present book.

#### **[6] Decreasing popularity of the Arthaśāstra in the *brahmanic* literature :**

Now we will see the impact of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra and

*kauṭīliya-nīti* which is reflected in the *brahmanic* literature, of course in a brief manner. From this brief sketch we come to know, 'How the popularity of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra decreased serially ?' At the end of this brief survey we will discuss the reasons of the decreasing popularity and how this valuable treasure of knowledge, was lost in darkness uptill its discovery in 1909 A.D.

In the Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali it is quoted that Maurya kings were greedy of wealth and gathered ample wealth with a lot of devices to fill their treasure.

In the dramas and one-act-plays of Bhāsa, who is the oldest among the available Sanskrit dramatists, the shadows and reflections of the terms, ideas, motifs and points enumerated in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra are found in frequent manner. Two of his dramas viz. the Pratijñā-yaugandharāyaṇa and the Avimāraka are full of the terms and devices used by Kauṭīliya. Scholars have pointed out the parallel references from Bhāsa's Pañcarātra and Abhiṣeka also.

From the literature of Kālidāsa, particularly from the Raghuvamśa and the Śākuntala, it can be well-inferred that Kālidāsa might have gone through the Kauṭīliya's Arthaśāstra thoroughly. But the famous verse of Kālidāsa which he put into the mouth of Śākuntalā, throws light on the fact that Kālidāsa does not carry full regard or honour towards Kauṭīliya. Śākuntalā says sarcastically, 'परतिसन्धानमधीयते यैः विद्येव ते सन्तु क्लिप्तवाचः ।'

In this remark it is reflected that the Arthaśāstra was regarded at that time as a science of deceitful means and studied by cunning persons.

If we place Bāṇabhṭṭa, famous for his 'Kādambarī', after Kālidāsa, the same attitude towards Kauṭīliya is seen. In his excla-

mation, 'किं वा तेषां साम्प्रतं येषां पराभिसन्धानपरा मन्त्रिणः उपदेष्टारः', it is implied that the ministers always suggest crooked ways to their lords (कौटिलीय अर्थशास्त्र, दुर्गा भागवत, प्रस्तावना (२), p.26). In the same book, Bāṇabhaṭṭa describes Cāṇakya as *nṛśāmsa*, *krūra* and *nirghṛṇa* (i.e. malicious, cruel and pitiless) (कौटिलीय अर्थशास्त्र, दुर्गा भागवत, प्रस्तावना (२), p.4).

Though in the works of Daṇḍin and in the Pañcatantra, the references to Kauṭilya are found, we cannot draw a conclusion that they possess a background of thorough study of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. At the very beginning, the *pañcatantrakāra* enumerates the *śāstras* as, 'ततो धर्मशास्त्राणि मन्वादीनि, अर्थशास्त्राणि चाणक्यादीनि, कामशास्त्राणि वात्स्यायनादीनि ।'

If we carefully study Viśākhadatta's *Mudrārākṣasa*, a totally political play dedicated to Cāṇakya-Candragupta and Rākṣasa, we come to know Viśākhadatta's deep study of the Arthaśāstra, but at the same time, it creates adverse impact by his famous terminology, 'कौटिल्यः कुटिलमतिः ।'. Cāṇakya's egoist remarks, the impropriety in addressing 'vṛṣala' to the king Candragupta, the pseudo-conflict with Candragupta in the third act and so many other things are quite eloquent to suggest the growing disregard toward Cāṇakya's intelligent crookedness. More details are given in a separate chapter written on the *Mudrārākṣasa*.

The growing impact of *smṛti* literature, particularly the *Manusmṛti* (Mānava-dharma-śāstra) and the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* were the last blow on the studies of Arthaśāstra. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* depicted Cāṇakya as a well-versed *brahmin* in the rites of magical lores. Silently the important topics of the Arthaśāstra, lost their popularity and negative side came forward.

The topics like *guḍha-puruṣa-praṇidhi*, *yoga-vāmana*, *upa-jāpa*, *apasarpa-praṇidhi*, *durga-lambhopāya* and *para-ghāta-prayoga* gained popularity and over-shadowed the practical and ethical values of the Arthaśāstra.

Cāṇakya's Arthaśāstra is evidently an important part of Magadhan literature. Magadha's connection with *śramaṇic* culture is a proved historical fact. The Nandas were pro-Jaina. Śakaṭāla, the minister of the last Nanda was a Jaina layman. That is why his son Sthūlabhadra accepted the Jaina *dīkṣā* and became the chief monk of the whole Jaina *saṃgha*. The *brahmanic* traits of Cāṇakya are quite clear though the Jainas depict him as a layman or a monk. Candragupta seems to be pro-Jaina. Otherwise he would not have allowed the first conference of the Jaina Canons at Pāṭaliputra. *Brahmanic* sources depict Candragupta as a *śūdra*. Some say that he was born from Murā *dāsī*. In the *Mudrārākṣasa*, Cāṇakya calls Candragupta, literally hundreds of times as *vṛṣala*. Candragupta's son Bindusāra was probably a pro-Jaina king and his grand-son Samprati was surely a Jainized king. Bindusāra's son, king Aśoka was certainly a Buddhist king.

Thus due to the *śramaṇic* connection of Magadha, the staunch *brahmanic dharmaśāstrakāras* might have a concealed rage against Cāṇakya because he was a mentor of pro-Jaina Candragupta who was a *śūdra* by birth.

*Dharmaśāstrakāras* always give importance to '*dharma puruṣārtha*'. Cāṇakya gave equal importance to *dharma-artha* and *kāma*. Though Cāṇakya was favourable to the traditional system of *varṇāśrama*, his views are comparatively mild and fair. Cāṇakya proclaimed, 'व्यवहारानुलोमो धर्मः ।' While the *Smṛitikāras* proclaimed,

‘धर्मनुलोमो व्यवहारः ।’ Slowly the religious and ritualistic views of *smṛtis*, particularly of Manu and Yājñavalkya gain popularity over the secular, ethical and practical nature of the Arthaśāstra. Yājñavalkya omitted many technical parts of the Arthaśāstra, related to kingdom and inter-state relationship etc. He concentrated on *ācāra*, *vyavahāra* and *prāyaścitta*. Hence the study of the *smṛtis* become a regular part of syllabus and the popularity of the Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra decreased. Though Yājñavalkya has taken a lot from Kauṭilya, still his treatise surpassed the Arthaśāstra.





## CHAPTER 2

### CĀṆAKYA : REFLECTED IN THE BRAHMANIC SOURCES

- [1]** The Mahābhārata (Ādiparva)
- [2]** Rājarṣi Cāṇakya in the Skandapurāṇa and the Matsyapurāṇa
- [3]** Cāṇakya's single-line references in the Viṣṇupurāṇa, the Vāyupurāṇa and the Matsyapurāṇa
- [4]** The story of Cāṇakya in the Kathāsaritsāgara
- [5]** The Bṛhatkathāmañjarī of Kṣemendra
- [6]** A brief review of Cāṇakya's personality in the *brahmanic* sources



## CHAPTER 2

### CĀṆAKYA : REFLECTED IN THE BRAHMANIC SOURCES

When we start to fathom the Indian literature for getting the information about Cāṇakya (Kauṭilya/Viṣṇugupta), we have to take a start from the *brahmanic* literature. Cāṇakya's being a *brahmin*, his tuft of hair, his well-versedness in *vedavidyā*, his intellectual brilliance, short-temperedness and vindictive nature comes forward immediately. His monumental work *Arthaśāstra* also reflects his brahminhood. Thus we will start our quest from the *brahmanic* sources.

In the present chapter, we will deal with the Cāṇakya-references in the *Mahābhārata*, some important *purāṇas* and two Sanskrit-collections of narratives viz. the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*.

#### [1] The Mahābhārata (Ādiparva) :

In the appendix of the *Ādiparva*, Kauṭilya is referred to by Vidura, the most eminent *nītikāra* in the galaxy of the personalities in the *Mahābhārata*. The verse is -

विदुरो धृतराष्ट्रस्य जानन्सर्वं मनोगतम् ।  
केनायं विधिना सृष्टः कौटिल्यः कपटालयः ॥  
इत्येवं चिन्तयन् प्राज्ञो ---

Mahābhārata, Ādiparva (Appendix) 85.10.2

Here, Kauṭilya is described as 'the abode of deceitfulness' by the great intelligent thinker Vidura. When we search the next part of the text with the expectation of some Cāṇakya-narrative, we are disappointed. In the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata*, prepared by

BORI, this portion is excluded because anachronism is evident in this case. In the later version of the Mahābhārata, some writer might have added it spuriously probably when the disregardful attitude towards Cāṇakya came in vogue i.e. after 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> century A.D. One observation is noteworthy that when the last *saṃskaraṇa* of the Mahābhārata was in vogue, the Ardhamāgadhī Jaina canons were prevalent in oral tradition. None of the old Ardhamāgadhī canons contains any reference of Cāṇakya. This fact supports the view that the above-mentioned reference of Cāṇakya in the Mahābhārata is certainly spurious and carries no weightage.

In the 59<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of the Śāntiparva, four *arthaśāstrakāras* are mentioned viz. Viśālākṣa, Bāhudantī, Bṛhaspati and Uśanas (or Śukra). These names are quoted in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra as *pūrvasūris*. In continuation with these ancient thinkers of the Arthaśāstra, somebody might have added the name of Cāṇakya in the Mahābhārata.

## **[2] Rājarṣi Cāṇakya in the Skandapurāṇa and the Matsyapurāṇa :**

In the 155<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of the Revākhaṇḍa (5), the Skandapurāṇa mentions the greatness of *śuklatīrtha*. It starts with this verse - 'इक्ष्वाकुसंभवो राजा चाणक्यो नाम धार्मिकः ।' Once upon a time, there was a king born in Ikṣvāku dynasty, who was religious and whose name was Cāṇakya. It is mentioned at the end that he went to the *śuklatīrtha* and donated cows, gold and land with great benevolence. Afterwards, he obtained *siddhi* at this place. The Matsyapurāṇa refers the same story in the following words -

शुक्लतीर्थं महापुण्यं नर्मदायां व्यवस्थितम् ।

चाणक्यो नाम राजर्षिः सिद्धिं तत्र समागतः ॥

Matsyapurāṇa 192.14

When we read this story of Cāṇakya, it immediately comes to our mind that though the similarity of name is there, this sage-like king of Ikṣvāku dynasty is not in any way connected with the *arthaśāstrakāra* Cāṇakya, who was a *brahmin* prime-minister of Candragupta Maurya.

However, Hariṣeṇa, the famous Digambara Jaina author of the Bṛhatkathā has incorporated these details of the Skanda and the Matsya-purāṇa in his Cāṇakya-muni-kathānakam. Surprisingly enough, Hariṣeṇa mentions, ‘चकार विपुलं राज्यं चाणाक्यो निजबुद्धितः’ (Bṛhatkathākoṣa, Cāṇakyamunikathānakam, verse 71) in which he says that Cāṇakya (?) ruled over the country for a long time with his great intelligence. The impact of the above-mentioned *purāṇas* was so deep on Hariṣeṇa, that according to him Cāṇakya (?) went to Krauñcapura and attained siddhi by embracing samādhi-maraṇa. (Bṛhatkathākoṣa, Cāṇakyamunikathānakam, verse 84)

The threads of the story of Cāṇakya-rājārṣi are skillfully woven in the depiction of Hariṣeṇa’s Cāṇakya-narrative. It is not only Hariṣeṇa to mix the two different tales but Pt. Mahadevshastri Joshi in his Bhāratīya-saṁskṛti-kośa had done the same thing. He quotes, ‘The reference of the Matsyapurāṇa probably tells us about the last days and death of this great person.’

This is the classic example of creating a new legend by blending various details with added imagination !

### **[3] Cāṇakya’s single-line references in the Viṣṇupurāṇa, the Vāyupurāṇa and the Matsyapurāṇa :**

Almost every scholar engaged in Cāṇakyan study, has invariably mentioned that we find the references of Cāṇakya in the *purāṇas* and specially in the Viṣṇu<sup>0</sup>, Vāyu<sup>0</sup> and Matsya-purāṇas. But when

we actually go through them, we are completely disappointed. Viṣṇupurāṇa starts with the history of Magadha by mentioning Śiśunāga dynasty. Afterwords it mentions Nandin, Mahānandin and Mahāpadmanandin. It treats Mahāpadma as a *kṣatriya* born from a *śudrā*. It is noted that Mahāpadma and his sons ruled for hundred years. Here enters the *brahmin* Kauṭilya, who killed the nine Nandas and who installed Candragupta Maurya on the throne. It is told that ten Mauryan kings will rule the country for 173 years. The whole history of these dynasties is presented by using future tense. The same accounts are repeated in the Vāyu and the Matsya - purāṇas. (Viṣṇupurāṇa, Amśa 4, *adhyāya* 24, *verses* 20-32 ; Vāyupurāṇa, Khaṇḍa 2, *prakaraṇa* 61, *verses* 188-192 ; Matsyapurāṇa, 272.21).

Thus the *purāṇic* sources provide no additional information or legends except a single line that Cāṇakya was a *brahmin* and he concecrated Candragupta Maurya on the throne of Magadha.

#### **[4] The story of Cāṇakya in the Kathāsaritsāgara :**

We find the story of Cāṇakya in the Kathā<sup>0</sup>, in a slightly developed form than that of the *purāṇas*. This story book, lit. 'the ocean of narratives' is written in the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D. by a sanskrit scholar Somadeva. Though Kathā<sup>0</sup> is included in the *brahmanic* literature, it is in real sense 'secular'. Though the sanskrit version is done by Somadeva, originally the legends and tales were gathered by Guṇāḍhya in one of the oldest Prakrit language, Paisācī. Guṇāḍhya is related to the Sātavāhana kings. So the date of his Baḍḍakahā (Bṛhatkathā) goes to the 2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D. In fact it was the treasure of legends from which the Hindus, Jainas and Buddhists had drawn a lot. The Vasudevahiṇḍī, one of the few Prakrit classics, owes much to the Baḍḍakahā.

Concerned purāṇas are generally interested in giving the detailed lists of Nanda and Maurya dynasties. Passing references of Cāṇakya are found in them. The Kathā<sup>0</sup> is in real sense the first source documenting legendary history of Cāṇakya. The story in the Kathā<sup>0</sup> (1.5.114) can be summarized in the following manner -

In Pāṭalipura, Nandas were ruling. The last among them was Yogananda. (A short story is given why he was called 'Yogananda'.) Śakaṭāla was his minister. For some reason, Śakaṭāla wanted to take revenge on Yogananda. (The details are given inbetween the story.) On one occasion, he saw a *brahmin* named Cāṇakya who was digging *kuśa* grass upto its root because the grass pricked the sole of his foot. Śakaṭāla thought that he was a proper person to retaliate Yogananda. He invited Cāṇakya in the palace of Nanda for *śrāddhabhojana*. Cāṇakya occupied the seat of honour (*agrāsana*). The seat was actually reserved for a *brahmin* called Subandhu. Śakaṭāla reported the situation to Nanda. Nanda told Śakaṭāla that Subandhu will adorn the seat and none other. Śakaṭāla reported this message to Cāṇakya and requested to vacate the seat. Due to this insult, Cāṇakya became furious. He abruptly loosened his tied tuft of hair and exclaimed, 'Within seven days I will destroy Nanda and then only I will tie down my tuft of hair.'

Nanda was overpowered by anger. Without giving him a chance to take any action, Cāṇakya ran away. Śakaṭāla, as if waiting for this opportunity, gave shelter to Cāṇakya in his house. Śakaṭāla made all the arrangements for Cāṇakya's practice of black-magic (*kṛtyā-sāadhanā*). The black-magic started showing its effects on Nanda by creating inflammatory fever. Within seven days Nanda died.

After the death of Nanda, Śakaṭāla killed Nanda's son Hiranyagupta and made Candragupta the king, who was in true sense 'a son of a previous Nanda' (*pūrvanandasuta*). Śakaṭāla persuaded Cāṇakya and made him Candragupta's chief-minister because he knew that Cāṇakya is bright like Brhaspati. Having completed this intended task, Śakaṭāla went to forest. Thus he overcome the grief of the death of his beloved sons and led a peaceful spiritual life.

### **Some Observations on the Kathāsaritsāgara :**

- \* The main focus of this story is on Śakaṭāla. Cāṇakya's appearance is secondary.
- \* It provides more data about Cāṇakya, in comparison with the *purāṇas*.
- \* Śakaṭāla and Subandhu are not mentioned in the *purāṇas*.
- \* The references of *śrāddha* and *śikhā* confirm the *brāhmaṇatva* of Cāṇakya.
- \* In the Jaina narratives it is told that, Subandhu was revengeful to Cāṇakya, but the reason is not given. With the help of the Kathā<sup>0</sup> we find the missing link in the Jaina narratives.
- \* The story of Śakaṭāla is very popular in the Jaina tales but the relation between Śakaṭāla and Cāṇakya is not established in the Jaina tales.
- \* The impact of this story is evidently seen in the Cāṇakya-muni-kathā of Hariṣeṇa but he might have taken the story from the Prakrit version of the Kathā<sup>0</sup> because the date of Hariṣeṇa is the 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> century and the date of the Kathā<sup>0</sup> is the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D.
- \* The Śvetāmbara Jaina writers have told that Śakaṭāla was the minister of the last Nanda and he had two sons named Sthūlabhadra

and Śrīyaka. Later on Sthūlabhadra became a Jaina monk and was the leader of the Jaina *saṃgha*. It is depicted in the Kathāsaritsāgara that Śakaṭāla's sons were killed in the dry well where Nanda had put the whole family of Śakaṭāla as a punishment of some offence. These details are not in congruence with the Jaina tradition. Therefore the whole Śakaṭāla-account is given by Hariṣeṇa as a story of Kavi (or sometimes Kāvi), who was also one of the ministers of Nanda.

- \* In the Kathā<sup>0</sup>, it was Śakaṭāla who installed Candragupta on the throne and persuaded Cāṇakya to become his minister. In the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī and also in the Jaina sources, Cāṇakya himself installed Candragupta on the throne and became his chief-minister.
- \* The Kathā<sup>0</sup> regards Candragupta as 'pūrvanandasuta' and suggests his 'kṣatriyatva'.
- \* According to the Kathā<sup>0</sup>, Cāṇakya killed Nanda by some occult practices of black magic. This is the main point of difference in the Brahmanic and the Jaina sources. This action of Cāṇakya described in the Kathā<sup>0</sup> belittles the bravery of Candragupta and political tacticks of Cāṇakya.

**[5] The Bṛhatkathāmañjarī of Kṣemendra (10<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) :**

In the 10<sup>th</sup> century, Kṣemendra, a Kashmirian *brahmin* wrote the sanskrit version of Guṇāḍhya's Baḍḍakahā. But the later version of Somadeva i.e. the Kathāsaritsāgara surpassed the Mañjarī due to its poetic values. So we have also dealt with the Kathāsaritsāgara first and then the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī. The story of Cāṇakya presented in the Mañjarī is brief than the Kathā<sup>0</sup>.

The story of the Mañjarī, basically describes the episode of

Vararuci and Śakaṭāla. Cāṇakya's reference is found in four verses (214-217, *guccha* 2, ch.1). The details are almost same as that of the Kathā<sup>0</sup> but the only difference is, it is Cāṇakya who installed Candragupta (a *pūrvanandasuta*) on the throne and not by Śakaṭāla. Cāṇakya's ministership is not mentioned in the Mañjarī.

In nutshell, both the Kathā<sup>0</sup> and the Mañjarī had gone a step forward than that of the *purāṇas* in the case of Cāṇakya, but the importance is given to Śakaṭāla. It is noteworthy that none of these authors have mentioned that the Arthaśāstra was written by Cāṇakya.

**[6] A brief review of Cāṇakya's personality in the *brahmanic* sources:**

- \* In the travel-accounts of the Greek ambassador Megasthenes and Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang, Candragupta is mentioned with high regards but Kauṭilya or Cāṇakya is not mentioned. Due to this, a team of scholars of Indology advocated that Kauṭilya is a mere myth and the Arthaśāstra was written by some other person, in the 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> century by using the name of Kauṭilya.
- \* After the discovery of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra, a team of Indian scholars exerted a lot to prove the fact and it is now an established fact that the present Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is written by Kauṭilya alias Cāṇakya alias Viṣṇugupta around the fourth century B.C. Some changes or interpolations might have done afterwards but the main core is same.
- \* There are two later versions of the Arthaśāstra. One is the Kāmandakīya Nīṭisāra of the *brahmanic* tradition and Somadeva's Nīṭivākyāmrta written by a Jaina scholar.
- \* The above mentioned three versions do not throw much light on the personal accounts of this genius.

- \* The Viṣṇu<sup>0</sup>, Vāyu<sup>0</sup> and Matsya-purāṇas have majorly documented the history of the Nanda and the Maurya dynasties while describing the legendary history of Magadha. Cāṇakya and Candragupta are mentioned but not a single piece of information is given about Cāṇakya's personality.
- \* In the dramas of Bhāsa and in the literature of Kālidāsa, some *sūtras*, terms, terminologies and details in polity are mentioned here and there. The treatment given to Cāṇakya and his Arthaśāstra by Bāṇa and Daṇḍin is not taht of full regard because they highlight Cāṇakya's crookedness and shrewdness. The *pañcatantrakāra*'s reference is brief and formal.
- \* The decreasing popularity of the Arthaśāstra due to the rise and popularity of the *smṛtis*, particularly the Manu and the Yājñavalkya, went to such an extent that this landmark work rested in darkness for many centuries.
- \* The Mudrārākṣasa of Viśākhadatta popularized the phrase 'कौटिल्यः कुटिलमतिः'. Cāṇakya's personality pictured in this drama creates a confused and debatable sketch of Cāṇakya. The details of Cāṇakya's birth and death are missing in this drama because the dramatist has chosen a particular part of Cāṇakya's life. But it is certain that he has gone through deeply the text of Arthaśāstra.

The Mudrārākṣasa, the only political play of this genre, is studied and edited by many Sanskritists and Indologists. A lot of research work is done with many perspectives. So far to my knowledge, nobody has brought out the Jaina-connections of this play.

Even the eminent scholar like Dr. R.D.Karmarkar had not paid any attention to the Jaina sources. In the introduction of his edition we find the title as - 'The Buddhist and Jaina Sources of the

Mudrārākṣasa'. But we are disappointed because not a single reference is given with any appropriate citation. (Mudrārākṣasa, Ed. R.D.Karmarkar, Introduction, pp.13-14)

Thus in the next chapter, an attempt has been made to reconsider the Mudrārākṣasa from the Jaina perspective.



### CHAPTER 3

#### INTERPRETATION OF THE MUDRĀRĀKṢASA FROM THE JAINA PERSPECTIVE

- [1] Rationale of the topic
- [2] The Jaina characters in the play
- [3] Cāṇakya's character in the Mudrārākṣasa
- [4] *Brāhmaṇatva* of Cāṇakya
- [5] Cāṇakya's tuft of hair
- [6] Strict laws of Cāṇakya
- [7] Wisdom of Cāṇakya
- [8] Cāṇakya's address to Candragupta
- [9] Conflict between Cāṇakya and Candragupta
- [10] Use of Prakrits in the Mudrārākṣasa
- [11] Main theme of the Mudrārākṣasa
- [12] Some minor similarities
- [13] Critical Comments



## CHAPTER 3

### INTERPRETATION OF THE MUDRĀRĀKṢASA FROM THE JAINA PERSPECTIVE

#### [1] Rationale of the topic :

In the galaxy of Sanskrit dramas, the Mudrārākṣasa of Viśākhadatta, is the unique political play, dedicated to the historical personalities, viz. Cāṇakya and Candragupta Maurya. The date of the Mudrārākṣasa is vastly discussed and debated by various sanskrit scholars as well as historians around the world. The approximate date of this play can be ascertained as the 7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The cross-references found in the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi and the Nīṣītha-cūrṇi are full of Cāṇakya-Candragupta-narratives and myths. This fact supports the above-mentioned inferred date of the Mudrārākṣasa, because important *cūrṇis* were written by Jinadāsagaṇi in the 7<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

The popularity of the the Mudrārākṣasa was so wide-spread that at modern times, many Indian authors have written the fictions dedicated to Cāṇakya and Candragupta with the help of the life-accounts pictured in the Mudrārākṣasa. For example, in Marathi literature, the 'Candragupta' of H.N.Apte, the 'Nṛpanirmātā Cāṇakya' of R.C.Dhere, the life-account of Cāṇakya documented in the 'Bhāratiya-saṁskṛti-kośa' and the novel 'Ārya' written by Vasant Patwardhan - all of them have basically relied upon the Mudrārākṣasa. We are quite sure that the same fact is true about the legendary histories written in all Indian regional languages.

When we go through the editions of the Mudrārākṣasa, it is found that the esteemed scholars have mentioned the Buddhist and

the Jaina sources about Cāṇakya and Candragupta in a very brief manner in their prefaces and forewords. The Buddhist sources are discussed in a little detailed manner but a total injustice is done to the Jaina sources though they are ample in number and cover the major life-accounts of Cāṇakya and Candragupta.

Therefore, at present, an attempt has been made to interpret the *Mudrārākṣasa* from the Jaina perspective, by writing a separate article.

## **[2] The Jaina characters in the play :**

### **(a) Jīvasiddhi Kṣapaṇaka :**

In the plot of the *Mudrārākṣasa* the role of Jīvasiddhi Kṣapaṇaka carries a certain weight. The name 'Jīvasiddhi' is a compound of two padas viz. '*jīva*' and '*siddhi*' which connote certain philosophical background of the Jainas. Jīvasiddhi means a person who is trying to attain liberation. 'Kṣapaṇaka' is a nude (Digambara) monk who has achieved a certain spiritual progress. All the Sanskrit scholars of the *Mudrārākṣasa* unanimously agree that Jīvasiddhi Kṣapaṇaka is a 'Jaina Bhikṣu'. Of course he is a spy appointed by Cāṇakya for getting the information from the camp of Amātya Rākṣasa. Jīvasiddhi is not a real Jaina monk. Cāṇakya's friend Induśarmā assumes a disguise of a Jaina monk. Cāṇakya is sure that a Jaina monk can win trust of Amātya Rākṣasa who is totally loyal to the last Nanda king Dhanānanda. From the inscriptions of Khāravela at Orissa, it is confirmed that Nandas have taken away the idol of 'Jina' from Kalinga.

Taking into consideration all these Jaina connections, we come to know the propriety of the character of Jīvasiddhi Kṣapaṇaka in the play. No other classical sanskrit play than the *Mudrārākṣasa*

possesses such a character.

If we examine the dialogues of Jīvasiddhi from the language-point-of-view, we can designate it as the specimen of Māgadhi Prakrit. Every now and then Kṣapaṇaka says, ‘अलहन्ताणं पणमामि’<sup>1</sup> or ‘सासणमलिहन्ताणं पडिवज्जह मोहवाहिवेज्जाणं’<sup>2</sup>. Jīvasiddhi greets others many a times with the specific greeting, ‘धम्मसिद्धी होदु सावगाणम्’<sup>3</sup>. Amātya Rākṣasa addresses Jīvasiddhi as ‘*bhadanta*’<sup>4</sup>.

Thus the role played by Jīvasiddhi in the play is quite noteworthy. In the first act, Cāṇakya himself refers the importance of the role of Jīvasiddhi Kṣapaṇaka.<sup>5</sup> The fourth and fifth acts are full of the dialogues between Rākṣasa and Jīvasiddhi. Jīvasiddhi suggests a proper *muhūrta* to Rākṣasa. It is remarkable that in the early history of the Jaina monastic conduct, it is depicted that the Jaina monks were well-versed in fortune-telling. (*nimitta*, *śakuna* etc.)

We can conclude that the role of Jīvasiddhi Kṣapaṇaka is quite eloquent to throw light on the intimacy of the Jains to the history of Cāṇakya-Candragupta and especially Amātya Rākṣasa alias Subandhu.

### (b) Candanadāsa :

It is not directly told in the play *Mudrārākṣasa* whether the chief city-merchant Candanadāsa was a Jaina householder or not. In the narrative literature of the Jains, generally the merchant class and especially the *nagara-śreṣṭhin* is always depicted as a Jaina person. The Jaina tales have pictured vividly that Cāṇakya gathered ample wealth from rich merchants to fill up the treasury of Magadha. Actually Candanadāsa is a *maṇikāraśreṣṭhin* i.e. chief of the jewelers. We find the term ‘*maṇikāra*’ in the ancient *Ardhamāgadhi* text

Jñātādharmakathā.<sup>6</sup> Candanadāsa and Amātya Rākṣasa are very close friends. As Jīvasiddhi being a Jain monk was reliable for Amātya, like-wise Candanadāsa might possibly a Jain house-holder, is equally reliable for him. Amātya handed over the responsibility of the protection of his family to Candanadāsa. The name of Candanadāsa's close relative is Dhanasena<sup>7</sup>, which is again a typical Jain name.

In the fifth act, the monologue of Candanadāsa carries some suggestions about his being a Jain. Candanadāsa speaks in Śaurasenī and uses the term *cārittabhaṅga-bhīru* for himself.<sup>8</sup> 'Cāritra' is a peculiar Jain term connoting 'right conduct'-one of the Jain *tri-ratnas*. The verse 'mottūṇa āmisāim'<sup>9</sup> is in Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit and the references of 'strict vegetarianism' and 'avoiding meat' also point at his being a faithful Jain.

### (c) Sarvārthasiddhi :

Amātya Rākṣasa is very eager to install Sarvārthasiddhi on the throne of Magadha. He is a person having the lineage of Nandas. Very surprisingly, 'sarvārthasiddhi' is the name of a supreme heavenly abode (*anuttara devavimāna*) in the hierarchy of the Jain heavens.

Secondly, *sarvārthasiddhi* is the oldest famous commentary of Pūjyapāda (5<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) on the well-known philosophical Jain text viz. the Tattvārthasūtra of Umāsvāmī, a resident of Kusumapura.

Amātya Rākṣasa's quest for Sarvārthasiddhi is a really strong Jain connection while considering the Mudrārākṣasa.

### [3] Cāṇakya's character in the Mudrārākṣasa :

Though the names Viṣṇugupta and Kauṭilya are used at some places in the play, the name 'Cāṇakya' is continued through the

whole play as a speaker of his dialogues. Likewise, in the Jaina literature mostly the name Cāṇakya (Cāṇakka, Cāṇikya, Cāṇākya) is found and references to Kauṭilya and Viṣṇugupta are very few.

#### **[4] *Brāhmaṇatva* of Cāṇakya :**

The Mudrārākṣasa depicts the *brāhmaṇatva* of Cāṇakya by calling him *ārya*<sup>10</sup>, *baṭu*<sup>11</sup>, *brāhmaṇa*, *bhaṭṭa*<sup>12</sup>, *upādhyāya*<sup>13</sup> and Viṣṇugupta.<sup>14</sup> Viśākhadatta never uses a term or epithet which is suggestive of his being a Jaina.

In the Jaina literature, the Śvetāmbaras depict him as a *śrāvaka* and the Digambaras especially Hariṣeṇa presented Cāṇakya as a Jaina monk leading a group of 500 *sādhus* which is glaringly an exaggeration.

#### **[5] Cāṇakya's tuft of hair :**

The point connected with the *brāhmaṇatva* of Cāṇakya is the reference of his long, black tuft of hair. Among all the *brahmanic* legends about Cāṇakya, the main legend is of his vow to destroy Nandas completely. It is told that at the end of the vow he released his long braided tuft. When Cāṇakya completed his vow and consecrated Candragupta on the throne of Magadha, he again tied his tuft.

In the Mudrārākṣasa, the incidents are presented in a different manner. Cāṇakya is not ready to tie his tuft until he manages to install Rākṣasa on the seat of chief-minister (Amātya) of the king Candragupta. The dreadful description of his long black tuft occurs in the first act of the Mudrārākṣasa. He compares his released tuft with a black, poisonous female serpent which is suggestive of the crooked and cruel means of Cāṇakya to fulfil his target. He exclaims -

नन्दकुलकालभुजर्गी कोपानलबहुललोलधूमलताम् ।

अद्यापि बध्यमानां वध्यः को नेच्छति शिखां मे ।

(Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, Act 1, verse 9, p.8)

At the end of the play, when helpless and blackmailed Rākṣasa accepts the chief-ministership of Candragupta, Cāṇakya ties his tuft with the following remarks -

पूर्णप्रतिज्ञेन मया केवलं बध्यते शिखा ।

(Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, Act 7, verse 17, p.310)

The Jaina authors are not ready to highlight Cāṇakya's *brāhmanatva* and are interested in depicting Cāṇakya as a *śrāvaka*. Therefore the incidents of releasing and tying of tuft are absent in the Jaina references. In the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi the reference of tuft is totally absent. In the Pāriśiṣṭaparva of Hemacandra, the verse related to śikhā (tuft) is added in the footnote.

Almost all the Jaina biographies have quoted one Sanskrit verse in which Cāṇakya's oath (or vow) is expressed. The verse runs thus -

कोशेन भृत्यैश्च निबद्धमूलं, पुत्रैश्च मित्रैश्च विवृद्धशाखम् ।

उत्पाट्य नन्दं परिवर्तयामि, हठाद् द्रुमं वायुरिवोग्रवेगः ॥

ĀvCū.(I) p.563

We have tried our best to locate this oft-quoted verse in the *brahmanic* literature viz. the Kathāsaritsāgara, the Purāṇas and the play Mudrārākṣasa. Unfortunately this verse is untraceable in the *brahmanic* sources. Thus the Jaina reference becomes important.

#### **[6] Strict laws of Cāṇakya :**

For maintaining the law and order situation, Cāṇakya and Candragupta are very strict. Ample examples can be quoted from the play in this connection. The following references truly depict the strictness of the kingly orders -

- 1) इदमनुष्ठीयते देवस्य चन्द्रगुप्तस्य शासनमिति - Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, Act 1, p.36
- 2) राजन्यविरुद्धाभिवृत्तिभिः - Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, Act 1, p.40
- 3) क्रियमाणेषु आज्ञाभङ्गेषु - Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, Act 2, p.96
- 4) अस्खलितपूर्वं देवस्य शासनं - Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, Act 3, p.112
- 5) प्रथमं तावन्ममाज्ञाव्याघातः - Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, Act 3, p.132
- 6) चन्द्रगुप्तेन आज्ञाभङ्गकलुषितेन - Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, Act 4, p.176
- 7) कीदृशं तत्कार्यगौरवं यद्राजशासनमुल्लङ्घयति - Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, Act 5, p.212

The discussion about ‘a mistake’ (*aparādha*) and ‘law-breaking’ (*ājñābhāṅga*) is found at length in Niśītha-cūrṇi while prescribing rules for monks and nuns. It is declared that law-breaking is more serious than a mistake or error. A narrative of Cāṇakya is quoted in the Niśītha-cūrṇi, as an example of this rule. It is mentioned that when the particular villagers disobeyed Cāṇakya’s order, he taught them a lesson by setting fire to the whole village. The cruel act of Cāṇakya is defended by the *cūrṇikāra*. A comment is made at the end that, the rules laid down by the Jinās are like the strict orders of Mauryan kings. They should be followed faithfully otherwise severe punishment in the form *prāyaśchittas*, would be given.<sup>15</sup>

Thus, the appreciation of the strictness of Candragupta and Cāṇakya is found in the Mudrārākṣasa and in the Jaina narratives.

### **[7] Wisdom of Cāṇakya :**

Sharp intellect is the prominent feature of Cāṇakya. All the shades of *buddhi* i.e. intelligence, wisdom, power of reasoning etc. are present in Cāṇakya. In a true sense, he is a genius. In the Mudrārākṣasa, it seems that he is very much aware about what type of intelligence he possesses. He enters in the first scene with the words -

‘कौटिल्यः कुटिलमतिः स एष येन  
क्रोधाग्नौ प्रसभमदाहि नन्दवंशः ।’

Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, Act 1, verse 7, p.8

In the 25<sup>th</sup> verse of the first act Cāṇakya says, ‘बुद्धिस्तु मा गान्मम’ i.e. ‘Let everything else leave me except my intelligence.’ According to the Jaina epistemology, intelligence is fourfold. *Autpattikī* is inborn ; *vainayikī* is the knowledge which we get through the instruction by *gurusevā* ; *karmajā* is acquired skill and *pāriṇāmikī* is the wisdom which one gets through the life-long experiences. The Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi depicts various incidents in the life of Cāṇakya as the examples of *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*. A bit underestimation is seen in the ĀvCū. Haribhadra, the literary mayestro of the 8<sup>th</sup> century depicts Cāṇakya as a possessor of threefold intellect i.e. *autpattikī*, *vainayikī* and *pāriṇāmikī*.<sup>16</sup> Though the Jainas have high regards for Cāṇakya, according to them the epitome of intelligence is Abhayakumāra, of course, a prominent personality in the Jaina history.

Cāṇakya in the Mudrārākṣasa is *kutīla-mati* i.e. an adept in all crooked ways. In fact Cāṇakya and Rākṣasa are both intelligent conspirators but Cāṇakya is always one-step-ahead. Both of them respect each other. In short we can say that Cāṇakya in the Mudrārākṣasa is extremely sharp, scheming, crooked, confident and to a certain extent, arrogant.

#### **[8] Cāṇakya’s address to Candragupta :**

In the whole drama, he addresses Candragupta as *vṛśala* i.e. an epithet showing the lower caste of Candragupta.

From the Jaina perspective of Cāṇakya, it is shocking and almost impossible that every now and then he refers the low birth of

Candragupta. The Jaina references are mostly found in the form of narration, giving very little scope for dialogues. The epithets used for Candragupta are 'vatsa' or 'rājan' and not a term like 'vṛṣala' showing disregard towards Candragupta. It is irrational, illogical and not at all convincing that the intelligent and towering person like Cāṇakya addresses the emperor in such a reproachful manner.

### **[9] Conflict between Cāṇakya and Candragupta :**

The pseudo-conflict (Kṛtaka-Kalaha) between Cāṇakya and Candragupta which is depicted in the third act of the drama, has no scope in the Jaina literature. Some scholars suggest that there is a possibility of true conflict between Cāṇakya and Candragupta due to the identity crisis of both the personalities in the last lapse of the life of Cāṇakya. We do not find neither true conflict or pseudo-conflict between Cāṇakya and Candragupta in the Jaina references.

The Śvetāmbaras depict a conflict between Bindusāra, the son of Candragupta and Cāṇakya. The conflict was deliberately created by Subandhu (most probably the Jaina counterpart of Amātya Rākṣasa) and the conflict terminated into the terrible death of Cāṇakya. Like Viśākhadatta, the Jains also wish to depict Cāṇakya as one-step-ahead of his enemy. Therefore with a great conspiracy, Cāṇakya managed to end the life of Subandhu.

### **[10] Use of Prakrits in the Mudrārākṣasa :**

Prakrit languages are profusely used in the Mudrārākṣasa and it is very amusing that Cāṇakya-Candragupta narratives are available in the Jaina Prakrit literature from the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. upto the 15<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

The Prakrits used in the Mudrārākṣasa are mainly Māgadhī, Śaurasenī and Māhārāṣṭrī. Other sub-dialects are also employed

occasionally. Sixteen characters of the *Mudrārākṣasa* speak in Prakrit. The snake-charmer Āhituṇḍika specifically mentions that he is a Prakrit-poet.<sup>17</sup>

Amātya Rākṣasa mentions the verse of the snake-charmer as a 'gāthā'. The relation of Prakrit and Jainism is very close. The Jainas have created a huge literature in all types of prakrit. Especially Cāṇakya-narratives are scattered over in the Prakrit literature.

### **[11] Main theme of the *Mudrārākṣasa* :**

At the very outset, it should be noted that the main plot and the happenings in the *Mudrārākṣasa*, are absent in the Jaina literature. The imaginary name Rākṣasa never occurs in the Jaina references. But we can find the reason behind the name Rākṣasa with the help of the Jaina stories. The Jainas say that Subandhu (or Subuddhi), a minister of Nandas, was waiting for a long time to retaliate upon Cāṇakya. Ultimately he succeeded in setting fire to Cāṇakya. Due to this brutal act, one can call him Rākṣasa - having a demonic mentality.

There are two versions of the Subandhu episode in the Jaina literature. Some narratives connect Subandhu with Bindusāra while others (especially the Digambaras) say that the minister of the Nandas, viz. Subandhu fled away from Pāṭaliputra and became a minister of a king of a southern country. When Cāṇakya became a Jaina monk and wandered towards south with his *saṃgha*, Subandhu recognized him and put him to death.

The main plot of the *Mudrārākṣasa* consists of various means and ways undertaken by Cāṇakya to persuade Rākṣasa by hook or by crook, for being a minister of Candragupta. All these conspira-

cies are not noted in the Jaina references. The Jainas might have thought that it is impossible to imagine Subandhu to work for Candragupta because he was totally loyal to the Nandas. Considering the revengeful mindset of Subandhu, there is a logical possibility that Subandhu may retaliate Cāṇakya and specially Candragupta after being a chief-minister of the Mauryan kingdom.

In nutshell we can say that though the *Mudrārākṣasa* is a successful political play, it's uniqueness left no impact on the later Jaina narratives. From this we can conclude that the legendary material available for the Jainas about Cāṇakya was different than that of the *brahmanic* literature and its antiquity starts before the Christian Era.

#### **[12] Some minor similarities :**

**(a) Pāṭaliputra :** Pāṭaliputra bears an important position in ancient history of Magadha and is closely connected with the history of the Nandas and Mauryas. Naturally, we find often references of Pāṭaliputra in the *Mudrārākṣasa* and in the Jaina literature.

The names Pāṭaliputra, Kusumapura and Puṣpapura are randomly used in the *Mudrārākṣasa* and also in the Jaina narratives. The Prakrit versions of Pāṭaliputra viz. Pāḍaliputta and Pāḍaliutta are found in the Prakrit portions of the *Mudrārākṣasa*.

Pāṭaliputra possesses a certain important position in ancient history of the Jainas, because the first conference of Ardhamāgadhī canons was held at Pāṭaliputra in the regime of Candragupta Maurya. It is noteworthy that the first Jaina Sanskrit philosophical text the *Tattvārthasūtra* of Umāsvāti was written at Kusumapura.

**(b) Cāṇakya's *parṇakuṭi* :** In the 15<sup>th</sup> verse of the third act of *Mudrā*<sup>0</sup> the simple hut-type residence of Cāṇakya is described. Here,

a person (i.e. Kañcukī) admires the desireless and detached outlook of Cāṇakya. Particularly the reference of dried cow-dung-cakes and dried grass are noteworthy from the Jaina perspective.

The Jaina authors admire Cāṇakya due to his selfless attitude and detached views. Hemacandra rightly says, ‘स सन्तोषधनः सदा’<sup>18</sup>. While describing the death of Cāṇakya, Hemacandra has noted down the following verse -

धूपाङ्गारेणानिलास्फालितेन प्रोद्यज्ज्वाले द्राक्करीषस्थले तु ।  
दारुप्रायो दह्यमानोऽप्यकम्पो मौर्याचार्यो देव्यभूतत्र मृत्वा ॥

(Pariśiṣṭa-parva, Sarga 8, verse 469)

The oldest Digambara reference of the Bhagavatī Ārādhana had mentioned that Cāṇakya was burnt by Subandhu at *gobbara-grāma*. He tolerated all the pains with calm and composed mind.<sup>19</sup>

The Bhagavatī Ārādhana mentions *gobbara-grāma* while the word ‘*gomaya*’ occurs in the description of *parṇakutī* in the Mudrārākṣasa.

**(c) Parvataka and Viṣakanyā :** Reference of Parvataka and his death caused by Cāṇakya by employing a *viṣakanyā* - these incidents are common in both the Mudrārākṣasa and the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi in almost the same manner. The episode of Malayaketu is totally absent in the Jaina references.

**(d) Cāṇakya’s power of observation :** Cāṇakya’s unique skill of minute observation is noted down in the second act of the Mudrārākṣasa. It is described that Cāṇakya suspected the danger to Candragupta’s life by minutely observing a line of ants (पिपीलिकापङ्क्तिम् अवलोक्य) coming from the hollow places of the broad walls of Candragupta’s palace.<sup>20</sup>

In the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi, it is told that a person called Naladāma

was killing ants by deeply digging the ground because the ants had done harm to Naladāma. By observing this act of Naladāma, Cāṇakya thought that, he was a proper person for finding out and killing the harmful persons of the Nandas. The Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi notes down the account briefly, in the following manner -

तिदंडी बाहिरियाए णलदामं मुङ्गमारणं दट्ठुं आगतो, रण्णा सद्भावितो,  
दिण्णं आरक्खं, वीसत्था कता, भत्तदाणे सकुडुंबा मारिया ।

(ĀvCū. (II) p.565)

**(e) Cāṇakya : A kingmaker or a shadow-king ?**

When we think of the relation between Cāṇakya and Candragupta with the help of the Mudrārākṣasa, it is quite clear that Cāṇakya is really dominating minister. His supremacy is crystal-clear. Cāṇakya says that Candragupta's kingdom is '*sacivāyatta*' i.e. dependent upon ministers.<sup>21</sup> The preceptor-disciple relationship between them is mentioned.<sup>22</sup> Candragupta expresses his inability to transgress Cāṇakya's words.<sup>23</sup> Not only in the third act dedicated to pseudo-conflict but at other places also the supremacy of Cāṇakya is quite evident. The strict orders of Cāṇakya are mentioned in the 6<sup>th</sup> act.<sup>24</sup> In the 7<sup>th</sup> act which is the climax of the drama, the dramatist gives a specific art-direction to the character of Candragupta - viz. राजा चाणक्यमुखमवलोकयति i.e. the king looks at the face of Cāṇakya.

The truth of Cāṇakya's supremacy is openly told in the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi. The astrologer says to Cāṇakya's father that, 'He will be a shadow-king'.<sup>25</sup> Many a times Cāṇakya stops Candragupta by merely raising his eyebrows.<sup>26</sup> Cāṇakya openly says in front of a group of merchants that, 'The king is under my thumb' (राया मे वसवत्ती)<sup>27</sup>. The preceptor-disciple relationship between Cāṇakya and Candragupta is also noted down in the ĀvCū. Hemacandra uses the

word ‘*mauryācārya*’ at the end of the biography of Cāṇakya.

The highest exaggeration is seen in the Hariṣeṇa’s Bṛhatkathākōśa. It is told that actually Cāṇakya became a king and ruled the country for many years.<sup>28</sup>

### **[13] Critical comments :**

If we try to know the biography of Cāṇakya from the *brahmanic* sources, the Purāṇas, Bṛhatkathāmañjarī and Kathāsaritsāgara, it provides scanty information. Many scholars have tried to understand Cāṇakya with the help of his monumental treatise Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. Some other scholars prefer to study the Mudrārākṣasa of Viśākhadatta for the better understanding of Cāṇakya.

Here, we have tried our best to interpret the text of Mudrārākṣasa from the Jaina viewpoint. We hope that they are unexplored up till now and will throw new light on the Mudrārākṣasa.

Though the Mudrārākṣasa is a political play, it is full of poetic values and rich with imaginative power. But we think that before writing such a play, the author Viśākhadatta might have gone through the written and oral material available to him. If we assume the date of Viśākhadatta as the 7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> century A.D., we know that the stray references in the Digambara literature and the Śvetāmbara references in the Āvaśyaka and Nīśītha-cūrṇi were available to the author. At least ample oral Prakrit narratives of the Jains were prevalent in the society. Through these Prakrit legends he might have come to know the last phase of Cāṇakya’s life, particularly his sad death.

Viśākhadatta has chosen a particular part of Cāṇakya’s life in his drama. But if we supply the data before the author with the Jaina narratives, we immediately come to know why he has chosen

the name Rākṣasa for Amātya Subandhu. The names of Jīvasiddhi Kṣapaṇaka and Sarvārthasiddhi are definitely connected with the Jaina environment. The Jaina concept of Cāṇakya's being a 'bimbāntarita rājā' is reflected in the third act of the drama titled 'pseudo-conflict'.

Thus we have to admit that the Mudrārākṣasa, observed from the Jaina viewpoint, reveals many new things which are not studied before. It is noteworthy that with a single exception of the Jugāi-jīṇḍa-cariya, the Mudrārākṣasa had left no impact on the Jaina literature up till the 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> century.

It is very interesting to note that, in the colophone of the Nīśītha-cūrṇi, it is told that, 'This cūrṇi is written by Viśākhagaṇi'. It is very curious to know that the Nīśītha-cūrṇi is full of Cāṇakya-narratives and it appreciates the strict rules of Cāṇakya.

The other coincidence is also noteworthy. The Digambara sources tell us that Candragupta was re-named after his initiation as 'Viśākhācārya'.

- \* In the Jaina narratives and the Mudrā<sup>0</sup>, extreme regard for Cāṇakya's political wisdom is seen. Both the sources honour Cāṇakya for his selfless attitude in spite of his shrewd methods.
- \* The Mudrā<sup>0</sup> highlights a particular portion in the political life of Cāṇakya and Candragupta, in such a manner that it acquired a unique position in the galaxy of classical Sanskrit dramas.
- \* The Jainas are interested in giving the whole biography of Cāṇakya, full of various dramatic incidents but they never tried to write a drama, which is of course a difficult form of literature.
- \* If a curious reader wishes to know more about Cāṇakya, he can

knew it by going through the Jaina sources. particularly, the tragic end of Cāṇakya and Subandhu (viz. *amātya Rākṣasa*) depicted in the Jaina literature, satisfies the readers by leading them to the logical end of the story. It is a particular tendency of the Jains that they never prefer loose ends in the philosophy and even in the narratives.

**Note :**

- \* The references of Mudrārākṣasa are given from the edition of Dr. G.K.Bhat.
- \* The abbreviation of Mudrārākṣasa is 'Mudrā<sup>0</sup>' in the present article.

**List of References**

- 1) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 5, p.192
- 2) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 4, p.186
- 3) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 4, p.186
- 4) राक्षसः - भदन्त अपरैः सांवत्सरिकैः सह संवाद्यताम् - Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 4, p.188
- 5) चाणक्यः - स मया क्षपणकलिङ्गधारी नन्दवंशवधप्रतिज्ञानन्तरमेव कुसुमपुरमुपनीय सर्वनन्दामात्यैः सह सख्यं ग्राहितो विशेषतश्च तस्मिन् राक्षसः समुत्पन्नविश्रम्भः। - Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 1, p.18
- 6) तत्थ णं रायगिहे णंदे णामं मणियारसेट्ठी परिवसइ । Nāyādhammakahā, *adhyayana* 13, p.72
- 7) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 1, p.38
- 8) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 6, p.286
- 9) चन्दनदासः - मोत्तूण आमिसाई मरणभएण तिणेहिं जीअन्तम् । वाहाणं मुद्धहरिणं हन्तुं को णाम णिब्बन्धो ॥ Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 7, verse 3, p.286
- 10) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 1, p.22
- 11) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 2, p.78

- 12) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 1, p.20
- 13) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 1, p.20
- 14) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 1, p.44
- 15) NisCū. Part IV, p.10-11
- 16) Upadeśapada-ṭikā Part I, verses 42,44,50,128
- 17) पाउडकवी अहं । Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 2, p.68
- 18) Parīśiṣṭaparva, Sarga 8, verse 201
- 19) Bhagavatī Ārādhana, verse 155
- 20) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 2, p.80
- 21) Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 3, p.126
- 22) चाणक्यः – शिष्येण स्वैररुचयो न निरोद्धव्याः । Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 3, p.126
- 23) न शक्नुमो वयमार्यस्य वाचा वाचमतिशयितुम् । Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 3, p.142
- 24) अज्जचाणक्काणत्ती Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 6, p.254  
अज्जचाणक्कादेसं Mudrā<sup>0</sup> Act 6, p.266
- 25) एताहे वि बिंबंतरितो भविस्सति । ĀvCū. p.563
- 26) चाणक्केण भिगुडी कता, णियत्तो । ĀvCū. p.565
- 27) ĀvCū. p.565
- 28) चकार विपुलं राज्यं चाणाक्यो निजबुद्धितः । Bṛhatkathākośa story 143,  
verse.71





## **CHAPTER 4**

### **CĀṆAKYA : REVEALED THROUGH THE JAINA LITERATURE**

**[1]** Introduction

**[2]** References of Cāṇakya in the Śvetāmbara literature

**(A)** 44 references in tabular form

**(B)** Translation, explanation and observations on each reference

**[3]** References of Cāṇakya in the Digambara literature

**(A)** 13 references in tabular form

**(B)** Translation, explanation and observations on each reference



## CHAPTER 4

### CĀṆAKYA : REVEALED THROUGH THE JAINA LITERATURE

#### [1] Introduction :

When we consider all the *brahmanic* sources alongwith the *Mudrārākṣasa*, we come to know that we get a meager information about the special features of Cāṇakya's personality, the incidents of his life, his relationship with Candragupta and his contribution in the governance of the Magadha kingdom.

When we cast a glance to the entries given in the *kośas* like the Marathi *Viśvakośa* or the *Bhāratīya-saṃskṛti-kośa*, they quote *brahmanic* sources like the *Purāṇas*, the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, the *Mudrārākṣasa* and some unknown legends without giving their exact literary sources. Generally they rely on the fanciful and imaginary novels like the 'Nṛpanirmātā Cāṇakya' of Dr. R.C.Dhere or the 'Ārya' authored by Shri Vasant Patwardhan.

The eminent scholars like Durga Bhagvat and Mr. B.R.Hivargavkar had given only one or two passing references from the Jaina literature, which are poorly interpreted by them. Without going into a deeper search, Mr. Hivargavkar says, "In the Brahmanic, Buddhist and Jaina literature, it is noted that Kauṭilya was a prime-minister of Candragupta. The Brahmanic books praise Kauṭilya while a kind of disregard and censure is seen in the Buddhist and Jaina literature. A harsh attitude towards *pāṣaṇḍas* (heretics i.e. the Jaina and Buddhist monks) is seen in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra, naturally the Buddhists and Jainas have expressed a disdainful and contemptuous attitude towards Cāṇakya." (Hivargavkar, प्रस्तावना II, p.22)

A pet model of the scholars of the first half of the last century is seen in this remark. They generally assume that, 'Since the Jainas and Buddhas are heretic sister systems, they possess the same view on certain points' - which is not true in every case. The other method of these scholars is to use the phrase - 'The Buddhas and Jainas' - in which the antiquity of the Jainas is totally neglected.

As noted in the prologue of this book, we have limited our scope to the Jaina literature. With a cursory look to the Buddhist literature, one can know immediately that there are very few tales and narratives about Cāṇakya in the Buddhist literature while the whole Jaina literature, both the Śvetāmbara and Digambara, is literally flooded with the references to Cāṇakya, from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C. to 15<sup>th</sup> century A.D. From the language-point-of-view, we find the references in Ardhamāgadhī, Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī, Jaina Śaurasenī, Sanskrit and Apabhraṁśa i.e. in all the languages adopted by the Jainas through several centuries.

In the introduction of the *Mudrārākṣasa*, the reputed scholar Dr. R.D.Karmarkar had noted the Hindu, Buddhist and Jaina sources of the play. (Introduction of the *Mudrārākṣasa*, R.D.Karmarkar, pp.13-14) It is queer that he had noted down four Buddhist sources and had completely ignored the Jaina sources.

It is a solemn duty of a true academician to highlight the neglected part in a certain area of research and to give justice to it. With this honest intention, we fathomed the whole available Jaina literature and classified it considering the century, language, author, title of the book and the gist of the references. The legacy of the Cāṇakya-narratives is divided into two parts. At first, the Śvetāmbara references are presented in a tabular form and then the Digambara

references are tabularized in the same manner. Both the tables are supplied with the summary of each reference with some important critical remarks.

## [2] References of Cāṇakya in the Śvetāmbara. Literature :

### (A) 44 references in tabular form

The serial order mentioned in this chart is likewise :

Serial No. - Century - Name of the Language - Title of the Work - Name of the Author - Reference Number - Gist of the Reference.

### Language - abbreviations used :

AMg. = Ardhamāgadhī ; JM. = Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī ; Skt. = Sanskrit.

1. 1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> ; AMg. ; Anuyogadvāra ; Ārya Rakṣita ; *sūtra* 49 ; The name of the book  
viz. 'Kautilīya', included in the list of the popular heretic texts.
2. 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> ; Old JM. ; Āvaśyaka-niryukti ; Bhadrabāhu ; Niryukti-saṃgraha, p.93 *gā.*51 ; Name of Cāṇakya in the list of examples given for *pāriṇāmikī-buddhī*.
3. 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> ; Old JM. ; Piṇḍa-niryukti ; Bhadrabāhu ; *gā.*500 (single verse) ; Reference suggestive of a short story about mystic powers of a monk.
4. 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> ; Old JM. ; Ogha-Niryukti ; Bhadrabāhu ; *gā.*418 (single verse) ; A rule of conduct prescribed for a monk.
5. 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Upadeśamālā ; Dharmadāsa-gaṇi ; *gā.*74, 150 ; Passing references of Cāṇakya and Candragupta.
6. 5<sup>th</sup> ; AMg. ; Nandīsūtra ; Devavācaka ; *gā.*80 (single verse) ; Name of Cāṇakya in the list of examples given for *pāriṇāmikī-buddhī*.

- 5<sup>th</sup> ; AMg. ; Nandisūtra ; Devavācaka ; *sūtra* 41 ; The name of the book Kautiliya, included in the list of heretic texts.
7. 5<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Ātura-Pratyākhyāna II (Prakīrṇaka) ; *gā.*23 (single verse) ; Death of Cāṇakya.
8. 5<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Bhaktaparijñā (Prakīrṇaka) ; *gā.*162 (single verse) ; Death of Cāṇakya.
9. 5<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Maraṇavibhakti (Prakīrṇaka) ; *gā.*479 (single verse) ; Death of Cāṇakya.
10. 5<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Saṁstāraka (Prakīrṇaka) ; *gā.*73,74 (two verse) ; Death of Cāṇakya.
11. 5<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Ārādhana-patākā (Prakīrṇaka) ; *gā.*824 (single verse) ; Death of Cāṇakya.
12. 6<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Vyavahārabhāṣya ; 1.91 (716) (single verse) ; Destruction of the enemies by Cāṇakya.  
 6<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Vyavahārabhāṣya ; 1.132 (952) (single verse) ; *Daṇḍanīti* of Kautilya.  
 6<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Vyavahārabhāṣya ; 10.592 (4420) (single verse) ; Death of Cāṇakya.
13. 6<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Nisītha-bhāṣya ; *gā.* 616, 4463, 4464, 4465, 5137, 5138,5139 ; These gāthās are connected to the rules of the Jaina monastic conduct.
14. 7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; p.156 (single line) ; The Arthaśāstra written by Kautilya.  
 7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; p.281 (short story) ; Praising of heretics.  
 7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; pp.563-566 ; Full biography in brief manner.

15. 7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Niśītha-cūrṇi Part II ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; p.33 ; A story concerned to the rule prescribed for a monk.
16. 7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Niśītha-cūrṇi Part III ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; pp.423-424; A story concerned to the rule prescribed for a monk ; Reference of the severe drought.
17. 7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Niśītha-cūrṇi Part IV ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; pp.10-11 ; A story concerned to the strict orders of the Maurya king.  
7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Niśītha-cūrṇi Part IV ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; p.395 To- tal verses 3 (in *praśasti*) ; Niśītha-sūtra written by Viśākha- gaṇi.
18. 7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Ācārāṅga-cūrṇi ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; p.49 (a single line); Wife of Cāṇakya, Destruction of the Nanda-dynasty.
19. 7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Sūtrakṛtāṅga-cūrṇi ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; p.166 (a brief reference) ; The Arthaśāstra written by Kautilya.  
7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Sūtrakṛtāṅga-cūrṇi ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; p.167 (a brief reference) ; Collecting money in deceitful manner.
20. 7<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Daśavaikālika-cūrṇi ; Jinadāsa-gaṇi ; pp.81-82 ; The remaining biography of Cāṇakya in continuation with the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi, in brief manner.
21. 8<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Āvaśyaka-ṭikā ; Haribhadra ; p.342 ; An example of *pāśaka* (in brief).  
8<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Āvaśyaka-ṭikā ; Haribhadra ; p.405 ; Advice given to Candragupta (in brief).  
8<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Āvaśyaka-ṭikā ; Haribhadra ; p.423 ; The Arthaśāstra- an example of *vainayikī buddhi* (in brief).  
8<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Āvaśyaka-ṭikā ; Haribhadra ; p.428 ; Example of *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi* (in brief).  
8<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Āvaśyaka-ṭikā ; Haribhadra ; pp.433-435 ; A short biography of Cāṇakya imitating the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi.

- 8<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Āvaśyaka-ṭikā ; Haribhadra ; p.817 (short story) ; Praising of heretics.
22. 8<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Daśavaikālika-ṭikā ; Haribhadra ; p.435 (short story) ; Collecting wealth from merchants.
23. 8<sup>th</sup>;JM.;Upadeśapada;Haribhadra ; gā.17,42,44,50,128,139,196 ; Various stories suggested in brief manner.
24. 8<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Kuvalayamālā ; Uddyotana ; Passing reference of the Arthaśāstra.
25. 9<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Ācārāṅga-ṭikā ; Śīlāṅka ; p.100 (single line) ; Wife of Cāṇakya ; Destruction of the Nanda-dynasty.
26. 9<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Sūtrakṛtāṅga-ṭikā ; Śīlāṅka ; p.169 (single line) ; Deceitful means to gather wealth.
27. 9<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Dharmopadeśamālā ; Jayasimha ; Two short stories, p.129,138 ; (i) Gathering wealth from merchants (ii) Death of Cāṇakya and Subandhu.
28. 11<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Kathā-kośa-prakaraṇa ; Jineśvara ; pp.176-177 ; Duties of a king without naming Kautilya's Arthaśāstra.
29. 11<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Sthānāṅga-ṭikā ; Abhayadeva ; p.281 (single line) ; Examination of various monks.
30. 11<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Samavāyāṅga-ṭikā ; Abhayadeva ; p.55 (single line) ; Kautilya-śāstra causing harm to the beings.
31. 11<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Jñātādharmakathā-ṭikā ; Abhayadeva ; p.12 (single line) ; The Arthaśāstra - a book for creating wealth.
32. 11<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Uttārādhyaṇa-ṭikā (Sukhabodhā) ; Nemicandra ; pp.57-69 ; Selected stories of Cāṇakya.
33. 11<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Ogha-niryukti-ṭikā ; Droṇācārya ; p.152 ; Short reference of strict orders of Cāṇakya.

34. 12<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Vyavahāra-ṭikā ; Malayagiri ; pp.76-77 ; Story of Naladāma, destructing favorite persons of Nanda.
35. 12<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Yugādi-jinendra-carita ; Vardhamāna ; pp.50-55 ; Whole biography of Cāṇakya - a part of Kuṇāla-kathā.
36. 12<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Viśeṣāvaśyaka-bhāṣya-ṭikā ; Maladhāri-Hemacandra ; ṭikā on *gā.464*; Secret script developed by Cāṇakya.
37. 12<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Upadeśamālā-ṭikā ; Ratnaprabha ; pp.354-363 (total *gāthās* 182) ; Whole biography of Cāṇakya with author's remarks in-between.
38. 12<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Upadeśapada-ṭikā ; Municandra ; pp.109-114 (total *gāthās* 178) ; Whole biography of Cāṇakya.
39. 12<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Upadeśapada-ṭikā ; Municandra ; p.154 ; Complete faith of Candragupta on his *guru* - Cāṇakya.
40. 12<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Pariśiṣṭa-parva ; Hemacandra ; Sarga 8, pp.77-86, *gā.194-469* ; The longest biography of Cāṇakya with rich poetic values.
41. 12<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi-nāmamālā ; Hemacandra ; *gā.853-854* ; Noted by scholars as synonyms of Cāṇakya.
42. 13<sup>th</sup> ; JM. ; Taraṅgalolā ; Nemicandra-gaṇi ; *gā.853* ; Passing reference of the duties of a female messenger.
43. 14<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Piṇḍa-niryukti-avacūri ; Kṣamāratna ; p.92, *ṭikā* on *gā.500* ; Incident during severe drought at Pāṭaliputra.
44. 14<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Vividha-tīrth-kalpa ; Jinaprabha ; Ch.36, p.69 ; A Kalpa (chapter) dedicated to Pāṭaliputra. Passing reference of Cāṇakya.

**[B] Translation, explanation and observations on each reference :**

**[1] The Anuyogadvāra of Ārya Rakṣita** is the late Ardhamāgadhī or old Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī text. Traditionally Ārya Rakṣita belongs to the 1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D.

It is mentioned in the 49<sup>th</sup> *sūtra* of the Anuyogadvāra that, 'से किं तं लोइयं भावसुयं ? जं इमं अण्णाणिएहिं मिच्छादिद्वीहिं सच्छंदबुद्धि-मइविगप्पियं। तं जहा-भारहं रामायणं हंभीमासुरुक्कं कोडिल्लयं-----चत्तारि य वेदा संगोवंगा ।'

Here, *koḍillaya* is certainly the treatise of Kauṭilya which is designated as '*laukika bhāvaśruta*' (viz. worldly or conventional scripture). It is mentioned that all these scriptures are composed by ignorant heretics with the help of their fanciful imaginations.

A sense of disregard is explicitly seen in this expression. But we have to interpret it in the light of the '*naya-theory*'. From the viewpoint of *nīścaya-naya* (spiritual outlook) the above-mentioned texts are less important than the *gaṇipīṭaka*, containing the eleven *aṅgas* constructed by the Jinas. Still, from the viewpoint of *vyavahāra-naya* (popular outlook) the enumeration of *laukika bhāvaśruta* is done.

Devavācakaṇi is aware of the fact that it is not proper to dismiss the popular texts totally. So one additional comment is seen in the Nandisūtra regarding these texts.

Some scholars have interpreted the word '*koḍillaya*' as '*kuṭila-śāstra*' i.e. 'a text written by a cunning person'. But when we observe the list, we realize that it is certainly a syllabus of formal education at that time. The word *koḍillaya* refers to the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra, a text containing economics, politics and ethics together. This is probably the oldest Jaina reference of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra noted down in the early centuries of Christian Era.

**[2] The Āvaśyaka-niryukti of Bhadrabāhu (2<sup>nd</sup>)** is an old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī text which belongs to the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. Bhadrabāhu says -

खवगे अमच्चपुते चाणक्के चेव थूलभदे अ ।

-----  
पारिणामिअ-बुद्धीए एवमाई उदाहरणा

Niryukti-saṁgraha, gā.51 (p.93)

Here Cāṇakya is mentioned as an example of *Pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*, i.e. the intellectual capacity or wisdom acquired by experience.

The examples and stories connected with *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi* are explained at length in the later texts. Many of the texts present a lot of Cāṇakya-episodes as the examples of *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*. The sense of appreciation and regards towards Cāṇakya is quite evident in these examples.

We know that the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is really a treasure-book which illuminates various aspects of human life in general and a miraculous blend of contemporary political thoughts, economy and socio-moral values in particular. We can easily conjecture that it is the essence of Cāṇakya's life-long experience of good governance. It is sure that Bhadrabāhu (II) had appreciated his text i.e. Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra by including him in the examples of *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*.

It seems that Ārya Rakṣita had a little hesitation to quote the text of Kauṭīliya, but Bhadrabāhu appreciates his wisdom wholeheartedly along with the revered Jaina monk Sthūlabhadra, a contemporary of Cāṇakya.

**[3] The Piṇḍa-niryukti of Bhadrabāhu (2<sup>nd</sup>)** is an old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī text written in the 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The *gāthā* runs as

follows -

चुन्ने अंतद्वाणे चाणक्के पायलेवणे जोगे ।  
मूले विवाहे दो दंडिणी उ आयाण परिसाडे ॥

*gā.500, p.91 b (pothi form)*

The first line of this *gāthā* is connected with one incident in the life of Cāṇakya. Two young disciples of a Jaina *ācārya* used cūrṇa (fine powder) to disappear temporarily for the naked eye. Cāṇakya realized the device and forced them to appear in front of the common eyesight. (*comm.* चूर्णेनान्तर्द्धानिऽदृष्टिकरणे चाणक्यविदितौ क्षुल्लौ निदर्शनम् ।)

This story is explained in three *bhāṣyagāthās* of the Piṇḍaniryukti. Further on, this account found place in the Niśītha-cūrṇi and in the life-history of Cāṇakya presented in the later story-literature.

Kṣamāratna (14<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) had written a full story while explaining this *gāthā*, in his Piṇḍa-niryukti-avacūri. We will give our comments on the story when we come chronologically to the 14<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

It is noteworthy that the Jainas have imbibed not only the name of Cāṇakya but have carried forward the tales about Cāṇakya in their commentarial literature.

**[4] The Ogha-niryukti of Bhadrabāhu (2<sup>nd</sup>)** is an old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī text written in the 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The concerned portion of the text is -

उग्गहकाईयवज्जं छंडण ववहारु लब्भए तत्थ ।  
गारविए पन्नवणा तव चेव अणुग्गहो एस ॥

*gā.418, p.152 (pothi form)*

The commentary of Droṇācārya (11<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) helps a lot to understand the text properly. It refers to the strict orders of Cāṇakya, prohibiting the disposal of excreta and urine in the populated area. The commentary runs like this -

“गृहस्थ पश्चादङ्गणे व्युत्सृजति , यतोऽसौ मध्यप्रदेशः , स च नरपतेः परिग्रहः , ततः कलहादिर्नः भवति । --- जहा चाणक्कएऽवि भणिअं - ‘जइ काइअं न वोसिरइ ततो अदोसो ।’ अयमित्थंभूतस्तत्र व्यवहारो लभ्यते , ततः कायिकां न व्युत्सृजति ।”

The above-mentioned *niryukti* is of utmost importance because it is directly connected with the rules of monastic conduct. The *chedasūtrakāra* Bhadrabāhu (Bhadrabāhu I) was most probably a contemporary of Cāṇakya. ‘The similarities between the *cheda*-rules and Cāṇakyan rules’-is a big interesting topic for a researcher. The present *niryukti-gāthā* and its commentary is really helpful to establish the connection of the both.

Later on the rule of *pariṣṭhāpanā-samiti* or *utsarga-samiti* was included in the daily routine conduct of a monk. The *Tattvārthasūtra*, the highly honoured Jaina philosophical text of the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. explains *utsarga-samiti* in the following manner - ‘Correct disposal of excreta means depositing stools, phlegm, spit, urine somewhere not occupied by mobile or immobile life-forms.’ (*Tattvārthasūtra*, ed. Nathmal Tatia, 9.5)

**[5] The Upadeśamālā of Dharmadāsagaṇi** is a text written in old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī during the 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

The book deserves the first and the foremost position in the long list of didactic books, written in the Jaina tradition. It contains 542 *dvāragāthās* in which 70 narratives are interwoven. The 150<sup>th</sup> *dvāragāthā* of *Upadeśamālā* says -

लुद्धा सकज्जतुरिआ , सुहिणोऽवि विसंवयंति कयकज्जा ।

जह चंदगुत्तगुरुणा , पव्वयओ घाइओ राया ॥

The context of this *gāthā* is altogether different. The author says, “Nobody should trust even one’s own son.” For this he gives the example of Śreṇika (Bimbisāra) and Kuṇika (Ajātaśatru). It is known that Kuṇika put his father Śreṇika in the jail and afterwards killed him treacherously. One more example of treachery is given in the above- mentioned *gāthā*. It is mentioned that, ‘The greedy and impatient persons who are very much eager to achieve their goal, deceive their own kinsfolk. See, how the *guru* of Candragupta killed king Parvataka by treacherous means.’

The concerned *dvāragāthā* provides enough scope for the commentator to give the full biography of Cāṇakya. Taking into consideration the tone of disregard reflected in this *dvāragāthā*, the commentator Ratnaprabha describes the deceitful and cunning nature of Cāṇakya by giving a lot of examples from Cāṇakya’s life-story. Ratnaprabha belongs to the 12<sup>th</sup> century A.D. So, when we proceed to the 12<sup>th</sup> century-references chronologically, we will give more details of his story with critical remarks.

At present, when we think over the above-mentioned *dvāragāthā*, three things are sure that -

(i) Cāṇakya is mentioned as the *guru* (preceptor) of Candragupta.

(ii) With the help of king Parvataka (Puru or Selyucus ?) Candragupta overpowered the kingdom of Magadha.

(iii) It was Cāṇakya, who advised Candragupta to kill Parvataka in order to become a sole king.

Jinadāsagaṇi, the author of the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*, has incorpo-

rated these facts in his Cāṇakya-kathā, but his perspective is different. He depicts these facts as the examples of Cāṇakya's 'pāriṇāmikī-buddhi', in which a tinge of appreciation can be guessed.

**[6] The Nandīsūtra of Devavācakagaṇi** is written in later Ardhamāgadhī or old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī during the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The concerned passage runs thus -

से किं तं मिच्छसुयं ? मिच्छसुयं जं इमं अण्णाणि एहिं मिच्छदिद्विहिं सच्छंदबुद्धि-  
मतिवियप्पियं, तं जहा - भारहं रामायणं हंभीमासुरक्खं कोडिल्लयं ----- चत्तारि य  
वेदा संगोवंगा , एयाइं मिच्छदिद्विस्स मिच्छत्तपरिगहियाइं मिच्छसुयं , एयाणि चेव  
सम्मदिद्विस्स सम्मत्तपरिगहियाइं सम्मसुयं । अहवा मिच्छदिद्विस्स वि सम्मसुयं ,  
कम्हा ? सम्मत्तहेउत्तणओ । (sūtra 72 (1))

In this passage, the *mithyāśrutas* (heretic scriptures) are enumerated. According to the author of Nandī (i.e. Devavācakagaṇi) the following heretic scriptures are full of falacies and free-willed imaginations. The texts are the Bhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa --- the book written by Kauṭīlya (i.e. the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra) --- the four Vedas with the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*.

But in the same passage, it is clearly mentioned that if they are studied by a person having *samyaktva* (enlightened worldview or right faith) then the same *śāstras* become *samyakśruta* i.e. source of right knowledge.

Almost all Indologists and particularly experts in the Kauṭīlyan studies, interpret this passage with the presumption that the Jainas possess a sense of reproach about Cāṇakya and censured his treatise as a *mithyāśruta*.

When we see the weightage given to the Cāṇakya-narratives in the Jaina literature, we come to know that the Jaina *ācāryas* are very well conversant with the text of the Arthaśāstra and have

keenly documented the floating legends of Cāṇakya whenever they got the opportunity.

The other noteworthy thing is, when Jainas pictured Cāṇakya or Kauṭilya as *parama-śrāvaka*, his treatise becomes a *samyak-śruta* automatically.

Thus it is not proper to interpret the passages describing *mithyāśrutas* in the Anuyogadvāra and the Nandī on its face-value, but a deeper insight is necessary.

**[7] The Ātura-pratyākhyāna (II)** is an old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī text, enumerated under the old *prakīrṇakas*. This anonymous text is probably included in the traditional 45 Arhamāgadhī canons during the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

The 23<sup>rd</sup> *gāthā* of the *prakīrṇaka* mentions -

एसो (एवं) सुहपरिणामो चाणक्को पयहिऊण नियदेहं ।  
उववन्नो सुरलोए, पच्चक्खायं मए सव्वं ॥

The religious minded person, who has accepted the willful death (*saṁthārā*) exclaims, “Cāṇakya allowed to burn his body, remaining in the pure state of mind (or soul). Due to this noble act, he was reborn in the heaven. Likewise, I will also abandon all my attachments.”

The *prakīrṇaka* and mostly all of the old *prakīrṇakas* deal with *paṇḍita-maraṇa* (i.e. the death of wise persons). Cāṇakya’s unperturbed mental state, unparalleled power of endurance and detached view towards life at the last moment of his life are highly appreciated and praised in the *prakīrṇakas*. The same regard is seen in one of the oldest Digambara text named the Bhagavati Ārādhana.

**[8] The Bhakta-parijñā** is a *prakīrṇaka* text written in old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī during the 5<sup>th</sup> century.

The 162<sup>nd</sup> *gāthā* of this text runs -

पाडलिपुत्तम्मि पुरे चाणक्को नाम विस्सुओ आसी ।

सव्वारंभनियत्तो इंगिणिमरणं अह निवन्नो ॥

From this single verse, we learn that Cāṇakya belonging to Pāṭaliputra was very famous at that time when this text was written. Many legends about Cāṇakya were in vogue in the society. The narratives were handed down from generation to generation. The adjective ‘सव्वारंभनियत्तो’ suggest that though Cāṇakya was active in politics throughout his life, at the fag end of his life, he completely abstained from violence. His death is described as ‘इङ्गिणीमरण’. In this type of death, a person never takes any help of others for his upkeep. The *gāthā* suggests that the death of Cāṇakya might have happened nereby Pāṭaliputra.

The same *gāthā* is found in *Samstāraka-prakīrṇaka*. The sense of regard towards Cāṇakya is evident.

**[9] The Maraṇa-vibhakti** is also an anonymous *prakīrṇaka* written in old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī around the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

*Gāthā* 479 gives the details as follows -

गोब्बर पाओवगओ सुबुद्धिणा णिग्घिणेण चाणक्को ।

दड्ढो न य संचलिओ , सा हु धिई चित्तिज्जा उ ॥

The information given in this verse can be analysed in the following manner -

- \* We find more details about Cāṇakya’s death than that of the previous *prakīrṇakas*.
- \* ‘Subuddhi’ was extremely pitiless and he burnt Cāṇakya in alive state.

- \* This incident took place at the village 'gobbara'.
- \* The death of Cāṇakya is designated here as 'प्रायोपगमन' or 'पादपोपगमन'.
- \* His unperturbed mental disposition is the ideal for every monk.
- \* The name 'gobbara' reminds us a place, where lord Mahāvīra once resided during his *varṣāvāsa* (i.e. a stay during the rainy-season).
- \* We can connect the adjective 'निर्घृण' to the personality of 'राक्षस', depicted in the drama *Mudrārākṣasa* of Viśākhadatta.

This verse almost matches with the verse quoted in the *Bhagavatī-Ārādhana*, a revered Digambara work of the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

**[10] The *Samstāraka prakīrṇaka*** quotes two *gāthās* about Cāṇakya's death, *gāthā* 73 is similar to *Bhakta-parijñā*.

*Gāthā* 74 runs in the following manner -

अणुलोमपूयणाए सह से सत्तुंजओ (? सत्तू जओ) डहइ देहं ।  
सो वि तह डज्झमाणो पडिवन्नो उत्तमं अट्ठं ॥

His (Cāṇakya's) enemy put fire on him in the disguise of performing *pūjā*. He endured all the pains afflicted on him and attained that which is 'extremely attainable' (i.e. heaven or liberation).

\* Here, the name of Cāṇakya's enemy is not given but one more detail is provided that he approached Cāṇakya to adore, but actually he put fire on him.

**[11] The *Ārādhana-patākā prakīrṇaka*** repeats almost the same details about Cāṇakya's death with very few new details.

It is told in the 824<sup>th</sup> *gāthā* that -

किं न सुओ चाणक्को सङ्को गुट्टे सुबंधुणा दड्ढो ।  
इंगिणिमरणपवन्नो धीरो चलिओ न ज्ञाणाओ ॥

We can summarize the verse as follows -

- \* The words 'किं न सुओ' suggest the oral tradition of the Cāṇakya-narratives.
- \* Cāṇakya is called 'सङ्ग' i.e. a Jaina householder.
- \* The horrific incident happened in a cow-pen ('गुड्ड').
- \* Subandhu put fire on him.
- \* His death is designated as 'इङ्गिनीमरण'.
- \* Cāṇakya's outstanding courage ('धीरो') is honoured.
- \* At that time Cāṇakya was in deep meditation.

Thus, the *prakīrṇakas* provide the details of Cāṇakya's death. Each reference tells something new. On this background it is queer that the *brahmanic* (or Hindu) sources have kept a mum about the death of Cāṇakya.

**[12] The Vyavahāra-bhāṣya** holds an important position among the traditional commentarial literature on the Jaina canons. It is conjunctured that the three famous *bhāṣyas* viz. Kalpa, Niśītha, Vyavahāra are probably written during the 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> century A.D. in Ārṣa Prakrit or in old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. The authors are unknown and the *bhāṣya* texts are found mixed with the *niryuktis*. All the *bhāṣyas* contain myths, legends, hearsays and popular stories alongwith the rules and regulations of the monastic conduct.

In the original *gāthās* of the Vyavahāra-bhāṣya, three references are found which are concerned to Cāṇakya. Without the help of Malayagiri's commentary (12<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) it is impossible to understand the brief and passing references. We will discuss the whole stories when we will reach up to the 12<sup>th</sup> century of this survey. At present, only the *bhāṣya-gāthās* are mentioned with a brief summary.

**[A] Vyavahāra-bhāṣya 1.91 (716) :**

नंदे भोइय खण्णा आरक्खिय घडण गेरु नलदामे ।  
मुईग गेह डहणा ठवणा भत्तेसु कत्तसिरा ॥

It is specifically mentioned here that for the welfare of the society how Cāṇakya completely eradicated the trouble-shooters who were pro-*nandas*. Taking into consideration the noble purpose behind Cāṇakya's ruthless measures, a sense of regard towards Cāṇakya is seen here. Malayagiri gives the full account at length by using the sources documented in the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*.

**[B] Vyavahāra-bhāṣya 1.132 (952) :**

भंभीयमासुरुक्खे , माढरकोडिण ( ? ल ) दंडनीतीसु ।  
अथऽलंछपक्खगाही , एरिसया रूवजक्खा तु ॥

Though the full meaning is not clear, it is sure that this *gāthā* refers to the science of *daṇḍanīti* employed by Kauṭilya i.e. the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. It is noted that in the regime of Kauṭilya there was no scope for bribery and his attitude was impartial.

The tone of admiration towards Cāṇakya is quite clear in this *gāthā* in spite of some ambiguity in it.

**[C] Vyavahāra-bhāṣya 10.592 (4420) :**

पडिणीययाए कोई , अग्निं से सव्वतो पदेज्जाहि ।  
पादोवगते संते , जह चाणक्कस्स व करीसे ॥

*Paṇḍita-maraṇa* of Cāṇakya is highlighted here by designating it as *pādapopagamana*. It is mentioned that how Cāṇakya's enemy put fire on him. It is told that one should remember the courage of Cāṇakya when one accepts *saṁthārā*. We have already seen that the same thing about Cāṇakya's death is repeatedly told in the *prakīrṇakas*.

Thus, the Vyavahāra-bhāṣya throws light on the three major things about Cāṇakya -

- (i) His harsh measures to eradicate enemies.
- (ii) His impartial attitude reflected in his *śāstric* work on *daṇḍanīti*.
- (iii) His horrific death with his extra-ordinary power of endurance.

**[13] The Nīśītha-bhāṣya** is one of the oldest triad of *bhāṣyas*, viz. Kalpa-Vyavahāra-Nīśītha belonging to the 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> century A.D. It is written in Ārṣa Prakrit or Old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. According to the tradition, Saṃghadāsagaṇi is the author of this *bhāṣya* who is of course different from the author of the Vasudevahiṇḍī. The number of *bhāṣya-gāthās* is 6703, which are divided into 20 *uddeśas*.

In the Nīśītha-bhāṣya, there are three sets of *bhāṣya-gāthās* which contain the seeds of the Cāṇakya-narratives. These suggestive stories are further elaborated in the Nīśītha-cūrṇi. Therefore, at this place, we will only enumerate the references in a brief manner.

**(A) Nīśītha-bhāṣya, gāthā 616 :**

णासा मुहणिस्सासा , पुप्फजियवधो तदस्सिताणं च ।  
आयाए विसपुप्फं , तब्भावितमच्च दिट्ठो ॥

The *bhāṣya* is connected with certain monastic rule in which smelling of live flowers are strictly prohibited for monks, due to many reasons. In the second line of the verse, it is told that there is a famous story of Cāṇakya the prime-minister who anointed the brich-leaf with some poisonous fragrance. The detailed story is given in the *cūrṇi*.

It is noteworthy that while prescribing the code of conduct to the monks and nuns, the *bhāṣyakāras*, every now and then remem-

ber Cāṇakya.

**(B) Nīśītha-bhāṣya, gāthās 4463 ; 4464 ; 4465 :**

जंघाहीणे ओमे , कुसुमपुरे सिस्स जोगरहकरणं ।  
 खुड्डगदुगंजणसुणणं , गमणं देसंत ओसरणं ॥  
 भिक्खे परिहायंते , थेराणं ओमे तेसि देंताणं ।  
 सहभोज्ज चंदगुत्ते , ओमोयरियाए दोब्बल्लं ॥  
 चाणक्कपुच्छ , इट्ठालचुण्ण दारं पिहेउ धूमो य ।  
 दिस्सा कुच्छ पसंसा , थेरसमीवे उवालंभो ॥

The connected Nīśītha-sūtra prescribes atonement to a monk who enjoys the food not by begging alms but by stealing the food in invisibly by enchanting some occult *mantra*. The *bhāṣyakāra* immediately remembers the same situation in the history of Cāṇakya-Candragupta. He describes in a brief manner, the story of the preceptor Susthita and his two junior disciples. The *cūrṇikāra* elaborates the story with interesting details and appropriate conversations.

It seems that, the severe drought in Magadha, led the Jaina *ācāryas* to formulate new rules for the monks and nuns.

**(C) Nīśītha-bhāṣya, gāthās 5137 ; 5138 ; 5139 :**

मुरियादी आणाए , अणवत्थ परंपराए थिरकरणं ।  
 मिच्छत्तं संकादी , पसज्जणा जाव चरिमपदं ॥  
 अवराहे लहुगतरो , किं णु हु आणाए गुरुतरो दंडो ।  
 आणाए च्चिय चरणं , तब्भंगे किं न भगं तु ॥  
 भत्तमदाणमडंते , आणड्वणं छेतु वंसवती ।  
 गविसण पत्त दरिसिते , पुरिसवति सबालडहणं च ॥

The main topic of discussion in the Nīśītha-sūtra is - “Whether ‘a fault’ is more serious or ‘breaking a particular order’ is more serious offence ?” The word ‘muriya’ is Candragupta Maurya. It is

told that in the reign of Candragupta, 'ājñābhaṅga' is the most serious offence. It is mentioned that Cāṇakya punished the whole village by putting fire to them because they didn't follow the written order of the king.

The whole story is given at length in the Nīśītha-cūrṇi. Thus there are total seven *gāthās* in the Nīśītha-bhāṣya which are connected to the rules of the Jaina monastic conduct. All of them reflect the high appreciation of the strict law-code laid down by Cāṇakya. **[14] The Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi** of Jinadāsagaṇi-mahattara carries a special position when we ponder over the Cāṇakya-references found in the Śvetāmbara Jaina literature. Traditionally the authorship of almost all the *cūrṇis* is given to Jinadāsagaṇi and it is told that he belongs to the 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi and the Nīśītha-viśeṣa-cūrṇi written in mixed Prakrit are highly praised by the scholars of Indology. These two treatises are literally a rich mine of minute details encompassing all the contemporary cultural features of India.

At three places, Jinadāsa has mentioned Cāṇakya in the *cūrṇi*.

**(i) Āv Cū (Part I) p.156 :** Passing reference of the Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra and its origin.

**(ii) Āv Cū (Part II) p.281 :** Praise of the heretics by Cāṇakya and its after-effects described in a small narrative.

**(iii) Āv Cū (Part II) pp.563-566 :** Except two major incidents describing the last lapse of Cāṇakya's life, the whole biography of Cāṇakya is noted down here in a brief manner. All the happenings are depicted as the examples of '*pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*'.

**(i) Āv Cū (Part I) p.156** presents the whole biography of Ṛṣabhadeva. It is described that how the first Tīrthaṅkara introduced 72 arts for

men and 64 arts for women. One of these art was ‘*daṇḍanīti*’. The *cūrṇikāra* comments - ‘अथसत्था कोडिल्लयमादी तदा उप्पन्ना ।’ It is remarkable that though the *cūrṇikāra* has given credit to Rṣabhadeva, as an originator of *daṇḍanīti* he is fully aware that it is Kauṭilya who has presented the Arthaśāstra in its final shape.

The concerned reference removes all the doubts whether Kauṭilya or Cāṇakya has authored the Arthaśāstra or not.

**(ii) Āv Cū (Part II) p.281** presents a small narrative in the following manner - “परपासंडपसंसाए – पाडलिपुत्ते चाणक्को, चंदओत्तेण भिच्छुयाणं वित्तिं हारिता, ते तस्स धम्मं कहेति, राया तूसति, चाणक्कं पलोएति, ण पसंसति त्ति ण देति, तेहिं चाणक्कभज्जा ओलगति, तीए सो करणं कारितो तेहिं कहिते भणति – तुब्भेहिं पसंसितं, सो भणति – मए पसंसितं अहो सव्वारंभपवन्ना किह लोगवत्तियावणगाणि करेति त्ति, पच्छा ठितो, कतो एरिसगा ? तम्हा ण कातव्वा।।”

The same narrative is given in the *Yugādi-jinendra-carita* of Vardhamāna (12<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) which is a classical book written in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. With the help of Yugādi’s story, the Āvaśyaka story can be freely translated as - “The subject of the story is ‘praising the heretics’ (i.e. one of the five transgressions of samyaktva). Cāṇakya was at Pāṭaliputra. Candragupta stopped the charity grants of the livelihood of the medicants. They delivered religious surmon to Candragupta. The king was happy.

Candragupta looked at Cāṇakya. He was not satisfied and impressed. He didn’t praise the heretics. Candragupta offered no donations to them. The ascetics approached Cāṇakya’s wife and requested her to persuade Cāṇakya in favour of them. When they again presented their surmon in the court, Cāṇakya exclaimed, ‘Well-said !’ The king releived their grants and offered them a lot more.

On the next day Cāṇakya asked the king, ‘Why so much

generosity ?' The king said, 'You have praised them.' Cāṇakya explained, 'My intension was not that. These mendicants are always engaged in various sinful acts like violence and non-celebacy. How can they carry on their business of professing ethical values to the people ?' With this explanation the king again stopped the grants.

Cāṇakya was able enough to bring the things on right track. But how many people have this ability ? Therefore it is better to refrain always from the praise of the heretics."

### **Interpretation of the Narrative :**

According to the Jaina tradition, Cāṇakya was a Jaina householder. Therefore it is depicted in this story that he was against the non-Jaina ascetics.

Some of the modern interpreters of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra claim that Cāṇakya's view about the Jaina and the Bauddha *bhikṣus* was harsh. They want to depict Cāṇakya as a re-installer of *vaidika-ārya-dharma*.

We think that both these views carry extremism. When we have a deeper view in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra, we know that though Cāṇakya is a bit partial to the *śrotriya brahmins*, his attitude towards all types of ascetics, mendicants or monk-class, is the same. He did not allow any householder to accept *dikṣā* in the young age without the permission of his family-members because the deserted families become the liability of the king and become a burden to the government-treasury. A punishment is prescribed for such type of mendicants. One more thing is told that such wandering monks should work as informers or spies for the good of the state.

In nutshell, we can say that if we remove the Jainification from the story, the truth remains that Cāṇakya was against the

charity in the name of religion, when it becomes a liability to the royal treasury. Cāṇakya prohibits such charities particularly when the economy of the state is in crisis. In some of the Jaina narratives it is told that the financial position of the Maurya kingdom was not well at that time.

**(iii) Āv Cū (Part II) pp.563-566** presents almost the whole biography of Cāṇakya excluding the last phase of Cāṇakya's life. Here the whole original story is divided in suitable parts and literal English translation of each part is given. At some places while translating, a certain liberty is taken because the language of *cūṇi* is a bit hard due to the brevity, which is the stylistic peculiarity of the language. The story runs in the following manner -

**Passage 1 :** चाणक्के - गोल्लविसए चणियग्गामो, तत्थ चणिओ माहणो, सो य सावओ, तस्स घरे साधू ठिता, पुत्तो से जातो सह दाढाहिं, तेण साधूण पाएसु पाडिओ, तेहिं भणितं, राया होहितित्ति, तेण चितियं - मा दोग्गतिं जाइस्सइत्ति दंता घट्ठो, पुणो वि आयरियाणं कहितं, तेहिं भणितं - किं कज्जतु ? एत्ताहेवि बिंबंतरितो भविस्सति त्ति ।

In *golla* region, there was a village called Caṇika (? Caṇaka). There lived a *brahmin* named Caṇika. He was a (Jaina) layman. Once, some (Jaina) mendicants resorted to his house. At that time a boy was born to him. The baby had molar teeth right from the birth. Caṇaka kept the baby at the revered feet of the mendicants. They told, 'He will be a king.' He thought, 'Since the king has to do many sinful activities (knowingly or unknowingly), he may go to hell in the next birth.' With this thought, he filed the baby's molar teeth with a chisel. He told the mendicants what he had done. They exclaimed, 'What else shall we do ? In spite of your efforts, he will be a pseudo-king (i.e. a kingmaker)'.

**Passage 2 :** उम्मुक्कबालभावेण चोद्दस विज्जाठाणाणि आगमियाणि, सोवि सावओ संतुद्धो, एगाओ भद्दमाहणाओ आणिया भज्जा से, अण्णदा कम्ही कोतुए भज्जा से मातिघरं गता, केति भणंति – भातिविवाहे गता, तीसे य भङ्गी अण्णेसिं खद्धादाणियाणं दिण्णेल्लियाओ, ता अलंकितभूसिताओ आगताओ, सव्वो परिजणो ताहिं समं लवति, सा एगंते अच्छति, तीसे अद्धिती जाता, घरं आगया, अद्धितिलद्धा अच्छति, णिब्बंढे सिद्धं, तेण चित्तिं – णंदो पाडलिपुत्ते देति तत्थ वच्चामि, गतो ।

When the boy passed his childhood and became a teen-ager, he acquired mastery over the fourteen branches of knowledge (the *veda*, the *vedāṅga* etc.) The layman (his father) was very happy. From a noble *brahmin* family he brought wife for his young son. On some occasion, she (Cāṇakya's wife) went to her mother's house. Some say that she went there for the marriage of her brother. Her sisters were married in very rich houses. They came there, adorned with precious ornaments. All the relatives talked with the rich sisters. She secluded herself in a corner. She become depressed and restless. The same mood continued when she came back. Cāṇakya (her husband) insisted her to tell the reason. He thought, 'In Pāṭaliputra the king Nanda gives out ample donations. I will go there.' He arrived there.

**Passage 3 :** कत्तियपुण्णिमाए पुव्वण्णत्थे आसणे पढमे णिविद्धो, तं च तस्स साल्लियातस्स राउलस्स सता ठविज्जति, सिद्धपुत्तो य णंदेण समं तत्थ आगतो भणति – एस बंभणो णंदवंसस्स छांयं अक्कमिऊण ठितो, दासीए भणितो – भगवं ! बितिए आसणे णिवेसाहित्ति, अस्त्विं बितिए आसणे कुंडियं ठवेति, एवं ततिए दंडगं, चउत्थे गणेत्तियं, पंचमे जण्णोवड्यं, धिद्धोत्ति निच्छूढो, पादो पढमो उक्खित्तो, भणति य –

“कोशेण भृत्यैश्च निबद्धमूलं, पुत्रैश्च मित्रैश्च विवृद्धशाखम् ।

उत्पाट्य नंदं परिवर्तयामि, हठाद् द्रुमं वायुरिवोग्रवेगः ॥”

He went there on the full-moon-day of the month of *kārttika* and sat on the first (foremost) seat. The seats were already arranged

with some protocol. The seat was reserved for the chief *brahmin* in the royal court (? : the brother in law of the king). Nanda entered the hall with the *siddhaputra* (a fortune-teller). He pointed out that, 'This *brahmin* has overshadowed the seats reserved for the persons belonging to the Nanda family.'

One female servant approached Cāṇakya and told him, 'Sir, please have the next seat.' 'Alright', he said and put his water-pot (*kamaṇḍalu*) on the second seat, his staff (*daṇḍa*) on the third, rosary on the fourth and the sacred thread on the fifth seat. Due to this arrogance, he was expelled from the hall. When he took his first step, he exclaimed - "As the terrific wind uproots a big tree though deeprooted and fully grown with branches, I shall uproot the Nanda family though deeprooted with enormous wealth and a band of servants and extensively spread due to the assistance provided by kinsfolk and friends."

**Passage 4 :** णिग्गतो, पुरिसं मग्गति, सुतं च णेण बिंबंतरितो राया होहामिति, नंदस्स मोरपोसगा, तेसिं गामं गतो परिव्वायगल्लिगेणं, तेसिं महत्तरस्स धीताए चंदपीयने डोहलो जातो, सो समुदारणेतो गतो, ताणि तं पुच्छंति, जदि ममं दारगं देह तो णं पाएमि चंदं, पडिसुणेति, पडमंडवो कतो, तद्विस्सं पुण्णिमा, मज्झे छिदं, मज्झण्हं गते चंदे सव्वरसालूहिं दव्वेहिं संजोएत्ता आसण्णे थालं भरितं कतं, सदाविता, पेक्खति पियति य, उवरि पुरिसो उच्छाडेति, अवणीते पुत्तो जातो, संवड्ढति, इमोऽवि धातुबिलाणि मग्गति ।

He (Cāṇakya) came out swiftly. Searched for a proper person. He had already heard from his father that he is going to be a kingmaker. Nanda had some peacock-keepers. Having dressed like an ascetic, he went to their native place. At that time, the daughter of the village-head had pregnancy-longings to drink the moon. During his alms-wanderings, he went there. The relatives asked his

help. He agreed to give them the solution on one condition. He said, 'If you will give the custody of the child to me, then only I will fulfil her longings.' They agreed.

An open shade was erected. The top was covered with a cloth. It was a full-moon-night. There was a proper hole in the middle of the shade-cloth. It was midnight. A sweet-dish was prepared and was garnished with all attractive food-articles. The dish was kept exactly beneath the hole. The moon was shining in the middle of the sky with calm splendor. A man, on the roof uncovered the hole for some time. The moon was reflected in the dish. The pregnant daughter drank the preparation. The man covered the hole again. When longings were fulfilled, she was satisfied and delivered a son. The son was growing. At that time he (Cāṇakya) was busy in search of wealth with the help of the science called '*dhātuvīdyā*'.

**Passage 5 :** सो य दारएहिं समं रमति, रायणीती विभासा, चाणक्को य पडिण्ण, पेच्छति, तेण विमग्गितो, अम्हवि दिज्जतु, भणति - गावीओ लहेहि, मा मारेज्ज कोति, भणति - वीरभोज्जा पुहवी, णातं जथा विण्णाणं से अत्थि । तो कस्सति दारएहिं कहितं - परिवायगपुत्तो एस, अहं परिव्वाओ, जामु जा ते रायाणं करेमि, चलिया ।

The boy loitered in the play with his friends. He always played a role of a king. The second version of the story is - Cāṇakya returned. He saw the boy donating cows to the supplicants. Cāṇakya said, 'Give some cows to me.' The boy answered, 'Take away any of the cows.' Cāṇakya said, 'Don't give me other's cows. The owners will kill you.' He said, 'The whole earth is enjoyed by a person who possesses valour.' Cāṇakya thought that the boy was a genius.

Some boys approached Cāṇakya and informed that this boy was given to a mendicant. he said, 'It's me. Let us go. I shall make

you a king.' They started their journey.

**Passage 6 :** लोगो मिलितो, पाडलिपुत्तं रोहितं, णंदेणं भग्गो परिव्वायगो, आसेहिं पुड्डिते लग्गो, चंदउत्तो य पउमसरे णिबुद्धे । इमो उपस्पृशति, सण्णाए भणति - बोलियत्ति, उत्तिण्णा णासंति, अण्णे भणंति - चंदउत्तं पउमिणीसंडे छुभित्ता रयओ जातो, पच्छा एगेण जच्चकिसोरगगतेण आसवारेण पुच्छितो भणति - एस पउमसरे पविद्धे, ततो तेण दिद्धे, ततो घोडगो चाणक्कस्स अल्लिविओ, तत्थेव खग्गं मुक्कं, जले पवेसणट्ठयाए कंचुयं मुयति ताव खग्गेण दुहाकतो, चंदगुत्तो वाहिता चडावितो, पलाया, पुच्छितो - तंवेलं किं तुमे चिंतितंति ? भणति - ध्रुवं एतं चेव सोभणं, अज्जो चेव जाणतित्ति णातो जोग्गो, ण एस विपरिणमतित्ति ।

Many people joined them. They encircled Pāṭaliputra. Nanda's people chased the mendicant (Cāṇakya) and he fled. Some horse-men ran after Cāṇakya and Candragupta. Candragupta took shelter in a lotus-pond. Cāṇakya stood by the pond sipping water, as if pretending a religious rite. When the horsemen asked him about Candragupta, Cāṇakya told them by sign that he is under the water. They plunged down to search him. in the meantime, both ran away.

The other version of the story is - Cāṇakya caused Candragupta to hide in the lotus-creeper and himself acted like a washer-man. Afterwards, a horse-man mounted upon an excellent horse, asked Cāṇakya about Candragupta. He said, 'Oh ! he has just entered into the lotus-pond.' The horse-man saw Candragupta. He kept the horse in the custody of Cāṇakya. Left his sword nearby. When he was engaged in removing his dress, before entering the water, Cāṇakya swiftly picked the sword and cut him into pieces.

Cāṇakya called out Candragupta, both mounted on the horse and ran away. Cāṇakya asked Candragupta, 'What do you think at that time when I told about you to the horseman ?' Candragupta said, 'What you have told, will be in my favour only. Sir, it is you who

know perfectly what is beneficial for me.’ Cāṇakya realized that he is a perfect man to achieve his goal. He will never misunderstand me.

**Passage 7 :** पच्छा छुहाइओ, चाणक्को तं ठवेत्ता अतिगतो, बीभेति - मा एत्थं णज्जेज्जामोत्ति, माहणस्स बहिं णिग्गयस्स पोढं फालितं, दधिकरंभं गहाय गतो, जिमितो, अण्णत्थ गामे रत्तिं समुदाणंति, थेरि य पुत्तभंडाणं विलेवितं देति उण्हं, एक्केण मज्झे हत्थो छूढो, दड्ढो रोवति, ताए य भण्णति - चाणक्कमंगलोसि, पुच्छियं, भणति - पासाणि पढमं घेप्पति ।

At some other time, Candragupta was hungry. Cāṇakya asked him to stay at a particular place and went elsewhere to arrange food for him. Cāṇakya was anxious and thought, ‘That, nobody should recognize them.’ He saw a *brahmin*, wandering in the outskirts to empty his belly. (Cāṇakya knew that he has just finished his dinner.) Cāṇakya tore open his belly. Took out the curd-rice. He made Candragupta to eat rice. Once they were wandering in search of food at a village. They saw that an old woman was serving hot gruel to her grandchildren. One of the child put its fingers in the middle of the hot gruel and its fingers were burnt. The child cried aloud. She exclaimed spontaneously, ‘Are you mad like Cāṇakya ?’ Cāṇakya came forward and asked her the reason. She told, ‘First he should have taken the portions around Magadha.’

**Passage 8 :** गता हिमवंतकूडं, पव्वइओ राया, तेण समं मित्तया जाता, भणति - समं समेण विभयामो रज्जं, ओतवेन्ताणं एगत्थ णगरं ण पडति, पविट्ठे तिदंडी, वत्थूणि जोएति, इंदकुमारियाओ, तासिं तणएण ण पडति, माताए णीणाविताओ, पडितं णगरं ।

After this, both went towards the hilly region of the mount Himālaya. Parvataka (Puru or Sellyukus ?) was the king. They became friends. They decided to divide the kingdom into two equal parts after the victory. One city nearby Pāṭaliputra was difficult to

take over. Cāṇakya entered the city in the apparel of a *tridaṇḍī* (a mendicant with a staff.) He inspected carefully all the objects of hindrance in the city. He saw the idols of Indrakumārī deities. Due to the occult protecting-power of the deities, they were unable to capture the city. With his yogic power (*māyā*) Cāṇakya removed the influence of the deities and captured the city.

**Passage 9 :** पाडलिपुत्तं रोहितं, पंदो धम्मदुवारं मग्गति, एणेण रहेण जं तरसि तं णीणेहि, दो भज्जातो एगा कण्णा दव्वं च णीणेति, कण्णा चंदउत्तं पलोएति, भणिता जाहित्ति, ताए विलग्गंतीए चंदगुत्तस्स रहे णव अरगा भग्गा, तिदंडी भणति - मा वारेहि णव पुरिसजुगाणि तुज्झं वंसो होहितित्ति, अतिगता, दो भागा कता ।

They besieged Pāṭaliputra. Nanda asked *dharmadvāra* (a way to go away). Cāṇakya said, 'Take away a chariotful load with you.' He took away two of his wives, one daughter and some precious things with him. The princess cast a glance at Candragupta when the chariot went forward. Her father said, 'Go with him.' When she was mounting Candragupta's chariot, nine spokes of Candragupta's chariot broke down. Cāṇakya said, 'Don't prevent her. (This is actually a good omen.) Your lineage will prosper for nine generations.' All of them entered the city. The city (and the kingdom) was divided into two equal parts.

**Passage 10 :** एगा कन्नगा विसभाविया, तत्थ पव्वतगस्स इच्छा, सा तस्स दिण्णा, अग्गिपरियंचणे विसपरिगतो मरितुमारद्धो, भणति - वयंसग ! मरिज्जति, चंदगुत्तो रुंभामित्ति ववसितो, चाणक्केण भिगुडी कता, णियत्तो, दो रज्जाणि तस्स जाताणि ।

Cāṇakya prepared a poisonous maiden (*viṣa-kanyā*). Parvataka was attracted to her. Their marriage was settled (by Cāṇakya). At the time of the sacred rounds of fire, Parvataka perspired. Due to the contact of the perspired hand, the poison of the bride spread in the

body of Parvataka. He was fainting. He said, 'My friend Candragupta save me, I am dying.' Candragupta stepped forward to save him. Cāṇakya lifted his eyebrows. Candragupta stopped and became the lord of both the kingdoms.

**Passage 11 :** णंदमणूसा चोरिगाए जीवंति, सो चोरग्गाहं मग्गति, तिदंडी बाहिरियाए णलदामं मुङ्गमारगं दट्ठु आगतो, रण्णा सद्दावितो, दिण्णं आरक्खं, वीसत्था कता, भत्तदाणे सकुडुंबा मारिया ।

Nanda's men were living around stealthily. Cāṇakya wanted to search and kill them. He was in search of a person who would do this task. Once he saw Naladāma, burning the hiding places of ants (or bugs). He told the king that he had searched a proper person. The king called him and provided security for him. Naladāma gave assurance to Nanda's people and invited them for dinner (lunch ?). Afterwards he killed them with their families.

**Passage 12 :** आणाए – वंसिहि अम्बगा परिक्खित्ता, विपरीतेकते रुद्धे, पलीवितो सव्वगामो, तेहि य गामेल्लेतेहिं तस्स कप्पडियत्तणे भत्तं ण दिण्णंति काउं ।

Once Cāṇakya issued order in the name of some village-heads that they should cut the mango-trees and protect bamboo-thickets by making compound-wall of mango-wood. The village-chiefs thought over it and carried out the order in exactly the opposite way. Cāṇakya was furious. He ordered his men to set fire on the whole village because in difficult days of his wanderings they refused to give him food.

**Passage 13 :** कोसनिमित्तं परिणामिता बुद्धी, जूतं रमति कूडपासएहिं, सोवण्णं थालं दीणारभरितं जो जिणति तस्स, अहं जिणामि एक्को दायव्वो । अतिचिरंति अण्णं उवायं चित्तेति ।

Later on, Cāṇakya applied his *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi* (i.e. wisdom acquired through experience) to gather wealth for the royal treasury.

First he prepared false (fictitious) dices and invited people to play Dyūta. He declared, 'If the opponent wins, I shall give him a plateful of golden coins. If I win, the player should give me only one coin.' Due to the tricky dice-playing, he always won. He thought that it will take a long time to gather ample wealth. Therefore he wanted to implement other effective method.

**Passage 14 :** नागराणं भत्तं देति, मज्जपाणं च दिण्णं, मत्तेसु पणच्चित्तो भणति गायंतो -

दो मज्झ धातुरत्ताओ, कंचणकुंडिया तिदंडं च ।  
राया मे वसवत्ती, एत्थवि ता मे होलं वाएहि ॥

Cāṇakya arranged a grand dinner for the wealthy citizens. He provided a liquor-bar also. When all the rich guests were under the influence of liquor, he started dancing (as if a druncard) and started to sing the self-composed song - "I have two red clothes and a golden pot with a golden staff. But see, the king is under my control. Oh drummers, beat the drums over my success."

**Passage 15 :** अण्णो असहमाणो भणति -

गयपोयगस्स (भद्दस्स, मन्थरगइए उ) जोयणसहस्सं ।  
पदे पदे सतसहस्सा, एत्थवि ता मे होलं वाएहि ॥

A rich guy did not tolerate the song of Cāṇakya and boasted, "If a young one of an elephant walks slowly the distance of thousand *yojanas*, I can pour one lakh golden coins on each step of the elephant. Such is my wealth. Oh drummers, beat the drums on my riches."

**Passage 16 :** अण्णो असहमाणो भणति -

तिलआढगस्स वुत्तस्स, णिप्फण्णस्स बहुसइतस्स ।  
तिले तिले सतसहस्सं, एत्थवि ता मे होलं वाएहि ॥

The other jealous person started singing, "If I saw sesame

seeds measuring one *āḍhaka* and if I get excellent crops, I can put one lakh golden coins for each sesame. Oh drummers, beat the drums on my riches.”

**Passage 17 :** अण्णो भणति -

णवपाउसंमि पुण्णाए, गिरिनइयाए य सिग्घवेगाए ।  
एगाहमहितमेत्तेणं, णवणीतेण पालिं बंधामि ॥

Another rich person came forward and announced, “If a mountain-river, full of water, flows forcefully in rainy season, still I can build a weir of butter which is produced by churning one day’s butter-milk. Now beat the drums for me.”

**Passage 18 :**

जच्चाण वरकिसोराणं, तद्धिवसं तु जायमेत्ताणं ।  
केसेहिं णभं छाएमि, एत्थवि ता मे होलं वाएहि ॥

One other rich person added, “I am able to cover the sky with the hair of the young ones of the excellent horses, born on the same day in my stud-farm. Now beat the drums for me !”

**Passage 19 :**

दो मज्झ अत्थि रतणाणि, सालिपसूई य गद्भिया य ।  
छिण्णा छिण्णावि रूहंति, एत्थवि ता मे होलं वाएहि ॥  
सेतुसुक्किल्लो णिच्चसुगंधो, भज्ज अणुव्वय णत्थि पवासो ।  
णिरिणो य दुपंचसतो य, एत्थवि ता मे होलं वाएहि ॥

The another rich farmer added, “I have two excellent species of rice-grain. If we sow the first type, we can reap any variety of rice as per our will. The second type viz. *gardabhikā* is so wonderful that, if we cut it, it grows again and again. So beat the drums for me too.”

The last one declared, “I possess vast flower-gardens and fruit-farms, having excellent fragrance ; my wife is loyal ; I never go

on tour ; I have no loan at my credit and I possess thousand golden coins. Oh drummers ! beat the drum on my happy (satisfied) life !”

**Passage 20 :**

एवं णाऊणं रयणाइं मग्गिऊणं गोद्वुगाराणि सालीणं भरियाणि रयणाइं गद्दभियादीणि पुच्छितो छिण्णाणि छिण्णाणि जायंति, आसा एगदिवसजाता मग्गिता, एगदिवसियं णवणीतं मग्गितं । एस परिणामिता चाणक्कस्स बुद्धी ।

Thus having known the abundance of wealth of rich persons, Cāṇakya asked for the jewels, the species of grains, the horses born during one day and the butter produced in one day. Thus Cāṇakya filled up the royal food-grannaries and treasury.

All these are the examples of Cāṇakya's wisdom-acquired through experience.

We observe that the famous *cūrṇikāra* Jinadāsagaṇi has given the life-story of Cāṇakya-Candragupta up to this point. From the *cūrṇi*s on Nisītha and daśavaikālika, we know that the *cūrṇi* of Āvaśyaka contains the whole biography of Cāṇakya up to his death. But in spite of our rigorous search, we were unable to find it in the ĀvCū. So, in continuation with the story of the ĀvCū, the further life-story is added here from the NisCū. and the DaśaCū. to know the whole biography of Cāṇakya at a glance. The translation is mostly according to the original text with a bit freedom.

**[15-17]**

Nisītha-cūrṇi of Jinadāsagaṇi-mahattara belongs to the 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The other name of this *cūrṇi* is Nisītha-veśeṣa-cūrṇi. The salient features of this *cūrṇi* are almost like the ĀvCū. Three important references to Cāṇakya are found in the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> parts of the concerned text. All the references are connected with the Jaina monastic conduct. The original textual parts and its summary is given herewith.

**[15]** The Nīśītha-cūrṇi (Part II) p.33 quotes that -

‘अमच्चो’ चाणक्यो, तदुवलक्खितो दिट्ठतो, जहा - तेण चाणक्येण योगविसभाविता गंधा कता सुबुद्धिमंत्रिवधाय । इदमावश्यके गतार्थम् ।

“The brief analogy is about the minister Cāṇakya. It is said that Cāṇakya prepared a fragrant poison by secret method for killing the minister Subandhu. The incident is already given in the Āvaśyaka.”

We were unable to trace the full incident in the ĀvCū., but the Daśavaikālīka-cūrṇi gives the full story. Critical observations are noted after the text of DaśCū, therefore they are avoided at this place.

**[16] Nīśītha-cūrṇi (Part III) pp.423-424**

**Passage 1 :** अप्पाणं अंतरहितं करेंतो जो पिंडं गेण्हति सो अंतद्वाणपिंडो भण्णति । तत्थ उदाहरणं -

If one partakes food with somebody remaining invisible to the eyes then it is called ‘*antardhāna-piṇḍa*’. Such food is prohibited for a monk. The example for this is as follows -

**Passage 2 :** पाडलिपुत्ते णगरे चंदगुत्तो राया, चाणक्यो मंती, सुट्ठिया आयरिया । ते य - अप्पणा गंतुं असमत्था ओमकाले सीसस्स साहुगणं दाउं तं सुभिक्षं पट्ठवेंति । तस्स य सीसस्स अंतद्वाणजोगं रहे एकांते कहेति । सो य अंजणजोगो दोहिं खुड्ढोहिं सुतो ।

King Candragupta was ruling at Pāṭaliputra. Cāṇakya was his chief-minister. The Jaina preceptor Susthita, was living there. He was physically unable to wander (as per the monastic code of conduct). Therefore at the time of severe drought, he handed over the group of monks to his immediate disciple and sent the monks to a prosperous region. Before their departure, he imparted a *mantra* to the chief of disciples in seclusion, due to which one can disappear

for a specific time by applying collyrium to the eyes. Two junior monks overheard the *mantra*.

**Passage 3 :** ततो सो गच्छो पयट्ठे जतो सुभिक्षं । ततो खुट्ठा दो वि आयरियणेहेण पडिबद्धा देसंताओ गच्छस्स ओसरित्ता आयरियसमीवं आगया । ततो ते थेरा जं लब्भंति तं तेसिं खुट्ठाणं समतिरेगं देति, अप्पणा ओमं करेति ।

Next day the whole group started its journey towards a prosperous region (where one can get alms easily.) The two junior monks returned from the boundary of the nearby place because of the love and regard towards their *guru*. They started living with the *guru*. The senior monk (Susthita) started a practice to distribute the major part of the alms among those two monks, leaving a little for himself.

**Passage 4 :** ततो तेहिं दोहिं वि खुट्ठोहिं सो अंतद्धानजोगो मेलिओ, एणं अक्खी अंजिता बितितो ण पस्सति । एवं लद्धपच्चया भोगकाले सह रण्णा चंदगुत्तेण भुंजंति, जं रण्णो सारीयं भत्तं तं ते अंतद्धिया भुंजंति, ततो रण्णो ओमोयरियाए दोब्बलं जायं ।

Then both the junior monks tested the *mantra* of antardhāna. When one of them anointed his eye with collyrium, the other could not see him. Thus, when convinced, they went to Candragupta and started sharing his food at the time of meals. They devoured the food by entering into Candragupta's stomach invisibly. Day by day Candragupta became weaker and weaker.

**Passage 5 :** ततो चाणक्केण पुच्छितो कीस परिहाणी ? भणाति - “मज्झ भत्तं कोति अंतद्धितो पक्खिवति त्ति, ण जाणामि ।” ततो चाणक्केण समंता कुट्ठे दाउं एगदुवारा भुंजणभूमी कता । दारमूले य सुहुमो इट्ठलचुण्णो विक्खित्तो । राया अंतो एगागी णिविट्ठो । ताहे खुट्ठा आगता, पविट्ठ अंतो । दिट्ठ पयपद्धती चुण्णे ।

Cānakya asked, ‘Why you are looking weak, day by day ?’ He replied, ‘Somebody eats my food invisibly when it enters into

my stomach.’ Then Cāṇakya closed all doors of the dining hall and kept open only one door. He scattered some fine brick-powder at the doorsteps. The king ate his food in seclusion. At that time, the two monks arrived. Entered into the hall, leaving their footmarks on the brick-powder.

**Passage 6 :** चाणक्केण णायं – पादचारिणो एते, अंजणसिद्धा । ताहे दारं ठवेउं धूमो कतो, अंसुणा गलंतेण गलितं अंजणं, दिट्ठं खुड्डादुगं । चंदगुत्तो पिच्छति – “अहमेतेहिं विट्ठलितो ।” ततो चाणक्केण भणियं – “एते रिसओ कुमारसमणा, पवित्तं ते एतेहिं सह भोयणं, तुमे सच्चसो अपवित्तेण एते विट्ठलित्ता ।”

Cāṇakya realized that those were the footmarks of the *añjanasiddha yogins*. He closed the doors and filled the hall with smoke. The smoke caused tears in their eyes and the collyrium faded out. The two monks were now visible. Candragupta commented, ‘These persons defiled me.’ Cāṇakya remarked, ‘These are pious and celibate young sages. It is actually meritorious to share food with them. In fact they are polluted because of your carnality.’

**Passage 7 :** ततो अप्पसागारियं चाणक्केण णीणिता । थेराणं समीवं चाणक्को गतो – “कीस खुड्डे ण सारवेह ?” ततो थेरेहिं चाणक्को उवालद्धो – “तुमं परमो सावगो, एरिसे ओमकाले साधूवावारं ण वहसि” ति । तेण भणियं – “संता पडिचोदणा, मिच्छा मे दुक्कडं” ति । गतो, खुड्डाण य वावारंतो पवूढो ।

जे भिक्खू जोगपिंडं , भुंजेज्ज सयं अहव सातिज्जे ।

सो आणा अणवत्थं , मिच्छत्त-विराधणं पावे ॥

Bhāṣyagāthā 4468

The two monks were driven out by Cāṇakya. Cāṇakya went to the senior monk with those two junior monks and asked, ‘Don’t you have a control over your juniors ?’ Then the monk said surcastically, ‘You are an excellent layman. In these days of drought, is it not your responsibility to provide them food ?’ Cāṇakya said in apologetic

tone, 'I agree that it is my fault. Please forgive me for my wrong behaviour.' From that day he personally looked after the well-being of the two junior monks.

The concerned *bhāṣyagāthā* of the *Niśītha* is - "A monk who himself earns the alms by using his yogic powers or enjoys such food brought by the others, he is the law-breaker of the Jina-śāsana and due to this, he deviates from the right faith."

**[17]** The *Niśītha-cūrṇi* (Part IV) pp.10-12 includes a story in which it is discussed that, 'transgressing an order', is a more serious offence than 'a mistake'. The concerned text is -

एत्थ दिट्ठतो मुरियादि । मुरिय त्ति मोरपोसगवंसो चंदगुत्तो । आदिगहणातो अण्णे रायाणो । ते आणाभंगे गुरुतर डंडं पवत्तेति । एवं अम्ह वि आणा बलिया ।

चंदगुत्तो मोरपोसगो त्ति जे अभिजाणंति खत्तिया ते तस्स आणं परिभवन्ति । चाणक्कस्स चिंता-आणाहीणो केरिसो राया ? कहं आणातिक्खो होज्ज ? त्ति । तस्स य चाणक्कस्स कप्पडियत्ते अडंतस्स एगम्मि गामे भत्तं न लद्धं । तत्थ य गामे बहू अंबा वंसा य । तस्स य गामस्स पडिणिविट्ठे णं आणट्ठवणणिमित्तं लिहियं पेसियं इमेरिसं "आम्रान् छित्वा वंशानां वृत्तिः शीघ्रं कार्ये" ति ।

तेहि य गामेयगेहिं दुल्लिहियं ति काउं वंसे छेत्तुं अंबाण वती कता । गवेसाविया चाणक्केण - "किं कतं ?" ति । आगतो, उवालद्धा, एते वंसा रोधगादिसु उवउज्जंति, कीस भे छिण्णा ?, दंसियं लेहचोरियं - "अण्णं संदिट्ठं अण्णं चेव करेहि" ति डंडपत्ता । ततो तस्स गामस्स सबालवुड्ढेहिं पुरिसेहिं अधोसिरेहिं वतिं काउं सो गामो सव्वो दड्ढो । अण्णे भणंति - सबालवुड्ढा पुरिसा तीए वतीए छोदुं दड्ढा ।

The purport of the text can be summarized in the following manner -

"Here, an analogy of Maurya is given. 'Maurya' means 'Candragupta' who was born in the family of peacock-breeders. This narrative is applicable to the other kings also. They punish the law-breakers severely. Likewise, 'an order' is more important for us."

Those Kṣatriyas who knew about the lower caste of Candragupta, disobeyed his orders. Cāṇakya thought, ‘What is the use of this type of king ? How can we strengthen his power ?’ When Cāṇakya was wandering in search of food in his bad days, he has not got food in one of the village. There were a lot of mango-groves and bamboo-thickets in that village. For giving a harsh punishment to the villagers, he sent a written order - ‘Cut the mangoes and make a compound wall to protect the bamboos, as soon as possible.’

The villagers thought that there is a mistake in the order. So they cut the bamboos and fenced the mango-groves. Cāṇakya send a man to follow their activities. The man told the truth. Cāṇakya taunted, ‘The bamboos are valuable. Why do you cut them ?’ The villagers showed the fault in the order. He said, ‘You are told to do something but you have done it otherwise, so you are worthy to be punished.’ Then the whole village was burnt including the children, aged people etc., after having hanging them with their heads down. Some say that Cāṇakya made the villagers inside the compound-wall and put fire on them.

### **Critical Comments:**

- \* The *cūrṇikāra* compares the strict orders of the Jinas with the strict orders of Cāṇakya.
- \* Candragupta’s lower caste is highlighted and it is told that the other kṣatriyas humiliate him due to this reason.
- \* Cāṇakya’s method was no doubt inhuman but it was praised by the *cūrṇikāra* because it was beneficial to keep good governance.

**General observations on the story of Cāṇakya in the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi and Nīśītha-cūrṇi:**

- \* It is the oldest continuous life-story of Cāṇakya found in the Jaina literature, whether the Śvetāmbara or Digambara, documented in a very brief manner.
- \* If supplied with the Nīśītha-cūrṇi, the story not only reveals the whole biography of Cāṇakya but also the Jaina attitude to look at him.
- \* All the later Jaina narratives are only the elaborations of the episodes documented in the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi. Even Hemacandra's Cāṇakya-account in the Paṛiśiṣṭa-parva is not the exception to this fact.
- \* 'Golla' is the birthplace of Cāṇakya. If the name designates the region at the bank of the river Godāvāri, then it supports the view of T. Ganapathi Shastry, that probably Cāṇakya belongs to the southern part of India because, the oldest manuscript of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is found near Trivendrum. This view is not accepted by many scholars.
- \* The name of the village viz. Caṇaka and the name of his father viz. Caṇika are conspicuously fictitious and imagined after the name of 'Cāṇakya'. On this analogy, some Jaina authors say that the name of his mother was Caṇeśvarī. But it is true that the Jaina tradition accepts the name 'Cāṇakya' as his first name and has very rarely used his other two names i.e. Viṣṇugupta and Kauṭīliya.
- \* When the incidents are narrated, the ĀvCū. invariably calls him अमच्चो चाणक्को but when it refers to Cāṇakya's anthological treatise, it says, 'अत्थसत्था कोडिल्लयमादी तदा उप्पन्ना ।' In the Anuyogadvāra and Nandī also, we find the name of the śāstra as 'कोडिल्लय'.

- \* The efforts of Cāṇakya's Jainification are not seen in the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi* except in the story 'पर-पासंड-पसंसा'. Though Cāṇakya's father is depicted as a Jaina householder, the *brahmanic* elements in Cāṇakya are obviously stronger.
- \* We find two important references to Cāṇakya's wife in the *ĀvCū.* but her name is not given. She belongs to a *brahmin* family and it is told that she is partial towards *brahmin*-ascetics. Due to her depressed mood, Cāṇakya approaches Nanda to get reasonable donation.
- \* Cāṇakya's inborn teeth, the prophecy of the Jaina mendicants, filing of the teeth and his being the king-maker - all these details are found only in the Jaina tradition and are most probably fanciful.
- \* The famous account of Cāṇakya's insult in the royal palace is almost similar to that of their Hindu or Brahmanic counter-parts but the incident of occupying many seats by keeping his staff, water-pot, rosary etc. is new in the *ĀvCū.* No reasonable explanation for this queer act is found in the later Jaina literature.
- \* The occult yogic powers of Cāṇakya are referred to in some incidents but as the Hindu sources depict, we cannot designate them as a 'black-magic' (*krtyā-prayoga*).
- \* The *ĀvCū.* and *NiśCū.* specifically say that Candragupta was not a *kṣatriya*. He was a grandson of a peacock-keeper of the Nandas. The name of Candragupta's father is not mentioned. He was called '*maurya*' due to his mother's lineage. It is specially noted down that some people did not honour Candragupta because of his lower caste. Still it is not depicted anywhere that Cāṇakya disregarded Candragupta due to his being a low-born. Unlike the

Mudrārākṣasa's Cāṇakya, he never calls him 'vṛṣala'.

- \* The incident of fulfilling the pregnancy-longings of Candragupta's mother is the free-lance display of the *cūrṇikāra*'s power of imagination, certainly carved after 'the mirror and the moon' episode of lord Rāma's childhood.
- \* Cāṇakya's first meeting with Candragupta when he was a teenager, is documented with some other versions. We can guess that there would be some floating myths about this in the society.
- \* The story of 'the old lady and hot gruel' is a peculiar Indian motif, oftenly used in the story literature. We find the same motif in the biography of Shivaji mahārāja in the later literature.
- \* Cāṇakya's political wisdom and Candragupta's bravery, loyalty and power of organization is evident in their joint-ventures to defeat the powerful Nanda kingdom with the help of Parvataka (might be an administrator appointed by Alexander the Great.) All these magnificent qualities are belittled if we read the Hindu sources carefully, where Cāṇakya kills Nanda by performing the magical rites.
- \* The preceptor-disciple-relationship between Cāṇakya and Candragupta is effectfully highlighted in the *ĀvCū.* and *NiśCū.* at many places. It leaves no scope for the conflict between them whether real or pseudo, as depicted in the *Mudrārākṣasa*. According to the *NiśCū.* it was Bindusāra, who dishonoured Cāṇakya, after the death of Candragupta, because of the malicious reporting of Subandhu, the enemy of Cāṇakya.
- \* It is already noted down that all the references in the *Niśītha-bhāṣya* and *Niśītha-cūrṇi* are closely connected with the Jaina

monastic conduct. In fact, we can infer that many of the rules in the *cheda-sūtras* came into vogue due to the strict law-code of Cāṇakya.

- \* It can be said that the *cūrṇikāra* was a thorough reader of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra because in the interesting story of merchants, the measures implimented by Cāṇakya to fill the royal treasury are obviously taken from the 92<sup>nd</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra viz. ‘*kośa-saṁgraha*’.
- \* It is curious that the *cūrṇikāra* does not throw light on the previous relationship between Cāṇakya and Subandhu. He has not identified him with Śakaṭāla.
- \* The horrific story of Cāṇakya’s death is almost the same in the Śvetāmbara and Digambara literature.

In totally we can say that, the *cūrṇikāra* basically has presented Cāṇakya as an example of *pārīṇāmikī-buddhi*. Though Cāṇakya has implimented harsh measures and deceitful tacticks, it was all meant for the well-being of the king and the kingdom. This genius chief-minister was personally so detached and selfless that the Jainas adore him for his loyalty, and his serene state of mind, at the time of death.

**[18] The Ācārāṅga-cūrṇi** is a text which is traditionally ascribed to the famous *cūrṇikāra* Jinadāsagaṇi (6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) But when we closely examine the language, it resembles the classical Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī than the old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. It contains only a passing reference about Cāṇakya and the text does not provide any clue or cross-reference of the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi.

(1) The context of this reference is very peculiar. At the very beginning of the first *uddeśaka* of the second *adhyayana* of Ācārāṅga

(I), a long list of close relatives is given -

माया मे पिया मे --- भज्जा मे --- इच्चत्थं गढिए लोए वसे पमत्ते ।

Ācārā.1.2.1

At the end, it is told that due to the emotional engrossment in these relations, one gets entangled and becomes malicious. Here the *cūrṇikāra* notes down many mythological and historical examples. In the context of 'wife' (*bhajā*), the author writes -

‘अणलंकिया हसियत्ति चाणक्केण णंदवंसो उच्छादितो’ (Ācārāṅga-cūrṇi p.49)

Cāṇakya's wife was ridiculed and neglected by the relatives because she was not adorned with jewellery. Considering her anxiety, Cāṇakya went to the king Nanda hoping gracious donations. He was insulted in the court of Nanda and ultimately rooted out the Nanda dynasty.

We see that, no new details of Cāṇakya are provided here but a particular incident of Cāṇakya's life is examined here from different viewpoint. The story of Cāṇakya's wife was well-known. The *cūrṇikāra* thinks that his wife was ultimately responsible to instigate Cāṇakya for asking donations to Nanda. And the remote cause of the destruction of Nandas is Cāṇakya's wife and his attachment towards her.

When we read the same story in the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*, we do not feel that Cāṇakya's wife is blamable for the *cūrṇikāra*. It is a subject of debate whether the *cūrṇikāras* of the *Āvaśyaka* and *Ācārāṅga* are the same or not. But one thing is certain that while explaining scriptural texts, the commentators remember Cāṇakya, every now and then.

(2) We find some special features of *golladeśa* in the *Ācārāṅga-cūrṇi*. According to Dr. J.C.Jain, 'golla' is the region situated near the

river Godāvārī. Some customs of *golladeśa* are mentioned. It is told that in the month of *caitra*, there is cold weather in *golla*. The slices of raw mangoes are dried in sunshine and a drink called ‘*ambapāṇaga*’ is prepared. The wheel of a potter-man is called ‘*asavattaa*’ in this region. (प्राकृत साहित्य का इतिहास, J.C.Jain, p.213)

We are unable to confirm that whether it is the same ‘*golladeśa*’ where Cāṇakya was born or not, because it is not noted in the *Ācārāṅga-cūrṇi*. The *Āvaśyaka* refers *golladeśa* but the above-mentioned description is not documented there. Thus the puzzle of Cāṇakya’s birth-place remains unsolved.

**[19] The Sūtrakṛtāṅga-cūrṇi** which is probably written in the 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> century, is anonymous and its language is designated nearer to the classical Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī.

(1) While commenting on a *gāthā* (Sūtrakṛtāṅga 1.8.5), the *cūrṇikāra* quotes Cāṇakya as an example of deceitfulness.

The concerned *cūrṇi* says -

‘माइणो कट्टु मायाओ कामभोगे समाहरे’ - तेण चाणक्क-कोडिल्लं  
ईसत्थादी मायाओ अधिज्जंति जहा परो वंचेतव्वो । तहा वाणियगादिणो  
उक्कंचण-वंचणादीहिं अत्थं समज्जिणंति । (Sūtrakṛtāṅga-cūrṇi p.167)

Those who want to deceive others, learn the science based on crookedness. Likewise the merchants etc. gather wealth by bribing and treachery.

### General Observations:

- \* Probably this is the first Jaina reference in which Cāṇakya’s censure is explicitly seen.
- \* Cāṇakya and Kauṭilya, both the names occur in the same sentence. Probably the *cūrṇikāra* might have thought that Cāṇakya is his first name and Kauṭilya is an adjective which is really meaningful.

- \* The anonymous *cūrṇikāra* opines his own view that the merchants etc. have learnt the art of gathering wealth from Cāṇakya.
- \* The Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi quotes the story of merchants as an example of Cāṇakya's *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*, in which a sense of admiration is seen, while in the Sūtrakṛtāṅga-cūrṇi a sense of reproach is quite evident.

(2) Sūtrakṛtāṅga 1.8.4 reads -

सत्थमेगे तु सिक्खंता , अतिवायाय पाणिणं ।  
एगे मंते अहिज्जंति , पाणभूयविहेडिणो ॥

While commenting upon this *gāthā*, the *cūrṇikāra* says -  
एगे असंजता , न सर्वे अधवा सर्वे कारणा अस्त्रशास्त्राण्यधीयते,  
हंभीमासुरुक्खं कोडल्लगं --- बावत्तरिं वा कलाओ सुट्ठु सिक्खंति ।

(Sūtrakṛtāṅga-cūrṇi p.177)

The tentative translation will be as follows -

Some householders or unrestrained monks, or (we can say) all, learn *astrasāstras* (i.e. the science of weapons or warfare) for particular reason and who are keen in harming or killing others, learn the sciences like the *Hambhīmāsুরুक्खा* (?), *Kauṭilyaka* --- and all the 72 arts (or sciences).

### General Observations:

- \* Here, *Kauṭilya* is mentioned as a promoter of *astrasāstra* and not of *arthaśāstra*. The *cūrṇikāra* prefers the reading '*atthasattha*' because he wants to despise *Kauṭilya* (he has not used the name Cāṇakya) for his deceitful activities and violence.
- \* It is sure that *Jinadāsagaṇi* is not the author of this *cūrṇi* because these views are totally against the views expressed in the *cūrṇis* on the *Āvaśyaka*, *Niśītha* and *Daśavaikālika*.
- \* We observe that though Cāṇakya is generally praised for his *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi* and *paṇḍita-maraṇa* in the previous litera-

ture of the *cūrṇikāra*, he is very bold and transparent in his assessment of Cāṇakya. The present *cūrṇikāra* has connected Cāṇakya with the vices like ‘*māyā*’, ‘*vañcanā*’ and ‘*prāṇātipāta*’.

- \* It is noteworthy that the stalwarts like Haribhadra, Śīlāṅka, Abhayadeva, Malayagiri, Jayasimha and even Hemacandra have not paid any attention to the views expressed in the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga-cūrṇi* and have retained the same position that of *Jinadāsagaṇi*.

**[20] (1) The Daśavaikālika-cūrṇi** (pp.81-82) quotes that, ‘The whole story of Cāṇakya is given in the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi* up to the death of Candragupta and the coronation of Bindusāra.’ Immediately after this remark, the rest of the story of Cāṇakya upto his death is told.

**Passage 1 :** नंदसंतीओ य सुबंधू नाम अमच्चो । सो चाणक्कस्स पदोसमावण्णो छिड्डुणि मग्गइ, अण्णया रायाणं विण्णवइ, जहावि तुम्हेहिं अम्ह वित्तं ( ? चित्तं ) न देह तहावि अम्हेहिं तुज्झ हियं वत्तव्वं, भणइ – तुम्ह माया चाणक्केण मारिया, रण्णा धाती पुच्छिया, आमंति, कारणं न पुच्छियं ।

Subandhu was the minister of the Nandas. He was very much jealous of Cāṇakya and always awaited the opportunity to slander Cāṇakya in front of the king Bindusāra. Once Subandhu approached Bindusāra and told, ‘Sir, though I am not in your service (or though you do not pay attention to me) it is my duty to tell the truth which is beneficial to you. See, Cāṇakya has killed your mother.’ Bindusāra asked the old wet-nurse. She said, ‘Yes’. He did not ask the reason or background.

**Passage 2 :** केणवि कारणेण रण्णो य सगासं चाणक्को आगओ, जाव दिट्ठिं न देइ ताहे चाणिक्को चिंतेइ, रुद्धो, अहं गयाऊत्ति काउं दव्वं पुत्तपोत्ताणं दाऊणं संगोवित्ता य गंधा संजोइया, पत्तयं च लिहिऊण सोवि जोगो समुगो छूढो, समुगो चउसु मंजूसासु छूढो, तासु छुभित्ता ततो गंधोव्वरए छूढो, तं बहूहिं खीलियाहिं सुघट्टियं करेत्ता

दव्वजायं णाड्वग्गं च कम्मे नियोएत्ता अडवीए गोकुले इंगिणिमरणं अब्भुवगओ।

For some other work, Cāṇakya came to Bindusāra. Bindusāra didn't pay attention to him. He thought that the king is displeased with him. It is better to give up the ministership and go elsewhere. Having distributed the wealth to the sons and grandsons, he collected some poisonous aroma, wrote a letter and he kept that letter fragrant into a pouch. He put that pouch inside four big chests. He kept the biggest chest in a room (lit. a fragrant-hall). The room was tightly closed by driving several nails into the door. Having done proper arrangements of his wealth and having appointed the relatives for the supervision of the work, he accepted voluntary death (*iṅginimaraṇa*) in a cow-pen near a forest.

**Passage 3 :** रण्णा आपुच्छियं - चाणक्को किं करेइ ? धाती य से सव्वं जहावत्तं परिकहेइ, गहिय-परमत्थेण य भणियं - अहो मया असमिक्खियं कयं, सव्वंतेउरओरोहबलसमग्गो खामेउं निग्गओ, दिट्ठो यऽणेण करिसि मज्झे ठिओ, खामिओ सबहुमाणं, भणियं चणेणं - नगरं वच्चामो, भणइ - मए सव्वपरिच्चागो कउत्ति ।

The king asked the old wet-nurse, 'What had Cāṇakya done at that time ?' She told him about all the true events. (This episode is noted down in the commentary of Dharmopadeśamālā, which is translated hereafter). When Bindusāra knew the facts, he exclaimed, 'Oh ! what a blunder I have done !' With the harem and army he marched towards Cāṇakya to confess his blunder. He saw Cāṇakya meditating in the cow-pen, sitting between the dried cow-dungs. The king apologized and said with a great honour, 'Sir, let us go to the capital.' Cāṇakya replied, 'I have abandoned all the worldly things.'

**Passage 4 :** तओ सुबंथुणा राया विण्णविओ - अहं से पूयं करेमि, अणुयाणह, अणुण्णाए धूवं डहिऊण तम्हि चेव एगप्पदेसे करिसस्सोवरिं ते अंगारे परिठवेइ, सो य

करीसो पल्लितो (? पलित्तो), दड्डो चाणक्को, ताहे सुबंधुणा राया विण्णविओ - चाणक्कस्स संतियं घरं, मम अणुजाणह, अणुण्णाते गओ ।

Subandhu requested the king, 'I will honour him. Please give me consent.' After getting the consent, he went to that place where Cāṇakya was. He put some fragrant sticks (*dhūpa*) on blazing charcoal. Secretly put that fire inbetween the heap of cow-dungs. Thus Cāṇakya was burnt in the blazing fire. Subandhu requested the king, 'Sir, please permit me to inspect Cāṇakya's house which is near to my residence.' The king permitted him to do so. He went to Cāṇakya's house.

**Passage 5 :** पच्चुवेक्खमाणेण य घरं दिट्ठे अपवरगो घट्ठिओ, सुबंधू चिंतेइ-किमवि एत्थ, कवाडे भंजित्ता उग्घाडिया जाव समुगं मघेंतगंधं सपत्तयं पेच्छइ, तं पत्तयं वाएइ, तस्स य पत्तगस्स एसो अत्थो - जो एयं चुण्णं अग्घाति, सो जइ ण्हाति वा समालभइ अलंकारेइ सीतोदगं वा पिबति महीए सेज्जाए सुयइ जाणेण गच्छइ गंधव्वं वा सुणेइ एवमादी अण्णे वा इट्ठु विसया सेवइ जहा साहुणो अच्छंति तहा सो जइ न अच्छइ तो मरइ ।

While inspecting his house, Subandhu saw an inner apartment which was tightly closed. Subandhu thought, 'Something is hidden here.' He opened the door, opened the chests and at the end saw the fragrant pouch accompanying a letter. He read out the letter. The meaning was like this - "Whosoever smells this powder and then bathes, adorns oneself, drinks cool water (unboiled water), sleeps on elevated bed, goes by cart, hears music or enjoys the other sensual pleasures, will die immediately. But if he observes the rules of monastic conduct, he will not die."

**Passage 6 :** ताहे सुबंधुणा विण्णासणत्थं अण्णो पुरिसो अग्घाइत्ता सद्दाइणो विसया भुंजाविओ मओ य, ताहे सुबंधूवि जीवितासाए अकामो साहू जहा तहा अच्छइ, किं सुबंधू तहा अकामो अतो साहू भण्णइ ? --- एवमभुंजमाणो कामे संकप्पसंकिलिड्डताए

चागी न भण्णइ ।

For examining the predictability of the letter, Subandhu made some person smell the powder and enjoy the sensuous pleasures. The person died immediately. Thus out of compulsion, Subandhu led the life of a monk. But can we say that Subandhu was a real *sādhū* ? Of course not. In the same manner, if a person helplessly abandons the pleasures and sorrowfully remembers those in his heart, then it is not considered as true renunciation.

**[20] (2) The Daśavaikālika-cūrṇi**, which is most probably authored by Jinadāsagaṇi (6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) supplies the reader with two valuable references of Cāṇakya.

(1) ‘Sāmaṇṇapuvvayam’ is the second *adhyayana* of Daśavaikālika. Its second verse is -

वत्थगंधमलंकारं , इत्थीओ सयणाणि य ।  
अच्छंदा जे न भुंजंति , न से चाइ ति वुच्चई ॥

“One who does not enjoy clothes, perfumes, ornaments, women, beds etc. due to helplessness or compulsion, is not in real sense a self-disciplined monk.”

While commenting on the verse, the *cūrṇikāra* has given the story of Bindusāra-Subandhu and Cāṇakya. The main purpose of this story is to highlight the deceptive monkhood of Subandhu. But it is so closely connected with Cāṇakya that the *cūrṇikāra* describes the tragic end of both Subandhu and Cāṇakya in a very elaborate manner.

We have already translated the story and given our comments on the story because in fact, it is the extension of the story given in the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*.

(2) The second reference of the Daśavaikālika-cūrṇi is connected with one of the variety of *kathā*, i.e. *arthakathā*. The *cūrṇi* says -

“अत्थकहा जा अत्थनिमित्तं कहिज्जति सा इमाए गाहाए अणुगंतव्वा । तं जहा - विज्जा-सिप्पमुवाओ --- अत्थकहा ॥ ११ ॥ १३ ॥”

The word *uvāya* (*upāya*) is explained as - उवाए ति दारं - दिङ्गंतो चाणक्को, ‘बे मज्झ धातुरत्ताइं ---’

The stories in which the measures of gaining wealth are described is called *upāya*. In this context, the *cūrṇikāra* remembers Cāṇakya. The story of gathering wealth for the royal treasury is mentioned here. The cross-references of the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi* and *Hāribhadriya-ṭikā* are given by the editor. He mentions - आव.चू.पत्र ५६५ ; हारिभद्रीय टीका-पत्र ४३५.

We have already translated the story given in the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*, however we can observe that -

While enumerating the varieties of *kathā*, *arthakathā* is invariably mentioned. When the Jaina writers comment on *arthakathā* they immediately remember Cāṇakya's *Arthaśāstra* and the measures adopted by Cāṇakya to create or gather wealth. We cannot claim that *arthakathās* given in the Jaina literature are true stories. But it is quite sure that they have studied the *Arthaśāstra* minutely, have chosen some seeds or motifs and developed them in full narratives with their unique power of imagination.

The overall impact of Cāṇakya and his *Arthaśāstra* is thus seen through the *Daśavaikālika-cūrṇi*.

### **[21-23] Cāṇakya : Quoted by Haribhadra (8<sup>th</sup> Century)**

Haribhadra was an all-rounder genius. He had equal proficiency in Sanskrit, Jaina *Māhārāṣṭrī* and *Apabhraṃśa*. Through his writings he encompassed various subjects and various forms of literature viz. Astronomy, Cosmology, Didactics, Ethics, Eulogy, Narratives, Yoga, Canonical commentaries, Philosophy, Metrics and Biography (*Carita*). His contribution to the Jaina literature is unparalleled.

His impartial attitude and love for learning without any sectarian bias has brought him a good name in the Jaina and non-Jaina circles.

Basically being a *brahmin* by birth, he might have studied the Arthaśāstra in his educational career. We find the reference to Cāṇakya in his commentarial and narrative literature in various context.

## **[A] References in the Āvaśyaka-ṭīkā and Daśavaikālika-ṭīkā**

### **(i) Āvaśyaka-ṭīkā p.342**

A small incident is noted down here in the form of an analogy for explaining the rareness of human birth. In the Āvaśyaka-niryukti 832, ten *drṣṭāntas* are enumerated, among which ‘*pāśaka*’ is mentioned. The short story is -

‘पासग’ ति, चाणकस्स सुवण्णं नत्थि, ताधे केण उवाएण विढविज्ज सुवण्णं?, ताधे जंतपासया कता, केइ भणंति - वरदिण्णगा, ततो एगो दक्खो पुरिसो सिक्खावितो, दीणारथालं भरियं, सो भणति-जति ममं कोइ जिणति सो थालं गेण्हतु, अह अहं जिणामि तो एगं दीणारं जिणामि, तस्स इच्छाए जंतं पडति अतो ण तीरइ जिणितुं, जहा सो ण जिप्पइ एवं माणुसलंभोऽवि, अवि णाम सो जिप्पेज्ज ण य माणुसातो भट्ठो पुण माणुसत्तणं ।

The analogy of *pāśaka* can be explained thus - Cāṇakya had no gold (in the royal treasury). He thought, ‘How can we gather gold?’ He prepared gambling-dices having peculiar magical power. Some say that he obtained the dices as a boon from a deity. He trained a clever person. Filled up a big plate with *deenāras* (golden coins). The trained person said, ‘If somebody wins, I will bestow on him the whole plate. If I win, I will take only one golden coin.’ The clever person had a full control over the dices. Therefore it was impossible to defeat him. As the possibility of his defeat is very low, likewise when a person loses his human birth, it is almost impossible to obtain the same birth again.

### Observations :

- \* The same story is given in the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi* but in a very brief manner.
- \* Haribhadra quotes the same story with a slight elaboration in different context to explain the extreme importance of human birth.
- \* The words 'केइ भणंति' indicate that, there were different oral versions of Cāṇakyan tales in the society.
- \* It is very interesting to note that in the 77<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of the 3<sup>rd</sup> *adhikaraṇa* of the Kauṭīliya

Arthaśāstra, the rules and regulations of the dice-play (*dyūta*) are mentioned. According to Kauṭīliya it was the privilege of *dyūtādhyakṣa* to produce the authorized dices. It seems that the details of the concerned *adhyāya* are used in the narrative as a motif. If it is true, then it throws light on the minute study of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra among the circle of the Jaina *ācāryas*.

### (ii) *Āvaśyaka-ṭīkā* p.405

An incident is quoted here as an example of *vimarśa*. This word has several meanings and almost all meanings are applicable in the present case. It is about deliberation, consideration, examination, impatience and dramatic change.

The text is - वीमंसाए - चंदगुत्तो राया चाणक्केण भणिओ - पारत्तियंपि किंपि करेज्जासि, सुसीसो य किर सो आसि, अंतेउरे धम्मकहणं, उवसग्गिज्जंति, अण्णतित्थिया य विणद्ध, णिच्छूढा य, साहू सद्दाविया भणंति - जइ राया अच्छइ तो कहेमो, अइगओ राया ओसरिओ, अंतेउरिया उवसग्गेति, हयाओ, सिरिघरदिट्ठं कहेइ।

The story is so concise, that the exact meaning is not clear. It is not found in the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*. Hemacandra elaborates this story in the *Parīśiṣṭa-parva* (*Sarga* 8, *gāthās* 415-435, p.85). With

the help of Hemacandra we can summarize the story in the following manner -

Cāṇakya advised Candragupta, ‘Do something good for the life hereafter.’ Candragupta was an obedient disciple. The heretics deliver religious sermon in Candragupta’s harem. There was a peep-hole in the wall between the preaching-hall and harem. When Candragupta left they gathered around the hole and peeped into the harem. Knowing the lack of control of the heretics Cāṇakya managed to spread fine brick-powder on the floor near the hole. he showed the foot-marks of the heretics to Candragupta. Candragupta ordered to drive them away. They left brazenly. Cāṇakya invited the Jaina monks to preach. They preached and observed the rules of celibacy strictly. They didnot indulge into the shameful act of peeping into the harem. Candragupta accepted them as gurus after their tough examination. From that day he became aloof from the heretics.

### **(iii) Āvaśyaka-ṭikā p.818**

Here, Haribhadra presents a small story of *parapāsaṇḍa-pasaṁsā* (i.e praising the heretics) exactly in the manner of the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi (pp.817-818). It has been already translated and commented upon previously. While reflecting on Haribhadra’s story, we can see that -

- \* Cāṇakya is depicted as a Jaina householder while Candragupta originally believes in the *brahmanic* tenets.
- \* The opinion of Cāṇakya was important to Candragupta during decision-making.
- \* Cāṇakya’s wife was in favour of the heretics. She was strong enough to lodge a complaint against the injustice done to the heretics.

- \* The reference of Cāṇakya's wife is important because it is very rare. The reference is not found in the Hindu and Buddhist sources.
- \* The effects of Cāṇakya's Jainification are incessantly seen in the previous and the present story.
- \* If we go through the details about the ascetic-class in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra, we see that Cāṇakya's attitude is overall strict to the ascetic-class and at some places he is lenient to the *śrotriya-brahmins*. Exactly contrary situation is seen in the above-mentioned story which is really hard to digest and provides scope for implanted Jainification.
- \* It is depicted here that Cāṇakya was not only the guru of Candragupta in politics but guided him in the religious matter also. This anecdote is employed by Hemacandra to describe the conversion of Candragupta from the *brahmanic* faith to the Jaina faith. Whether it was intended by Haribhadra or not is a dubious matter. It seems that Haribhadra wants to focus on the examination or consideration part of the story.
- \* The motif of 'spreading the fine brick-powder' is explicitly picked up from the Nīśītha-cūrṇi.

**(iv) The Daśavaikālika-tīkā** contains a passing reference to Cāṇakya while explaining a *dvāragāthā* of the Āvaśyaka-niryukti.

The concerned sentence is - उवाए ति दारं --- दिदुंनो चाणक्को, जहा 'बे मज्झ धातुरत्ताइ' एवमादीहिं चाणक्केण उवाएहिं धणोवज्जणं कतं। (Daśavaikālika-tīkā p.435)

The story of Cāṇakya's *dhanopārjana* for the royal treasury was famous in the oral tradition of Jains and the Jaina writers oftenly quote the story probably imitating the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi. Haribhadra has quoted the same story here in a brief manner.

## [B] References in Upadeśapada

The Upadeśapada is a didactic work of Haribhadra written in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī, which is a collection of traditional narratives presented in 1039 *dvāragāthās*. These *dvāragāthās* contain hundreds of stories in a very brief manner. Muncindrasūri has written a voluminous commentary on these *dvāragāthās* in the 12<sup>th</sup> century A.D. At this place only the *dvāragāthās* are mentioned with their numbers and subjects, which are connected with the anecdotes of Cāṇakya.

The numbers of *gāthās* are - 7 ; 50 ; 139 ; 196.

### (i) Upadeśapada, *gāthā* 7

जोगियपासिच्छियपाडरमणदीणारपत्तिजूयम्मि ।

जह चेव जओ दुलहो धीरस्स तहेव मणुयत्तं ॥

Here, the analogy of *pāsaka* is indicated to explain the rareness or infrequency of human birth. The short story is documented in the *Āvaśyaka-ṭīkā* (p.342) by Haribhadra.

### (ii) Upadeśapada, *gāthā* 50

खमए अमच्चपुत्ते चाणक्के चेव थूलभदे य ।

नासिक्कसुंदरीणंद वइर परिणामिया बुद्धी ॥

Two *gāthās* (No.49-50) are dedicated to enumerate the famous personalities possessing *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi* (wisdom acquired through experience). Cāṇakya is one of them. In the *Āvaśyaka-ṭīkā* (pp.433-435), Haribhadra has written the life-story of Cāṇakya up to the incident of filling the royal treasury, following the *cūrṇikāra*, without any major changes.

### (iii) Upadeśapada, *gāthā* 139 -

चाणक्के वणगमणं मोरियचंदं तह थेरि रोहणया ।

उवयारत्थग्गहणं धणसंवरणं च विन्नेयं ॥

The whole life-story of Cāṇakya from birth to death is indicated here with few key-words. Municandra, the commentator of Upadeśapada, elaborates the biography in total 178 *gāthās*.

**(iv) Upadeśapada, *gāthā* 196**

जह चेव चंदउत्तस्स विब्भमो सव्वहा ण चाणक्के ।  
सव्वत्थ तहेतस्सवि एत्तो अहिगो सुहगुरुम्मि ॥

The content of the *gāthā* can be summarized as -

When a disciple has a complete faith in his preceptor, he becomes a recipient of immense spiritual progress. For explaining this fact, the example of Cāṇakya and Candragupta is given. And it is noted that due to the impeccable faith in Cāṇakya, Candragupta enjoyed the royal prosperity.

On the whole, we can say that the reverence for the both, Cāṇakya and Candragupta, is seen even in the short and suggestive *dvāragāthās* of the Upadeśapada.

**[C] Satirical reference in the Dhūrtākhyāna**

Haribhadra's satirical work Dhūrtākhyāna (Dhuttakkhāṇa) is enumerated among the few celebrated classics in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit. We do not find any direct reference of Cāṇakya in this small poem (*khaṇḍa-kāvya*) but it is worth-seeing how Haribhadra describes Khaṇḍapānā, 'the lady don' among the five hundred rogues. He says -

अह भणइ खंडवाणा विहसंती अत्थसत्थणिम्माया ।  
बुद्धीइ अहिअबुद्धी धुत्ते तुल्लेउं वयणमिमं ॥

Dhūrtākhyāna 5.1 (p.24)

“Taking into consideration all the narrations of the rogues (*dhūrtas*), Khaṇḍapānā, the creator of the Arthaśāstra, the most intelligent lady-rogue started her narration with a cunning smile on her face.”

When Haribhadra paints a picture of an intelligent, shrewd and crooked lady using deceitful means to acquire wealth, he immediately remembers Cāṇakya and says ironically that (as if) she is the composer of the Arthaśāstra, a science of polity. Indirectly Haribhadra has highlighted the aspects of shrewdness and crookedness in the personality of Cāṇakya.

### **General Remarks on Haribhadra's Cāṇakya :**

- \* Haribhadra is very keen on depicting Cāṇakya as a Jaina householder.
- \* He emphasises the skill of Cāṇakya to gather wealth.
- \* According to Haribhadra, the pair of Cāṇakya-Candragupta is the pair of ideal *guru-śiṣya*.
- \* Haribhadra might have minutely studied the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra during his formal education.
- \* He highlights Cāṇakya's *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi* again and again but the part of Cāṇakya's death is missing in his writing.
- \* In spite of the satirical attitude reflected in the Dhūrtākhyāna, generally the sense of appreciation is seen through all the references found in Haribhadra's literature.

**[24] The Kuvalayamālā of Uddyotanasūri** is a grand novel written in classical Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī during the 8<sup>th</sup> century A.D. This text is written in *campū* style and is full of rich cultural data. We find the references of Cāṇakya in this text, in the following manner -

- (i) “जहिं च णयरीहिं जणो देयणओ अत्थ-संगह-परो य, --- सिक्खविज्जंति जुवाणा कलाकलावइं चाणक्कसत्थइं च ।” (Kuvalayamālā, p.56 - lines 27-28)

“There, in the city of Vārāṇasī people were wealthy and munificent. Young people were instructed in various arts and sciences as well as the sciences composed by Cāṇakya etc.”

It is noteworthy that Uddyotana's reference is very specific. In the 8<sup>th</sup> century, the study of Cāṇakya's Arthaśāstra was in vogue along-with the other Arthaśāstras.

(ii) At another place, while describing 16 types of *deśī* dialects, Golladeśa is referred to in the following manner -

तत्थ य (हट्ठमग्गे) पविसमाणेण दिट्ठ अणेय-देस-भासा-लक्खिए देस-वणिए ।  
तं जहा -

कसिणे णिट्ठुर-वयणे बहुक-समर-भुंजए अलज्जे य ।  
'अड्ढे' उल्लवंते अह पेच्छइ गोल्लए तत्थ ॥

“When he entered the busy market-streets of the city, he saw the merchants of various regions speaking their dialects. They were mentioned as - People of *golladeśa* were black, harsh-speaking, excessively passionate, combative and brazen. They were repeatedly using the word ‘*aḍḍe*’ in their conversation.”

If we presume that *golla* is the region around the river Godāvārī, then we can ascribe Cāṇakya as a ‘*dākṣiṇātya*’. The Śvetāmbara writers generally have accepted *golladeśa*, as the birth-place of Cāṇakya. In that case the Digambara accounts of the arrival of Cāṇakya to *dakṣiṇāpatha*, at the end of his life, cannot be negeted totally.

In nutshell, the Kuvalayamālā's references to *cāṇakya-śāstra* and *golla* are both important for exploring Cāṇakya in the Jaina literature.

### [25-26] Śīlāṅka's Views about Cāṇakya

Śīlāṅka, famous for his ‘Cauppanna-mahā-purisa-cariya’ has written two Sanskrit commentaries on the first two aṅga canons (viz. the Ācārāṅga and Sūtrakṛtāṅga) in the 9<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

(i) Ācārāṅga-ṭīkā runs as -

भार्यानिमित्तं रागद्वेषोद्भवः, तद्यथा – चाणाक्येन भगिनीभगिनीपत्याद्यवज्ञातया भार्यया चोदितेन नन्दान्तिकं द्रव्यार्थमुपगतेन कोपान्नन्दकुलं क्षयं निन्ये । (Ācārāṅga-  
ṭikā p.100)

The point of discussion is - ‘How the feelings of attachment and aversion are created while interacting with our dear ones ?’ For explaining the point, the example of Cāṇakya and his wife is given.

In the above-mentioned passage, many incidents are noted briefly viz. humiliation of Cāṇakya’s wife by her sisters and their husbands ; Cāṇakya’s arrival to the court of Nanda for getting donation ; his insult in the palace and his revenge on Nanda. Śīlāṅka follows the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi in this small passage but the context and presentation is different. Secondly, he uses the word Cāṇākya in Sanskrit, following Hariṣeṇa, a Digambara ācārya.

**(ii) In the Sūtrakṛtāṅga-ṭikā,** we find one-line comment on Cāṇakya.

‘तथा चाणक्याभिप्रायेण परो वञ्चयितव्योऽर्थोपादनार्थम् । (p.169)

According to Śīlāṅka, Cāṇakya intends that one should employ deceitful means to acquire wealth.

“With the help of Śīlāṅka’s passing remarks, one cannot know his exact attitude towards Cāṇakya. The revengeful nature and deceitful means of Cāṇakya are looked at with a sense of reproach.”

### **[27] Cāṇakya : From Jayasimha’s outlook**

The Dharmopadeśamālā with *vivaraṇa* is a collection of traditional narratives written with new perspective during the 9<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The *dvāragāthās* and stories both are written by the same author, Jayasimha. Two stories of Cāṇakya are found in this text. Both the stories start with *dvāragāthās*. The stories are not new because the author himself has given references of the Āvaśyaka-niryukti-cūrṇi-ṭikā and Upadeśamālā. But it is the contribution of

Jayasimha to provide new context and new outlook to the old stories.

**(i) Dharmopadeśamālā, *dvāragāthā* 40 (p.129) is as follows -**

हिययगयं सभ्भावं गिण्हिज्जा तयणुरूव-चिट्ठाहिं ।  
जह गिण्हइ चाणक्को वणियाणं नच्चमाणाणं ॥

“For knowing the truth, hidden in the minds of others, one should behave and act like them to win their belief. The example of Cāṇakya is revealing because he made the merchants to dance and knew the details about their real financial position.”

A sense of appreciation is clearly seen in the above-mentioned *dvāragāthā*. The story of merchants is presented at length with a few changes after this *dvāragāthā*. We have already seen that Śīlāṅka disregards Cāṇakya for his deceitful means to gather wealth. Jayasimha looks at the episode from a different angle and praises him.

**(ii) Dharmopadeśamālā, *dvāragāthā* 50 (p.138) is as follows -**

भावं विणा करेतो मुणि-चेट्ठं पावए मोक्खं ।  
अंगारमद्दओ विव अहवा वि सुबंधु-सचिवो व्व ॥

“One who observes the monkhood outwardly and does not enhance the spirit of religion in his mind, will never attain liberation. Their are two examples. One is that of *aṅgāra-mardaka* and the second is of the minister - Subandhu.”

After quoting this *dvāragāthā*, a story containing forty lines is given. it covers the last part of the life of Cāṇakya and Subandhu. Cāṇakya's death is designated as *iṅgiṇī-maraṇa*. It is noted that like an excellent Jaina householder, he distributed and donated his wealth to 'Jina-sādhū-saṁgha-śramaṇa-brahmaṇas'. We do not find the reference of his wife, sons, grandsons or other relatives. The detached attitude of cāṇakya is highlighted.

The story of Subandhu - after the death of Cāṇakya, is focused by Jayasimha because Jayasimha wants to unveil the pseudo-monkhood of Subandhu.

**Remarks :**

Thus, from the both stories, it can be guessed that Jayasimha possesses a feeling of honour and regard towards Cāṇakya. In the first story the author wants to highlight Cāṇakya's great skill of mind-reading and in the second story, Cāṇakya's detached and self-less attitude towards life.

**[28] The Kathākoṣaprakaraṇa of Jineśvarasūri**, a collection of narratives written in the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D., is a Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī text, which represents Cāṇakya in a unique manner. Muni Jinavijayaji has written a studied introduction to the Kathākoṣa<sup>0</sup>. Jinavijayaji has located textual references given by Jineśvara from Āyurveda, Dhanurveda, Nāṭyaśāstra, Kāmasāstra and particularly the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra (Intro.pp.123-124). The Sundarīdattakathānaka of the Kathākoṣa<sup>0</sup> provides a lot of details by paraphrasing the actual words of Kauṭīliya in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit. The related passage can be quoted at this place, as a specimen. The text runs as follows-

(i) “किं रज्जं सुकरं काउरिसेहिं ? --- नियकलत्तस्स वि न वीससियव्वं । निययपुत्ताण अमच्च-सामंताण परिकखणं कायव्वं । करि-तुरय-वेज्ज-पउमतार-महासवइ-दूय-संधिविग्गहिय-पाणिहरिय-महाणसिय-थइयावाहय-सेज्जवाल-अंगरक्खाइयाणं चङ्गुणा कायव्वा । पडिराईण य पहाणमंतियण-सामंतभेयणं विहेयं । ---अवि य - पडिरायगोहववएसेणं कूडलेहकरणेणं सुवण्णपेसणभूमिविलंभेण य नियमंतिसामंता परिक्खियव्वा । पुत्ता वि मंतीहिं सामंतेहिं य गुत्तमंतेहिं भाणियव्वा, जहा - रायाणं गेण्हिय तुमं रज्जे ठावेमो ति । --- सुंकद्वणेसु वणिज्जारए पेसिय लंचादाणेण सुंकभंगं काराविय कारणिया परिक्खियव्वा । इच्चेवमाइ सव्वत्थ अविस्सासो कायव्वो । --- अंब ! जो रज्जसिरिं पालिउं समत्थो सो पव्वज्जं पि पालिउं समत्थो।” (pp.176-177)

We can locate almost each sentence of this passage in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra, particularly in the first *adhikaraṇa* and more precisely in the *adhyāyas* from 8 to 20. A queen is persuading her son to accept kingship. The prince explained to her as to why he was reluctant to become a king. He says, “One has to rear a feeling of constant disbelief while ruling a country. At every moment you have to be cautious. You have to put spies on almost each and every important person. Oh mother, I think, one who is able to govern a country, can observe the monkhood very easily.”

The above-mentioned passage reflects the author’s acquaintance with the Arthaśāstra and also his regard for Cāṇakya, who guided the king Candragupta and accepted detached life, at the end of his life-span.

(ii) In the Sundarīdatta-kathānaka, a merchant named Sāgara, highlights the importance of the Arthaśāstra, because charity, enjoyment and religious ceremonies are related to the financial condition of a person. Sāgaradatta’s thoughts remind us the famous Cāṇakyaśūtra, viz. ‘अर्थमूलौ धर्मकामौ ।’

(iii) Jineśvara, in his another text viz. the Pañcaliṅgī-prakarāṇa mentions, “A kind-hearted person should not study Cāṇakya, Pañcatantra, Kāmandaka etc. because these treatises encourage deceitful activities, treachery, breach in trust and so many bad things.” (Kathākoṣa<sup>0</sup>, Introduction p.56).

To sum up, we can say that, instead of giving Cāṇakya-narratives, Jineśvara prefers to paraphrase the actual text of the Arthaśāstra which is his unique way to follow the legacy of Cāṇakya in the Jain tradition.

**[29-30-31] Abhayadeva's understanding of Kauṭilya and the  
Arthaśāstra**

Abhayadeva was a versatile literary personality of the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D. Among his vast literature, his commentaries on nine canonical texts are important, due to which he got the epithet - 'navāṅgī tīkākāra'. Like his predecessors Abhayadeva has not repeated the famous Cāṇakyan tales. His references about Cāṇakya and his Arthaśāstra are occasional and brief. The language is Sanskrit.

**(i) Commentary on Sthānāṅga 4.4.361, p.281**

**Context :** A monk endures various kinds of troubles (*upasargas*) afflicted upon him by human beings, gods and animals. The man-created *upasargas* are further divided into four kinds. The third subvariety is *vīmaṁsā* (troubles created during discussion or consultation). Abhayadeva quotes the example in the following words -  
“विमर्षाद्यथा चाणक्योक्तचन्द्रगुप्तेन धर्मपरीक्षार्थं लिङ्गिनोऽन्तःपुरे धर्ममाख्यापिताः  
क्षोभिताश्च साधवस्तु क्षोभितुं न शकिता इति ।”

“Cāṇakya advised Candragupta to test the religiosity of heretics (*brahmin* ascetics) and (the Jaina) monks. Candragupta kept all the monks in the vicinity of his harem.

Heretics were agitated due to the rise of erotic feeling in their minds while the Jaina monks remained unperturbed.”

Abhayadeva quotes this story on the line of the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi but very briefly and in the different context of *pariśahas*. Hemacandra documents this incident in his *Pariśiṣṭa-parva* in the elaborative manner. Abhayadeva depicts Cāṇakya as a Jaina lay votary and proves the superiority of the Jaina monks after proper examination. Abhayadeva here wants to glorify Cāṇakya for his impartial justice based on sufficient evidence.

**(ii) Commentary on the Samavāyāṅga 30 gā.26, p.55**

Abhayadeva explains the word ‘*kathādhikataṇāni*’ as follows-  
 “कथा-वाक्यप्रबन्धः शास्त्रमित्यर्थस्तद्रूपाण्यधिकरणानि कथाधिकरणानि-  
 कौटिल्यशास्त्रादीनि प्राण्युपमर्दनप्रवर्तकत्वेन तेषामात्मनो दुर्गतावधिकारिकत्वकरणात्,  
 कथया वा क्षेत्राणि कृषत गामसूयतेत्यादिकया अधिकरणानि तथाविधरूपाणि ।”

The purpose of this long sentence is to establish the relation between the Jaina technical term ‘*adhikaraṇa*’ and the fifteen *adhikaraṇas* (chapters) of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra.

According to the Jaina terminology ‘*adhikaraṇa*’ means the base or support of various acts of violence. In fact, many times this word is used as a synonym of violence (*himsā*). Abhayadeva knows that various *adhikaraṇas* (chapters) of the Arthaśāstra are written to encourage the subjects in farming, cattle-breeding etc. According to the Jaina notions, all these activities incur violence and therefore all are ‘sinful activities’.

Abhayadeva looks at the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra as a science which creates trouble to the earth, vegetation, animals etc. He adds that one who follows this science, causes *durgati* to one’s self.

From the context, it is clear that Abhayadeva negates the study of the Arthaśāstra for monks and nuns by giving the etymology of the word ‘*adhikaraṇa*’. We have to understand that Abhayadeva does not intend to extend this rule to the lay-votaries which owe to the merchant-class, whose traditional vocations are कृषि-गोरक्ष-वाणिज्य (i.e. farming, cattle-rearing and commerce).

**(iii) Commentary on the Jñātādharmakathā, 1.15, p.12**

Abhayadeva quotes -

“अर्थशास्त्रे - अर्थोपायव्युत्पादग्रन्थे कौटिल्यराजनीत्यादौ ।”

Here, Abhayadeva describes prince Abhayakumāra who was well-versed in various *śāstras*. In the long list of *śāstras* he enumer-

ates the Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, which is a treatise on polity and which encourages to create and increase wealth. The word 'राजनीत्यादौ' suggests that at the time of Abhayadeva (i.e. 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) there were many treatises on polity among which the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra was probably the first and foremost.

### **Conclusive Remark :**

Thus, after the scrutiny of the Cāṇakya-references given by Abhayadeva, we come to know that, for him, the study of the Arthaśāstra is necessary for a good governance and the prosperity in the mundane life but for a monk, who is engaged in the spiritual progress of the soul, there is no need to study the Arthaśāstra because it is full of *adhikaraṇas* (means of violence).

**[32] The Sukhabodhā-ṭīkā** of Nemicaṇḍra alias Devendraṇḍa is a reputed commentary on Uttarādhyayana. The explanations are given in Sanskrit while the concerned traditional stories are written in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī prakrit, during the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D. This book is widely studied by the Indian and foreign scholars of Prakrit. Two references are found in this commenatry.

### **(i) Commentary on Uttarādhyayana 2.17**

It records some of the important details in the life of Sthūlabhadra. The narrative starts from the history of the rise and fall of some important cities in the Magadha kingdom. The details are given in the following manner -

“In ancient times, Kṣitipratīṣṭhita city was prosperous. When it's glory perished, Caṇakapura was settled. After that Ṛṣabhapura became glorious, then Rājagṛha, then Campā and then Pāṭaliputra. Śakaṭāla was the minister of the 9<sup>th</sup> Nanda.”

Though Hemacandra has written the whole Śakaṭāla-Sthūlabhadra narrative in the 8<sup>th</sup> canto of the Parīśiṣṭa-parva on the same lines of

Sukhabodhā, still the history of Magadhan cities is the unique feature of Sukhabodhā. Though the sources are taken from the Āvaśyaka (तहा कहाणयं आवस्सए दट्ठवं - p.31) the history of the above-mentioned cities is absent there.

## (ii) Commentary on the Uttarādhyayana 4.1

At this place, Devendra notes the ten traditional examples of the rareness of the human birth, given in the *niryukti* - ‘चोल्लग पासग धन्ने’ etc. While explaining ‘*pāsaga*’, viz. dices, the story of the miraculous dices produced by Cāṇakya is mentioned. Though the small episodes of *pāsaga* was sufficient, Devendra could not resist the temptation to give the life-story of Cāṇakya. Thus he copied the first half of the Cāṇakya-narrative.

The story is a mere repetition, still it is noteworthy that Devendra has passed a favourable remark about ‘*cāṇakya-nīti*’, which is not found in the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi or even in the latter literature. When Parvataka was about to die, Candragupta came forward to save him. Cāṇakya stopped him by raising his eyebrow. Devendra remarks -

चाणक्केण भिउडी कया इमं नीतिं सरंतेण -  
 “तुल्यार्थं तुल्यसामर्थ्यं , मर्मज्ञं व्यवसायिनं ।  
 अर्द्धराज्यहरं भृत्यं , यो न हन्यात्स हन्यते ॥”

(Sukhabodhā-ṭīkā p.58b)

It means, “It is almost a rule in the politics that if one does not kill a person (lit. servant) who has equal wealth and strength, one who knows the secrets, who is industrious and who is the master of the half of the kingdom, then it is likely to be killed by him at the earliest opportunity.”

The above-mentioned verse quoted in the defence of Cāṇakya

is sufficiently eloquent in depicting the soft attitude of the author towards Cāṇakya.

**[33] The Oghaniryukti-ṭīkā** includes a passing reference of Cāṇakya on *niryukti gā.*418 in which the strict orders of Cāṇakya about passing excreta and urine are mentioned. The commentary on Oghaniryukti is written by Droṇācārya in the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D. We have already discussed this reference in the 4<sup>th</sup> number of this chapter. So, the reader may go through the details given at that place.

**[34] The Vyavahāra-bhāṣya-ṭīkā of Malayagiri** written in the 12<sup>th</sup> century A.D. holds a peculiar position among the *chedasūtras* because it contains the narratives of the revolutionary personalities like Ārya-Rakṣita, Ārya-Kālaka, king Sātavāhana, *anārya* king Muraṇḍa, the versatile monk Pādālipta, *amātya* Cāṇakya, thief Rohiṇeya, *muni* Viṣṇukumāra and many others.

The term *vyavahāra* carries multiple meanings viz. daily routine, behavior, work, dealing, trade, commerce, legal dispute or procedure etc. But especially in the Jaina monastic conduct, the term designates nine or ten types of *prāyaścitta* (expiation or atonement). When a monk (or nun) transgresses a general rule of conduct, it is compulsory for him (or her) to expiate properly.

**Context :** Vyavahāra-bhāṣyagāthās from 715 to 718 (continuous numbers) and the concerned commentary of Malayagiri, is dedicated to the topic of ‘*pravacana-rakṣā*’ i.e. ‘protection of the preaching of the Jinas and the fourfold *saṃgha*’. It is told that one should adopt sober ways to make the king favourable to the *pravacana*. As far as possible hot discussions should be avoided. A monk can use his miraculous powers, chants or powders etc. to persuade the king. In spite of this, if the king does not change his merciless and malacious

attitude towards *pravacana* and *saṃgha*, then he should be uprooted with the help of others.

While commenting *gāthā* 716, the story of Cāṇakya and Naladāma (name of a weaver) is given by Malayagiri. In the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*, the story is given in a brief manner. Malayagiri gives the narrative in a very elaborate manner.

The summary of the story is -

Nanda was driven away by Cāṇakya. Candragupta was installed on the throne. After some time, the followers of Nanda created nuisance by theft and robbery. They bribed the policemen and continued their anti-king acts. Cāṇakya was in search of a reliable and faithful person to curb their activities. He saw Naladāma who was busy in burning the holes of insects because his son was bitten by the insects. Cāṇakya appointed Naladāma to teach a lesson to the followers of Nanda. Naladāma followed the advice of Cāṇakya. He called all of them for dinner with their families and cut off their heads. While commenting on *gā.*91, Malayagiri says -

“तदेवं यथा चाणिक्येन नन्द उत्पाटितो यथा नलदाम्ना मत्कोटकाश्चोराश्च समूला उच्छेदितास्तथा प्रवचनप्रद्विष्टं राजानं समूलमुत्पाटयेत् । --- ते सर्वे शुद्धाः प्रवचनोपघातरक्षणे प्रवृत्तत्वात् ॥” (Vyavahāra-bhāṣya p.77)

### Observations :

\* At first, we feel that it is very odd that a monk, who observes a complete vow of non-violence, is preached here to retaliate a king by employing ruthless measures. But when we think of the situational difficulties, it seems natural and practical (*vyavahārya*) from the point of view of *pravacana-rakṣā* (survival of the Jaina faith).

\* Malayagiri has categorically pointed out that if a monk is involved in eradicating a king who is completely adverse to the *pravacana*, he is not liable to a blame or stigma. Further, it is noted that if he dwells

at the royal residence more than two or three days, he should expiate *cheda* or *parihāra*.

\* For the *bhāṣyakāra* and Malayagiri, Cāṇakya and Naladāma are so praiseworthy that they are represented here as the idols for monks. In nutshell, we can say that Cāṇakya is admired here for the purity of his intentions in spite of his harsh and ruthless measures of administration and thus confirms the relation between *chedasūtras* and *cāṇakyaśūtras*.

**[35] The Yugaḍi-jinendra-carita** written by Vardhamānasūri is also known as Ādinātha-carita. Vardhamānasūri was busy in his literary activities during the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D. In this book, the whole life-history of Cāṇakya is found at length (pp.49-55).

**Context :** King Samprati of the *maurya* dynasty is adored in the Jaina history. According to the Jaina tradition, he was a complete Jainized king. Therefore the Jaina writers thought that it is necessary to narrate the complete history of *mauryas* while depicting Samprati. In the present text, Vardhamāna started Kuṇāla-kathā (Kuṇāla - the blind father of Samprati) with the life-sketch of Cāṇakya-Candragupta.

**Language and Style :** The big narrative is written in the classical Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. Vardhamāna's style is very lucid, properly embellished with *alamkāras* and decorated with crisp dialogues. It is written mainly in prose but Sanskrit and Prakrit verses are used inbetween to maintain the interest of the readers. The details of Cāṇakya-Candragupta are taken from the *cūṛṇis* on Āvaśyaka and Daśavaikālika. It seems that Vardhamāna knows the narratives of Cāṇakya written by all his predecessors viz. Haribhadra, Jayasimha and specially the non-Jaina dramatist Viśākhadatta.

### Some observations on Vardhamāna's Cāṇakya-kathā :

- \* Probably this is the largest prose narrative written in Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī.
- \* An attempt has been made by Vardhamāna to depict the whole continuous biography without topic-wise division like - *pārīṇāmikī-buddhi*, rareness of human birth, gathering of wealth for the royal treasury, *ājñābhāṅga* etc. In his story, every episode seems to be the natural culmination of the previous one and the springwell of the next one.
- \* Although the *brāhmaṇatva* of Cāṇakya is clear, every possible occasion is exploited to hammer the *śrāvakatva* of Cāṇakya, from start to end. Especially the nine verses put in the mouth of Cāṇakya after the acceptance of *īṅginī-maraṇa*, throw light on the well-versedness of Cāṇakya in the Jaina religion. In the last verse it is noted that due to the *paṇḍita-maraṇa*, Cāṇakya was reborn in the heaven.
- \* In this context, it is quite surprising that Vardhamāna has omitted the incidents of (i) praising the heretics and (ii) the account of famine and two disciples of Sussthitācārya. Probably he has not gone through the Nīśītha-cūrṇi.
- \* Vardhamāna repeats the verse 'कोशेन भृत्यैश्च ---' from the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi. 'तुल्यार्थं तुल्यसामर्थ्यं ---' is the verse, which is quoted by Vardhamāna as well as by Devendra in the Sukhabodhā-ṭīkā. Both the works are contemporary.
- \* In the present narrative, Cāṇakya addresses Candragupta: 'अरे ! वृषल ! स्वतन्त्र इव लक्ष्यसे, नेदं कर्तव्यं'. This sentence reminds us of the drama Mudrārākṣasa of Viśākhadatta. The vocative frequently used for Candragupta by Cāṇakya is 'vṛṣala'. It seems that Vardhamāna is acquainted with the Mudrārākṣasa. The Āvaśyaka-

cūrṇi notes that Candragupta was born in the caste of *maurya-poṣakas*, which is a lower caste. Therefore Vardhamāna has chosen the word ‘*vṛṣala*’ for Candragupta imitating Viśākhadatta.

- \* Subandhu-Cāṇakya - episode is written at length. In the last monologue, Cāṇakya’s repentance is expressed in peculiar Jaina terminology. It is noted that Cāṇakya begged for forgiveness for all except Subandhu.
- \* Cāṇakya’s death is designated as ‘*anaśana*’ or ‘*iṅgiṇī-marāṇa*’ - a perfect religious death according to the Jaina norms.
- \* Vardhamāna has not added his disregardful comments anywhere in the whole biography of Cāṇakya. Cāṇakya’s good governance is appreciated. Nowhere his *kauṭilya* (crookedness) or *māyā* (deceitfulness) is despised.

The author’s perception about Cāṇakya can be truly described in Vardhamāna’s own words -

मइमाहप्यं सो च्चिय चाणक्को धरउ जीवलोगम्मि ।

Long live the fame of Cāṇakya in the world, the brilliant one!

**[36] The Viśeṣāvaśyaka-bhāṣya-ṭīkā** of Maladhārī Hemacandra is a text written in the 12<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

While commenting on the word ‘सुबहुलिविभेयनिययं’, which occurs in *gāthā* 464 of the Viśeṣāvaśyaka-bhāṣya. The commentator says -

तत्र सुबह्व्यो या एता अष्टादश लिपयः शास्त्रेषु श्रूयन्ते, तद्यथा - हंसलिवी भूयलिवी --- । तह अनिमित्ती य लिवी चाणक्की मूलदेवी य ।

In this passage, total eighteen scripts are enumerated. Cāṇakya-script is one of them.

Dr. Hiralal Jain has made an effort to explain all these scripts with the help of Yaśodhara’s commentary on the Kāmasūtra. About the *cāṇakya*-script Dr. Hiralal Jain says -

“In *kauṭīlīyā* (or *cāṇakyaī*) script, the letter kṣa (क्ष) is added at the end of each word. Short and long vowels are mutually exchanged. *Anusvāras* and *visargas* take place of each other. The tradition of *cāṇakyaī* and *mūladevī* script is very old and people used them for a long time.” (भारतीय संस्कृति में जैनधर्म का योगदान, p.286)

In the *Ardhamāgadhī* text *Samavāyāṅga*, a list of eighteen scripts is given but *cāṇakyaī* and *mūladevī* scripts are not mentioned. It is noteworthy that in the narrative literature of the Jainas, *Mūladeva* is a famous personality like *Cāṇakya*.

Thus, the rarest reference of *cāṇakyaī*-script preserved by *Maladhārī Hemacandra* is really valuable.

**[37] The Upadeśamālā-ṭīkā** of *Ratnaprabhasūri* is a didactic text full of narratives written in the 12<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The *dvāragāthās* are written by *Dharmadāsagaṇi* and the commentary is written by *Ratnaprabhasūri*. We find two references of *Cāṇakya* in this text. The first one is a passing reference and the second one is the full life-account of *Cāṇakya* given in a very different context with the author's remarks inbetween.

**(i) Upadeśamālā-ṭīkā p.347 line 3 :**

अहो महिला पगईए चेव चाणक्कवंकभावं विसेसेइ ।

While describing the natural deceitful attitude of womanfolk, *Ratnaprabha* comments, ‘Oh ! a woman instinctively surpasses the crookedness of *Cāṇakya* very easily.’

The author's sweeping remark throws light on his attitude towards womankind in general and towards *Cāṇakya* in particular.

**(ii) Upadeśamālā-ṭīkā Dvāragāthā 150, pp.354-363**

Context of the *Dvāragāthā* :

In the 149<sup>th</sup> *dvāragāthā*, *Dharmadāsagaṇi* discusses the reliability of one's own son through the example of *Śreṇika* and *Koṇika*.

In the present *dvāragāthā* he says -

लुद्धा सकज्जतुरिआ , सुहिणोऽवि विसंवयंति कयकज्जा ।  
जह चंदगुत्तगुरुणा , पव्वयो घाइओ राया ॥

“The person who is greedy and very much anxious to fulfil his motive it is seen that after the fulfilment of his purpose, he betrays even his close friend. See ! how the preceptor of Candragupta (i.e. Cāṇakya) killed the king Parvataka by treacherous means !”

The present *dvāragāthā* provides sufficient clue to the commentator to despise various deeds of Cāṇakya. Following this guideline, Ratnaprabha presents the whole biography of Cāṇakya with his own critical remarks in total 182 *gāthās*. The language is Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī with the occasional use of Sanskrit and Apabhraṃśa. It will not be out of place if we provide some examples for understanding Ratnaprabha’s viewpoint.

(a) During his wanderings with Candragupta, Cāṇakya tore up the belly of a *brahmin* to get curd-rice to feed Candragupta who was extremely hungry. Dharmadāsa exclaims,

महासाहसिओ एसो , को सक्कइ बंभहच्चमिय काउं । (p.357 *gā.60*)

None other than Cāṇakya will dare to perform a sin of *brahmahatyā* i.e. killing a *brahmin* of one’s own caste !

(b) Cāṇakya’s ungrateful nature is censured in the episode of Parvataka, in harsh words. The author remarks -

(तत्रापि मित्रोत्तमे) । कौटिल्यः कुटिलां क्रियामिति दधौ धिग्धक्कृतघ्नान् जनान्।  
(p.358 *gā.86*)

“Parvataka was their best friend (who contributed a lot to acquire the kingdom). Still the crooked Kautilya acted treachously to him. Down with such ungrateful persons !”

(c) While commenting upon the episode of *grāma-dāha* (burning the village) Ratnaprabha exclaims - ‘आः केयं क्रूरकर्मप्रसररसिकता’

‘What a great taste in merciless acts !’

And he further adds, ‘सोऽयं कटुकुटिलमतेर्निर्विवादः प्रमादः’ (p.359 *gā.98*) i.e ‘It is certainly a serious offence of that crooked Cāṇakya.’

### Observations :

Though Ratnaprabha uses a lot of pejorative phrases to describe Cāṇakya, it is surprising that he depicts the end of Cāṇakya in the traditional manner. It is noted that Cāṇakya accepted *īngiṇī-marāṇa* after a great lament of repentance.

जह जह करीसजलणेण , तस्स धन्नस्स डज्झइ देहो ।

तह तह पलयं पावंति , कूरकम्माइं कम्माइं ॥ (p.363 *gā.175*)

“As the body of the blessed one (i.e. Cāṇakya) was burnt by the blazing fire in the cow-dungs, all his cruel deeds slowly disappeared.” The author further adds, ‘Due to the pure meditation and equanimity of mind, Cāṇakya acquired heavenly realm of birth.’

Thus in spite of all the cruel, ungrateful and crooked acts undertaken by Cāṇakya throughout his life, Cāṇakya stands as an iconic figure to Ratnaprabha due to his noble death !

**[38-39] The Upadeśa-pada-ṭīkā** of Municandra is a collection of narratives written in poetical form during the 12<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The narratives suggested in the *dvāragāthās* by Haribhadra are expounded in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit by Municandra.

(i) *Dvāragāthā* 139 contains the life-story of Cāṇakya in nutshell. Municandra spares 178 *gāthās* to document it (pp.109-114). Each and every incident noted down by all the previous writers is included in this biography. In the story-line, nothing is new. Therefore literary translation of *gāthās* is avoided. The noteworthy points of this story are -

\* Every opportunity is exploited to depict Cāṇakya as a Jaina householder from start to end. Even the voluntary death of Cāṇakya is

designated as an outcome of his *pāriṇāmikī buddhi*.

- \* The legacy of the traditional verse viz. ‘कोशेन भृत्यैश्च ----’ is retained.
- \* Municandra’s large narrative is not simply a collection of scattered accounts but he has joined each incident to the next one with a great skill.
- \* The description of the fierce war between Candragupta and Nanda, is Municandra’s new addition. He might have thought that it is necessary to highlight the valour of Candragupta and parvataka. It adds a new measure to the traditional character of Candragupta as a ‘puppet-king’.
- \* Generally Municandra avoids to pass his own remarks inbetween the story but at the horrific incident of *grāma-dāha* he remarks -  
 बारनिरोहेण पलीविऊण गामो सबालवुड्ढो सो ।

दड्ढो दुवियड्ढमइत्तणेण चाणक्कपावेण ॥ (p.111 gā.89)

“Cāṇakya, the evil-doer, closed all the gates of the village and with his puffed-up crooked intellect, burnt the whole village including children and old persons.”

- \* At the incident of famine, the *Niśītha-cūrṇi* documents the name of the preceptor as ‘Susthita’, but Municandra gives the name as ‘Sambhūtavijaya’.
- \* Municandra specifically mentions that Cāṇakya was the ‘śāsanapālaka’ i.e. the actual administrator, through Candragupta was a throned king, Municandra’s Cāṇakya gives his word to Sambhūtavijaya to take care of the *pravacana* i.e. the religious order of the Jinas in Candragupta’s kingdom. (gā.128)
- \* The author depicts Cāṇakya as an expert surgeon. Cāṇakya saved the foetus of the queen by a precise cut on her belly. (gā.134) The exaggeration is quite clear in upgrading Cāṇakya as a skilful

surgeon.

- \* When Cāṇakya decided to accept voluntary death, Municandra says, 'He distributed his wealth among his sons, grandsons and relatives.' This reference is not reliable because the author has not mentioned elsewhere about Cāṇakya's family except his wife.
- \* The incident of the death of Cāṇakya caused by Subandhu, the ex-minister of Nanda is presented by Municandra in a slightly different manner. The author says -

न य नाऊण वि सिद्धं सुबन्धुविलसियं तया रत्नो ।

चाणक्येण पेसुन्नकडुविवागं मुणंतेण ॥ (p.114 gā.160)

After having realized the false allegation of Subandhu, Cāṇakya kept mum and told nothing to the king because he knew that *parapaisūnya* (slandering others) is enumerated among the 18 *pāpasthānas*.

- \* The word '*adhikaraṇa*' used in the *gāthā* 170 consists a pun because it is used in the sense of 'violent acts' as well as in the sense of 'chapters of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra'.
- \* From this long narration, it is evident that Municandra possesses high regards for Cāṇakya and looks at his death as an essence of his *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*. Municandra further adds that due to his repentance and the true meditation of *pañcaparamēṣṭhin*, all the sinful acts of Cāṇakya burnt away slowly along-with his body. (p.114 gā.170-171)

(ii) While commenting upon the 196<sup>th</sup> *dvāragāthā* of Upadeśapada, municandra explains - "As Candragupta acquired the excellent prosperity in the form of kingdom, due to his firm faith on his *guru* Cāṇakya, likewise a true loyal disciple acquires hundred times more glory in the form of his spiritual upliftment due to his firm faith in

his spiritual preceptor.”

Thus Cāṇakya and Candragupta both are the idols for the Jaina tradition.

**[40] The Paṛiśiṣṭa-parva** of Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.) is famous by the name - ‘Sthavirāvalīcaritram’. This treatise, written in Sanskrit holds a peculiar position among the legendary histories (viz. *prabandhas*) written by the Jaina authors. In ‘Triṣaṣṭi-śalākāpuruṣa-caritra’, Hemacandra has documented the history of the ‘powerful’ or most aptly the ‘illustrious’ Jaina personalities. In the present work, he has documented the biographies of the ‘*sthaviras*’, viz. Jambūsvāmī, Prabhava, Śayyambhava, Yaśobhadra, Bhadrabāhu, Sthūlabhadra, Sambhūtavijaya, Ārya Mahāgiri, Ārya Suhasti, Vajrasvāmī and Ārya Rakṣita in 13 cantoes (*sargas*).

The Paṛiśiṣṭa-parva is closely connected with the political history of Magadha. While describing the biographies of Bhadrabāhu and Sthūlabhadra, Hemacandra takes into account the royal dynasties viz. the Nandas and Mauryas. Hemacandra has given a deep thought to all the available material whether oral or written about Cāṇakya, the kingmaker. The Āvaśyaka-literature is his main source still he has not neglected the latter narrative and didactic literature. Cāṇakya-carita, written by the Śvetāmbara *ācārya* Hemacandra, is the first and authentic biography written in the classical Sanskrit.

The actual Cāṇakya-account starts from the 194<sup>th</sup> verse of the eighth canto and ends at the 469<sup>th</sup> verse of the same canto. The episode of Subandhu extends upto the 13<sup>th</sup> verse of the ninth canto, where the Cāṇakya-story really ends.

### **Comparative remarks on Hemacandra’s Cāṇakya-kathā :**

(1) The Golla region, Caṇaka village, Caṇī *brahmin* are the same like the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi. The name Caṇeśvarī, Cāṇakya’s mother is

added, which is most probably imaginary one.

(2) The prophesy of the baby-boy was told by a *sādhū* in the *ĀvCū*. Hemacandra presents it in a more Jainized way. He says, ‘ज्ञानिनो जैनमुनयः पर्यवात्सुश्च तद्गृहे’ – The knowledgeable Jaina monks reside for some time at the house of the householder Caṇī (8.195)

(3) The *śrāvakatva* of Cāṇakya is described very effectively, in the following manner -

चाणक्योऽपि श्रावकोऽभूत्सर्वविद्याब्धिपारगः ।

श्रमणोपासकत्वेन स सन्तोषधनः सदा । (8.200-201)

The layman Cāṇakya was well-versed in all *vidyās*. He possessed contented attitude due to his being a layman (a Jaina householder).

(4) Name of Cāṇakya’s wife is not mentioned in the *ĀvCū* and *Pari-P*. The incident of her insult due to her poverty is described at length in the *Pari-P*. Cāṇakya’s decision to approach Nanda at Pāṭaliputra for getting some donation is same in both of the texts. Śīlāṅka’s perception is a bit different. In the *Ācārāṅga-ṭīkā* he presents this incident as an example of *rāga-dveṣa* i.e. Cāṇakya’s attachment towards wife and hatred towards the king Nanda.

(5) The episode of Cāṇakya’s insult in the court of Nanda is almost same. The *ĀvCū* mentions the specific day as the full-moon-day in the month of *kārttika*. Hemacandra ignores the day. The ‘*siddhaputra*’ in the *ĀvCū* is the ‘Nanda-putra’ in the *Pari-P*. In both of the texts, Cāṇakya was actually driven away by a female-servant (*dāsī*).

(6) The famous verse quoting Cāṇakya’s oath viz. ‘कोशेन भृत्यैश्च --’ etc. is not literary quoted by Hemacandra. He paraphrases the same purport in the following manner -

सकोशभृत्यं ससुहृत्पुत्रं सबलवाहनम् ।

नन्दमुन्मूलयिष्यामि महावायुरिव द्रुमम् ॥ (8.225)

(7) The often-quoted incident of *śikhāmocana* (unfastening the tuft of the hair) is absent in the ĀvCū. Hemacandra has not included it in the main Sanskrit text but it is given as a foot-note by quoting one Sanskrit and one Prakrit verse.

(8) Cāṇakya's quest for a proper person to retaliate upon Nanda is mentioned briefly in the ĀvCū and Pari-P. It is not clear in both of the texts whether the daughter of the *mayūrapoṣaka* of Nandas was pregnant due to Nandas or not. Candragupta's birth in the low-caste is told in a suggestive manner without any comment.

(9) The fulfilment of the pregnancy-longings and the birth of Candragupta is described at length by Hemacandra. (8.230-8.239)

(10) A number of episodes are documented in the Pari-P according to the ĀvCū uptill Candragupta becomes a sovereign king after the death of Parvataka. At this particular juncture, Hemacandra mentions the exact date of Candragupta's coronation in the following verse -

एवं च श्रीमहावीरमुक्तेर्वर्षशते गते ।

पञ्चपञ्चाशदधिके चन्द्रगुप्तोऽभवन्नृपः ॥ (8.339)

‘Thus after 155 years after Mahāvīranirvāṇa, (i.e. 372 B.C.) Candragupta became the king.’

The exact date is not given in the ĀvCū and thus throws light on Hemacandra's sense towards historicity and provides important literary evidence for the date-fixation of Candragupta's coronation. Hemacandra's attitude towards chronology is really worthy of appreciation.

(11) The incident of appointing a guard for the vigilance of Nanda's followers is same in the ĀvCū and Pari-P.

(12) The episode of *grāma-dāha* is repeated with a slight elaboration. In the Nīśitha-cūrṇi it is presented as an example of *ājñā-bhaṅga*

(disobeying the orders) and Cāṇakya is praised for his strictness. Hemacandra avoids to pass his personal comments on the varied cruel acts of Cāṇakya.

**(13)** Two instances are given to exhibit Cāṇakya's efforts to increase the royal treasury. The incident of *kūṭa-pāśaka* (fake-dices) is mentioned in the ĀvCū as an example of Cāṇakya's *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*. In the Pari-P it is just an episode in the flow of narration without any title-tag. In the Dharmopadeśamālā and Upadeśapada-ṭīkā, the example of *kūṭa-pāśaka* is told to underline the rareness of human birth.

The second instance in which Cāṇakya instigates the merchants to disclose their wealth is very popular in many Jaina story-books written in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. The Dharmopadeśamālā quotes this story as a device to know the real intention of the people. Almost all other writers present the story as an example of *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*. In the Pari-P Cāṇakya is praised for such brilliant ideas to increase the royal wealth. Hemacandra exclaims -

चक्रे समर्थमर्थेन तेन मौर्यं चणिप्रसूः ।

धियां निधिरमात्यो हि कामधेनुर्महीभुजाम् ॥ (8.376)

“Cāṇakya made the Mauryan kingdom financially very sound. The prime-minister, having such brilliant ideas is like a *kāmadhenu* for the king”.

**(14)** The severe famine of twelve years and the story of *ācārya* Susthita is narrated at length in the NisCū to explain a rule for a Jaina monk. In the Piṇḍa-niryukti-bhāṣya also the story is presented to prohibit *antardhāna-piṇḍa*. The Pari-P dedicates 37 verses (i.e. 8.377 upto 8.414) to narrate the story. Every now and then Hemacandra emphasizes the laymanship of Cāṇakya.

**(15)** Hemacandra thinks that the story of *para-pāsaṇḍa-pasaṃsā* can

be employed to highlight the inclination of Candragupta towards heretics and Cāṇakya's firm faith on the Jaina religion (8.415 upto 8.435). At the end of this story Hemacandra specifically mentions that, "When the king saw the detachment of the Jaina monks and attachment of the heretics in sensual pleasures, he was practically converted to the Jaina faith."

The ĀvCū presents this story in brief. The role of Cāṇakya's wife is important in the ĀvCū, but it is dropped in the Pari-P. The ĀvCū wants to convince that one should not praise the heretics even out of courtesy. It creates a breach in faith which is told as a transgression of *samyaktva*.

Vardhamāna in the Yugādi-jinendra-carita and Abhayadeva in the Sthānāṅga-ṭīkā have presented this story in the same context of *samyaktva*. Hemacandra goes a step forward and describes Candragupta's acceptance of the Jaina faith.

**(16)** The scattered details of Cāṇakya's life are thus gathered and properly presented by Hemacandra in the Pari-P. He mentions Candragupta's death as '*samādhimaraṇa*' but the date and other details are not given.

The story of Bindusāra's birth is documented in short. It is mentioned that Subandhu was appointed as a minister by Cāṇakya with the consent of Candragupta. Subandhu's ministership was continued in the regime of Bindusāra. After the sad demise of Candragupta, Subandhu conspired against Cāṇakya due to jealousy and vindictiveness. Subandhu become successful in creating ill-feelings and disregard towards Cāṇakya in Bindusāra's mind. When Cāṇakya grasped this attitude of aversion in Bindusāra, he decided to retire from his position as a prime-minister and accepted the vow of voluntary death (*anaśana*) after distributing his wealth etc. to the needy people.

In spite of Bindusāra's efforts to persuade him, Cāṇakya remained stable in his vow. At the end, Subandhu deceitfully set fire on Cāṇakya. With a great determination, Cāṇakya endured the severe pains and embraced death with a great courage. He acquired '*devagati*' in the next life.

In the ninth canto, the story of Subandhu is seen extended up to the 13<sup>th</sup> verse. Cāṇakya's life-account in the Pari-P ends here.

The narrative of Cāṇakya, Subandhu and Bindusāra is quoted in the NisCū in different context than that of the Pari-P. It is prescribed in the Niśītha-sūtra that, "A monk should not smell and enjoy the *sacitta gandha* and if he smells, a punishment is there in the form of atonement." The example of Subandhu is given who smelt the poisonous birch-leaf kept in a box by Cāṇakya and became a monk unwillingly.

In the Dharmopadeśamālā, this story is presented in a different context. The writer wants to teach a lesson that, "If renunciation is outwardly imposed upon somebody, it is futile because one cannot attain spiritual progress by observing vows out of compulsion."

The same story is found in the Upadeśapada-ṭīkā and Upadeśamālā-ṭīkā in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī with the comments of the authors inbetween. The regardful mention of Cāṇakya's religious death is noted in various *prakīrṇakas* like the Āturapratyākhyāna, Saṁstāraka, Bhaktaparijñā, Maraṇavibhakti and Ārādhana-patākā. Cāṇakya's death is designated as *anaśana*, *iṅgiṇī* and *prāyopagamana*.

### **Salient Features of Pariśiṣṭa-parva :**

- \* Systematic collection of Prakrit narratives presented in 288 Sanskrit verses.
- \* Authentic Śvetāmbara version of Cāṇakya-biography.
- \* Historical importance due to mentioning two important dates (corona-

tion of Candragupta and death of Bhadrabāhu).

- \* No direct contact between Bhadrabāhu-Sthūlabhadra and Cāṇakya-Candragupta.
- \* Abrupt end of Candragupta at Pāṭaliputra.
- \* Death of Cāṇakya near Pāṭaliputra.
- \* Mention of 12 years famine at Magadha.
- \* Bhadrabāhu's journey towards Nepal and not towards the south.
- \* Repeated use of the same name 'Cāṇakya' (not Kauṭilya or Viṣṇugupta).
- \* Purposeful use of the Jaina terminology to underline Cāṇakya's laymanship.
- \* Constantly emphasizing the *brahmanic* features of Cāṇakya.
- \* Absence of the most favourite myth of 'unfastening the tuft'.
- \* Hemacandra's acquaintance with the Mudrārākṣasa can be guessed from the Subandhu episode.
- \* No direct mention of Cāṇakya's Arthaśāstra, Bhadrabāhu's Chedasūtra or the first Pāṭaliputra-vācanā of Śvetāmbara canons.

### **Comprehensive rating of Cāṇakya reflected in the Paṇiṣṭa-parva:**

The Āvaśyaka and Nisītha literature presents Cāṇakya with the sense of extreme regard. In the later texts, particularly in the Upadeśapada-ṭīkā and Upadeśamālā-ṭīkā, Cāṇakya's deceitful nature, crookedness, anger and vindictive nature is mentioned and commented upon. At very few places, hemacandra mentions Cāṇakya as निस्त्रिंश (ruthless 8.268) ; धूर्त (rouge 8.300) and उग्रधी (furious 8.455). But when we see Hemacandra's Cāṇakya in a broad perspective, a profuse use of honourific epithets is seen every now and then. Hemacandra's sense of extreme regard can be sensed through his conclusive remark -

दारुप्रायो दह्यमानोऽप्यकम्प्यो मौर्याचार्यो देव्यभूतत्र मृत्वा (8.469)

**[41] The Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi-nāmamālā** of Hemacandra (12<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) is a lexicon dedicated to the proper-nouns of famous personalities. This Sanskrit work provides valuable information about Cāṇakya in the following verse -

वात्सायने मल्लनागः कौटल्यश्चणकात्मजः ।

द्रामिलः पक्षिलस्वामी विष्णुगुप्तोऽङ्गुलश्च सः ॥ 853 ॥

According to Hemacandra, these eight proper-nouns are synonyms. It means Hemacandra has mentioned seven other names of Cāṇakya. He has personally chosen the name 'Cāṇakya', still in the course of narration he has used the names - 'caṇiprasū' and 'caṇakātmaja' for metri-causa. In the Pari-P none of the other names are employed.

In the self-commentary of the above-mentioned verse, Hemacandra provides us the etymology of each name with the concerned grammatical rules. The detailed scrutiny of each word is a vast subject of research. At this place, we will neglect the grammatical part and try to gather the additional information provided by Hemacandra.

Hemacandra has enumerated three popular names of Cāṇakya in the concerned verse. Therefore, whatever the modern thinkers opine, at least for Hemacandra, it is certain that Kauṭilya, Cāṇakya and Viṣṇugupta are the names of the same person.

Some Indologists like A.B.Keith mention that, 'According to Hemacandra, the *kāmasūtrakāra* Vātsyāyana is none other than the *arthaśāstrakāra* Kauṭilya.' Actually it is not clear in the citation quoted by Hemacandra that by the name Vātsyāyana he intends to mention *kāmasūtrakāra*.

If we accept the etymology of *dramila* as 'द्रामिले देशे भवो द्रामिलः', then the birthplace of Cāṇakya is modern Tamilnāḍa. In that case the word 'golla-viṣaya' mentioned in the most of the Śvetāmbara

texts can be interpreted as a region around the river *Godāvārī*. We can locate the word ‘*aḍḍe*’ mentioned in the *Kuvalayamālā* in Tamil language. It is a very supportive fact that the old manuscripts of the *Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra* are in the Tamil and Telugu scripts. The Digambara writers hold the view that Cāṇakya came to the southern region in his last days. So, for conjecturing the south-Indian origin of Cāṇakya, Hemacandra’s present citation is favourable.

A peculiar physical feature of Cāṇakya is noted in the name ‘*amṅula*’. The citation can be interpreted in two ways -

- (i) One, who is benefit of one fingure. OR
- (ii) One, having deformity in one of the fingures.

The myth about the teeth of Cāṇakya is repeated in many of the Śvetāmbara texts. But the deformity of his fingers is noted only in the present citation. If we generalize the myths into Cāṇakya’s ugly appearance, it contradicts the reference of Kāmandaka where he says that Cāṇakya was ‘*darśaniya*’. Thus the riddle of Cāṇakya’s physical appearance remains unsolved.

Hemacandra uses the word ‘*Kauṭalya*’ (not *Kauṭīliya*) and mentions -

कुटो घटस्तं लान्ति कुटलाः कुम्भीधान्याः तेषां अपत्यं कौटल्यः ।

In this etymology, he follows the *Kāmandakīya Nitisāra*. Some scholars think that it is a fictitious etymology. If we suppose the fictitiousness for a time being, still one fact remains that Hemacandra is totally against the word ‘*Kauṭīliya*’ which indicates the crookedness of Cāṇakya. It seems that Viśākhadatta’s famous terminology ‘*कौटिल्यः कुटिलमतिः*’ was not acceptable to Hemacandra.

While explaining the word *Caṇakātma*, Hemacandra introduces Cāṇakya’s father as a ‘*ṛṣi*’. The peculiar word underlines the brahminhood of Cāṇakya’s father and raises question-mark on his

laymanship. This contradiction provides scope for the elements of Jainification in the case of Cāṇakya's father and to some extent Cāṇakya also.

The name '*mallanāga*' is explained thus - मल्लो नवनन्दोच्छेदने स चासौ नागश्च मल्लनागः - which means - "Who is like a wrestler as well as like an elephant in eradicating 'nine' (or 'the new') Nandas."

Hemacandra's etymologies of the names 'पक्षिलस्वामी' and 'विष्णुगुप्त' do not provide any noteworthy information.

Thus, Hemacandra's explanatory citation of the Abhidhānacintāmaṇi provides valuable information about Cāṇakya which we do not get from the Hindu *purāṇic* sources and not even from the other Jaina sources.

**[42] The Saṃkṣipta-taraṅgavatī-kathā (Taraṅgalolā)** is technically a *khaṇḍakāvya* written in the classical Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī by Nemicandraṇi during the 13<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

We have already seen that in the Kathākoṣaprakaraṇa of Jineśvara, the paraphrase of some of the *kauṭilyan sūtras* is found at particular places. Likewise, in the Taraṅgalolā, wherever the situation arises, Nemicandra quotes the concerned part of the Arthaśāstra in his own words.

It is mentioned by Nemicandra in the introductory verses of the poem that his book is based on the romantic and miraculous poem Taraṅgavatīkathā of Pādalipta (2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D.). The references to the Arthaśāstra and Arthaśāstrakaras might have occurred in the text of Pādalipta who is always enumerated among the list of the '*prabhāvaka ācāryas*' in the Jaina tradition. Nemicandra describes a female messenger in the following manner -

तो भणति अत्थसत्थम्मि वण्णियं सुयणु सत्थयारेहिं ।  
 दूती परिभव-दूती न होइ कज्जस्स सिद्धिकरी ॥ *gā.853* ॥

“Oh young lady, it is told by the *śāstrakāras* in the *Arthaśāstra* that when a female-messenger is humiliated, she becomes unable to fulfil her given task successfully.”

This verse and the next two verses actually describe the same content expressed in the 16<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of the 1<sup>st</sup> *adhikaraṇa* of the Kauṭīliya *Arthaśāstra* titled, ‘Sending a messenger and his performance.’

These type of references exhibit the well-versedness of the Jaina authors in the pan-Indian *śāstric* knowledge and at the same time, shows the deep-rootedness of Kauṭīliya’s polity in the medieval history of India.

**[43] The Piṇḍaniryukti-avacūri of Kṣamāratna** is a Sanskrit commentary written on the Piṇḍaniryukti with *bhāṣya* during the 14<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

The story of the severe drought and Susthita *ācārya* with his two disciples, is repeated in this *avacūri* (*gā.500* - *bhāṣya* 35,36,37 ; p.91). This small story is actually the literal Sanskrit version of the story quoted in the *Niśītha-cūrṇi*. Slight differences can be enumerated as -

- \* Cāṇakya is designated as a ‘*mantrīn*’ and not as an ‘*amātya*’.
- \* The author is not very keen to depict Cāṇakya as a Jaina householder. The Jainification is almost absent in the whole story.
- \* The use of hybrid Sanskrit vocabulary is quite noteworthy. viz. क्षुल्लौ (two junior monks), विटालित (contaminated), मुत्कलिनौ (freed) etc.

**[44] The Vividha-tīrtha-kalpa of Jinaprabhasūri** holds an important position among the *prabandha* literature of the Jinas. The

mythological and legendary history of 40 places of pilgrimage in India is documented in 40 chapters (*kalpas*). Jinaprabha has used both the languages i.e. Sanskrit and Prakrit (Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī). This fourteenth-century-text is widely studied by Prakritists, Sanskritists and particularly by Orientalists due to its historical importance.

We get the reference to Cāṇakya (Jinaprabha refers his name as 'Cāṇikya') in the 36<sup>th</sup> chapter entitled 'Pāṭaliputra-nagara-kalpa'. Since Cāṇakya is supposed to be a historical personality and the history of Jainism and Cāṇakya is related with Magadha and particularly with Pāṭaliputra, we gather a lot of information from Jinaprabha. But we become totally disappointed when we find only two passing references to Cāṇakya in this chapter. Jinaprabha documents one-line-story as below -

‘तत्रैव च चाणिक्यः सचिवो नन्दं समूलमुन्मूल्य मौर्यवंश्यं श्रीचन्द्रगुप्तं न्यवीविशद्विशांपतित्वे ।’ (p.69)

“There, Cāṇikya-the minister completely uprooted Nanda. The great Candragupta of the *mauryan* dynasty was installed upon the throne by him.”

After this, Jinaprabha has enumerated Candragupta's successors very briefly in a single line. Samprati's contribution to Jainism is underlined. The story of femine is repeated here in a brief manner. The only remarkable thing is, among all the names of Cāṇakya, Jinaprabha has used the name 'Viṣṇugupta', which is very rare in the Jaina tradition.

We can conclude that during the 14<sup>th</sup> century A.D., the Cāṇakya-narrative was on the verge of disappearance from the horizon of the Śvetāmbara literature.

### [3] References of Cāṇakya in the Digambara literature:

#### (A) 13 references in tabular form

The serial order mentioned in this chart is thus -

Serial No. - Century - Name of the Language -

Title of the Work - Name of the Author - Reference

Number - Gist of the Reference.

#### Language-abbreviations used :

JŚ. = Jaina Śaurasenī ; Skt. = Sanskrit ; Apa. = Apabhramśa

1. 3<sup>rd</sup> ; JŚ. ; Bhagavatī Ārāḍhanā ; Ācārya Śivakoṭi ; gā.1551, one verse ; Death of Cāṇakya. 3<sup>rd</sup> ; JŚ ; Bhagavatī Ārāḍhanā ; Ācārya Śivakoṭi ; gā.2070, one verse ; Names of Śakaṭāla-Vararuci & Mahāpadma-nanda.
2. 4<sup>th</sup> ; JŚ. ; Mūlācāra ; Vaṭṭakera ; Passing reference to Kauṭilya's book as a heretic text.
3. 6<sup>th</sup> ; JŚ. ; Tiloya-Paṇṇatti ; Ācārya Yativṛṣabha ; 4.1481, one verse ; Initiation of Candragupta.
4. 10<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Bṛhatkathākośa ; Hariṣeṇa ; Story no.143, Total 85 verses ; Whole Biography.
5. 10<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Nītivākyāmrta ; Somadeva ; Abridged version of the Arthaśāstra.
6. 11<sup>th</sup> ; Apa. ; Kahakosu ; Śricandra ; Sandhi 50, *kaḍavakas* 11-18 ; Short Biography.
7. 11<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. Mūlācāra-ṭikā ; Vasudevanandī ; Two-fold explanation of the word *kauṭilya-dharma*.
8. 11<sup>th</sup> ; JŚ. ; Gommaṭasāra (J.) ; Nemicandra ; one verse ; The names of the heretic texts.
9. 12<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Pūṇyāśrava-kathā-kośa ; Rāmacandra-mumukṣu ; Story no.38 ; Selected incidents from the whole biography.

10. 13<sup>th</sup> ; Skt. ; Ārādhana-kathā-prabandha (Kathākośa) ; Prabhācandra ; Story no.80, pp.212-217 ; Short version of Hariṣeṇa's story.
11. 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> ; Apa. ; Bhadrabāhu-Cāṇakya-Candragupta-kathānaka ; Raidhū ; *kaḍavakas* 8,9 ; Small part of a short poem having total 28 *kaḍavakas*.
12. Cāṇakya-ṛṣi-kathā ; Devācārya ; Manuscript noted in Jinaratna-kośa.
13. 16<sup>th</sup> ; Hindi ; Hindi commentary on Puṇyāśrava-kathā-kośa ; Pt. Daulatram Kashaliwal ; pp.155-157 ; old Hindi translation.

**(B) Translation, explanation and observations on each reference**

**[1] The Bhagavati Ārādhana** (Ārādhana/Mūlārādhana) is probably the oldest Jaina Śauraseī treatise of the Digambaras, documenting the death of Cāṇakya as a religious or voluntary death called *pādopagamana*.

A list of distinguished persons with the brief accounts of their voluntary death is given in several verses i.e. from *gā*.1534 up to *gā*.1553.

*gā*. 1551, runs thus -

गोट्टे पाओवगदो सुबंधुणा गोब्बरे पलिविदम्मि ।  
डज्झंतो चाणक्को पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्ठं ॥

“Even if set on fire by Subandhu at *gobbara-grāma*, in that blazing condition at a cow-pen, Cāṇakya accomplished the ultimate aim of human life (i.e. acquired higher heaven or liberation).”

**Comments :**

- \* The horrific end of Cāṇakya is documented along-with the name of his rival - Subandhu.

- \* The Śvetāmbara texts contemporary to the Bhagavatī Ārādhana are the Anuyogadvāra and the Niryuktis (Āvaśyaka<sup>0</sup>, Piṇḍa<sup>0</sup> and Ogha<sup>0</sup>). These texts highlight the intellect of Cāṇakya and some other details but Cāṇakya's death is not mentioned.
- \* We get the reference to Mahāpadma-nanda and his two ministers named Śakaṭāla and Vararuci in the 2070<sup>th</sup> verse of the Bhagavatī Ārādhana. The suicide of Śakaṭāla is treated there as a religious death. This information matches with the details given in the Kathāsaritsāgara.
- \* Commentators of the Bhagavatī Ārādhana do not throw light on both the verses (No.1551 and No.2070) hence we get little information about Cāṇakya.

**[2] The Mūlācāra of Vaṭṭakera** is a Jaina Śaurasenī text written during the 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The Digambaras treat this text as an authentic guidebook of the monastic conduct. A stray reference to Kauṭilya occurs in the 257<sup>th</sup> *gā.* of the Mūlācāra in the following manner -

कोडिल्लमासुरक्खा भारहरामायणादि जे धम्मा ।

होज्ज व तेसु विसुत्ती लोइयमूढो हवदि एसो ॥

“The religion preached in the book of Kauṭilya, in the texts dedicated to the well being of a human (i.e. *āyurveda*) as well as the texts like (Mahā) Bhārata and Rāmāyaṇa is of course based on misconceptions (*laukika-mūḍha*) and common people are misguided by these texts.” (Further on, disregard towards the *vedas* is shown in the next verse.)

#### Comments :

- \* Vaṭṭakera has cautioned the monks against the *mithyā-śrutas* (false scriptures of the heretics).

- \* The same attitude is seen in the contemporary Śvetāmbara texts viz. the Anuyogadvāra and Nandī. Vaṭṭakera and his commentator is totally against the study of these texts and particularly against the writings of Kauṭilya while *nandikāra* has smoothen his tone and advises to the monks to read it with *samyak-dṛṣṭi* (enlightened world-view).
- \* The commentator Vasudevanandī (Vasunandī ?) belonging to the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D., has explained the verse fully and harsh comments are passed.

**[3] The Triloka-prajñapti** of Yativṛṣabha is a Jaina Śaurasenī text which is enumerated under ‘*karaṇānuyoga*’ and is written inbetween the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D. and 8<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The text is divided into nine *mahādhikāras* (i.e. chapters). The 148<sup>th</sup> *gāthā* of 4<sup>th</sup> *mahādhikāra* runs as follows -

मउडधरेसुं चरिमो जिणदिक्खं धरदि चंदगुत्तो य ।  
तत्तो मउडधरा दु प्पव्वज्जं गेव गेण्हंति ॥

“Among the crowned kings, Candragupta was the last one, who was initiated in the tradition of the Jinas. Further on, none of the crowned king accepted such *dikṣā*.”

### Observations :

- \* In the Triloka-prajñapti, Candragupta is mentioned and we find no reference to Cāṇakya or Kauṭilya.
- \* Many scholars have suggested that this Candragupta is not a Mauryan king but a king belonging to the Gupta dynasty.
- \* If this text belongs to the 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> century, the authors of the *cūrṇis* and *īkāś* of the Ardhamāgadhī texts might not have failed to mention Candragupta Maurya’s *dikṣā*-ceremony. Even Hemacandra, an alrounder genius possessing certain historical sense describes

Candragupta Maurya's death in a very simplified manner. He says -

बिन्दुसारे प्रपेदाने वयो मन्मथवल्लभम् ।  
समाधिमरणं प्राप्य चन्द्रगुप्तो दिवं ययौ ॥

Pari-pa, sarga 8 verse 444

This reference confirms that Candragupta Maurya has not taken *dīkṣa* and has not moved towards south as depicted by Hariṣeṇa. Hemacandra never associated this Mauryan king with the first Bhadrabāhu.

**[4] The Br̥hatkathākoṣa** of Hariṣeṇa is the oldest collection of the narratives available in Sanskrit which is written during the 10<sup>th</sup> century A.D. Hariṣeṇa is a Digambara writer who collected 157 traditional narratives of the famous historical personalities. In these narratives he has given the full life-accounts of Bhadrabāhu, Vararuci, Svāmi Kārttikeya etc. These narratives are written in poetical-form. It seems that Hariṣeṇa has got the inspiration from the Bhagavati Ārādhana in which the names of the personalities are referred to in a brief manner.

The 143<sup>rd</sup> tale is titled as, 'Cāṇakya-muni-kathānakam' (pp.336-338) in which Cāṇakya's whole biography is documented in 85 Sanskrit verses. As the main source of the Śvetāmbara narratives of Cāṇakya is the Āvaśyaka literature, likewise Hariṣeṇa's Cāṇakya-muni-kathā is the spring-well of the legacy of Cāṇakya in the Digambara literature.

Here, an attempt has been made to give literal translation of each verse of Cāṇakya-kathā accurately as far as possible. Afterwards, the salient features of this narrative are noted in comparison with the Śvetāmbara accounts of Cāṇakya.

### Cāṇakya-muni-kathānakam

(1) पुरेऽस्ति पाटलीपुत्रे नन्दो नाम महीपतिः ।

सुव्रता तन्महादेवी विषाण(?)दललोचना ॥

Once upon a time, Nanda was the king of Pāṭalīputra. Suvratā was his chief queen, having the eyes like lotus petals.

(2) कविः सुबन्धुनामा च शकटाख्यस्त्रयोऽप्यमी ।

समस्तलोकविख्याता भूपतेरस्य मन्त्रिणः ॥

There were three famous ministers of the king viz. Kavi, Subandhu and Śakaṭa.

(3) अस्मिन्नेव पुरे चासीत् कपिलो नाम माहनः ।

तद्भार्या देविला नाम चाणक्यस्तत्सुतः सुधीः ॥

In the same city, there was a *māhana* (? *brahmin*) called Kapila. Devilā was his wife and Cāṇakya was their son, who was intelligent.

(4) वेदवेदाङ्गसंयुक्तः सर्वशास्त्रार्थकोविदः ।

समस्तलोकविख्यातः समस्तजनपूजितः ॥

Cāṇakya was wellversed in the *vedas*, *vedāṅgas* and in different *śāstric* texts. Due to his intelligence and learning, he became famous and adorable to the people.

(5) नीलोत्पलदलश्यामा पूर्णिमाचन्द्रसन्मुखी ।

यशोमतिः प्रिया चास्य यशोव्याप्तदिगन्तरा ॥

Yaśomatī was his wife, having a lustre like a blue lotus, possessing a moon-like face and whose fame was spread over far and wide.

(6) कपिलस्य स्वसा तन्वी नाम्ना बन्धुमती परा ।

विधिना कवये दत्ता मन्त्रिणे कपिलेन सा ॥

Bandhumatī was the sister of Kapila. She was given in marriage to the minister Kavi with a proper religious ceremony.

(7) प्रत्यन्तवासिभूपानां क्षोभो नन्दस्य भूभुजः ।

कविना मन्त्रिणा सर्वो यथावृत्तो निवेदितः ॥

One day the minister Kavi told the king Nanda about the actual facts of the agitation and outbreak of the negihbouring kings against him.

(8) कविवाक्येन भूपालो नन्दो मन्त्रिणमब्रवीत् ।

प्रत्यन्तवासिनो भूपान् धनं दत्वा वशं कुरु ॥

Having thought over the report of Kavi, Nanda suggested Kavi to pacify the agitated kings by offering handsome amount of money.

(9) नरेन्द्रवाक्यतोऽनेन मन्त्रिणा कविना तदा ।

वितीर्णं लक्षमेकैकं राज्ञां प्रत्यन्तवासिनाम् ॥

As per the suggestion of the king, Kavi distributed one lac golden coins to each of the agitated negihbouring kings.

(10) अन्यदा नन्दभूपालो भाण्डागारिकमेकम् ।

पप्रच्छेदं कियन्मानं विद्यते मद्गृहे धनम् ॥

On another occasion, king Nanda asked his treasurer confidentially, 'Oh, tell me how much wealth is there in my treasury ?'

(11) नन्दवाक्यं समाकर्ण्य धनपालो जगावमुम् ।

भाण्डागारे धनं राजन्न किञ्चिद्विद्यते तव ॥

After having heard the query of Nanda, the treasurer told the fact that there is nothing left in the treasury.

(12) प्रत्यन्तवासिभूपानां कविना तव मन्त्रिणा ।

नरेन्द्र दत्तमेतेषां त्वदीयं सकलं धनम् ॥

He added, 'Oh king, Kavi, your minister has given out all your wealth to the negihbouring kings.'

(13) निशम्य तद्वचो राजा पुत्रदारसमन्वितम् ।

अन्धकूपे तं वेगान्मन्त्रिणं निदधौ रुषा ॥

After having heard the report, the king was enraged and gave immediate orders to throw the minister into an old hidden well, along-with his family.

(14) एकैकं सकलं तत्र शरावं भक्तसंभृतम् ।

दीयते गुणयोगेन कवये हि दिने दिने ॥

The king ordered his servants to provide the meal to Kavi in the earthenware plate, on each day.

(15) अत्रान्तरे कविः प्राह कुटुम्बं निजमादरात् ।

अन्धकूपसमासंगदुःखसंहतमानसः ॥

(16) वैरनिर्यातने यो हि समर्थो नन्दभूपतेः ।

स परं भोजनं भुङ्क्तां शरावेऽत्र सभक्तके ॥

In the meantime, Kavi, who was extremely hurt due to the seclusion in the well, addressed his family with a great concern, 'Whoever among you is able to retaliate the enmity of the king Nanda, should take this platterful of meal daily.'

(17) कविवाक्यं समाकर्ण्य तत्कुटुम्बो जगाद तम् ।

त्वमेव भोजनं भुङ्क्व शरावे सौदनं द्रुतम् ॥

After having heard the speech of Kavi, the family-members exclaimed unanimously, 'Sir, you should immediately start to dine the rice-plate in order to bring the desired effects.'

(18) उक्तं कुटुम्बमेतेन कविनासन्नवर्तिना ।

अन्धकूपान्तरे खात्वा बिलं तत्तटगोचरम् ॥

(19) तत्तटस्थः प्रभुञ्जानः शरावे सौदनं तदा ।

एवमुक्त्वा बिलं कृत्वा कविस्तस्थौ रूषान्वितः ॥

Kavi explained his whole scheme to his near and dear ones. He told that he intend to dig an opening at the other end of the burrow and it is possible for him if he has a meal every day. Thus he carried out his scheme, nurturing great fury in his mind.

(20) वर्षत्रयमतिक्रान्तं तत्रस्थस्य कवेः स्फुटम् ।

जीवनं चास्य संजातं मृतमन्यत् कुटुम्बकम् ॥

In this manner, three years of Kavi's life elapsed. At the end, all his family-members passed away and his life was spared.

(21) किंवदन्तीं तकां ज्ञात्वा कवेः कोपारुणक्षणैः ।

प्रत्यन्तवासिभिः भूपैर्वेष्टितं नन्दपत्तनम् ॥

When the negihbouring kings knew the hearsay about Kavi, they furiously beseiged the capital-city of Nanda.

(22) स्मृत्वा कवेः क्षणं राज्ञा नन्देनायमुदारधीः ।

पादयोः पतनं कृत्वा कूपादुत्तारितः पुनः ॥

When this calamity occured, Nanda immediately remembered his intelligent minister Kavi. The king saluted his feet and rescued him from the well.

(23) क्षमापणं विधायास्य नन्देनायं प्रचोदितः ।

वरं ब्रूहि महाबुद्धे प्रसन्नोऽस्मितव स्फुटम् ॥

Nanda asked Kavi to forgive him and told him, 'Oh intelligent one, I am pleased. I offer you a boon. please express your wish, I will fulfil it.'

(24) नन्दस्य वचनं श्रुत्वा कविरूचे नरेश्वरम् ।

स्वहस्तेन मया द्रव्यं दातव्यं ते न चान्यतः ॥

Having heard Nanda's boon, Kavi told king Nanda, 'I will surpervise all the transactions of the treasury. It is my privilege to give out the wealth from the royal treasury and of none others.'

(25) निशम्य वचनं तस्य भूभुजा मन्त्रिणः कवेः ।

प्रतिपन्नं सभामध्ये बालवृद्धसमाकुले ॥

The king accepted the condition of the minister Kavi, in the assembly full of (the ministers as well as) children and elderly persons.

(26) अन्यदा भ्रमताऽनेन कविना द्रव्यमिच्छता ।

दर्भसूचीं खनन् दृष्टश्चाणाक्यश्चात्र संगतः ॥

Once Kavi was wnadering here and there, thinking about the means of gathering wealth for the royal treasury. Suddenly he saw Cāṇākya (Cāṇakya) who was deeply engrossed in digging out the root of the needle-like grass.

(27) दृष्ट्वाऽमुं कविना पृष्टश्चाणाक्यः स्वपुरः स्थितः ।

भट्ट किं कारणं दर्भसूचीं खनसि मे वद ॥

When Kavi saw Cāṇākya in front of him, he asked, 'Oh *brahmin*, why are you digging out this *darbha* grass ?'

(28) कवेर्वचनमाकर्ण्य चाणाक्यो निजगावमुम् ।

दर्भसूच्याऽनया विद्धो ब्रजन् पादे सुतीक्ष्णया ॥

After having heard the words of Kavi, Cāṇākya answered, 'The sharp point of this *darbha* grass pierced my foot.'

(29) पश्य पादमिमं भिन्नमनया रुधिरारुणम् ।

शेषतोन्मूलयाम्येतां दर्भसूचीं नरोत्तम ॥

'Oh gentleman, see my bleeding foot. I am going to dig this sharp grass upto its root.'

(30) अवाचि कविना भूयश्चाणाक्यः खिन्नविग्रहः ।

खातं बहु त्वया विप्र पर्याप्तं खननेन ते ॥

When Kavi saw Cāṇākya completely fatigued with exertion, he said again, 'Oh *brahmin*, you have dug it sufficiently. So now stop it.'

(31) कविवाक्यं समाकर्ण्य चाणाक्यो निजगावमुम् ।

तदाग्रहसमुद्भूतविस्मयव्याप्तमानसः ॥

Cāṇākya was surprised at Kavi's insistence and said his mind was overwhelmed by wonder and he exclaimed -

(32) मूलं नोन्मूलते यस्य तत्किं खातं भवेद् भुवि ।

स किं हतो नरैरज्ञैश्छिद्यते यस्य नो शिरः ॥

'What is the use of the digging unless the thing is completely uprooted ? Foolish are those persons who intend complete destruction of a man and still do not cut his head off.'

(33) यावन्मूलं न चाप्नोति दर्भसूच्याः कृताग्रसः ।

भूयो भूयः प्रबन्धेन तेन यावत् खनाम्यहम् ॥

'Unless I reach the root of this wretched grass, I will dig again and

again.'

(34) निशम्य तद्वचः सत्यं नन्दस्य सचिवः कविः ।

दध्यौ स्वचेतसि स्पष्टं विस्मयाकुलमानसः ॥

When Kavi heard that passionate utterances (of Cāṇakya), first he wondered and ascertained in his mind clearly about the personality of Cāṇakya.

(35) नन्दभूपालवंशस्य समर्थस्य महीतले ।

नाशं करिष्यति क्षिप्रं एष कोऽपि महानरः ॥

This great person is quite capable to destroy quickly the whole dynasty of the Nanda kings, who are mighty on the earth.

(36) चिन्तयित्वा चिरं तत्र सभामध्ये जनाकुले ।

श्लोकमेकं लिलेखेमं कविर्विस्मितचेतसा ॥

Greatly amazed at his revelation, kavi wrote a verse thoughtfully, on the central pillar of the court of Nandas, always bustled with people, in an astonished mood.

(37) नरेणैकशरीरेण ( ? शक्यमेकसहस्रेण ) नयशास्त्रयुतेन च ।

व्यवसायेन युक्तेन जेतुं शक्या वसुन्धरा ॥

A person wellversed in the science of polity and having great resolve with efforts, is able to win the whole earth with the help of a thousand warriors.

(38) अन्यदाऽयं विलोक्यात्र श्लोकमेकं विचक्षणः ।

लिलेख निजहस्तेन चाणाक्यो धीरमानसः ॥

(39) नरेणैकशरीरेण नयशास्त्रयुतेन च ।

व्यवसायेन युक्तेन जेतुं शक्या वसुन्धरा ॥

Once Cāṇakya saw the verse (written on the pillar). The witty and courageous Cāṇakya wrote another verse with his own hand (carrying out a slight important change). 'A person alone, wellversed --- is able to win the whole earth.'

(40) इमं लिखितमालोक्य कविः श्लोकं मनोहरम् ।

चाणाक्योपरि संतुष्टश्चेतसाश्चर्यमीयुषा ॥

Kavi saw the new verse written in an attractive manner by Cāṇākya. The verse was a pleasant surprise for Kavi (which confirmed his conjecture about Cāṇākya's ability.)

(41) अन्यदा भार्यया सार्धं चाणाक्योऽत्र निमन्त्रितः ।

कविनाश्चर्ययुक्तेन तद्गृहं स गतोऽशितुम् ॥

At another time, Kavi invited Cāṇākya for meal at his house along with his wife. Cāṇākya went there wondering why he was invited.

(42) ततोऽपि कविना तेन चाणाक्यस्य गृहाजिरे ।

दीनारा बहवः शीघ्रं निक्षिप्तास्तं परीक्षितुम् ॥

Moreover, Kavi buried abundant *dīnāras* (golden coins) in the courtyard of Cāṇākya very swiftly (in the meantime) to test him.

(43) यशोमत्या गृहीतास्ते दीनाराः स्वगृहाङ्गणे ।

आदाय तान् पुरस्तुष्टा जगौ चाणाक्यमादरात् ॥

Yaśomati took those *dīnāras* which were buried in their courtyard. With a feeling of satisfaction, she addressed Cāṇākya ardently -

(44) ददाति कपिलां नन्दो ब्राह्मणेभ्यो मनःप्रियाम् ।

तदन्तिकं परिप्राप्य गृहीत्वाऽऽगच्छ तामरम् ॥

'Nanda donates attractive brown cows to the *brahmins*. Please go to him and bring the cow as soon as possible.'

(45) भार्यावचनमाकर्ण्य चाणक्यो निजगाद ताम् ।

त्वद्वाक्यतः प्रगृह्णामि गत्वा तां कपिलामहम् ॥

After having heard the request of her spouse, Cāṇākya said to her, 'I will go and bring the cow only to respect thine wish.'

(46) तत्संप्रधारणं श्रुत्वा कविमन्त्री कुतूहलात् ।

इदं निवेदयामास नन्दस्य प्रीतचेतसः ॥

(47) बहुदुग्धसमायुक्तं महाराज समुज्ज्वलम् ।

गोसहस्रं प्रदेहि त्वं माहनेभ्यः सुभक्तितः ॥

After knowing the decision, Kavi - the minister, told Nanda anxiously when Nanda was in a good mood that, 'Your excellency, I suggest you to donate thousand cows, having abundant milk and lustre, to thousand *brahmins*, in charity, with a mind full of devotion (which is a meritorious act).'

(48) कविवाक्यं समाकर्ण्य नन्दोऽपि निजगाद तम् ।

गोसहस्रं ददाम्येव ब्राह्मणानानय द्रुतम् ॥

Hearing Kavi's request, Nanda declared, 'Quickly invite the *brahmins*, I will give them thousand cows.'

(49) ततश्चाणक्यमाहूय नरेन्द्रवचनादरम् ।

कविर्निवेशयामास प्रधानाग्रासने तदा ॥

Immediately after Nanda's order, Kavi invited Cāṇakya and caused him to sit on the chief and foremost seat.

(50) उपविष्टः स चाणक्यो दर्भासनकदम्बकम् ।

कुण्डिकाभिर्बृशीकाभी रुद्ध्वा तस्थौ नृपान्तिके ॥

Cāṇakya sat on the seat meant for Nanda and occupied many *darbhāsanas* (seats made up of darbha grass) with his water-pot, sacred staff etc.

(51) ततोऽयं कविना प्रोक्तो भट्टनन्दो जगाविदम् ।

तदर्थमासनं चैकं मुञ्च विप्राः समागताः ॥

Kavi told Cāṇakya, "The king Nanda has arrived. please vacate one seat for him and see, all the *brahmins* have entered the hall."

(52) तद्वाक्यतो विहायैकं विष्टरं स द्विजः पुनः ।

एकैकमासनं मुक्तं भूयः प्रोक्तोऽमुनेदृशम् ॥

On his (Kavi's) request, the *brahmin* (Cāṇakya) vacated one seat and sat on the next. In this way Cāṇakya vacated the seats one by one.

(53) भट्टनन्दो वदत्येवं भवन्तं भक्तितत्परः ।

अग्रासने परो विप्रो गृहीतो भूभुजा महान् ॥

(Kavi sent somebody to Cāṇakya and he said,) 'king Nanda regards you a lot but this seat is reserved by the king for a great *brahmin*.'

(54) भव राजगृहाद् दूरे निर्गत्य त्वरितं द्विज ।

गत्वा बहिर्गृहद्वारे तिष्ठ त्वं सुसमाहितः ॥

(The person continued,) 'Oh *brahmin*, leave this palace immediately and wait patiently for your turn at the door place.'

(55) निशम्य वचनं तस्य चाणक्यो रक्तलोचनः ।

जगाद् कर्तिकाहस्तस्तं नरं परुषस्वनः ॥

When Cāṇakya heard this humiliating message, his eyes became red with anger and keeping a pair of scissors in hand exclaimed in a harsh tone, addressing that person in a loud voice (so that all would hear)-

(56) इदं न युज्यते कर्तुं भवतो न्यायवेदिनः ।

भोजनार्थं निविष्टस्य त्वद्गृहे मन्त्रिरासनम् ॥

'Oh king, since you are the well-versed in the laws, it is not proper on your part to banish me from the royal palace, when I have already occupied a seat to dine.'

(57) अर्धचन्द्रं गले दत्वा चाणक्यो धाटितोऽमुना ।

तन्निमित्तं रुषं प्राप्य निर्गतस्तद्गृहाद्बहिः ॥

He (Nanda or Nanda's servant) turned out Cāṇakya seized by the neck. Burning with insult and fury, Cāṇakya left the palace.

(58) नन्दवंशक्षयं शीघ्रं विदधामि विसंशयम् ।

एवं विचिन्त्य चाणक्यो निजगाद वचः स्फुटम् ॥

'I will definitely ruin the Nanda dynasty'-Cāṇakya thought and exclaimed loudly -

(59) यदीच्छति नरः कोऽपि राज्यं निहतकण्टकम् ।

ततो मदन्तिके शीघ्रं तिष्ठतु प्रीतमानसः ॥

'One who wants to rule a kingdom, devoid of enemies (lit. thornless) he should quickly stand by my side, delighted at heart.'

(60) चाणाक्यवचनं श्रुत्वा नरः कोऽपि जगाविदम् ।

अहमिच्छामि भो राज्यं दीयतां मे द्रुतं प्रभो ॥

After having heard Cāṇākya's speech, some person (came forward and) told, 'Sir, grant me the kingdom quickly since I long for it.'

(61) निजहस्तेन तं हस्ते समादाय त्वरान्वितः ।

चाणक्यो रोषसंपूर्णो निजगाम पुरादरम् ॥

Cāṇākya immediately held his hand and angrily went elsewhere from the city.

(62) वातवेगं समारुह्य तुरङ्गं प्रीतमानसः ।

अवाहयत्तकं शीघ्रं चाणक्यो निजलीलया ॥

Cāṇākya being delighted at heart, caused the person to mount a horse, swift as wind and carried him away with his expertise in horse-riding.

(63) जलदुर्गं प्रविश्यासौ वार्धिमध्ये सुधीरधीः ।

राज्यमन्वेष्टयंस्तस्थौ चाणाक्यः कृतनिश्चयः ॥

Cāṇākya, the brilliant one, entered with him into a sea-fort, situated in the middle of an ocean, waiting for a suitable opportunity to acquire kingdom, with a great resolve.

(64) एवं हि तिष्ठतस्तस्य नरेणैकेन वेगतः ।

प्रत्यन्तवासिभूपस्य निवेदितमिदं वचः ॥

When Cāṇākya was staying there, one person (spy) of the neighbouring country (of Nanda) promptly informed his lord in these words -

(65) जलदुर्गे महानेकः समुद्रजलसंभवे ।

तिष्ठति प्रीतचेतस्को नरनागः सुबुद्धिमान् ॥

'At the sea-fort in the middle of the ocean, there stays an intelligent and distinguished person (resembling an elephant), calmly waiting (for an opportunity).'

(66) प्रत्यन्तवासिभूपोऽपि निशम्यास्य वचः परम् ।

निनाय तं निजस्थानं चाणक्यं मतिशालिनम् ॥

After getting such valuable information, the neighbouring king led Cāṇakya, possessing great intelligence, to his own country.

(67) पर्वतान्तं परिप्राप्य भूपाः प्रत्यन्तवासिनः ।

भक्तं प्रवेशयामासुर्धनं च सकलं तदा ॥

The neighbouring kings brought Cāṇakya (and the other person) in the hilly region (or to the king Parvataka). They provided all necessary things like food, wealth etc. to him.

(68) ततोऽमी नन्दभूपालं भूपैः प्रत्यन्तवासिभिः ।

उपायैर्भेदमानीतास्तस्थुस्तद्वेषमागताः ॥

Then he (Cāṇakya) created discord among the ministers of Nanda by using all deceitful means, with the help of the neighbouring kings. The ministers became malicious to Nanda.

(69) प्रत्यन्तशत्रुभूपालैर्नन्दो दण्डं प्रयाचितः ।

अयं वक्ति न तं नूनं ददामि भवतां करम् ॥

The neighbouring kings asked for heavy fines to Nanda. Nanda said (arrogantly,) 'I will not give you the taxes.'

(70) ततोऽभिनन्दभृत्यानां मन्त्रभेदं विहाय च ।

निर्धाटनं छलेनैषां भ्रान्तिसंभ्रान्तिचेतसाम् ॥

(71) स्वेन नन्दं निहत्याशु सुपुरे कुसुमनामनि ।

चकार विपुलं राज्यं चाणाक्यो निजबुद्धितः ॥

Then Cāṇakya created a breach of counsel among the persons appointed by Nanda. The confused and perplexed ministers were driven away by Cāṇakya with deceitful means. Afterwards he himself killed Nanda in Kusumapura (i.e. Pāṭaliputra) and ruled over the vast empire for many years with his great (administrative) talent.

(72) कृत्वा राज्यं चिरं कालं अभिषिच्यात्र तं नरम् ।

श्रुत्वा जिनोदितं धर्मं हित्वा सर्वं परिग्रहं ॥

(73) मतिप्रधानसाध्वन्ते महावैराग्यसंयुतः ।

दीक्षां जग्राह चाणाक्यो जिनेश्वरनिवेदिताम् ॥

After having ruled the kingdom for a long period, he consecrated that person (i.e. candragupta) as a king. When he heard the preaching of the Jinas, he abandoned all his possessions and with a completely detached mind, accepted vows of monk which are proclaimed by the Jinas, from a preceptor having deep insight (or intellect).

(74) विहरन् गतियोगेन शिष्याणां पञ्चभिः शतैः ।

वनवासं परिप्राप्य दक्षिणापथसंभवम् ॥

(75) ततः पश्चिमदिग्भागे महाक्रौञ्चपुरस्य सः ।

चाणक्यो गोकुलस्थाने कायोत्सर्गेण तस्थिवान् ॥

Wandering in a natural course with his five hundred disciples, he (Cāṇakya) arrived at a place called *vanavāsa*, which was situated in the southern region (*dakṣiṇāpatha*). In the westward direction of *vanavāsa*, there was a city called Mahākrauñcapura. In the cow-house of that city, Cāṇakya stayed in *kāyotsarga* meditation.

(76) बभूव तत्पुरे राजा सुमित्रो नाम विश्रुतः ।

तत्प्रिया रूपसंपन्ना विनयोपपदा मतिः ॥

Sumitra was the famous king of that city. Vinatamatī was his charming wife (queen).

(77) मन्त्री सुबन्धुनामास्य नन्दस्य मरणेन सः ।

चाणक्योपरि संक्रुध्य तस्थौ तच्छिद्रवाञ्छया ॥

Subandhu, the previous minister of Nanda, who was angry at Cāṇakya and seeking the flaws of Cāṇakya -

(78) ततः क्रौञ्चपुरेशस्य महासामन्तसेविनः ।

सुबन्धुर्बन्धुसंपन्नः समीपे तस्य तस्थिवान् ॥

Having approached the king of Krauñcapura, who was a refuge of many eminent feudatory kings, Subandhu lived there with his kinsmen.

(79) अथ क्रौञ्चपुराधीशः श्रुत्वा मुनिसमागमम् ।

महाविभूतिसंयुक्तस्तं यतिं वन्दितुं ययौ ॥

Once, the king of Krauñcapura got the news of the arrival of the sages. With a great paraphernalia, he went there to salute him.

(80) चाणक्यादिमुनीन् नत्वा स तत्पूजां विधाय च ।

महाविनयसंपन्नो विवेश निजपत्तनम् ॥

He bowed down to Cāṇakya and all the other sages and performed *pūjā*. With a great respect in his mind, he came back to his city.

(81) ततोऽस्तमनवेलायां यतीनां शुद्धचेतसाम् ।

साग्निं करीषमाधाय तत्समीपेऽपि रोषतः ॥

(82) विधाय स्वेन देहेन पापराशेरुपार्जनम् ।

महाक्रोधपरीताङ्गः सुबन्धुर्नरकं ययौ ॥

At the time of sunset, Subandhu went towards them angrily and kept burning cow-dungs around the pure-minded ascetics. Thus, encompassed with a great fury, Subandhu acquired a heap of evil and entered the fierce hell.

(83) चाणक्याख्यो मुनिस्तत्र शिष्यपञ्चशतैः सह ।

पादोपगमनं कृत्वा शुक्लध्यानमुपेयिवान् ॥

The revered sage Cāṇakya along-with his five hundred disciples, accepted wilful death, engaging himself in *śukladhyāna*, the supreme type of meditation.

(84) उपसर्गं सहित्वेमं सुबन्धुविहितं तदा ।

समाधिमरणं प्राप्य चाणक्यः सिद्धिमीयिवान् ॥

Cāṇakya endured the troubles created by Subandhu at that time. He accepted *samādhimarāṇa* and attained liberation.

(85) ततः पश्चिमदिग्भागे दिव्यक्रौञ्चपुरस्य सा ।

निषद्यका मुनेरस्य बन्धतेऽद्यापि साधुभिः ॥

At the western part of the divine Krauñcapura, there exists one platform created in the memory of this sage (Cāṇakya) even now, which is adored by the monks.

### Some observations on Hariṣeṇa's Cāṇakya-narrative :

- \* As the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi is the main source of the Cāṇakya-narratives in the Śvetāmbara sect, likewise Hariṣeṇa's Cāṇakya-muni-kathānakam is regarded as the main source by all the later writers of the Digambara sect.
- \* Before Hariṣeṇa, we find some passing references of Cāṇakya in the Digambara literature but Hariṣeṇa's Cāṇakya-kathā containing 85 Sanskrit verses is the first and foremost biography of Cāṇakya.
- \* Hariṣeṇa, being a *brahmin* by birth, uses mostly the *brahmanic* sources viz. the Skandapurāṇa, Matsyapurāṇa and Kathāsaritsāgara (probably the early version of the Kathāsaritsāgara) with some changes.
- \* Influence of the main theme of Viśākhadatta's Mudrārākṣasa is not found in Hariṣeṇa.
- \* Hariṣeṇa uses both the words Cāṇakya and Cāṇākya according to the requirement of the metre.
- \* The details of Cāṇakya's mother, father and residence are different in Śvetāmbara literature. The incidents of Cāṇakya's childhood are completely dropped. His *brahminhood* and teachership is highlighted.
- \* Cāṇakya's *śrāvakatva* is not explicitly told by Hariṣeṇa but suggested by using the word 'महन्:'. It is really startling that he abruptly became a Jaina *muni* in the last phase of his life. The Jainification of Cāṇakya depicted in the Śvetāmbara literature, though superimposed, is more logical and convincing because Cāṇakya's laymanship is focused and described by creating three or four stories.
- \* Hariṣeṇa always prefers the name 'Cāṇakya' (or 'Cāṇākya'). He has never mentioned his name as 'Viṣṇugupta' or 'Kauṭilya' and

had not underlined the crookedness or wickedness of Cāṇakya. When broadly comprehended, it would be seen that the 'kuṭīlamatitva' of Cāṇakya/Kauṭilya is noted down by the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras after the 12<sup>th</sup> century A.D. We have already observed that, in the *brahmanic* literature the signs of disregard for Cāṇakya's is seen from the 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> century onwards, when the *dharmaśāstras* overpowered the legacy of the Arthaśāstra.

- \* The various small incidents noted down in the Āvaśyaka and Niśītha-cūrṇis about Cāṇakya, are totally neglected by Hariṣeṇa. He had not incorporated these small accounts in his biography. Three reasons can be given for this -

(i) He should have thought that these accounts are fanciful, artificially created and added wilfully to Cāṇakya's biography by the Śvetāmbara writers.

(ii) He neglected the stories totally because of the strong sectarian bias against the authenticity of the Śvetāmbara literature.

(iii) He was not ready to accept the relationship of *guru-śiṣya* between Cāṇakya and Candragupta Maurya depicted in the Śvetāmbara literature. In his Cāṇakya-muni-kathā, Hariṣeṇa had never mentioned Candragupta Maurya, instead he mentions 'स नरः' by using the pronoun in third person singular.

- \* In the 'Bhadrabāhu-kathānakam' (Kathā No.131 ; p.317 of Bṛhatkathā), Hariṣeṇa presents a story of Bhadrabāhu (probably the second Bhadrabāhu famous as the *niryuktikāra*) and Candragupta, probably a '*gupta*' king and not a '*maurya*' king. The Candragupta belonging to the *gupta* dynasty, accepted *dīkṣā* and was renamed as Viśākhācārya. He went to *dakṣiṇāpatha* along-with Bhadrabāhu (II<sup>nd</sup>). In the Bhadrabāhu-kathānaka, not

a single reference to Cāṇakya is found. The Hariṣeṇa's Cāṇakya is totally a different personality having no connection with the Candragupta and which is more close to *brahmanical purāṇas*, who personally killed the king Yogananda by black magic, ruled over the kingdom for a long time, accepted *munidīkṣā* and obtained liberation by voluntary death.

- \* Hariṣeṇa never mentions that Cāṇakya has written a treatise on polity. In fact the reference to Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra is found in Tiloyapaṇṇatti (Trilokaprajñapti) - a revered ancient Jaina text written by Yativṛṣabha, a renowned Digambara sage. Therefore it is likely that Hariṣeṇa might have regarded Kauṭilya as a different person than Cāṇakya - who become a Jaina *muni* and came to south.
- \* The whole Śvetāmbara tradition presents Cāṇakya as an example of *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*. Hariṣeṇa shows the sense of extreme regard towards Cāṇakya by using the terms like सुधीः (v.3) ; नरनागः सुबुद्धिमान् (v.65) ; चाणक्यं मतिशालिनम् (v.66) and चकार विपुलं राज्यं चाणक्यो निजबुद्धितः (v.71) etc. Hariṣeṇa praises the intelligence and wisdom of Cāṇakya in general without using the terminology of the fourfold *buddhi*. It is natural because the Digambaras never explain the Jaina Epistemology in the terms of fourfold *buddhi*.
- \* Hariṣeṇa is successful in portraying the image of Cāṇakya as a brave revolutionary, expert in the skills like horse-riding, a political visionary who manages the chief of the neighbouring countries with great wisdom and an able administrator having good governance. The image of Cāṇakya portrayed by Hariṣeṇa is not seen in the Śvetāmbara literature because they treat him as a *bimbāntarita-rājā* while Hariṣeṇa depicts him as an actual king.

**[5] Cāṇakya : Reflected in the Nītivākyāmr̥ta - (An abridged version of Arthaśāstra)**

When we go through the chronology of Cāṇakya-legacy in the Jaina literature, we have to take a big halt at the Nītivākyāmr̥ta of Somadevasūri written in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. The legacy of Nītivākyāmr̥ta is aptly quoted by R.Shamashastri in the introduction of his edition of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. He says, “सोमदेवसूरिणा नीतिवाक्यामृतं नाम नीतिशास्त्रं विरचितं तदपि कामन्दकीयमिव कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रादेव संक्षिप्य संगृहीतमिति तद्ग्रन्थपदवाक्यशैलीपरीक्षायां निस्संशयं ज्ञायते ।”<sup>1</sup>

Somadevasūri is a Digambara writer having supreme command on Sanskrit language. He has written the Yaśastilaka-campū, one of the prestigious *campūkāvyas* which exhibits his mastery over the classical Sanskrit. Somadeva's second available work is the Nītivākyāmr̥ta. In spite of being a Jaina monk, his keen interest in the science of polity (Arthaśāstra) is noteworthy. He is a thorough scholar of *ānvikṣikī* and *dharmaśāstras*.

Though Somadeva's work is the abridged and simplified version of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra, it is remarkable that he neither imitates nor Jainifies the revered work of Kauṭīliya. Generally he has followed the *sūtra*-style of Kauṭīliya. We can locate many such *sūtras* from the Nītivākyāmr̥ta which are similar to the Kauṭīliyan *sūtras*. Interested readers may go through the similar *sūtras* quoted in the introduction written by Pt. Nathuram Premi.<sup>2</sup>

Somadeva has selected the ethico-religious part of the Arthaśāstra and presented it in a unique way to guide any common Indian as such. Though he has followed the traditional system of *varṇāśrama*, unlike the Manu and Yājñavalkya *smṛtis*, the *brahmin*-focused and *brahmin* biased viewpoints are moderated and softened so skilfully

that it becomes an ethical-value-based text, ideal for day-to-day guidance.

Its uniqueness is evident from the very beginning. The initial benediction is dedicated to the kingdom or nation. He says -

अथ धर्मार्थकामफलाय राज्याय नमः ।

In spite of being a Jaina monk, he written three chapters on the three *puruṣārthas*, viz. *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma*. He has woven the chief Jaina tenets of *samatā* and *ahiṃsā* so beautifully in the *sūtras* that the general appeal becomes universal. He says, ‘सर्वसत्त्वेषु हि समता सर्वाचरणानां परमाचरणं’ i.e. equality to all living beings is the best way of conduct. About non-violence, his *sūtra* runs like this - ‘न खलु भूतद्रुहां कापि क्रिया प्रसूते श्रेयांसि’ i.e. one who harms the living beings, his actions do not create any good or merit for him.

Although he has treated the topics like *swāmī*, *amātya*, *janapada*, *durga*, *kośa* etc. on the lines of Kauṭilya, the brilliance of his genius is seen in the topics like - *divasānuṣṭhāna*, *sadācāra* and *vyavahāra*.

With this explanatory background we will scrutinize the specific references of the Arthaśāstra and Cāṇakya, imbibed in the Nītivākyaṃrta and its commentary. The observations can be enumerated in the following manner -

- \* Neither Somadeva nor his commentator have expressed the debt of Cāṇakya or Kauṭilya directly.
- \* At the very outset, Somadeva mentions that for acquiring the *jitendriyatā* (control over one’s senses) one should study the Arthaśāstra i.e. Nītiśāstra (Ethical science). Though in this aphorism, direct reference of Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is not given, Somadeva certainly intends to highlight the ethical side of the Arthaśāstra.<sup>3</sup>
- \* In the third aphorism of *mantrisaṃuddheśa*, Somadeva says, “If a

great person install a stone, it becomes a god. If it is so, then what about a human being ?”<sup>4</sup> The author Somadeva immediately remembers Cāṇakya and Candragupta. he says, ‘तथा चानुश्रूयते विष्णुगुप्तानुग्रहादनधिकृतोऽपि किल चन्द्रगुप्तः साम्राज्यपदमवाप’ - i.e. It is heard that though Candragupta was not the legitimate heir of the throne, he acquired the seat under the patronage of Viṣṇugupta.<sup>5</sup>

The word ‘अनुश्रूयते’ employed in this aphorism is very peculiar. We can infer that, at Somadeva’s time, the heresay and legends about Cāṇakya and Candragupta were prevalent. Up to the time of Somadeva, ample narrative-data about Cāṇakya was available even in the Jaina tradition. According to this data, Candragupta was not eligible to adorn the throne.

The commentator provides more information. He identifies ‘Viṣṇugupta’ with ‘Cāṇakya’. he quotes one verse as -

महामात्यं वरो राजा निर्विकल्पं करोति यः ।  
एकशोऽपि महीं लेभे हीनोऽपि बृहलो यथा ॥

Nītivākyaṃṛta comm. on 10.4

In this verse the word ‘बृहल’ is of course ‘वृषल’ - which is used literally hundreds of times in the drama ‘Mudrārākṣasa’. According to the commentator, Candragupta is ‘मौरिककुलोत्पन्न’ and ‘मौरिक’ is a lower caste.

\* One more reference to Cāṇakya is found in the 13<sup>th</sup> chapter of the Nītivākyaṃṛta. It says, ‘श्रूयते हि किल चाणक्यस्तीक्ष्णदूतप्रयोगेणैकं नन्दं जघानेति ।’ (sūtra 14)

“It is heard that by sending a sharp-witted and shrewd messenger, Cāṇakya killed one of the Nandas.”

This particular incident told by Somadeva is important because this legend is not available in other written narratives of the Jainas. The Kathāsaritsāgara mentions that Cāṇakya killed Nanda and his

sons by applying black-magic while living at the residence of Śakaṭāla.<sup>6</sup> The same story is given in the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī. The Śvetāmbara sources have not painted Cāṇakya as a killer of Nanda.

\* In the chapter dedicated to *amātya*, it is noted that the minister having revengeful disposition, creates calamity. Two examples are given that of Śakuni and Śakaṭāla.

In the Kathāsaritsāgara (*lambaka* 1), it is told that Śakaṭāla, the minister of Nanda who was displeased by some reason, ultimately chose Cāṇakya to retaliate Nanda. Hariṣeṇa, the Digambara writer, tells the same story in his Bṛhatkathākośa but he uses the name ‘Kavi’ instead of ‘Śakaṭāla’. (Chapter 143, चाणक्यमुनिकथानकम्)

\* In the chapter *vyavahārasamuddesa*, it is noted in the 38<sup>th</sup> *sūtra* that, ‘स सुखी यस्य एक एव दारपग्रिहः’-i.e. ‘The householder can live happily if he has one wife.’ For explaining the *sūtra*, the commentator quotes two and half verses of Cāṇakya (Cāṇikya). The purport of the passage is - “When there are two wives in a house, there is always quarrel and conflict. That man is happy and enjoys heavenly pleasures who possesses one wife, three issues, two ploughs, ten cows, five thousand golden coins and who daily performs Agnihotra rites.”

The concept of happy life is noted by Cāṇakya, according to the commentator. It reflects the thirstless and contented attitude of Cāṇakya towards life. The high regard for Cāṇakya is seen in almost all the Jaina references about Cāṇakya. It is due to his wisdom, his aspirations for the betterment of the people, his strict and just attitude and his ideas about contented life.

\* In nutshell we can say that the Nītivākyāmṛta of Somadevasūri is itself a tribute to Cāṇakya, given on behalf of the Jaina tradition.

All the *anūsṛutis*, legends and narratives preserved in the Jaina

tradition, might have inspired Somadevasūri to revive the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra in the form of an ethical guidebook without bringing any elements of Jainification. The easy, lucid and communicative style of the *sūtras* adds more value to the coarse subject. While exploring Cāṇakya in Jaina literature, the Nītivākyāmr̥ta is an unavoidable stop.

### List of References

- 1) Introduction of Nathuram Premi to Nītivākyāmr̥ta, p.5
- 2) pp.6-7
- 3) अर्थशास्त्राध्ययनं वा । Nītivākyāmr̥ta 1.9
- 4) महद्भिः पुरुषैः प्रतिष्ठितोऽश्मापि भवति देवः किं पुनर्मनुष्यः । Nītivākyāmr̥ta 10.3
- 5) Nītivākyāmr̥ta 10.4
- 6) Kathāsaritsāgara, Lambaka 1, verse 122-123

**[6] The Kathākoṣa (Kahakosu)** of Śrīcandra is a famous collection of narratives written in Apabhraṃśa during the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D. Śrīcandra has selected certain *gāthās* from the Bhagavatī Ārādhana, in which traditional narratives pertaining to famous personalities are suggested in few words. The narrative of Cāṇakya is given as an example of an ascetic, who endures the troubles afflicted by the enemy with great equilibrium of mind and attains heavenly abode (Kahakosu pp.508-512).

Śrīcandra generally follows Hariṣeṇa's Sanskrit Kathākoṣa. In the case of Cāṇakya-muni-kathā, Śrīcandra's main purport is Hariṣeṇa's narrative, still we can enumerate the changes and peculiarities of Śrīcandra in the following manner -

\* Like Hariṣeṇa, he mentions three ministers of Nanda viz. Kavi (sometimes Kāvi), Subandhu and Śakaṭāla.

\* The *brahmanic* elements in the personality of Cāṇakya are highlighted and his *śrāvakatva* is not mentioned.

\* Śrīcandra is not satisfied with the vague reference to Candragupta in the story of Cāṇakya. Unlike Hariṣeṇa, he says -

ता रज्जत्थिउ नंदहो केरउ , चंदगुत्तु नामे दासेरउ ।

पुट्ठिहे लग्गउ तं लेप्पिणु धणु , गउ चाणक्कु णंदमारणमणु ॥ (p.511)

Thus according to Śrīcandra, Candragupta was a *dāsīputra* of Nanda (as suggested in the Āvaśyaka literature) and had an ambition to be a king.

\* At one place, Śrīcandra uses the name ‘Śaśigupta’ for ‘Candragupta’ which is a peculiarstyle of the classical Apabhramśa poetry.

\* Unlike Hariṣeṇa, Cāṇakya offers the kingship to Candragupta and becomes his chief-minister. This is probably the effect of the concept of ‘*bimbāntarita rājā*’ seen in the Śvetāmbara narratives.

\* There is no direct reference of Cāṇakya’s Arthaśāstra and his strict discipline. Still in the following lines Kahakosu mentions Cāṇakya’s mastery over polity -

अप्पणु पडिगाहिउ मंतित्तणु चिंतिउ देसु कोसु सुहि परियणु । (p.511)

\* Subandhu’s hatred and enmity towards Cāṇakya is described at length very effectively.

\* The death of Cāṇakya is ascribed as *samādhimaraṇa*. In spite of Cāṇakya’s monkhood and his hearty repentance, Śrīcandra is not ready to offer him ‘*siddhigati*’. He says -

धीरधीरु गुरुगुणहिं गुरुक्कउ , गउ सब्बड्ढहो मुणि चाणक्कउ ॥ (p.512)

“The sage Cāṇakya, who was extremely courageous and virtuous, attained the supreme heavenly abode *sarvārthasiddhi*.”

In nutshell, we can say that Śrīcandra’s attitude is more logical and convincing than that of Hariṣeṇa. He has done justice to the great personality of Cāṇakya by incorporating some of the Śvetāmbara

elements. But following the footsteps of Hariṣeṇa, he has not given the full life-account of Cāṇakya in a detailed manner.

**[7] The Commentary on Mūlācāra** was written by Vasunandi (? Vasudevanandi) in the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D. While commenting upon *gāthā* 257, he had written a lot about ‘*laukika*’ texts of heretics which are based on misconceptions and preach violence.

He criticizes Kauṭilya alias Cāṇakya in the following manner-

कोडिल्ल-कुटिलस्य भावः कौटिल्यं तदेव प्रयोजनं यस्य धर्मस्य सः कौटिल्यधर्मः  
ठकादिव्यवहारो लोकप्रतारणाशीलो धर्मः परलोकाद्यभावप्रतिपादनपरो व्यवहारः ।  
आसुरकखा-असवः प्राणास्तेषां छेदनभेदनताडनत्रासनोत्पाटनमारणादिप्रपञ्चेन  
वञ्चनादिरूपेण वा रक्षा यस्मिन् धर्मे स आसुरक्षो धर्मो नगराद्वारक्षिकोपायभूतः ।  
अथवा कौटिल्यधर्मः , इंद्रजालादिकं पुत्रबन्धुमित्रपितृमातृस्वाम्यादिघातनोपदेशः ,  
चाणक्योद्भव आसुरक्षः मद्यमांसखादनाद्युपदेशः । --- इत्येवमादिका  
असद्गर्भप्रतिपादनपरा ये धर्मास्तेषु या भवेद्विश्रुतिर्विपरिणामः एतेपि धर्मा इत्येवं मूढो  
लौकिकमूढो भवत्येष इति ॥

This passage can be summarized thus -

“Absence of straightforwardness is the nature of Kauṭilya. The science of administration is written by him and is called *kauṭilya-dharma*. In this popular science, established rules and practices of cheats and swindlers are mentioned. Here, the inclination towards cheating the people is obvious. This heretic text proclaims the absence of life beyond the present life. ‘*Āsurakkhā*’ is that in which the people and other beings are beaten, killed and tormented by using deceitful means for the sake of well-being of one’s own. Or ‘*āsurakṣo dharmo*’ can be explained as the means or devices used by the so called protectors of the town, village etc. Or we can explain *kauṭilya-dharma* in which jugglery and tricks are employed to slaughter one’s own sons, relatives, friends, father, mother or even master. What type of ‘*āsurakṣa*’ is given by Cāṇakya ? He preached us to eat flesh

and enjoy liquor. He suggested medical treatments to strengthen the sexual ability and to remove the diseases. --- All such practices create adverse effects and misconceptions in the common people.”

### Observations :

- \* This passage exhibits the most severe and contemptuous criticism on *kautilya-śāstra* and *āsurakṣa*. In the whole Jaina literature such an open contempt towards Cāṇakya is not found elsewhere.
- \* The author is sure that Kauṭilya and Cāṇakya are the names of the same person.
- \* He confuses between the ‘science of polity’ (Arthaśāstra) and the ‘science of life’ (Āyurveda) and advances criticism against them by using the same parametres.
- \* He might have gone through the text of Arthaśāstra which gives importance to three *puruṣārthas* (i.e. *dharma-artha-kāma*) and omits the goal of *mokṣa*. The Jaina tradition, is totally *mokṣa*-centred. Hence the strict rules, laws and punishments which were used in the administration are despised by the writer Vasunandi, because such type of violence does not lead oneself to *mokṣa*.
- \* He totally neglects the fact that the eminent Śvetāmbara and Digambara writers have shown their high regard and honour to Cāṇakya, for Cāṇakya’s unparalleled intelligence, detached views, selfless attitude and his forbearance in accepting voluntary death.

In nutshell we can say that this is the extreme case of complete misunderstanding and underestimation of the science of polity in the whole senario of Cāṇakya-references found in the Jaina tradition.

**[8] The Gommaṭa-sāra** of Nemicandra (Siddhānta-cakravartī) is a Jaina Śaurasenī text written during the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The same *gāthā* ‘कोडिल्लमासुरक्खा’ (Mūlācāra 257) is quoted in the first part of this text viz. Jīvakāṇḍa, with a remarkable change. The text reads -

आभीयमासुरक्खं भारहरामायणादि उवएसा ।

तुच्छा असाहणीया सुयअण्णाणेत्ति णं बेत्ति ॥

(Gommaṭa-sāra (J.)*gā.304*, p.510)

The first word quoted in the concerned *gāthā* of Mūlācāra is altogether omitted here. Probably Nemicandra knows that Cāṇakya or Kauṭilya is praised and adored in the text like Bhagavatī Ārādhana for accepting the sublime way of death, i.e. *pāḍopagamana*. Therefore while giving the examples of *śruta-ajñāna* (i.e. texts based on ignorance) Nemicandra prefers the variant 'आभीत' and omits 'कौटिल्य'.

Perhaps, as a royal *guru* of the Gaṅga dynasty, he does not want to blame the science of good governance laid down by Kauṭilya. Though his contemporary writer Vasudevanandi passes several caustic remarks on *kauṭilya-dharma*, he calmly omits the controversy by replacing the word.

**[9] The Puṇyāśrava-kathā-koṣa** is a collection of traditional narratives written in Sanskrit prose during the 12<sup>th</sup> century A.D. by the author named Rāmacandra-mumukṣu. The concerned topic is 'Upavāsa-phala-varṇanam'. The title of the 38<sup>th</sup> story is 'Bhadrabāhu-Cāṇakya-Candragupta-kathā.'

In this prose narrative, the episode of Śakaṭāla and Cāṇakya is described in a brief manner. It was Śakaṭāla who chose Cāṇakya-*dvija* for the destruction of the king Nanda. The incident of the insult of Cāṇakya in the royal *bhojanaśālā* (dining hall) is described in short.

According to the author, Candragupta was born in a *kṣatriya* dynasty. Cāṇakya and Candragupta jointly uprooted Nanda's kingdom with the help of neighbouring kings. It is clearly mentioned that Cāṇakya made Candragupta the king of Pāṭaliputra.

The whole biography of Cāṇakya is not given in this text.

The author is more interested in documenting the story of Bhadrabāhu and Samprati (also called Candragupta II).

Raidhū, the Apabhraṃśa poet follows Rāmacandra and adds the description of the kings called Kalkis to this narrative.

**[10] The Ārāḍhanā-kathā-prabandha (Ārāḍhanā-kathā-kośa)** of Prabhācandra is a Sanskrit text pertaining to the 13<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

As the name suggests, the whole book is written to explain the stories noted in the Bhagavatī Ārāḍhanā, in a very compact form.

The 80<sup>th</sup> story of this text, documents the Cāṇakya-Subandhu episode in a very focussed manner and ascribes ‘*prāyopagata*’ death to Cāṇakya. This story is written on the lines of Hariṣeṇa. The only difference is, it is written in prose-form in Sanskrit. Kavi is invariably mentioned as Kāvi. Kāvi spotted Cāṇakya to fulfil his purpose to retaliate against the king Nanda. Like Hariṣeṇa, the author has not disclosed the name of Candragupta. Cāṇakya himself killed Nanda and enjoyed the kingdom for a long period.

In the Bhagavatī Ārāḍhanā, it is told that Subandhu killed Cāṇakya. In the narratives of Hariṣeṇa, Śrīcandra and Prabhācandra, it is Subandhu who sets fire to five hundred monks along-with Cāṇakya. Prabhācandra exaggerates further and says, ‘All of them attain Siddhi (i.e. liberation).’

One more story about Cāṇakya is found in the Ārāḍhanā-kathā-prabandha in the context of the rareness of the human birth. He starts the subject with the following words -

दस दिङ्मता मणुयलंभे 90.21 (p.262)

The ten allegorical stories are famous in the Śvetāmbara literature. The *pāśaka-dr̥ṣṭānta* is always explained by quoting the narrative of Cāṇakya. Prabhācandra explains the *dr̥ṣṭānta* in the same manner but the name of Cāṇakya is replaced by a *brahmin* called

Śivaśarman. In a way, this is a mute consent to the *brahminhood* of Cāṇakya.

The impact of Hariṣeṇa's story is clearly seen and the details added by Prabhācandra are almost negligible.

**[11] The Bhadrabāhu-Cāṇakya-Candragupta-kathānaka** of Raidhū is a small poem containing 28 *kaḍavakas*. This small Apabhramśa book pertains to the 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

Out of 28 *kaḍavakas*, two *kaḍavakas* are dedicated to the episode of Śakaṭāla, Cāṇakya and Candragupta. Raidhū is not interested in giving the full life-account of Cāṇakya up till his death.

Śakaṭāla and Cāṇakya get acquainted with each other in the incident of digging out and burning the *kuśa* grass. On the request of Śakaṭāla, Cāṇakya agrees to take his daily meal in the royal *bhojanaśālā* of Nanda, by occupying the golden seat. On a particular day, Śakaṭāla intentionally changes the golden seat and places a bamboo-seat instead. Cāṇakya takes this change as an insult and accepts the vow to uproot Nanda from the kingdom. He, along-with Candragupta, joins the enemy-king (Puru or Parvataka) and completely annihilates Nanda. He consecrates Candragupta on the throne of Pāṭalīputra.

We do not get any new information about Cāṇakya in this tale. According to Raidhū, the search of Cāṇakya for retaliating Nanda was done by Śakaṭāla and not by Kavi (Kāvi) as mentioned by Hariṣeṇa and Śrīcandra. From this aspect, his story goes nearer to the Kathāsaritsāgara. Raidhū depicts the incident in the royal dining hall, more convincingly than his previous writers. According to him, the capital-city of Nanda is Pāṭalīputra and not Pāṭalīputra.

We find a small story of Candragupta (II), the son of Kuṇāla (Nakula ?) in this text, who is the disciple of Bhadrabāhu (II) and

who went towards *dakṣiṇāpatha* along-with Bhadrabāhu and other 12000 monks.

**[12] The Cāṇakyaṛṣikathā** of Devācārya is given in the Jina-ratna-kośa of Prof.H.D.Velankar, published by Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune. It is found in manuscript-form and probably not published up till now. Detailed information is not given but we can guess that it is a small biography of Cāṇakya written in Sanskrit, probably written by the Digambara *ācārya* (Devācārya), following Hariṣeṇa's Cāṇakya-muni-kathānakam.

We have to take a note of this independent *kathā* because except this book, we do not find separate *carita* of Cāṇakya in the Jaina tradition. Cāṇakya-narratives are presented either in the form of examples, analogies or incorporated in the life-sketches of Bhadrabāhu and Sthūlabhadra.

**[13] A commenatry on the Puṇyāśrava-kathā-kośa** is written by Pt. Daulatram Kashliwal in the old Hindi during the 16<sup>th</sup> Century A.D. It is actually the old Hindi translation of the Puṇyāśrava-kathā-kośa. The narrative of Cāṇakya is given on pp.155-157.

Nothing is remarkable in this old Hindi version but it proves that the legacy of Cāṇakya-narratives was continued in the Jaina tradition from 3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D. upto 16<sup>th</sup> century A.D.



## CHAPTER 5

### FROM THE WINDOW OF ARTHAŚĀSTRA

- [1]** The seeds of Cāṇakya-narratives explored in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra
- [2]** Some glimpses of the socio-cultural similarities in the Arthaśāstra and Ardhamāgadhī canons
- [3]** Common terminology in the Jaina ethical texts and Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra
- [4]** The Jaina code of conduct (from the perspective of Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra)
- [5]** Re-interpretation of the Jaina monachism in the light of Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra



## CHAPTER 5

### FROM THE WINDOW OF ARTHAŚĀSTRA

#### **[1] The seeds of Cāṇakya-Narratives explored in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra**

In the previous chapter, the narratives of Cāṇakya noted in the Jaina literature are translated, scrutinized and compared very carefully. Here we intend to cast a glance at the narratives from the window of the the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra.

At the very outset, it is remarkable that Kauṭīliya presents lists of narratives in his treatise in which some traditional stories are included in an abridged manner. This peculiar style is seen in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> chapters (*adhyāyas*) of the Arthaśāstra. In the 6<sup>th</sup> chapter, twelve such persons are mentioned who were ruined due to the lack of control over their senses. In the 20<sup>th</sup> chapter it is prescribed for a king that he should not visit his queen's apartment without proper inspection. Seven examples of Bhadrāśeṇa etc. are given who were killed by the queens treacherously. In the 95<sup>th</sup> chapter, six personalities related to the king are mentioned who took the hint from subtlest actions that they are out of favour of the king and immediately left the king.

*Niryuktikāra* Bhadrabāhu (i.e. Bhadrabāhu II) (3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) has developed this peculiar style of presenting the list of traditional narratives in his *niryuktis*. The examples of *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi* are enumerated in the Āvaśyaka-niryukti 51 (p.93) in which Cāṇakya is included. In the list of Piṇḍaniryukti 500, surprisingly enough, again Cāṇakya is enumerated. Twelve examples of *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi* are mentioned in Nandī gā.74. This peculiar style of quoting *dvāragāthās* is followed by the later Jaina writers in

the Upadeśapada, Upadeśamālā, Dharmopadeśamālā, Ākhyānamāṇikośa etc.

One observation should be noted that the stories mentioned by Cāṇakya are mostly untraceable in the Brahmanic and Jaina literature.

Most of the Cāṇakya-narratives in the Jaina literature are related to the content of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. The Jaina writers might have gone through the text of Kauṭīliya and picked up some motifs which are suitable to convert them into stories, tales, parables, examples and legends. It is really a big job to explore fully the text of Arthaśāstra from this point of view. At this place, an attempt has been made to trace the connection between the text of Arthaśāstra and the narrative literature of the Jains, as a specimen or a sample study.

**[A]** The 23<sup>rd</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra informs about the preservation of forest, specially meant for elephants. Kauṭīliya mentions, ‘if one wishes to trail a male elephant, the female elephants can do it, if one anoints the path and bushes with the excreta and urine of the elephant.’

In the narrative of Abhayakumāra, Āmradevasūri has used the same motif with a slight change. When Udayana wishes to abduct the famous elephant of king Pradyota viz. Nalagiri, he uses the same method mentioned in the Arthaśāstra. Udayana fills four big pots with the urine of Nalagiri and the female elephant Bhadrāvati trails the elephant by smelling the sprinkled urine. By using this device, Udayana and Vāsavadattā complete their journey from Avanti to Kauśāmbī. The concerned verses of the Abhayākkhyāna are -

उस्सिंघइ जाव तयं हत्थी ता हत्थिणी पवणवेगा ।

पणुवीसजोयणाइ गया पुणो नलगिरी पत्तो ॥

तो अवरा मुत्तघडीउ तप्पुरो पाडियाओ जा तिन्नि ।  
ता संपत्तो कोसंबिनियपुरिं उदयणनरिंदो ॥

[Ākkhyānamaṇikośa,

Abhayākkhyāna gā.243-244 (p.16)]

**[B]** The 30<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra is dedicated to the examination of the officials. Three types of officials are mentioned. *Mūlahara* is the one, who devours all the wealth accumulated by the forefathers. *Tādātvika* keeps the capital safe and consumes the profit completely. *Kadarya* accumulates wealth by inflicting pains to oneself and others.

This motif is seen in the famous Arddhamāgadhi-*mūlasūtra* text (viz. Uttarādhyayana) in the particular context of ‘the rareness of the human life.’ Three type of merchants are mentioned which are comparable to *mūlahara* etc. In the last verse it is told that the human life is the capital, divine life is the profit and if we loose the capital, we have to go in the animal kingdom or hell. The concerned *gāthās* are -

जहा य तिण्णि वणिया मूलं घेतूण निग्गया ।  
एगोऽत्थ लभई लाभं एगो मूलेण आगओ ॥  
एगो मूलं पि हारेत्ता आगओ तत्थ वाणिओ ।  
ववहारे उवमा एसा एवं धम्मे वियाणह ॥  
माणुसत्तं भवे मूलं लाभो देवगई भवे ।  
मूलच्छेएण जीवाणं नरग-तिरिक्खत्तणं धुवं ॥

(Uttarādhyayana 7.14-15-16)

Sukhabodhā, the reputed commentary on Uttarādhyayana has developed the story in a very interesting manner.

**[C]** The 48<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra is about courtezans and harlots. At the end of this chapter, Kauṭilya expects espionage from them.

In the Abhayākkhyāna, Caṇḍapradhyota and Abhayakumāra

both have used the *gaṇikās* for the abduction of each other. In the 192<sup>nd</sup> verse of Abhayākkhyāna, the *gaṇikā* says to Caṇḍapadyota -

तं निसुणिऊण विन्नवइ नरवइं चमरहारिणी गणिया ।  
आइससु देव ! मं झत्ति जेण बंधिय तमाणे हं ॥

In verse 260, it is told that Abhayakumāra went to Avanti to abduct Caṇḍapadyota with two *gaṇikās*.

गणियाओ दोन्नि घेतूण सा गओ नयरिमुज्जेणिं ।  
गुडियकयावररूवो रायदुवारम्मि आवणं घेतुं ।  
पारद्धो ववहरिउं अभओ अह अन्नदिवसम्मि ॥

[Ākkhyānamanikośa,

Abhayākkhyāna gā.260-261 (p.16)]

At the end of this narrative, it is described how Abhaya abducted Pradyota by employing a servant of the same name who acted like an insane person. This motif is seen in the 12<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra.

The other details about *gaṇikās* are discussed under the head of ‘the socio-cultural and political conditions’ in the same chapter.

**[D]** Rules about gambling are found in the 22<sup>nd</sup>, 77<sup>th</sup> and 87<sup>th</sup> *adhyāyas* of Arthaśāstra. The main theme of the 22<sup>nd</sup> chapter is - ‘How to populate a new village ?’ It is told that there should a ban on the plays like gambling. The 77<sup>th</sup> chapter is totally dedicated to gambling, dices and other crimes. it is suggested that the ‘gambling houses’ should be run by the government and private gambling should be totally prohibited. In the 87<sup>th</sup> chapter, it is catagorically mentioned that, ‘Fake dices are strictly banned.’ A strict punishment is prescribed for such crimes. *Kākaṇī* dices are authorized for gambling and others are banned.

The motif of acquiring wealth by fake gambling is one of the

popular theme in the Jaina narratives of Cāṇakya. The Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi quotes this as an example of *pāriṇāmikī -buddhi* of Cāṇakya. Haribhadra employs the short story of *kuṭa-pāśaka* as one of the ten examples to explain ‘the rareness of human birth.’

It is very queer that the Jaina writers do not hesitate to portray Cāṇakya as a law-breaker in the matter of gambling. Or they might have thought that Cāṇakya can be excused because these efforts were made to gather wealth for the royal treasury and not for any personal benefit.

**[E]** In the 80<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, eight unforeseen calamities are enumerated. The last calamity is noted as ‘an advent of evil spirits.’ The implemented measures are described thus -

“On some holy day, one should erect a sacred platform under a *caitya-vṛkṣa* (holy tree). It should be decorated with an umbrella and handmade flags. A goat should be slaughtered for banishing the evil spirit. A *brahmin*, wellversed in the Atharvaveda should help the concerned person to perform these rites.”

Exactly the same description is found in one of narratives of Vasudevahiṇḍī. At the end of the story, there is a turn according to the Jaina philosophy. A Jaina sage recognizes the goat by employing his spiritual power and tells the sons of the *brahmin* that the goat is their father. Their dead father is reborn as a goat. The writer comments at the end that the sons of the *brahmin* accept the vow of non-violence and observe it permanently.

Thus, when we scrutinize the motifs of the Jaina narratives and especially the old Prakrit tales, we find that the Jaina writers have utilized the details given in the Arthaśāstra to teach the Jaina tenets more effectively.

**[F]** The 44<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra deals with the duties of the officer who supervises the vocation of thread-spinning. It is mentioned that the wives of errant husbands, the women who are crippled, aged, unmarried ladies and others who are unable to leave the house for earning livelihood, should be given the work of spinning the thread through the female servants serving in the factory.

In the Sūtrakṛtāṅga-cūrṇi, a story of Ārdraka-kumāra is given at length in the chapter called Ārdrakīya (Sūtrakṛtāṅga-cūrṇi II, p.414 onwards). Once, the wife of Ārdraka was spinning the yarn at home. Her son asked, ‘Mother, why are you doing this work when my father is here ?’ She told, ‘Oh my dear son, your father is leaving us very soon. So I am practising to spin.’ The innocent son approaches his father and takes twelve rounds with the thread to tie him. Ārdraka, the father counts the round and stays at house for twelve more years.

This is a remarkable specimen indicating the skill of the Jaina writers to interweave the motifs provided by the Arthaśāstra in their tales. It also throws light on the social condition of women at that time.

**[G]** The 87<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra deals with the punishments given to the criminals. The punishments like ‘cutting the hands, feet and other limbs’ are considered in this chapter. At the end of the chapter Kauṭilya mentions -

“The judge should use the power of discretion before giving the punishments to the convicts. The punishments are of three types - highest, medium or lowest. The punishment depends upon the nature of the crime and the criminal, the reason, intension, time, place, the social and royal status of the criminal and many other things.”

In the collection of the Prakrit stories called ‘Prākṛta-vijñāna-kathā’ Shri Vijaykastura-sūri mentions the story titled ‘जारिसो माणवो तारिसी सिक्खा’, in which it is depicted that three persons are punished in three different ways though their crime is the same.

The content of the 87<sup>th</sup> chapter of Arthaśāstra is as if transformed into a story-form in this Jaina narrative. It is noteworthy that the Jaina model of *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* is also very much suitable to develop such type of stories.

**[H]** The Jaina writers have given utmost importance what is told in the 92<sup>nd</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra dedicated to the emergency devices used to gather wealth for the royal treasury. The chapter viz. ‘*kośasaṃgraha*’ has inspired the writers to develop Cāṇakya-episodes right from the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi up to the Paṇḍita-parva of Hemacandra. The most attractive and classic story is presented in the Dharmopadeśamālā-vivaraṇa.

Kauṭilya notes, “In the case of emergency, the king should ask the citizens to donate. The wealth of heretics, the *deva-dravya* gathered by people other than *śrotriya*s, the wealth of a widow and naval merchants can be snatched away in a particular situation. The political persons should declare their wealth and should compell the rich persons (merchants etc.) to declare their wealth by hook or crook. Then the treasurer should ask certain legitimate amount from them. But this device should be applied once (*adhyāya* 92)”. We find the exact reflection of this content in the Dharmopadeśamālā.

The Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi presents a story titled ‘*parapāṣaṇḍa-praśamsā*’ [ĀvCū (II) p.281] in which it is told that Cāṇakya snatched away the maintenance-amount of the heretics. It is evident that the *cūrṇikāra* has literally quoted it from the text of Arthaśāstra. The

same attitude towards heretics is mentioned in the 18<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra.

Since the Jaina *śrāvakas* owe to the merchant-class, the motif of ‘gathering the wealth’ might have appealed to them a lot.

**[I]** In the 94<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, Kauṭilya says, “Generally the fire will burn a body or a part of a body, but when a king is enraged he will kill a person along-with his whole family.”

In the Niśītha-bhāṣya, we find the story of ‘*grāma-dāha*’ in which it is depicted that when the villagers broke Cāṇakya’s orders, the village was set on fire by Cāṇakya. It is very interesting that the *bhāṣyakāra* does not blame Cāṇakya for his cruel act. Likewise the story of the weaver Naladāma occurs in the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi and Pariśiṣṭa-parva where Naladāma kills the people of Nanda by adding poison in their food. The strict administration of Cāṇakya is admired in spite of the cruel punishments provided by him.

Both the narratives are as if the concrete examples of the purport expressed at the end of the 94<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra.

**[J]** In the 84<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, the examination of a person having sudden death is dealt with. The details of the funeral rites are given in such cases. Kauṭilya says, “A person whether male or female, commits suicide with anger, jealousy or other sinful intentions, or causes others to do so, then his feet should be tied with a rope and a lower-caste person should drag him with rope on the royal highway. His relatives are not allowed to perform the funeral rites like *śrāddha*. One who breaks this rule, would be punished in the same way.”

When we see the reflection of this rule in the Ardhamāgadhi text Bhagavatī-sūtra, we really get startled. In the 15<sup>th</sup> *śataka* (chap-

ter) of this book, the end of Gośālaka's life is described. Gośālaka, the leader of Ājīvakas accompanies lord Mahāvīra in the initial years of his penance, but in the last lapse of Gośālaka's life, he becomes hostile to Mahāvīra and tries to burn him by his vicious power (*tejoleśyā*). When his power rebounds, it becomes fatal to him. When he gasps his last breath he gives orders to his followers as -

“नो खलु अहं जिणे जिणप्पलावी --- समणे भगवं महावीरे जिणे जिणप्पलावी --- तं तुब्भं णं देवाणुप्पिया ममं कालगयं जाणित्ता वामे पाए सुंभेणं बंधेह, बंधेत्ता तिकखुत्तो मुहे उट्ठुभेह --- सावत्थीए नगरीए --- महापह-पहेसु आकट्ट-विकट्टिं करेह । --- महया अणिट्ठी-असक्कार-समुदएणं ममं सरीरगस्स नीहरणं करेज्जाह, एवं वदित्ता कालगए ।”

(Bhagavatī ; Śataka 15, *sūtra* 141)

“I am not a Jina (the conqueror), not a proper person to be called as Jina. The great ascetic lord Mahāvīra is in true sense a Jina and fit to be called as Jina. Oh gentlemen, after my death, please tie a rope to my left foot, spit on my mouth three times, drag my dead body on the roads and highways of the city of Śrāvastī. Dispose of my body unceremoniously.”

The secterian bias expressed in this passage is quite evident and a subject of a separate article but the Prakrit terminology used in this passage is the exact echo of words used in the 84<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra.

The 15<sup>th</sup> *śataka* of Bhagavatī-sūtra is designated as one of the oldest specimen of Ardhamāgadhī by the scholars. Thus the similarity between the above-mentioned passage and the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is useful for the date-fixation of the Bhagavatī-sūtra. If we accept the upper limit of the eleven *aṅgas* as the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D., we can draw a conclusion that the available version of the Arthaśāstra was popular among the Jaina circle during the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

**[K]** Jñātādharmakathā, the sixth Ardhamāgadhī canonical text is totally comprised off narratives and analogical tales. The 14<sup>th</sup> chapter that of the first part contains a story of Tetaliputra Amātya. When read the story carefully with all intricacies, we feel that the whole story of Tetaliputra Amātya is overshadowed with the life-story of Amātya Cāṇakya, somehow knowingly or unknowingly. The wicked king; rearing up of a prince by the minister; anointing the prince on the throne; the smooth administration in the initial years; king's changed attitude towards the minister; the minister's childlessness and voluntary death at the end - certainly reminds the reader - the story of Amātya Cāṇakya described in the Āvaśyaka and Niśītha-cūrṇis which is neatly presented in the Paṛiśiṣṭa-parva.

We can find the sources of the story of Tetaliputra in the biography of Cāṇakya in a very elaborate manner, but since it is a subject of a separate research paper, we cannot lengthen the subject at this place. It is also noteworthy that the 10<sup>th</sup> chapter of Ṛṣibhāṣita, one of the old Ardhamāgadhī text, repeats the same story of Tetaliputra Amātya in an abridged form, where he is called '*nītiśāstra-viśārada*' i.e. 'wellversed in the science of polity.'

The Jñātādharmakathā is traditionally known as the Mahāvīravāṇī. The later *ācāryas* might have thought that they cannot include the Cāṇakyan tales in canonical literature due to the fault of anacronism. Many of the chapters of Jñātādharmakathā are written in the classical Ardhamāgadhī which is nearer to the Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī than Ārṣa Ardhamāgadhī. When we grasp the shadow of Cāṇakya-kathā in the chapter of Tetaliputra, we can straightly proceed to the conclusion that this chapter is surely an interplotation.

**[L]** In the 14<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, (viz. Aupaniṣadika) contains four *adhyāyas* (146 upto 149). All types of *abhicāras*, *mantras*,

rites based on black magic and fatal miraculous powers of medicinal plants are described in this ‘*adhikaraṇa*’. It is told in the beginning that those deceitful means should be employed to preserve *cāturvarṇya* and to punish the sinful persons.

The writer of the *Mūlācāra* (i.e. Ācārya Vaṭṭakera) openly condemns Cāṇakya most probably concentrating on the 14<sup>th</sup> *adhikaraṇa* of *Arthaśāstra*.

The *Niśītha-cūrṇi* presents a story based on *añjanasiddhi* (III. 423-424). In the story it is depicted that the two disciples of Sūsthitā Ācārya utilized the ‘power of disappearing’ against Candragupta. Cāṇakya revealed them. At the end of the story, Cāṇakya appologizes the Jaina *guru* by saying ‘*micchāmi dukkaḍam*’, which is totally an unbelievable Jainification.

One more story of Cāṇakya is given in the *Niśītha-cūrṇi* II. p.33. Here, Cāṇakya retaliates against Subandhu, his enemy, by besmearing fragrant poison to the birch-leaf. It is depicted that Cāṇakya compels Subandhu to initiate.

It is observed that the Śvetāmbara writers defend Cāṇakya in spite of his *māyācāras* when the Digambara texts like *Mūlācāra* despise Cāṇakya for the same.

### **Observations :**

When we look at the Cāṇakya-narratives in the Jaina literature, through the window of Kauṭīliya *Arthaśāstra*, we know immediately that numerous details of the *Arthaśāstra* are used as motifs. It throws light on the fact that the Jaina authors have gone through the text of *Arthaśāstra* very minutely.

But when we think of the authenticity and historicity of the Cāṇakyan tales, we find that they are incredible and not reliable because many of the motifs and details of the *Arthaśāstra* are

presented as if they are the actual events in the life of Cāṇakya.

The Jainas have created a perfect thought-model to present Cāṇakyan tales. Each and every chapter of the Arthaśāstra is the outcome of Cāṇakya's *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi* (acquired knowledge through experience). Therefore they imbibed each and every incident in Cāṇakya's own life-story. Thus the Cāṇakyan stories are a perfect blend of legends, myths and superimposed fantasies. The whole biography of Cāṇakya is chronologically adequate and logically sound at many times but we cannot claim that it is factually reliable.

## **[2] Some glimpses of the socio-cultural similarities in the Arthaśāstra and Ardhamāgadhi Canons**

The oral tradition of the Ardhamāgadhi Canons, particularly of eleven main (*aṅgas*) texts started from the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C. and the texts were finalized after approximately one thousand years (i.e. 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D.). Even though a long rope is given for the time-to-time interpolations, we have to admit that the socio-cultural environment apparently matches with the conditions of the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya - the unique text on polity available to us at present.

The similarities are so many and so striking, that if we enumerate and document them in an essay-form, it would convert a lengthy article with hair-splitting discussions. Here, an attempt has been made to present some glimpses of the socio-cultural similarities in the both, in a concise form. In this matter, the original Sanskrit words and citations from Arthaśāstra and the original words and citations from Ardhamāgadhi texts are quoted side by side, in *devanāgarī* script. The titles of the subject-matter are given in English. English translation of each and every word is not given because we intend to highlight the phonetic similarities between Sanskrit and Prakrit terms.

For the convenience of the common readers and research-scholars, a simple method is adopted. The socio-cultural references which are more important, are noted and discussed first. Comparatively less important and miscellaneous references are dealt afterwards.

Like the previous topics, a sample study is presented here. We can extend the study on these lines, in multiple ways. The remarkable similarities are -

### **[A] Castes :**

Four principal castes (i.e. ब्राह्मण, क्षत्रिय, वैश्य, शूद्र) are mentioned in both which was an obvious fact in the contemporary society. But many of the subcastes were found due to inter-caste marriages and relationships of which are also mentioned with great details and that too without any reproachful attitude, in the Arthaśāstra and Ardhamāgadhī scriptures. The staunch and disregardful attitude towards these sub-castes or so called lower castes is remarkably absent in the Arthaśāstra and ancient Jaina scriptures.

In the 63<sup>rd</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, the various castes originated due to the anuloma and pratiloma marriages are referred to. They are - अंबष्ठ, निषाद (पारशव), उग्र, ब्रात्य, क्षत्य, आयोगव, चांडाल, मागधव, पुक्कस, वैदेहक, सूत, कूटक, वैण, कुशीलव, श्वपाक and अंतराल. We can trace many of these inter-castes in Ardhamāgadhī texts in the following manner -

- (i) अंबष्ठ (अंबष्ठ) : Sūtrakṛtāṅga 1.9
- (ii) णिसाय (निषाद) : Deśināmamālā 4.35
- (iii) उग (उग्र) : Jñātādharma-kathā 1.108, p.105 (ब्यावर edn.) ; Dhavalā Book 13, p.387-389
- (iv) खत्त (क्षत्त) : Supāsaṇāhacariya 197
- (v) चंडाल (चाण्डाल) : Sūtrakṛtāṅga 1.8 ; Uttarādhyayana 1.10 ; 3.4

(vi) बोक्कस (पुक्कस) : Uttarādhyayana 3.4

(vii) वड़एह, वेदेह (वैदेहक) : Sthānāṅga Comm. p.358

(viii) सोवाग (श्वपाक) : Uttarādhyayana 12.1 ; 12.37

**[B] The servants appointed in the harem :**

In the Ardhamāgadhī scriptures, a long list of female servants and others is given, who were the persons appointed in the harems of kings and in the harems of rich merchants. A representative list from the Jñātādharmakathā can be given as follows -

तए णं से मेहे कुमारे---बहूहिं खुज्जाहिं चिलाइयाहिं वामणि-वडभि-  
बब्बरि-बउसि-जोणिय-पल्हविय-ईसिणिय-धोरुगणि-लासिय-लउसिय-दमिलि-  
सिंहलि-आरबि-पुलिंदि-पक्कणि-बहलि-मुरुंडि-सबरि-पारसीहिं---  
चेडियाचक्कवाल-वरिसधर-कंचुइज्ज-महयरगवंद-परिक्खित्ते---सुहंसुहेणं वड्डइ ।

[Jñātādharmakathā 1.1.96 (p.92)] (ब्यावर edn.)

The 12<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra is dedicated to the appointments of the spies in the royal harem. Herewith, two citations from the 12<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* are noted, from which the similarity with the Jaina scriptures can be easily observed. Kauṭilya says -

‘रसदाः (चाराः) कुब्ज-वामन-किरात-मूक-बधिरजडान्धछद्धानो ---  
स्त्रियश्चाभ्यन्तरं चारं विद्युः । --- अन्तर्गृहचरास्तेषां कुब्ज-वामन-षण्डकाः ।  
शिल्पवत्यः स्त्रियो मूकाश्चित्राश्च म्लेच्छजातयः ।’

In the Jaina scriptures, it is seen that all these persons are actually appointed while Kauṭilya advises to appoint ‘*rasada*’ type of spies in disguise of the above-mentioned males and females.

While describing the personal security-guards of a king, Kauṭilya repeats many such names of females and males. He says-

शयनादुत्थितस्त्रीगणैर्धन्विभिः परिगृह्येत । द्वितीयस्यां कक्ष्यायां  
कञ्चुकोष्णीषिभिर्वर्ष वराभ्यागारिकैः । तृतीयस्यां कुब्ज-वामन-किरातैः ।

(Arthaśāstra *adhyāya* 21)

Kauṭilya uses the word ‘म्लेच्छजातयः’ in the 12<sup>th</sup>, 70<sup>th</sup> and 146<sup>th</sup> *adhyāyas* but all the dastes are not enumerated. It is very interesting that the Ardhamāgadhī text Praśnavyākaraṇa presents a full list of म्लेच्छा<sup>s</sup> and a comment is passed that these people are seen active in violent acts.

‘इमे य बहवे मिलक्खुजाई, के ते ? सग-जवण-सबर-बब्बर---पुलिंद-डोंब---चीण-लासिय-खस-खासिय---हूण-रोमग-रुरु-मरुया चिलायविसयवासी य पावमङ्गो ।’ (Praśnavyākaraṇa 1.1, p.23) (ब्यावर edn.)

### [C] Festivals :

It is surprising that social festivals are not enumerated independantly in the Arthaśāstra. In the 80<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, eight unforeseen calamities are mentioned. Various *pūjas*, *homa*, *bali* and *svastivācana* are referred to for dispelling the calamities. Such *pūjas* are social ‘*devakāryas*’. Certain deities are mentioned which are worth-worshipping viz. Nadi, Indra, Gaṅgā, Parvata, Varuṇa, Samudra, Draha, Nāga and Caityavṛkṣa.

The more vivid picture of festivals and pilgrimages is seen in the Ardhamāgadhī scriptures. The Jñātādharma-kathā mentions -

अज्ज रायगिहे नयरे इंदमहे इ वा खंदमहे इ वा एवं रुद-सिव-वेसमण-नाग-जक्ख-भूय-नई-तलाय-रुक्ख-चेइय-इ वा उज्जाण-गिरिजत्ता इ वा ? (Jñātādharma-kathā 1.1.96) (ब्यावर edn.)

In this passage, ‘मह’ is a festival and ‘जत्ता’ is ‘यात्रा’ means a pilgrimage or *jaṭrā* which means ‘a local fair’. Almost the same list is found in the Ācārāṅga 2.10.2.3 and Bhagavatī 9.33.158 (Ladnu edn.)

After going through the lists carefully, one can realize that both the references almost point to the same strata and time of the society.

### [D] Deities :

When we consider the *Brahmanic* deities and Jaina deities (i.e. *devaloka*) it is obvious that the Jaina concept of heaven, the varieties and subvarieties of *devas*, their Indras and their abodes are very systematically presented than that of the *brahmanic* (both *vedic* and *purāṇic*) deities. Kauṭilya refers various deities in the 25<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* in which he deals with the topic दुर्गनिवेश (i.e. habitating a castle). Kauṭilya says, “In a middle of the fort-city, the temples of Aparājītā (Lakṣmī), Apratihata (Viṣṇu), Jayanta (Kārtika), Vaijayanta (Indra), Śiva, Kubera, Aśvinikumāra, Madirā (Cāmuṇḍā) etc. should be built. Vāstudevatās should be installed at the proper places in those temples. The idols of Brahmā, Indra, Yama and Kārtika should be installed at the entrance. At particular directions, particular (ten) deities should be placed.”

It is known that in the ancient Jaina texts, Kubera is called Vaiśramaṇa and Kārtikeya is called Skanda. We have already seen that in the list of festivals, Ardhamāgadhī books have referred the deities viz. Indra, Skanda, Rudra, Śiva, Vaiśramaṇa and Mukunda, which are of course the contemporary *brahmanic* deities. But the philosophical text Tattvārthasūtra mentions the five highest abodes of gods. Their names are Vijaya, Vaijayanta, Jayanta, Aparājita and Sarvārthasiddha (Tattvārtha. 4.20). The ancient Jaina Śaurasenī text Trilokaprajñapti (3171) mentions that Soma, Yama, Varuṇa and Kubera are four *lokapālas* and serially protect four directions i.e. the east etc. The Jainendra-siddhānta-kośa gives detailed information of the *dik-kumāras*, *dik-kumārīs* and *dik-pāla-devas*. The Pratiṣṭhāsāroddhāra, a book dedicated to rituals quote the names of some other deities as Jayā, Vijayā, Ajitā, Aparājītā etc.

The similarity of the names seen in Kauṭilyan and Jaina deities is really stunning.

**[E] The custom of *arcā* :**

At present, the term '*arcā*' is used as a twin term used with the term '*pūjā*'. The separate meaning of *arcā* is forgotten and is dominated by the word *pūjā*. When going through the studied introduction of the Arthaśāstra written by Mr. Hivargaonkar, I stumbled at the reference which occurred on p.22. He remarks, "The custom of *arcā* for obtaining the wealth is mentioned by Kauṭilya, in which a beast is sacrificed by the worshipper. Aśoka was a staunch follower of non-violence. Therefore the custom might have prevalent during the period of Candragupta and Bindusāra because how can Aśoka allow this violent act ? Thus it is certain that the Arthaśāstra is written before Aśoka."

We can accept Mr. Hivargaonkar's conjecture if it is supplied by some other parallel reference. It is very much revealing that we find the word *accā* (Skt. *arcā*) in the Ardhamāgadhī texts like Sūtrakṛtāṅga (1.13.17 ; 1.15.18 ; 2.2.6) and Sthānāṅga (comm.p.19) in the sense of 'body'. The Ācārāṅga 1.1.6 (*sūtra* 140 - Ladnūn edn.) quotes in *himsā-viveka-pada* that - से बेमि-अप्पेगे अच्चाए वहंति, अप्पेगे अजिणाए वहंति - which means, 'Some people kill animals to get the body, some others kill to get the skin' etc. Here, the term '*accā*' means the 'body'.

In the light of the Jaina references, it is quite clear that the custom or ritual called '*arcā*', noted in the Arthaśāstra which is performed to get wealth is a lower type of 'animal sacrifice'.

**[F] The meaning of *kulaidāka* :**

If we extend this point a little, one similarity between the Arthaśāstra and the Ardhamāgadhī text Uttarādhyayana is noteworthy-

thy. Some debatable words in the Arthaśāstra are discussed by the Kauṭilyan scholar J.S.Karandikar after the introduction of Hivargaonkar. The word ‘कुलैडक’ is used in the 137<sup>th</sup> and 141<sup>st</sup> *adhyāyas* of Arthaśāstra. Shamshastry and Ganapatishastri explain it as - ‘A ram or sheep which is deviated from the flock.’ Karandikar has opposed this meaning because it is not in accordance with the context. He is of the opinion that the word means - ‘A ram (or sheep) nurtured in a house for the purpose of sacrifice (killing).’

The meaning suggested by Karandikar is more appropriate when we supplant it by the poening verses of the *Elaijja* (or *Urabbhijja*) *adhyayana* of Uttarādhyayana. The verses are -

जहाएसं समुद्दिस्स , कोइ पोसेज्ज एलयं ।

ओयणं जवसं देज्जा , पोसेज्जा वि सयंगणे ॥

(Uttarādhyayana 7.1)

तओ से पुट्टे परिवूढे , जायमेए महोदरे ।

पीणिणं विउले देहे , आएसं परिकंखए ॥

(Uttarādhyayana 7.2)

The picturesque description of a fat elaya (Skt. एडक) nurtured in the courtyard of a house, is found in the Uttarādhyayana. It is told that actually it is a waiting period for the ram because as soon as a guest arrives, it is cut into pieces and served to him in a meal.

Thus the word ‘कुलैडक’ can be explained in the light of Uttarādhyayana, more convincingly.

### **[G] Seven-fold kingdom and four-fold *nīti* :**

These two concepts are the distinctive core-concepts of the Arthaśāstra. We expect that we will find it very easily and at many times in the ancient Jaina literature. But to our surprise, these two concepts occur in the Jñātādharma-kathā which is comparatively a later canonical text.

The seven bodies of the kingdom are called ‘*Prakṛtis*’. स्वाम्यमात्यजनपददुर्गाकोशदण्डमित्राणि प्रकृतयः (Arthaśāstra-*adhyāya* 97). *Sāma*, *dāna* (*upapradāna*), *daṇḍa* and *bheda* are the four devices mentioned by Kauṭilya to tackle the enemies, neighbouring kings and others.

The exact definitions and the nature of these *nītis* are explained at various places in the Arthaśāstra. (*adhyāya* 13 ; 14 ; 31)

The prince Abhaya, who was the prime-minister of the king Śreṇika is described in the Jñātādharmakathā in the following manner -

(अभय णामं कुमारे) सामदंडभेयउवप्पयाणणीइ --- अत्थसत्थमइविसारए  
--- सेणियस्स रण्णो रज्जं च रुद्धं च कोसं च कोट्टगारं च बलं च वाहणं च पुरं च  
अंतेउरं च सयमेव समुपेक्खमाणे विहरइ ।

(Jñātādharmakathā 1.1.15, p.22) (ब्यावर edn.)

The same passage is repeated in the 14<sup>th</sup> *adhyāyana* of the same text in context of Tetaliputra Amātya. It is already noted that the whole narrative of Tetaliputra carries a close comparison with the life story of Amātya Cāṇakya.

### [H] Amātya Cāṇakya :

We find that four words are repeatedly used in the Arthaśāstra, very loosely viz. अमात्य, मन्त्रि, सचिव and प्रधान. Their exact designation and hierarchy is not mentioned. Still one fact is clear that Kauṭilya places *amātya* immediately after *rājā*. The whole 8<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* ‘*amātyottpatti*’ is dedicated to describe *amātya*. While dealing with *mantri* and *purohita*, Kauṭilya starts with enumerating the qualities of *amātya* and explains each of the quality catagorically (*adhyāya* 9). In the 10<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* the touch-stones for examining the *amātyas* are provided. Taking into consideration the importance given to the

*amātyas*, the Jaina authors have always referred him as Amātya Cāṇakya. Many of the Jaina prakrit narratives begin with the following words, ‘पाडलिपुत्ते चंदगुत्तो राया । अमच्चो चाणक्को ।’ The Jainas have never called him *mantri* or *saciva*.

## **[II] Geographical regions and kingdoms :**

The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is a prominent text of Magadhan literature. The ancient history of Jainism is closely associated with Magadha region and Ardhamāgadhī language. Therefore we find a close resemblance between the Arthaśāstra and the ancient Ardhamāgadhī texts in which various geographical regions and kingdoms are noted which were politically important at that time.

The Anuyogadvāra gives ten synonyms of the word ‘*skandha*’ [Anuyogadvāra-*sūtra* 58, p.55 (ब्यावर edn.)] in which the word *gaṇa* is the first one. Scholars of Indology say that this word is suggestive of the *gaṇarājyas* like *licchavi*, *vajji*, *malla* etc. in ancient India.

While explaining the *laukika-āgamas*, Anuyogadvāra refers the four *vedas* with *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*. The commentator of this text mentions four *upavedas* of four main *vedas*. According to him the Arthaśāstra is the *upaveda* of Atharvaveda. (Anuyogadvāra p.412, ब्यावर edn.) Though Kauṭīliya eliminates the Atharvaveda from *trayī*, still he preaches people to chant the *mantras* of Atharvaveda on various occasions.

With all this background, there is no wonder if we find the names of various kingdoms which are common in the Arthaśāstra and ancient Jaina texts. While documenting various myths, Kauṭīliya mentions Pauṇḍra, Kosala, Magadha, Avanti, Vaṅga and particularly king Pradyota of Ujjayinī and his son ‘Pālaka’ (*adhyāya* 95).

The spies called *vaidehaka* and *māgadha* are certainly related to their concerned regions (*adhyāya* 12). Kauṭilya says that Magadha, Paṇḍra, Kāśī, Vatsa and Mālava are famous for cotton clothes (*adhyāya* 13) and Kalinga, Aṅga, Saurāṣṭra, Daśārṇa and Pañcanada (Punjab) are famous for elephants.

These kingdoms and regions occur in the Ardhamāgadhi and old Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī texts for literally hundreds of times. Almost all traditional narratives of the Jainas start with the names of the *janapadas* mentioned above.

**[J] Miscellaneous cultural references in brief :**

i) All the details of *gaṇikās* are documented in the 48<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra. *Gaṇikās* and *rūpājīvās* (*veśyās*) are differentiated. Kauṭilya says that each *gaṇikā* should note and declare her rate of service. The Jñātādharma-kathā mentions that a particular *gaṇikā* was available at one thousand (golden coins) per day (Jñātādharma-kathā 1.3.46). In the Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī narrative literature, the high social and cultural status of *gaṇikās* and *veśyās* is seen frequently. Their roles in the ‘crime-world’ are painted in the texts like Ākhyānamāṇikośa, Kumārapālāpratibodha and Manoramākathā.

ii) The 40<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra is dedicated to the ‘weights and measurements’. The weights and measurements like *māṣa*, *aṅgula* etc. frequently occur in the contemporary Jaina texts. One remarkable thing is, Kauṭilya suggests to use the standard weights which were prepared in Magadha. *Māgadha-prastha* is referred to in the Anuyogadvāra p.230, p.423 (ब्यावर edn.)

iii) Kauṭilya mentions various types of liquor, wine and alcohol in the 46<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*. The varieties are mentioned as madhu-maireya-surā-sīdhū etc. The Jñātādharma-kathā repeats the same list in the

same order while describing the preparations made for the *svayamvara* of Draupadī (Jñātādharma-kathā 1.16.118).

iv) A list of wild beasts and animals is seen in the 38<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra from which human beings get leather, teeth, horns, hair etc. for their use. The same list of animal products are mentioned in the Ācārāṅga (1.1.140 Ladnun edn.), where it is told that this type of violence should be avoided by accepting the vow of non-violence.

v) In the 36<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, the lists of स्नेहवर्ग, क्षारवर्ग, लवणवर्ग, फलाम्लवर्ग, द्रवाम्लवर्ग, कटुकवर्ग, शाकवर्ग etc. are mentioned. Majority of the eatable articles are seen in the chapter called पिण्डैषणा in the 2<sup>nd</sup> *śrutaskandha* of Ācārāṅga. In some of the cases, we actually get the Prakrit renderings of the Sanskrit words quoted in the Arthaśāstra. For example, Kauṭilya quotes -

सैन्धवसामुद्रबिडयवक्षारसौवर्चलोद्भेदजा लवणवर्गः । (*adhyāya* 36)

The Daśavaikālika gives a list of prohibited articles prescribed for a monk in the third chapter. It quotes -

सोवच्चले सिंधवे लोणे , रोमालोणे य आमए ।

सामुदे पंसुखारे य , कालालोणे य आमए ॥

सव्वमेयमणाइणं णिगंथाण महेसिणं ॥

(Daśavaikālika 3.8.11)

vi) The title of the 32<sup>nd</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra is ‘कोशप्रवेश्यरत्नपरीक्षा’ i.e. “The examination of the excellent articles which are worthy to deposit in the royal treasury.” The whole chapter reveals the ultimate richness of our country by enumerating the varieties of pearls, ornaments, jewels and diamonds, sandalwoods, scents and fragrances, exclusive leathers, wools and decorated woolen articles, silks and silken clothes and cotton of the highest quality.

When we go through the minute details provided by the Nīśitha-cūrṇi, we find almost every detail in a very elaborate manner.

Especially, the references of leather-types, sandlewood, wools and blankets are a big surprise for a scholar. It is impossible to note each detail because they are innumerable. At this juncture, it is requested that an interested reader may go through the book of Dr. Madhu Sen titled, 'A Cultural Study of Niśītha-cūrṇi.'

vii) The 33<sup>rd</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra is dedicated to metallurgy in which mines, ores, mints and coins are discussed. The Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi provides an important reference in its depiction of Cāṇakya's brief biography. When Cāṇakya conspires with the help of Candragupta and parvataka to snatch away Nanda's kingdom, the first step taken by Cāṇakya was to gather the information about the mines of valuable metals. The Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi says, 'सो धातुबिलाणि मगति ।'. The important coins mentioned in the Arthaśāstra (*adhyāya* 33) are *paṇa*, *māṣa* and *kākaṇī*. The references of '*paṇa*' as a coin, are very few in the Ardhamāgadhī literature but the words *āvaṇa*, *āvaṇavīhi* and *āvaṇīya* are very common.

The frequent use of the words 'माष' and 'काकिणी' is seen in the Prakrit narratives. Uttarādhyayana quotes -

जहा कागिणिए हेउं , सहस्सं हारए नरो ।

अपत्थं अंबगं भोच्चा , राया रज्जं तु हारए ॥

(Uttarādhyayana 7.11)

“As one loses thousand to get a *kākiṇī*, likewise the king lost his kingdom by transgressing his dietary regimen by eating a mango.”

In the 8<sup>th</sup> *adhyayana*, it is mentioned that -

जहा लाहो तहा लोहो , लाहा लोहो पवड्डइ ।

दोमासकयं कज्जं कोडीए वि न निट्ठियं ॥

(Uttarādhyayana 8.17)

“As one gains some profit, one's greed increases. I started this work to get two *māṣas* but my lust does not end even after getting

crores.”

In the Upadeśapada (gā. 545) it is noted that one *kākiṇī* is equal to twenty cowries.

The reference of Kumārapālpratibodha is important because it tells a story about Candragupta, Bindusāra, Aśoka and his son Kuṇāla. The verse runs as -

चंदगुप्त-पुत्रो य बिंदुसारस्स नत्तुओ ।  
असोगसिरिणो पुत्तो अंधो जायइ काकिणिं ॥

(Kumārapālpratibodha p.170)

“The great-grandson of Candragupta, the grandson of Bindusāra and the son of the great Aśoka is a blind begger who is begging a *kākiṇī*.” As the story advances, the other meaning of *kākiṇī* is explained as ‘a kingdom’, which is very rarely used in Sanskrit. The Samavāyāṅga provides altogether new information about ‘*kākiṇī*’. In the 14<sup>th</sup> *samavāya* (chapter), it is mentioned that a Cakravartin possesses fourteen excellent things in which a precious diamond called *kākiṇī* is included.

### Observations :

There are numerous socio-cultural resemblances in the Arthaśāstra and especially in the ancient Prakrit literature of Jainas. A colourful spectrum is presented here which is seen through the window of Arthaśāstra. On one hand, these resemblances put light on the hidden socio-cultural facts of the Jaina literature while on the other hand, due to this parallelism, the facts of the Arthaśāstra are confirmed.

### [3] Common terminology in the Jaina ethical texts and Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra

Generally the conduct of householders and monks is covered under the title ‘Ethics’. Śrāvakācāra and Sādhuācāra contain general and specific rules and its transgressions in the Jaina literature dedi-

cated to ethics. Since the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is a science of governance and administration, it is expected that each person should follow the rules laid down for him as a citizen, in spite of one's religion. When the Jaina writers codified their *ācāra-saṃhitā*, naturally they carefully studied the Arthaśāstra. The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is an important part of Magadhan literature, where Jainism flourished in its initial centuries. Therefore, there is no wonder that we find ample examples of common terminology in both.

Here, some important words and expressions are considered with the relevant citations, as a sample study. If the whole data is fully exploited, it can be easily converted into a doctoral thesis.

### **[i] Śāsana :**

The 31<sup>st</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra gives all the details of the king's edict i.e. written order. At the very outset it is told that these types of written orders are called 'śāsana'. It is a duty of a king to draw such edicts and it is the duty of a citizen to follow it without any breach. Several types of orders are described in this chapter at length.

It is seen that the words *śāsana* and *jinaśāsana* are very popular in the old Ardhamāgadhī texts. It is expected that every Jaina person particularly a monk should follow the strict orders of the Jinas or Tīrthaṅkaras because they carry no less importance than that of a king's verdicts. The Sūtrakṛtāṅga (1.3.69) notes that -

एवमेगे उ पासत्था पणवेति अणारिया ।

इत्थीवसं गया बाला जिणसासणपरंमुहा ॥

In this verse it is told that, "The Pārśvasthas (the followers of Pārśvanātha) have deterred themselves from the order of the Jinas (Jinaśāsana) because they are subjected to womanfolk.

The Daśavaikālika expects the calmness and quietness of mind in a monk because it is a natural culmination of the Jinaśāsana. (आसुरत्तं न गच्छेज्जा सोच्चाणं जिणसासणं - Daśavaikālika 8.25) The Uttarādhyayana advises a monk to remain unperturbed in any type of adversity because he has heard the order (or preaching) of the Jinas (Uttarādhyayana 2.6). The same text mentions that king Sañjaya abandoned the kingdom and became a member of the realm of the Jinas (Uttarādhyayana 18.19). The word Jinaśāsana is repeatedly used in the 18<sup>th</sup> chapter of the Uttarādhyayana.

It is very curious to note down the traditional slogan of all the Jainas despite of sects and subsects viz. जैनं जयति शासनम् ।

### [ii] Adhikaraṇa :

Kauṭilya uses the word ‘*adhikaraṇa*’ for the chapters in his Arthaśāstra. There are 15 *adhikaraṇas* and 150 *adhyāyas* in the book. Seven different meanings are noted of the word ‘*adhikaraṇa*’ in common Sanskrit dictionaries. The word is normally used in the judicial matter or in the grammar.

Tattvārthasūtra, the Jaina philosophical text uses the word ‘*adhikaraṇa*’ in different sense. It says -

अधिकरणं जीवाजीवाः (Tattvārtha 6.8)

“The instrument of long-term *karmic-flow* are both - sentient and non-sentient entities.”

The later writers simply say that there are 108 varieties of the *karmic* bondage, viz. *hiṃsā* (violence). The commentator of Mūlācāra has located two different meanings of ‘*adhikaraṇa*’ and says that, ‘The *adhikaraṇas* (chapters) of Arthaśāstra are in true sense the instruments of *karmic-bondage* due to violence involved in it.’

### [iii] Vyavahāra :

The term ‘*vyavahāra*’ is used literally hundreds of times in the Arthaśāstra. Normal Sanskrit dictionaries mention eleven meanings of the word ‘*vyavahāra*’. We can group the meanings into four categories. The first one is normal work, matter or affair. The second one is related to conduct, behaviour or action. The next one is related to commerce and trade. The fourth one takes care of legal disputes and legal procedures. Though Kauṭilya uses the word at different places with different meanings, the word ‘*vyavahāra*’ used in the 58<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* is very peculiar. It is limited to the ‘witness’ or ‘testimony’.

In the Jaina literature, we find several meanings of *vyavahāra*, but one meaning is more peculiar and technical which is implied in the word ‘*vyavahārasūtra*’. The Kalpa-Niśītha and Vyavahāra are the three important ancient Chedasūtras written by the 1<sup>st</sup> Bhadrabāhu in the language, Ardhamāgadhī. The Vyavahāra is a law-book for a monk or nun in which general and specific rules of behaviour are given and atonements are prescribed, in the form of penances, if the rules are transgressed knowingly or unknowingly. When we go through the three *bhāṣyagāthās* of Vyavahāra (viz. 1.91 ; 1.132 ; 10.592), we know immediately that they are concerned with Cāṇakya, his administration and his death. This fact throws light on the connection of the Arthaśāstra and the Jaina code of conduct.

### [iv] Pāṣaṇḍa (Pākhaṇḍa) :

The terms *pāṣaṇḍa* and *pāṣaṇḍin* (viz. heretics) are used in almost ten *adhyāyas* of the Arthaśāstra. All the subsects of non-vedic schools are designated as *pāṣaṇḍas*. The Śākyas (Bauddhas), Ājīvakas and Jainas are enumerated among *pāṣaṇḍas*. The overall treatment

given to the *pāṣaṇḍas* is very rude and strict. Kauṭilya keeps close watch on the ascetic class. He is comparatively soft towards *śrotriya* (vedic) *brahmins* while too harsh towards all *pāṣaṇḍas*. Kauṭilya's attitude can be seen thus -

- a) Heretics can be sent to the other states as messengers. (*adhyāya* 16)
- b) If necessary, the contribution collected by the groups of heretics can be snatched away and added to the royal treasury. (*adhyāya* 18)
- c) The dwellings of heretics and lower castes (*cāṇḍālas*) should be beyond the boundaries of the crematory. (*adhyāya* 25)
- d) The dwellings of heretics etc. should be properly searched from time to time. (*adhyāya* 57)
- e) The heretics and others (i.e. *āśramavāsins*) should live together peacefully without creating nuisance to each other. (*adhyāya* 73)

The Prakrit terms '*pāṣaṇḍa*' and particularly '*para-pāṣaṇḍa*' are seen in the Āvaśyaka-sūtra under the transgressions of '*samyaktva*' (right faith on the Jaina tenets). There is a close connection between the Āvaśyaka literature and Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. The first full biography of Cāṇakya is found in the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi. Probably at that time (6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) the legends and myths about Cāṇakya were at the zenith of its popularity. Side by side, the Jaina writers were studying the text (i.e. Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra) carefully. They might have stumbled at the despicable term '*pāṣaṇḍa*' used for them. Naturally the *cūrṇikāra* presents the story of Cāṇakya as an example of *para-pāṣaṇḍa-praśamsā* in which Cāṇakya is depicted as a Jaina householder and praises *brahmanic* ascetics erroneously (ĀvCū. II, p.281)

This is the natural reflective reaction of the harsh and strict attitude towards heretics depicted in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra.

Later Jaina authors have avoided the word *para-pāṣaṇḍa* and have used the word ‘*anya-dṛṣṭi*’ (Tattvārtha 7.18). Likewise the Jainas created the new word ‘*mithya-dṛṣṭi*’ or ‘*mithyātvī*’ to replace the word ‘*pāṣaṇḍa*’.

It is noteworthy that the liberal-minded monarch Aśoka offered a new measure to the word ‘*pāṣaṇḍa*’ in his rock-edicts. According to him ‘*pāṣaṇḍa*’ is ‘sect’ whether it is one’s own or of the others and expects that there should be an equal honor towards ‘*ātma-pāṣaṇḍa*’ and ‘*para-pāṣaṇḍa*’.

#### **[5] Tīrtha :**

The term ‘*tīrtha*’ carries a peculiar meaning in the Arthaśāstra and in the Jaina religion, based on the etymological meaning viz. a passage, way, road, ford or a descent into a river.

In the 12<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, Kauṭīliya uses the phrase ‘अष्टादशेषु तीर्थेषु’ in which eighteen departments of the government are implied. We find the same meaning of the word in the Rāmāyaṇa (Hivargaonkar, Introduction p.43). According to Kauṭīliya, *mahāmātra* is the chief of each department and in this sense the person is the *tīrthakara*.

In the second chapter of the work ‘Nītivākyaṃṛta’ which is a later version of the Arthaśāstra, the Digambara writer Somadeva says, ‘धर्मसमवायिनः कार्यसमवायिनश्च पुरुषाः तीर्थम् ।’ It is seen that Somadeva includes the officers in the definition of *tīrtha*, who look after the religious matter as well as carry out the legislative, judicial and executive functions of the government.

The Tīrthaṅkara or Tīrthakara is a Jaina Arhat who is a sacred preceptor, who shows the right path of liberation. He is

always called a 'ford-maker' or creator and guide of four departments (*saṃghas*) i.e. *sādhū-sādhvī* and *śrāvaka-śrāvikā*. In the Jaina literature we find the words like अन्यतीर्थिक (Samavāya 60) तीर्थसिद्ध, अतीर्थसिद्ध (Sthānāṅga 1) etc. Instead of using reproachful term *pāṣaṇḍa* or *pākhaṇḍa*, the Jaina texts prefer the word '*anyatīrthika*' to describe their non-Jaina cult.

Thus, the old stock-word '*tīrtha*' was taken and developed by Kauṭilya and the Jaina tradition in different directions.

#### **[6] Saṃgha and Gaṇa :**

In the science of polity, two technical words viz. '*saṃgha*' and '*gaṇa*' carry extreme importance. Like the word '*tīrtha*', these two words are also stock-words used in the *brahmanic* and *śramaṇic* culture with a slight difference.

Kauṭilya uses the word '*saṃgha*' in two senses. In the 14<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* he says, 'तेन संघभूता व्याख्याताः ।' Here, the groups or corporations of labourers and workers are referred to. But in the 17<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, when he says, 'कुलसंघो हि दुर्जयः', the word suggests the type of governmental system or polity. The scholars who have studied the ancient literature of Jains and Bauddhas, opine that the words '*saṃgha*' and '*gaṇa*' point out to the free, autonomus, independant republic states of the contemporary political India. (see Hivargaonkar, Introduction p.31-32)

The Jains and Bauddhas have used these words in the constitution of their religions. Buddha, Dhamma and Saṃgha - these three are adorables in the Buddhism. The Jains declared that the 'fourfold *saṃgha*' is the base of their religious activities. Besides this, like Kauṭilya, the Jaina texts use the words '*saṃgha*' and '*śreṇī*' which denote the corporations or guilds of skilled workers. In the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of Jñātādharma-kathā, we find the references of

*kumbhakāra-śreṇī*, *citrakāra-śreṇī* etc. [1.8.80 (p.382) ब्यावर edn. ; 1.8.90 (p.390) ब्यावर edn.]. The Jaina texts like *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* have used the word *śreṇī* which suggests the spiritual status of an aspiror. The doctrine of *guṇaśreṇī* is found elaborately in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* (1<sup>st</sup> century A.D.)

The term '*gaṇa*' in the Arthaśāstra possesses a common meaning i.e. 'a group'. Kauṭilya refers '*kṣatriya*' and '*śreṇī*' as the examples of *saṃghas* (republican states) but he does not recognize it as *saṃgha-rājyas* or *gaṇa-rājyas*. (Hivargaonkar p.32)

The reference of *Ācārāṅga* is extremely important in this matter because it presents a list of the modes of administration. The text runs as -

अरायाणि वा गणरायाणि वा जुवरायाणि वा दोरज्जाणि वा विरुद्धरज्जाणि वा ।

(*Ācārāṅga* 2.12.1.7)

The names of *gaṇarājyas* (republic states) are noted by the Indologists by the help of the Greek historians. Therefore the mention of *gaṇarājyas* in the *Ācārāṅga* is valuable. We find the example of '*dveirājya*' (Prakrit-*dorāyā*) in the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*, in which dual kingship of Candragupta and Parvataka is mentioned.

The term '*gaṇa*' is used in the Jaina history for a particular group of monks. There were eleven *gaṇadharas* who got instructions from lord Mahāvīra and divided these religious preachings into eleven *aṅga-granthas*.

Furtheron, the Jaina *mūlasaṃghas* were divided into different *gaṇas* and *gacchas*. Here the word *gaṇa* is used in its narrower sense.

Thus the usage of the terms '*gaṇa*' and '*saṃgha*' goes back to the ancient political history of Magadha, Aṅga, Vaṅga and Kāliṅga.

## [7] Daṇḍa :

There is no need to say that Kauṭilya is very much cautious

about *daṇḍa* and *daṇḍanīti*. The 2<sup>nd</sup> *adhyāya* opens with the names of fourfold *vidyās*, viz. *ānvīkṣikī*, *trayī*, *vārtā* and *daṇḍanīti*. In the 5<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* he says that the fourth one is at the base of the other three *vidyās*. The 4<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* discusses about तीक्ष्णदण्ड, मृदुदण्ड and यथार्हदण्ड categorically. In the 13<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, the four measures to satisfy the dissatisfied ones are told, viz. *sāma*, *dāna* (*upapradāna*), *daṇḍa* and *bheda*. In the 31<sup>st</sup> *adhyāya*, the definitions of these four measures are given. With a great thought-clarity Kauṭilya says, “Killing (violence), torture (ill-treatment) and snatching away the wealth (fine) is called *daṇḍa* (punishment)”. The famous *cāṇakyaśūtras* throw light on the importance of *daṇḍa* and *daṇḍanīti*.

The Jaina code of conduct, discusses a lot about *daṇḍa*, *arthadaṇḍa*, *anarthadaṇḍa*, *manodaṇḍa*, *vacanadaṇḍa*, *kāyadaṇḍa*, *dravyadaṇḍa*, *bhāvadaṇḍa*, and so on and so forth, but with a slight different manner. *Daṇḍa* is violence. *Arthadaṇḍa* is violence with some purpose or reason. *Anarthadaṇḍa* is purposeless violence. The *Uttarādhyayana* says -

दंडाणं गास्वाणं च, सल्लणं च तियं तियं ।

जे भिक्खू चयई निच्चं , से न अच्छई मंडले ॥ (Utt.31.4)

The three types of *daṇḍas* mentioned here are the inauspicious activities of mind, speech and body which are harmful to one's self and other living beings. *Anartha-daṇḍa-viramaṇa* is the third *guṇavrata* among the 12 vows prescribed for a Jaina householder. This is the vow to abstain from frivolous and harmful activities which do not serve any human purpose (Tattvārtha.7.16).

Though the word '*daṇḍa*' is same in the *Arthaśāstra* and Jaina ethics, the implications are different. Kauṭilya's *daṇḍa* is the punishment inflicted by the king to the criminals but the Jainas think

that when we lead an uncontrolled life, we are criminals because we inflict unnecessary punishments to the organisms around us.

The Āvaśyaka-sūtra (sūtra 80) provides all the details of *anartha-daṇḍa*, which is significant because we have already observed the close connection between the Āvaśyaka and its literature with Arthaśāstra.

### [8] Vṛṣala-Vṛṣālī

Now, we will consider the most debated words ‘vṛṣala’ and ‘vṛṣālī’ in the light of (i) Arthaśāstra (ii) the drama Mudrārākṣasa and (iii) its Prakrit equivalents.

In the 12<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, Kauṭilya deals with the wandering spies. While describing female-espionage, he says -

परिव्राजिकाः --- प्रगल्भा ब्राह्मण्यः --- महामात्रकुलानि अधिगच्छेत् ।

He adds - एतया मुण्डा वृषल्यो व्याख्याताः ।

In this passage, it is clear that the *brahmin* female ascetics are called ‘परिव्राजिकाः’. Furtheron, Kauṭilya expects the same duties from the tonsured *vṛṣālīs*. Many of the Kauṭilyan scholars translate the word as ‘female ascetics of lower-caste (शूद्रा)’.

All the translators and scholars of the drama Mudrārākṣasa think that Cāṇakya addresses Candragupta as ‘vṛṣala’ due to his birth in the lower-caste. This hypothesis is not true when we examine the reference of Arthaśāstra. In the same chapter on espionage, the word ‘śramaṇa’ occurs which includes all the non-*vedic* cults. In the 77<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, we get the reference as -

शाक्य-आजीवकादीन् वृषलप्रव्रजितान् देवपितृकार्येषु भोजयतरश्शत्यो दण्डः ।

Here, the word *vṛṣala* is used for the monks who are initiated in the Buddhist, Āvīvaka and other (Jaina) *saṃghas*. This is certainly a list of non-*vedic* (*śramaṇa*) monks. It is possible that some of them might have arrived from lower-caste but there is no proof that

the word ‘*vṛṣala*’ necessarily means *sūdra*. On the other hand the non-*vedic* root of them is confirmed by the close examination of the above-mentioned references in the *Arthaśāstra*.

After the critical examination of the Prakrit words बुसि (वृषि, वृषिन्) ; वुसी (वृषी) and also बुसि etc. quoted in the dictionary *Pāiasadda-mahaṇṇavo*, we know that this term is used for a ‘*muni*’ initiated in a non-*vedic* tradition. When we go through the citation, ‘एस धम्मे वुसीमओ’, which is repeated in the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* (1.8.19 ; 1.11.15) and *Uttarādhyayana* (5.18) we come to the final conclusion that the terms *vṛṣala* and *vṛṣalī* are closely connected with the Jaina monks.

### Observations :

In this small article, eight key-words are chosen and brought under the scanner. Each word possesses a basic etymological meaning. Kauṭīlya uses it with the shade of the meaning which is suitable for the writing his treatise on polity. Ancient Jaina texts incorporate the same words with the meanings suitable for their ethical and philosophical framework. These are some of glimpses of our common heritage - called the ‘Indian Culture’. We can extend the study with more words like - इंगित-आकार ; उज्छ ; एषणा ; कापटिक ; आवाप ; परिहार and so on.

### [4] Jaina code of conduct from the perspective of Kauṭīlya

#### Arthaśāstra

In this topic we are not going to discuss the whole Jaina Ethics which is distinctively divided into (i) the code of conduct for the Jaina householders and (ii) the code of conduct for the Jaina monks. Jaina Ethics is a wide and independent branch of the Jaina literature which is flourished through centuries and expressed in various old, middle and modern Indo-Āryan languages.

It is already noted that the Ardhamāgadhī texts and particularly the *aṅga*, *mūlasūtra* and *chedasūtra* texts are closely connected with the history of Magadha. *Śrāvakācāra* (the conduct of householders or laymen) is documented in the *aṅga*-text Upāsakadaśā while Mūlasūtras and Chedasūtras contain *sādhuācāra*. The Āvaśyaka mentions both the *ācāras*. Whether a *sādhu* or *śrāvaka*, he is basically a citizen of this country. Though the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra is a comprehensive treatise on Polity, one part of the Arthaśāstra provides rules of conduct for the citizens and if transgressed, recommends various type of punishments.

Almost all the scholars of Kauṭīliyan studies have commented upon Kauṭīliya's attitude towards ascetic class in general and his attitude towards the Jaina and Buddhist monks in particular. While dealing with different topics, Kauṭīliya speaks many times about *saṃnyāsī*, *siddha*, *tāpasa*, *śrotriya*, *brahmin*, *parivrājaka*, *bhikṣu*, *kṣapaṇaka* and *pāṣaṇḍin*. Though he is a little bit liberal and partial to *śrotriya brahmins*, his overall attitude to ascetic class is harsh, practical and full of expectations from them. But it is clear that Kauṭīliya basically treats them as the citizens of the country and expects from them the following of the general rules of conduct with very few exceptions.

The fourth *adhikaraṇa* of Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra titled '*kaṇṭakaśodhana*', deals with the search of criminals and proper punishments are prescribed accordingly. When a person, well-versed in the Jaina Ethics goes through the *adhyāyas* of Arthaśāstra from seventy-eight upto ninety of the 4<sup>th</sup> *adhikaraṇa*, he immediately remembers the Jaina code of conduct, prescribed for an householder (*śrāvaka*). Jaina *śrāvakācāra* is based on *vratas* (vows) and *aticāras*

(transgressions). Surprisingly enough, the title of the 90<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* is ‘*aticāraḍaṇḍa*’.

A layman is expected to follow the five smaller vows (*aṇu-vratas*) and to avoid five transgressions of each *aṇuvrata*. In each of the five smaller vows, the word ‘*sthūla*’ is added because a householder is expected to observe the vows grossly, in the perspective of an ideal monk who observes the bigger vow with all the subtle implications. Afterwards three *guṇa-vratas* and four *śikṣā-vratas* are mentioned in order to stabilize the *śrāvaka* in the five *aṇu-vratas*. If we see the nature of these seven *vratas*, they are more or less religious and spiritual. The first five *aṇu-vratas* are related to ethics and morality which is expected from every human being irrespective of class, caste or religion. Among these five, the last one is *parigraha-parimāṇa* i.e. limiting one’s own needs or possessions. We cannot generalize the exact scope of this vow. So we can treat it as an ethical principle and not as an ethical rule. The first four smaller vows can be converted into ethical rules if a deep thought is given. Thus with the help of the text *Upāsakadaśā* (1<sup>st</sup> *adhyāya*), four *aṇu-vratas* and its transgressions can be documented in a consolidated form. But since our purpose is to correlate it with the *Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*, after documenting each vow and each transgression, the concerned part of the *Arthaśāstra* is quoted.

**1<sup>st</sup> Aṇuvrata :** The vow of desisting (abstaining) from gross injury (non-violence)

The five transgressions are enumerated as *vadha*, *bandha*, *chaviccheda*, *atibhāra* and *bhaktapānaviccheda*.

(i) **Vadha :**

One should not kill and beat the animal (and also the human being).

Arthaśāstra :

The 88<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* is totally dedicated to the crime titled ‘*vadha*’. Here, crimes related to humans and animals are enumerated. Corporal punishments and fines are prescribed by Kauṭilya. In the 50<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, it is mentioned that if one beats or abducts animals, he should be punished by capital punishment. Fine is prescribed for harming animals (*adhyāya* 76).

(ii) Bandha :

One should not keep the animal (and human being) tied so as to cause discomfort.

Arthaśāstra :

In the 74<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, it is specifically mentioned that one who deliberately keeps a man or woman tied, a fine of 1000 *paṇas* is prescribed.

(iii) Chaviccheda :

One should not cut or pierce the animal (or human being) in any part of the body.

Arthaśāstra :

A whole paragraph on ‘*chaviccheda*’ is given in the 76<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* by giving the examples of cutting hands, legs, ears or breaking teeth are mentioned. A severe fine is prescribed. The punishment of fine is extended for the ‘*chaviccheda*’ of animals and trees in the same *adhyāya*. In fact the whole topic on ‘*daṇḍapāruṣya*’ is summarized by the Jaina *ācāryas* in the title of the transgression i.e. *chaviccheda*.

(iv) Atibhāra :

One should not overload or burden an animal which is unbearable.

Arthaśāstra :

If the bullocks (50<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*), horses (51<sup>st</sup> *adhyāya*) and elephants (52<sup>nd</sup> *adhyāya*) are overloaded and utilized carelessly, severe fine is prescribed.

(v) Bhaktapānaviccheda :

One should not underfeed the animal or disturb it during its feeding.

Arthaśāstra :

In the 50<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, it is mentioned that if an animal dies due to underfeeding, the caretaker should be punished. A proper care should be taken of the calves, old cows and diseased animals.

**Observations :**

Many scholars, who have studied the householder's conduct of Jainas, express their surprise that the five transgressions of 'gross non-violence' are majorly connected to animals and not to human beings. This riddle can be solved easily if we read the concerned chapters of the Arthaśāstra. The Jaina householders generally owe to merchant class (*vaiśya-varṇa*). Kauṭilya notes four *vidyas* among which the third one is *vārtā*. He says, 'कृषिपशुपाल्य वाणिज्या च वार्ता' (*adhyāya* 4) i.e agriculture, cattle-rearing and trade is called '*vārtā*'. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> *adhyāya*, Kauṭilya says that the *vaiśyas* earn livelihood by these three occupations. Naturally rules and regulations prescribed for *paśupālana* are important for the Jaina householders of that time.

At the advent of time, the Jaina householders concentrated on '*vāṇijjya*' due to many reasons, but in the Ardhmāgadhī canonical texts there is equal stress on the occupation of cattle-rearing. The behavioural patterns of the Jainas have changed but the rules of

*śrāvakācāra* are the same. Thus, there is no wonder that the above-mentioned transgressions of gross-non-violence reflect the Kauṭilyan views on 'paśupālana'. In fact the concept of *aticāras* is based on the 90<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra i.e. *aticāraḍaṇḁa*.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Aṇuvrata :** The vow of desisting (abstaining) from gross falsehood.

*Sthūla-mṛṣāvāḁa-viramaṇa-vrata* is elaborated in two ways. *Sahasā-abhyākhyāna* etc. are the five transgressions which are traditionally known and noted in the Upāsakadaśā and Āvaśyaka-sūtra. Among these five, four are concerned with personal ethhics but the last transgression is important because of it's social importance.

(i) The last transgression is *kūṭalekha-karaṇa* i.e. to make false documents.

In the 80<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, Kauṭilya says, 'Deporation is the proper punishment for the persons who prepare false agreements.' In the 86<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, there is a separate paragraph on the clerk (*lekha*) in the court who dabbles with the facts, changes it, adds something new or ministerpretes the documents. A severe fine is prescribed for preparing such type of *kuṭalekha*.

(ii) A further account of the 2<sup>nd</sup> *aṇuvrata* mentions a number of events in which ambiguous, misleading or deceitful behaviour is likely to occur. However, it is pointed out that such deceitful behaviour is no less a transgression though it is common or natural.

Falsehood regarding the engagement or wedding of a girl is known as *kanyālika*. 89<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra titled '*kanyāprakrama*' takes notice of all the crimes regarding unmarried girls. No doubt, the transgression '*kanyālika*' covers all these crimes.

Falsehood regarding selling or buying of cattle is called

*gavālīka*. We can easily connect this transgression to the subject-matter discussed in the 50<sup>th</sup>, 51<sup>st</sup> and 52<sup>nd</sup> *adhyāyas* of Arthaśāstra.

Falsehood regarding selling or buying of land is *bhūmyalīka*. The 64<sup>th</sup>, 65<sup>th</sup> and 66<sup>th</sup> *adhyāyas* of Arthaśāstra deal with the crimes and punishments regarding immovable properties, sale deeds of land, medows-pastures-cultivated lands and many other land-connected issues. We can claim that the transgression called *bhūmyalīka* can take care of all these issues.

(iii) Falsehood regarding the deposits is called *nyāsāpahāra*. Kauṭilya speaks a lot in this matter in the 83<sup>rd</sup> *adhyāya*. He says -  
स्तेन-निधि-निक्षेप-आहारप्रयोग-गूढाजीविनामन्यतमं शङ्केतेति शङ्काभिग्रहः ।

(iv) False-witness (*kūṭasākṣī*) is the last transgression enumerated under the second *aṇuvrata*. In the 81<sup>st</sup> *adhyāya*, Kauṭilya says, 'deportation is the proper punishment for the false witness'. The words '*kūṭa*' and '*gūḍha*' are oftenly used in the 81<sup>st</sup> *adhyāya*. All types of falsehood are enumerated in this chapter. Thus we can say that the transgressions of falsehood described in the Jaina *śrāvakācāra* might have some connection with 81<sup>st</sup> chapter of the Arthaśāstra. The following terms and sentences are quite eloquent to endorse this guess -

- \* गूढजीविनं शङ्केत ।
- \* ग्रामकूटमध्यक्षं वा सत्री ब्रूयात् ।
- \* कृतकाभियुक्तो वा कूटसाक्षिणोऽभिज्ञाताऽनर्थवैपुल्येन आरभेत ।
- \* ते चेत्तथा कुर्युः 'कूटसाक्षिणः' इति प्रवास्येर न् ।
- \* कूटपणकारकाः, कूटरूपकारकं, कूटसुवर्णव्यवहारी and so on.

The word *kūṭa* used in the transgressions of the 3<sup>rd</sup> *aṇuvrata* in a very apt manner.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Aṇuvrata :** The vow of desisting (abstaining) from appropriating

that which belongs to others.

The crime of 'theft' is considered by Kauṭilya in total six *adhyāyas* (78<sup>th</sup>, 79<sup>th</sup>, 85<sup>th</sup>, 86<sup>th</sup>, 87<sup>th</sup>, 88<sup>th</sup>). At the end of the 78<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, a noteworthy comment is passed. A long list of specific occupations is given and a caution is given that a king should keep an eye on the concerned person. He says, 'actually we can't count them as thieves but they are as good as thieves. A vigilance is necessary on the merchants, businessmen, artizans, ascetics, flatterers, snake-charmers and magicians.'

The title of the 79<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* is, 'To protect the subjects from merchants and traders.' When we go through the minute details, we immediately realise the connection between the transgressions of the 3<sup>rd</sup> *aṇuvrata* and the Arthaśāstra.

(i) The first transgression is *stenāhṛta* i.e. buying a stolen good. *Adhyāya* 86 takes care of this and a severe fine or death-penalty is recommended.

(ii) *Taskaraprayoga* is encouraging a thief. The crime is noted in the 88<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* and a punishment is prescribed for providing shelter, food, clothing for a thief or even giving advice to him.

(iii) The third transgression is *viruddha-rājyātikrama* which means cheating the state of its dues and all type of conspiracies against the government. All the seditious activities are mentioned elaborately in the 88<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* and the horrific punishments like burning and snatching away one's tiunge are prescribed.

(iv) 'Cheating in weights and measures' is the 4<sup>th</sup> transgression of the 3<sup>rd</sup> *aṇuvrata* of a householder. Kauṭilya uses the same wording in the 79<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* for which a strict punishment is given.

(v) Adulteration and producing duplicate things are mentioned

in the 5<sup>th</sup> transgression. These two are cognisable offences which are dealt with in the 79<sup>th</sup> and 81<sup>st</sup> *adhyāyas*. A long list of articles is given by Kauṭilya where there is a possibility for adulteration.

### **Observations :**

We have already seen that the first *aṇuvrata* is specially applicable to cattle-breeders. In the same manner, the third *aṇuvrata* and its transgressions are categorically mentioned for the merchant-class, which is almost based on the 79<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra.

**4<sup>th</sup> Aṇuvrata :** The vow of restricting one's sexual life only to one's wife (or one's husband)

The last two *adhyāyas* (viz. 89<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup>) of the 4<sup>th</sup> *adhikaraṇa* of Arthaśāstra deal with all kinds of sexual crimes. In the 89<sup>th</sup> chapter, the sexual crimes regarding unmarried girls are dealt with. The offence of rape is discussed in the 90<sup>th</sup> chapter. If we go through the wording of Arthaśāstra and the five transgressions of the 4<sup>th</sup> *aṇuvrata*, the reader is astonished due to the striking similarities among them. The five transgressions noted down in the 4<sup>th</sup> *aṇuvrata* are -

- (i) Sexual enjoyment with a kept woman.
- (ii) Sexual enjoyment with an unmarried woman or a widow.
- (iii) Unnatural and perverted intercourse.
- (iv) Obsession with sexual desire even in relation to one's wife.
- (v) Interest in match making.

The last transgression is to be understood in the total context of the Jaina life. We can keep it aside for a moment because of its particular religiosity but the other four transgressions are described in details with appropriate punishments in the 89<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> chapters of Arthaśāstra.

According to Kauṭilya, the following are sexual crimes -

- (i) Rape on an unmarried girl.
- (ii) Sexual intercourse without the consent of another's wife or a widow.
- (iii) Rape on a sex-worker or her daughter without consent.
- (iv) Unnatural or perverted sexual activities.
- (v) Raping one's wife without her consent.
- (vi) Sexual intercourse with animals and birds.
- (vii) Sexual activities with the idols of gods and goddesses.

We can say that these details of the Arthaśāstra are as if reflected or echoed in the five transgressions of the 4<sup>th</sup> *aṇuvrata*. Especially the sexual intercourse with animals and birds and sexual activities with the idols of gods and goddesses are covered under the vow called '*svadārasantośa*'.

In the Jaina code of conduct, seven bad habits (*sapta-vyasanās*) are enumerated with the advice to shun it totally. Two among the seven are *veśyāgamana* and *para-strī / para-puruṣa-gamana*, which are sexual crimes from the viewpoint of religion as well as the law-code of the state.

### **Observations :**

It is argued that Jaina religion is not an independant religion because it does not owe separate code of conduct than that of the Hindus. Since the Jainas live in the same socio-cultural environment of the Hindus, they might have felt that a separate law-book is not necessary. It is a great contribution of the Jaina law-makers, particularly who codified the conduct of the Jaina householders, to accomodate the state laws into their religious vows and its transgressions. We do not find this type of *gr̥hasthadharma* even in

*brahmanic smṛtis* and *dharmaśāstras*. The Buddhist *śrāvakācāra* in the form of *pañcaśīla* does not contain minute details as the Jainas have, in the transgressions of vows. It is noteworthy that the sources of the Jaina *śrāvakācāra* are deeply rooted in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. This is one of the convincing reason, why the Jainas have so much regard and honour towards Cāṇakya alias Kauṭīliya.

*Ahimsā*, *Satya* etc. are no doubt the universal values which are applicable to all human beings. But the Jaina mentors are not satisfied with preaching the *sādhāraṇa-dharmas*. They have made a successful effort to collaborate the *viśeṣa-dharmas* by mentioning transgressions of each vow in order to bring it in the domain of practicability. In this process, the Kauṭīliya's Arthaśāstra helped them a lot.

*Guṇavratas* and *Śikṣāvratas* are based on the distinct religious, philosophical and ritualistic tenets of the Jainas. Thus the whole *śrāvakācāra* is the unique example of assimilation and identity.

#### **[5] Re-interpretation of the Jaina monachism in the light of Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra**

Scholars of Indology always claim that the *śramaṇic* traditions in India are basically renunciative in nature. This fact is aptly applicable to the Jaina tradition, which is almost the most ancient so called 'atheist' spiritual tradition. Austerities, penances and meditation are the benchmarks of the renunciative reflections gathered together in the ancient Ardhmāgadhī scriptures of the Jainas, which is the first stage of the Jaina literature. We can call it as a pre-Cāṇakyan stage. Ardhmāgadhī *mūlasūtras* like the *Āvaśyaka*, *Uttarādhayayana* and *Daśavaikālika*, represent the second stage of

Jaina monachism in which a separate and systematic code of conduct for the *bhikṣus* and *bhikṣunīs* is prescribed. The antiquity of these treatises can also go upto the pre-Cāṇkya period. The third stage is seen - (i) in the Ardhamāgadhī *chedasūtras* (viz. Niśītha, Kalpa, Vyavahāra) (ii) in the *niryuktis*, and *bhāṣyas* on *mūlasūtras* and (iii) in the Śaurasenī texts like Mūlācāra, Bhagavatī Ārādhana and Kundakunda's literature. Some of the texts of the third stage are contemporary to Cāṇkya and some are written in the post-Cāṇkya period. The code of conduct prescribed for the *bhikṣus* and *bhikṣunīs* at this stage is nicely carved out and is accomplished with the rules and transgressions. The punishments are provided in the form of various atonements (*prāyaścittas*). *Chedasūtrakāra* Bhadrabāhu is closely connected to the history of Candragupta and Cāṇkya.

Thus, this is an interesting task to re-interpret the Jaina monachism with the help of the commentarial literature of Ācārāṅga, Uttarādhyayana, Daśavaikālika and Niśītha. The *sādhu-ācāra* is presented in the Śaurasenī texts in the form of *mūlaguṇas* and *uttaraguṇas* while Ardhamāgadhī scriptures consider it under the five *mahāvratas*, five *samitis*, three *guptis* and tenfold *dharma*s. It is impossible to explore each and every detail of the *sādhu-ācāra* in the light of the the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. An attempt has been made here to highlight the impact of the Arthaśāstra on the Jaina *sādhu-ācāra* with few important examples and observations.

We can enumerate at least thirty references in the Arthaśāstra where the ascetic class is mentioned by using the terms like *bhikṣu*, *sādhu*, *parivrājaka*, *siddha*, *tāpasa*, *kṣapaṇaka*, *saṁnyāsī*, *pāṣaṇḍī* etc. Some of them are mentioned by Kauṭīlya as *āśrama-vāsins* (i.e. residing at one place) and *caras* or *parivrājakas* (i.e. wandering from

place to place). We can guess that, the ascetic-class was so noticeable in the contemporary social structure, that Kauṭilya has no other way than giving a strict code of conduct for the monks and nuns.

**[1]** The general attitude of Kauṭilya to look at a *sādhu* is very strict in spite of his being a Brahmin, Buddhist or Jaina. In the 73<sup>rd</sup> *adhyāya*, he says, “Any type of misbehaviour will not be tolerated even in the case of a *saṃnyāsī*. A monk is liable to be punished by a king in the case of any misconduct.”

If we cast a glance at the second *śrutaskandha* of Ācārāṅga, we know immediately that each and every activity of a monk and nun is brought under a scanner. The details can be enumerated as -

- (i) *Pinḍaiśaṇā* : Details of acceptable food-articles and alms-begging.
- (ii) *Śaiyyaiśaṇā* : Details of residence (both temporary and during rainy season).
- (iii) *Īryaiśaṇā* : Details of wanderings and begging tours.
- (iv) *Bhāṣaiśaṇā* : Details of speech and communication.
- (v) *Vastraiśaṇā* : Details of clothing.
- (vi) *Pātraiśaṇā* : Details of the pots and other utensils which are permissible for a monk.
- (vii) *Avagrahaiśaṇā* : Asking permission of five concerned authorities before utilising the necessary things.
- (viii) *Uccāraprasavaṇa* : The rules about urination and excretion.

**[2]** The close connection between the Daśavaikālika and Ācārāṅga (II) is quite noteworthy. The chapters of Daśavaikālika titled *Pinḍaiśaṇā*, *Suvākyaśuddhi*, *Ācārapraṇidhi*, *Vinayasamādhi* and *Sabhikṣu* describe the same details of Ācārāṅga (II). In fact, we can say that the systematic presentation in prose-form is seen in the Ācārāṅga with some important additions to its prior version named Daśavaikālika.

**[3]** Kauṭilya expects from the ascetic class to follow the orders of the state, as they are citizens first and then the religious and spiritual achievers. The rules laid down by the state are *ājñāpatras* and the same are called ‘śāsana’ (government) in totality. The Jaina *ācāryas* say that the rules laid down by the Jinās are called *jinaśāsana* in totality. As various punishments are given for the law-breakers in the Arthaśāstra, various atonements in the form of fasting are prescribed for the transgressors of the *jinaśāsana* in the Niśītha, Kalpa and Vyavahāra.

**[4]** If one renounces the world without the permission of the elders and without making proper future provisions for the family, a severe fine is prescribed by Kauṭilya in the 22<sup>nd</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra.

In the text called Antakṛddāśā, Kṛṣṇa (Vāsudeva) proclaims, “Whoever wants to renounce the mundane world, I will take care of his or hers family.” (Antakṛddāśā, Varga 5, p.103, व्यावर edn.) In one of the chapters of Uttarādhyayana, it is depicted that the two young sons ask permission of their father and mother to enter into monkhood. The parents are not ready to allow the sons to go away like this without fulfilling their duties (Uttarādhyayana, Adhyāya 14). The same discussions are seen in the first chapter of Jñātādharma-kathā.

**[5]** In the 77<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, it is specifically mentioned that whoever will invite a Buddhist or Jaina monk or a lower-caste person for the meals provided in the *deva-kārya* (festivals of gods) and *pitṛ-kārya* (an offering to the manes) will be punished by the king.

In the Ācārāṅga, there is a strict prohibition for a monk or a nun to enter into a charity-food (*saṁkhaḍī*). The concerned text of Ācārāṅga runs like this -

से भिक्खू वा भिक्खुणी वा --- इंदमहेसु वा खंदमहेसु वा --- तहप्पगारे महामहेसु वट्टमाणेसु --- असणं वा पाणं वा --- णो पडिगाहेज्जा । (Ācārāṅga 2.1.2, p.22, ब्यावर edn.)

The Niśīthasūtra prescribes atonements for accepting food in a *samkhaḍī* (common meals) in the following manner -

जे भिक्खू --- संखडिपलोयणाए असणं वा पाणं वा पडिगाहेइ --- तं सेवमाणे आवज्जइ मासियं परिहारद्वणं उघाइयं । (Niśītha, Uddeśa 3, sūtra 14)

The Niśīthasūtra mentions three types of exceptions for the general rules prescribed for a monk. The sentence runs as -

नन्नत्थ रायाभिओगेण वा गणाभिओगेण वा बलाभिओगेण वा । (Niśītha, Uddeśa 9)

Thus it is expected from a monk or nun to honour the law of a king or the law passed in the *gaṇarājya* system.

**[6]** In the 73<sup>rd</sup> *adhyāya*, Kauṭilya says, “The hermitage-dwellers and *pāṣaṇḍins* (Jaina, Buddhist and Ājīvaka monks) should live in a ascetic-dwelling (*maṭha* etc.) without creating nuisance to others.”

The Ācārāṅga goes one step forward and says that in such type of dwellings where there is a continuous disturbance due to the coming in and going out of the travellers, the monk and nun should specifically avoid that place. The concerned text is -

से आगंतागारेसु वा, आरामागारेसु वा, गाहावइकुलेसु वा, परियावसहेसु वा, अभिक्खणं अभिक्खणं साहम्मिण्हिं उवयमाणेहिं णो उवइज्जा । (Ācārāṅga II, Uddeśa 2)

**[7]** In the 57<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra, a severe fine is prescribed for evacuation of the faeces and urinating at improper places.

The 10<sup>th</sup> *adhyāyana* of Ācārāṅga (II) is totally dedicated to this topic. *Uccāraprasravaṇa-samiti* is enumerated among the five

*samitis* (i.e. proper or careful physical activities). Ācārāṅga says -

से भिक्खू वा भिक्खुणी वा --- तहप्पगारंसि थंडिलंसि अचित्तंसि तओ  
संजयामेव उच्चारपासवणं परिद्विविज्जा ।

(Ācārāṅga 2.10, p.259, ब्यावर edn.)

The Uttarādhyayana gives a list of prohibited places where one should avoid to pass the urine etc. (Uttarādhyayana 22.2 ; 24.18)

[8] ‘Tenfold *dharma*’ is a famous topic given in the code of conduct of a Jaina monk. The ten points given in the Tattvārthasūtra 9.6 are religious and spiritual. The Sthānāṅgasūtra enumerates ‘*daśavidha dharmas*’ from the social point of view as well as religious point of view. The Sthānāṅga quotes -

दसविहे धम्मे पण्णत्ते, तं जहा-गामधम्मे, णगरधम्मे, रट्ठधम्मे, पासंडधम्मे,  
कुलधम्मे, गणधम्मे, संघधम्मे, सुयधम्मे, चरित्तधम्मे, अत्थिकायधम्मे । (Sthānāṅga  
10.135)

The first seven *dharmas* depict social elements and the last three are connected with the Jaina religion. It is remarkable that Sthānāṅga relates the term *sthavira* (*thera*) for the heads of the village, city, state etc., side by side with the senior monks (Sthānāṅga 10.136). We can interpret the terms like ‘*kula*’, ‘*gaṇa*’ and ‘*saṃgha*’ more meaningfully in the light of Arthaśāstra.

[9] In the 20<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, Kauṭilya states clearly that the womenfolk in the harem should avoid the contact of the shaven-headed or long-haired monks and black-magicians.

Niśītha-sūtra might have taken notice of this rule in the following manner :

जे भिक्खू रायपिंडं गेण्हइ गेण्हंतं वा साइज्जइ --- तं सेवमाणे आवज्जइ  
चाउम्मासियं परिहारद्वणं अणुग्घाइयं ।

(Niśītha, Uddeśa 9, p.181, ब्यावर edn.)

It seems that taking into consideration the strict rules of Cāṇakya, the rule-makers of Jainas might have come to the conclusion that it is always better for a monk and nun to beg the food at other places than at the palaces of kings.

It is mentioned in the 15<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra that other than a *śrotriya brahmin*, nobody is worthy to be invited on the occasion of an yearly ritual of a dead person (*śrāddha*). The Nīśītha prescribes to avoid *agrapīṇḍa* for a monk (Nīśītha, Uddeśa 2, *sūtra* 32). The word *agrapīṇḍa* can be interpreted in the light of either a sacrificial rite or a funeral rite. In both of the cases the philosophical and religious background does not allow a Jaina monk to accept such type of food.

**[10]** Cases of defamation are considered in the 75<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra. Details are provided in this chapter under which circumstances, a faulty person can be sued for the libel. Any kind of slander, using contemptuous language or scornful acts against somebody, disdainful remarks about one's religion, sect, caste, lineage, nation or about one's close relatives, purposeful taunting, despising one's occupation, using abusive or foul language, threatening somebody by using weapons, hands or by using the index finger, satirical remarks against one's physical disabilities, making someone ashamed in his family and society, seeking excuses to support wrong views etc. - are the instances of defamation and punishments are prescribed in the form of fine according to the gravity of the crime.

If we closely examine the chapters related to *bhaśaiṣaṇā* in the Jaina monachism, we really get startled. The above-mentioned *adhyāya* of Arthaśāstra is literally reflected in the concerned parts of the Ācārāṅga (II), Uttarādhyayana and Daśavaikālika which de-

scribe *bhāṣā-samiti* and *vacana-guṇti*. The only difference is of the language. Jaina compilers have presented Kauṭilya's views about defamation in Prakritized form.

The reading of the *Ācārāṅga* [2.4.1, p.181-182, ब्यावर edn.] goes like this -

से भिक्खू वा भिक्खुणी वा --- तहप्पगारं भासं सावज्जं सकिरियं कक्कसं  
कडुयं णिट्ठुरं फरुसं अण्हयकरिं छेयणकरिं भेयणकरिं --- भासं णो भासिज्जा ।

It is mentioned in the *Ācārāṅga* and *Daśavaikālika* that a monk and nun should catagorically avoid the contemptuous language against one's social status and occupation, viz.

से भिक्खू वा भिक्खुणी वा --- णो एवं वड्ज्जा - होले ति वा, गोले ति  
वा, वसुले ति वा कुपक्खे ति वा, घडदासे ति वा, साणे ति वा, तेणे ति वा ।  
(*Ācārāṅga* 2.4.1, p.181-182, ब्यावर edn.)

One verse from the *suvākyaśuddhi adhyayana* of *Daśavaikālika* is worth-quoting. It says -

तहेव काणं काणे ति , पंडगं पंडगे ति वा ।

वाहियं वा वि रोगि ति , तेणं चोरेति णो वए ॥

(*Daśavaikālika* 7.12)

The *Uttarādhyayana* goes one step ahead and gives advice to a monk that he should not even praise the alms because it shows a monk's lust for food and creates pride in the donor due to the flattery.

**[11]** Rules about crossing the river, sea or lake etc. are discussed in the 49<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya* of *Arthaśāstra* titled '*nāvādhyakṣa*'. Kauṭilya discusses a lot about the ports, revenue and licences for those who travel through water with a boat or ship. It is specifically mentioned that the licences should be provided free of cost to the *brahmins*, ascetics, children, old people, diseased persons, ambassadors and

pregnant women. It means that a licence was compulsory for all.

In the framework of the monastic conduct, the use of a boat or ship comes under *īryā-samiti*. In the 12<sup>th</sup> *uddeśaka* of Nīśītha-sūtra, this topic is discussed. Total 47 *bhāṣyagāthās* are dedicated to this topic (*gā.* 4208-4255). Five big rivers are mentioned. The regions viz. Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kāliṅga and punjab are mentioned. It seems that at the time of the Nīśītha-bhāṣya (i.e. 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) travelling by boat was allowed for a monk or nun. The Nīśītha-sūtra 3.12 quotes, “A monk or a nun is not prohibited to cross the river but if one crosses the river twice or thrice in a month, he or she should undergo a particular atonement.” The Samavāyāṅga says clearly that a monk can cross the river once in a month (Samavāyāṅga 21). We find the references of *nāvāgamana* in the Ācārāṅga and Uttarādhyayana also. (Ācārāṅga 2.3.1, p.156, व्यावर edn. ; Uttarādhyayana 36.50-54)

From the *chedasūtras*, we come to know that crossing the water was not totally banned at that time but now a days, all the Jaina monks and nuns who wander on foot, do not use a boat or ship because it is a type of vehicle.

### Observations :

- \* So far we have seen that all the important rules laid down by Kauṭilya are skilfully incorporated in the monastic conduct of the Jainas.
- \* If we go through the eight-point-programme (*eṣaṇās*) of the Ācārāṅga II, we immediately come to know that all the rules prescribed for a citizen are taken care of.
- \* Close association with the king is avoided as far as possible.
- \* Any kind of friction with the non-Jaina ascetic-class is kept away.

- \* Kauṭilya expects two important tasks to be done by the ascetic class
  - (i) working as a spy and (ii) working as an ambassador. He mentions specifically that the heretics (*pāṣaṇḍins*) should be employed to do this work or any other person should do this work in the disguise of a *pāṣaṇḍin*. Though the Jainas are accommodative in nature, avoid conflicts as far as possible and though they are peace-loving, they are very much keen in observing their strict monastic rules and penances. The development in the Jain monastic conduct is seen in three stages. none of this stage allows a monk or a nun to be a spy or an ambassador. It is likely that in the course of time, it would have been made compulsory for them to do this work, that is why the *chedasūtras* like Nīśītha include a line, 'नन्नत्थ रायाभिओगेण वा गणाभिओगेण वा बलाभिओगेण वा ।'
- \* When a careful scrutiny of all the references of ascetic class in the *Arthaśāstra* is done, it is evident that Kauṭilya is in favour of the *śrotriya brahmins* and harsh toward *pāṣaṇḍins*.
- \* The frequent references of *purohit* class, *vedavidyā*, *yajñakarma*, *atharvaveda*, *uñchavṛtti*, *dakṣiṇā*, *āśramavāsi*, *devotsava*, *pitṛkārya*, *śāntimantra* etc. support the fact clearly that Kauṭilya owes to the *brahmanic* tradition and not at all a Jain householder or a monk. Jainification of Kauṭilya alias Cāṇakya is definitely superfluous.
- \* A certain respect and honour towards Cāṇakya is seen in the Jain literature due to his strict governance, selfless service, detached world-views and sublime death.
- \* In the 145<sup>th</sup> *adhyāya*, Kauṭilya says that there should be a complete ban on violence during the important fifteen days of *cāturmāsa*.

There is a tradition to quote *cāṇakyaśūtras* at the end of *Arthaśāstra*. One of the aphorism is - ‘अहिंसालक्षणो धर्मः’. This quotation might have attracted the attention of the Jaina *ācāryas* while rating the personality of Cāṇakya.



**CHAPTER 6****CONCLUDING REMARKS**



## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

The sum and substance of the revelation of Cāṇakya through the Jaina literature can be summarized in few paragraphs with the suitable titles in the following manner -

#### **[1] Application of the two-fold methodology :**

According to the Jaina philosophy a thing, person or incident can be looked at or observed from various facets, attitudes or stand-points. The nature of truth or reality is complex. For the subtler and deeper knowledge, the linear method of observation is less useful. In this book (project) twofold methodology is applied for the better revelation of the complex personality of Cāṇakya.

In the initial chapters of the book, all the Hindu (Brahmanic) and Jaina (both the Śvetāmbara and Digambara) references about Cāṇakya are collected, arranged, translated and compared in a detailed manner.

Keeping aside the whole comparative data, again the Jaina literature is observed through the window-frame of the reputed text of Cāṇakya (Kauṭilya) viz. the Arthaśāstra. The study of each and every aphorism is not the aim of this book. So in the perspective of the original words (and not the translation) of Kauṭilya, the Jaina narratives, myths, analogies and particularly the Jaina code of conduct appears altogether different. Thus the observations noted in the fifth chapter of this book is the unique outcome of the twofold methodology applied for discovering the deep connections between the Jaina literature and Arthaśāstra.

#### **[2] Māgadha-connection of the Arthaśāstra and Jaina literature :**

The known confirmed history of the ancient India starts from

the history of Magadha. The Arthaśāstra is no doubt an important part of Magadhan literature. Likewise the first conference of the Ardhamāgadhī canons surely took place in Magadha after the severe famine of twelve years. While describing the lineage of kings before, after and contemporary to Lord Mahāvīra, many of the important Jaina texts describe serially the king Prasenajita-Śreṇika (Bimbisāra)-Koṇika (Ajātaśatru)-Udāyī-nine of the Nandas-Candragupta (Maurya)-Bindusāra-Aśoka-Kuṇāla and Samprati. The Jains necessarily refer Śakaṭāla, the minister (*amātya*) of the ninth Nanda because he is the father of the revered Jaina *ācārya* Sthūlabhadra under whose supervision, the first conference of the Ardhamāgadhī canons took place. That is the reason why the political, socio-cultural and religious conditions reflected in the Arthaśāstra grossly match with these conditions reflected in the ancient Ardhamāgadhī canons.

### **[3] Why older Cāṇakya-narratives are in Prakrit ?**

The *śramaṇic* traditions are connected with the region Magadha and the colloquial languages of Magadha i.e. Ardhamāgadhī and Pālī. The initial history of the compilation of the Ardhamāgadhī canons is connected with Pāṭaliputra. The *chedasūtrakāra* Bhadrabāhu codified the rules of monastic conduct during the reign of *mauryan* dynasty. The *mūlasūtras* and particularly the Āvaśyakasūtra came into vogue during this period. Naturally the commentarial literature, which was in *ārṣa* Prakrit, contains the contemporary floating myths, tales and narratives. There was a great awe, fear and regard towards the strict administration of Cāṇakya in the ambience. Following the foot steps of Lord Mahāvīra, the Jaina *ācāryas* preach their religion through the colloquial languages - Ardhamāgadhī, Śaurasenī

and Māhārāṣṭrī. A good treasure of oral traditional stories was available for the Jaina authors in Prakrits. Vaḍḍakahā (Bṛhatkathā) was a great collection of tales in Paisācī by Guṇāḍhya. The Jaina counterpart of Vaḍḍakahā is Vasudevahiṇḍī - probably the oldest huge story-collection in India. This is the canvas of Prakrits on which the narratives of Cāṇakya were portrayed with a perfect blend of traditional oral narrations mixed with the power of imagination. It is the unique contribution of the Jaina *ācāryas* who imbibed the story-material in their commentarial literature.

It is a different but an important subject to locate the hybrid Sanskrit and *deśī* words in the Arthaśāstra, which are found in the *cūrṇi* and are connected with the things, ideas and articles of the common people.

#### **[4] The first Jaina occurrences of Cāṇakya :**

The oldest Śvetāmbara reference occurs in Anuyogadvāra (1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D.) and the oldest Digambara reference occurs in Bhagavatī Ārādhana (2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D.). The points of references differ in both the texts. The Anuyogadvāra stamps Kauṭilyaka-śāstra as a *mithyā-śruta* (heretic text). The Digambaras pay homage to Cāṇakya because of his sublime religious death. These two references give two important clues, viz. the non-Jaina character of the treatise and the utter reverence towards Cāṇakya for his exalted way to welcome death.

#### **[5] Nandī's unique approach to Arthaśāstra :**

Nandīkāra Devavācakaḡaṇi went one step ahead. He opened the doors to study Kauṭilya-śāstra for the Jainas by declaring that, "The *mithyā-śrutas* become *samyak-śrutas* when studied with the right attitude." The effects of this new attitude are seen in the later

literature of the Jainas. From the 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> century onwards, Cāṇakya tales, narratives and analogies are found in the Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī, Jaina Śaurasenī and Sanskrit literature.

#### **[6] The modes of references in the Śvetāmbara texts :**

Around 50 references of Cāṇakya are found in Śvetāmbara literature. Somewherer only the name is given. At other places a particular story or incident is given in two-three verses. *Cūrṇis* present scattered stories or the whole biography in prose-form but very briefly. The commentaries of Upadeśapada and Upadeśamālā contain Cāṇakya's biography in around 200-250 Prakrit verses. Hemacandra's Cāṇakya-kathā in Sanskrit is the ultimate collection of all the previous episodes.

#### **[7] Cāṇakya's personality depicted in the Śvetāmbara and**

##### **Digambara texts :**

Digambaras honoured Cāṇakya mainly for his peaceful and pious death.

Digambara-references are approximately one-third in number and scope in comparison with the Śvetāmbara-references. While dealing with Cāṇakya, the Digambara writers throw awfully dim light on the personality of Candragupta. They present Cāṇakya himself as a king or a sage-like-king. Hariṣeṇa's Cāṇakya leads a big group of 500 ascetics and marches towards *dakṣiṇāpatha*. We observe a slow steady growth in the Cāṇakya-narratives of the Śvetāmbaras but in the Digambara literature, Hariṣeṇa's Cāṇakya-muni-kathā is exhaustive and it prevailed over all the later Digambara-tales. Cāṇakya in Śrīcandra's Kathākoṣa is more real and convincing than Hariṣeṇa. The influence of Hindu *purāṇas* on Hariṣeṇa is evident. Though Hariṣeṇa gives references to Cāṇakya's *durga-gamana* etc.

still his Cāṇakya and Candragupta do not reveal neither their valour nor their excellence in polity. Cāṇakya-muni's travel-tour towards Krauñcapura create a puzzle. Due to this reference, there is a remote possibility of Cāṇakya's being a south-Indian. Because if the *golla-deśa* referred by Śvetāmbaras is the region on the bank of Godāvārī, there might be a possibility about Cāṇakya to arrive at the birth-place. There could be a connection between these two things - the discovery of the manuscripts of Arthaśāstra in Tamil and Malyalam and the *golla-deśa* being the birth-place of Kauṭilya. Otherwise, the Śvetāmbaras are confirmed that the death-place of Cāṇakya is a place called *gokula-sthāna* near Pāṭalīputra.

#### **[8] The variety of themes in the Śvetāmbara-references :**

Hariṣeṇa's Cāṇakya-kathā is the most standardised story in the Digambara literature while the Śvetāmbaras present Cāṇakya in multiple ways. They are enthusiastic in imagining, creating and remembering Cāṇakya on different occasions. They have presented Cāṇakya as an epitome of intellect. They have appreciated Cāṇakya's interesting ways of gathering wealth for the royal treasury. His strict orders, rules and punishments are also praised and compared with the *jinājñās*.

#### **[9] The elements of historicity in the narratives :**

Actually and frankly speaking there is no proof for the historicity of the Cāṇakya-narratives. When we look at the stories from the window of Arthaśāstra, we feel that the tales are quite logical and mostly match with the cultural details depicted in the Arthaśāstra. Many of the narratives carry seeds from the Arthaśāstra, therefore we cannot dismiss the stories as a total display of imagination.

**[10] Arthaśāstra : The spring-well of the code of conduct of the Jainas :**

When we go through the details of the Arthaśāstra and particularly with the help of the chapters dedicated to the rules, crimes and punishments, we immediately come to know that the Jaina *ācāryas* have accommodated the contemporary civic rules in the conduct of a Jaina monk and a householder. The similarity between the Cāṇakyan rules for merchants and the Jaina transgressions of *aṇuvratas* is really stunning.

Monachism found in *aṅgas* and *mūlasūtras* is of prescriptive nature. Bhadrabāhu (I), a contemporary of Cāṇakya added punishments in the monastic conduct in the form of various penances during this period. Later on, the study of *chedasūtras* and *prāyascittas* was made compulsory for a *bhikṣu* who desires to lead the *saṃgha*.

In nutshell, we can say that the duties and rules prescribed for a Jaina householder or a Jaina monk are connected with the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra and remained the same through the several centuries. It is interesting to note that the description of *gṛhasthāśrama* and *saṃnyāsāśrama* is not so neatly carved in the *brahmanic* tradition and gone through several changes during the centuries.

**[11] The attitude to look at Cāṇakya and the Arthaśāstra :**

Though the Arthaśāstra is enumerated among the list of the books of the *brahmanic* literature, its overall liberal attitude, secular nature and the pure Polity (*rājanīti*) was not appreciated by the latter *dharmaśāstrakāras* and *smṛtikāras*. We observe that the high regard towards Cāṇakya and his Arthaśāstra is slowly diminishing in the *brahmanic* tradition. In the Jaina tradition the same awe, honour and regard for Cāṇakya and his Arthaśāstra is seen through centuries.

When *brahmanic* tradition was revealing the dispassionate attitude towards the text of Arthaśāstra, by not protecting the manuscripts of Arthaśāstra in *brāhmī*, *śāradā* or *grantha* scripts, the Jainas were enthusiastically engaged in creating new stories and protecting oral traditional stories of Cāṇakya in various Prakrits as well as Sanskrit.

### **[12] The Jaina version of the Arthaśāstra :**

The Nītivākyāmṛta of the Digambara *ācārya* Somadevasūri, is the highest homage paid by the Jaina tradition to Cāṇakya's Arthaśāstra. Having kept aside the typical religious *śrāvakācāra*, Somadeva prepared a purely ethical code of conduct which was based on the Arthaśāstra. In the scholarly field, the Nītivākyāmṛta is enumerated immediately after the Kāmandakīya Nītisāra, a version of the Arthaśāstra in poetical form. It is the greatness of Somadeva, that he has the courage to document *śrāvakācāra* for every human-being after having documented the traditional religious Jaina *śrāvakācāra* in his Yaśastilakacampū.

### **[13] Depiction of the life-story of Cāṇakya :**

*Pūrāṇas* provide few mechanical details of royal dynasties while describing the kingdom of Magadha. There is only one prominent story of Cāṇakya repeated in the *Pūrāṇas* and Kathāsaritsāgara. The insult of the *brahmin* Cāṇakya, his being wellversed in the *vedas*, his tuft of hair and his revengeful oath in the royal hall is the only important episode. The Kathāsaritsāgara emphasizes on the black-magic-part of Cāṇakya and does not reveal his intelligence or political skills.

In fact, Hindu sources in general do not provide the details of his birth, death and his life - which is full of varied incidents.

Mudrārākṣasa, the unique political Sanskrit drama provides some details of the personalities of Cāṇakya, Candragupta and their relationship. Of course, it is noteworthy that Viśākhadatta had gone through the minute details of the Arthaśāstra while writing his play. The Mudrārākṣasa popularized the phrase ‘कौटिल्यः कुटिलमतिः’, but otherwise the playwright prefers the name Cāṇakya, everywhere in the play. The incidents in Mudrārākṣasa carry a limited time-span. We cannot expect full life-story of Cāṇakya and Candragupta in the Mudrārākṣasa. If the Mudrārākṣasa is read in the light of the Jaina background and environment, it will reveal many more facts which are otherwise unexplained.

Exactly opposite is the case of the Jaina and particularly of the Śvetāmbara literature. Cāṇakya’s mother, father, birth-place, some incidents in his childhood, the prophesy of the child, his marriage, his wife, his journey to Pāṭaliputra for getting wealth in charity, his insult by Nanda, search of a proper person, meeting of Candragupta, his search of golden mines, association with the king Parvataka (may be Sellucus-Śailaukas), seeking the kingdom, Parvataka’s death by deceit, well-being of the state, enriching the royal treasury, his strict rules and orders, Candragupta’s death, insult by Bindusāra, his decision of voluntary death, his retirement in the *gokula-grāma*, his meditation, the revenge of Subandhu by putting fire on Cāṇakya’s residence, the calm and peaceful acceptance of death by Cāṇakya and the death of Subandhu caused by Cāṇakya - these are some of the selected details of the Cāṇakya-narratives documented by the Śvetāmbaras and presented in a consolidated form in the *Pariśiṣṭa-parva* by Hemacandra.

#### **[14] The Jaina-references : Useful in removing many doubts :**

The Jaina references are valuable because they help the scholars to remove many doubts about Candragupta, Cāṇakya and his Arthaśāstra. They are -

- (i) Cāṇakya and Candragupta Maurya both are the historic personalities. The date of Candragupta's coronation is documented in the *Parīśiṣṭa-parva* with reference to the year of Mahāvīra-nirvāṇa.
- (ii) Cāṇakya, Kauṭilya and Viṣṇugupta are the names of the same person. Probably 'Viṣṇugupta' is the birth-name, 'Cāṇakya' - after the name of his birthplace and 'Kauṭilya' - no doubt an epithet.
- (iii) The Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra was an important part of syllabus in the prominent Indian study-centres like Nālandā.
- (iv) The Arthaśāstra is not a tentative collection on Polity but a deliberate effort of a genius called Cāṇakya and an epitome of the *śāstric* knowledge combined with the real experiences of his own. That is why the Jainas call the Arthaśāstra as the ultimate expression of Cāṇakya's *pāriṇāmikī-buddhi*.
- (v) Cāṇakya-Candragupta-relationship was that of an ideal *guru* and a faithful disciple. Cāṇakya was really Candragupta's mentor, guide and philosopher.

#### **[15] A total justice given to Cāṇakya's personality :**

When we reflect comprehensively on the personality of Cāṇakya from the Jaina point of view, we observe that - he possesses detached world-views ; is devoid of personal vested interests and ambitions ; a total '*aparigrahī*' by nature and also by having no issues ; who distributed all his meager wealth among the relatives before accepting wilful death very bravely ; his liberal and practical

views towards society in general ; the importance given by him to a *arth* and *kāma* in congruence with *dharma* ; his shrewd political wisdom directed with the aphorism - ‘प्रजासुखे सुखं राज्ञः’ ; a prominent economist who snatched wealth and prosperity for the well-being of the people ; a psychologist having a power of mind-analysis with the *īngita* and *ākāra* ; a nationalist with a deep insight in the rural and urban areas of India and the last but not the least - an eminent author having a comprehensive grasp to document the wisdom of his predecessors and his own in the form of a monumental treatise the Arthaśāstra - All these details are available directly from the text Arthaśāstra as well as from the Jaina literature with a stunning similarity.

#### **[16] Excessive Jainification :**

It is a standard habit of the Jainas to depict all the influential personalities with excessive Jainification. This typical mentality and methodology is seen through the big-sized and still increasing model of *śālākāpuruṣas*. The Jainas went on adding the list of the illustrious personalities at the advent of time. In the same line they proclaimed Cāṇakya as being a Jaina. The Śvetāmbaras portray him as a *śrāvaka* while the Digambaras claim that he was a *muni* leading a *saṃgha* of 500 *sādhus* - which is simply impossible and out of reason considering his strict attitude towards ascetic class. The Jainas have made Cāṇakya to apologize with the traditional phrase - ‘मिच्छामि दुक्कडं’. They have written the story in which Cāṇakya praises ‘परपाषण्ड’ (heretics). When Cāṇakya accepts religious death with a calm and composed mind, the Jainas have labelled his death as पादपोषगमन, अनशन or इंगिनीमरण - by using a particular terminology.

In spite of all the efforts of excessive Jainification, Cāṇakya's *brahminhood* and *vedic* legacy is quite evident. We should give a long rope to the Jainas in this matter considering the justice given by them to the personality of Cāṇakya.

**The last remarks :**

The full biography of Cāṇakya from the birth to death; his personal characteristics ; his contribution to the ancient Indian polity ; his life flooded with hundreds of details and particularly his time-slaughter mentioned as the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C. - is an apt answer given to the doubts raised by some of the scholars about the authenticity and historicity of Cāṇakya and his Arthaśāstra by the Jaina tradition. Accepting the limits of the literary sources for establishing the historicity of the happenings, an impartial researcher has to admit that the Jaina-portrait of Cāṇakya is very convincing except the Jainification because they have skilfully filled it in the religio-socio-cultural framework of contemporary India. In other words we can say that Cāṇakya's portrait painted by the Jainas is the solemn homage paid to this great personality.

For the last two years, I was deeply engrossed in exploring, discovering and revealing all the conspicuous and hidden details of Cāṇakya documented in the Prakrit and Sanskrit literature of the Jainas, with my enthusiastic and dedicated research team. At the end, it is our confident opinion that the branch of Kauṭilyan studies will remain always incomplete if we neglect the valuable literary sources of the Jainas.

Or, in a more generalised way, we can say that any issue concerned to ancient India should be observed, examined and paraphrased in the broader light of the contemporary literature written

in Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pāli. In the domain of research, one research project is the harbinger of the next research project. May the Almighty bless us to explore many such new aspects of the Jaina studies in the future !!



**BIBLIOGRAPHY**



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. अणुओगद्वाराई : आर्यरक्षित, सं. पुण्यविजय, श्री महावीर जैन विद्यालय, मुंबई, १९६८.
2. अनुयोगद्वार-सूत्र : सं.नेमीचन्द बांठिया, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २०१२.
3. अभिधानचिन्तामणि-नाममाला : हेमचंद्र, श्री जैनसाहित्यवर्धक सभा, अहमदाबाद, वि.सं.२०३२.
4. आचारांगसूत्र (भाग १,२) : अनु. अमलोकऋषिजी, सं.पं. शोभाचन्द्र भारिल्ल, श्री अमोल जैन ज्ञानालय, धुलिया (महाराष्ट्र)२००६
5. आचारांग-सूत्र (भाग १,२) : सं. नेमीचन्द बांठिया, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २०१०.
6. आचारांग-चूर्णि : सम्यक् ज्ञानभांडार, रावटी जोधपुर, ऋषभदेव केसरीमल पेढी, रतलाम.
7. आचारांग-टीका : शीलांक, आगमोदयसमिति मेहसाना, १९१६.
8. आराधना-पताका : पड़णयसुत्ताई (भाग १,२) महावीर जैन विद्यालय, १९८७.
9. आर्य : वसंत पटवर्धन, विश्वकर्मा साहित्यालय, पुणे १९८०.
10. आवश्यक-सूत्र : सं. नेमीचन्द बांठिया, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २०११.
11. आवश्यक-सूत्र-चूर्णि (पूर्वभाग, उत्तरभाग) : जिनदासगणि, श्री ऋषभदेवजी केशरीमलजी श्वेतांबर संस्था, रतलाम, १९२८, १९२९.
12. आवश्यक-टीका (पूर्वभाग, उत्तरभाग) : हरिभद्र, आगमोदयसमिति, मेहसाना, १९१६.
13. ओघनिर्युक्ति (वृत्ति) : द्रोणाचार्य, आगमोदयसमिति, मेहसाना, १९१९.
14. उत्तरज्झयणाणि : जैन-विश्व-भारती, लाडनूँ (राजस्थान), १९९७.

15. उत्तराध्ययन-सूत्र (भाग १,२) : सं. नेमीचन्द बांठिया, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २०१०.
16. उपदेशपद-टीका : हरिभद्र, टी. मुनिचंद्र, श्रीमन्मुक्तिकमलजैनमोहनज्ञानमन्दिरम्, वडोदरा, १९२५.
17. उपदेशमाला-टीका : धर्मदासगणि, सं. हेमसागरसूरि, धनजीभाई देवचंद्र झवेरी, मुंबई, १९५८.
18. उपासकदसांग-सूत्र : सं. नेमीचन्द बांठिया, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २०१२.
19. कथाकोषप्रकरण : जिनेश्वरसूरि, सं. जिनविजयमुनि, सिंधी जैनशास्त्र विद्यापीठ, भारतीय विद्याभवन, मुंबई, १९४९.
20. कथासरित्सागर (प्रथमखंड) : अनु. केदारनाथ शर्मा, बिहार राष्ट्रभाषा परिषद्, पटना, १९६०.
21. कहाकोसु : श्रीचंद्र, सं. हिरालाल जैन, प्राकृत ग्रंथ परिषद्, अहमदाबाद, १९६९.
22. कामंदकीय नीतिसार : खेमराज श्रीकृष्णदास, मुंबई, शके १८७४.
23. कुवलयमाला : उद्योतनसूरि, सं. ए.एन्.उपाध्ये, सिंधी जैनशास्त्र विद्यापीठ, भारतीय विद्याभवन, मुंबई, १९५९.
24. कौटिलीय अर्थशास्त्र (पूर्वार्ध, उत्तरार्ध) : ब.रा.हिवरगांवकर, प्रस्तावना : दुर्गा भागवत, 'वरदा', सेनापती बापट मार्ग, पुणे, १९८८.
25. गोम्मटसार (जीवकांड - कर्मकांड) : नेमिचंद्र, जे.एल्.जैनी, लखनौ, १९२७.
26. जिनरत्नकोश : एच्.डी.वेलणकर, भांडारकर प्राच्यविद्या संशोधन संस्था, पुणे, १९४४.
27. जुगाइजिणिंदचरिय : वर्धमानसूरि, सं. रूपेन्द्रकुमार पगारिया, लालभाई दलपतभाई भारती संस्कृति विद्यामंदिर, अहमदाबाद, १९८७.
28. ज्ञाताधर्मकथा-टीका : अभयदेवसूरि, रामचंद्र येशु शेडगे, आगमोदयसमिति, निर्णयसागर प्रेस, १९१९.

29. तत्त्वार्थसूत्र : उमास्वाति, सुखलाल संघवी, पार्श्वनाथ विद्यापीठ, वाराणसी, २००७.
30. त्रिलोकप्रज्ञप्ति : यतिवृषभ, ए.एन्.उपाध्ये, जैन संस्कृत संरक्षक संघ, सोलापुर, १९४३.
31. दशवैकालिक-सूत्र : अनु. घेवरचंदजी बांठिया, अखिल भारतीय साधुमार्गी जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, सैलाना, १९८३.
32. दशवैकालिक-सूत्र : सं. नेमीचन्द बांठिया, पारसमल चण्डालिया, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २०११.
33. दशवैकालिक-चूर्णि : जिनदासगणि, श्री ऋषभदेवजी केशरीमलजी श्वेताम्बरसंस्था, इन्दौर, १९३३.
34. दशवैकालिक (निर्युक्ति, चूर्णिसहित) : शय्यंभव, प्राकृत ग्रंथ परिषद, अहमदाबाद, १९७३.
35. धर्मोपदेशमाला-विवरण : जयसिंहसूरि, सं. जिनविजय, सिंधी जैन ग्रंथमाला, मुंबई, १९४९.
36. धूर्ताख्यान : हरिभद्र, सं. जिनविजय, भारतीय विद्याभवन, मुंबई, १९४४.
37. नंदीसूत्र : पारसकुमार, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २०११.
38. नंदीसूत्र-टीका : मलयगिरि, आगमोदयसमिति, मुंबई, १९२४.
39. निर्युक्ति-संग्रह : भद्रबाहु, सं. विजयजिनेंद्र, हर्षपुष्पामृत जैन ग्रंथमाला, शांतिपुरी (सौराष्ट्र), १९८९.
40. निशीथसूत्र : सं. नेमीचन्द बांठिया, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २००९.
41. निशीथसूत्र-चूर्णि (भाग १,२,३,४) : जिनदासगणिमहत्तर, सं. अमरमुनि, मुनि कन्हैयालाल 'कमल', भारतीय विद्या प्रकाशन, दिल्ली, १९८२.
42. नीतिवाक्यामृत : सोमदेवसूरि, सं. पन्नालाल सोनी, माणिकचन्द्र दिगम्बर जैन ग्रंथमाला, बम्बई, १९२३.

43. परिशिष्टपर्व : हेमचंद्र, श्री जैनधर्म प्रसारक सभा, भावनगर, १९११.
44. पिण्डनिर्युक्ति (तथा पिण्डनिर्युक्तिभाष्य) : भद्रबाहु, देवचंद लालभाई जैन पुस्तकोद्धार फंड, सूरत, १९५८.
45. पुण्याश्रव-कथाकोष : रामचंद्रमुमुक्षु, हिंदीभाषाटीका, पं. दौलतरामजी काशलीवाल, हिंदी ग्रंथरत्न भांडार, गिरगाव, मुंबई, ४.
46. प्रश्नव्याकरण-सूत्र : अनु. रतनलाल डोशी, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २०११.
47. बृहत्कथाकोश : हरिषेण, सं.डॉ.ए.एन्.उपाध्ये, भारतीय विद्याभवन, मुंबई, १९४३.
48. बृहत्कथामञ्जरी : क्षेमेन्द्र, निर्णयसागर प्रेस, मुंबई, १९३१.
49. भगवती आराधना : शिवकोटि, देवेंद्रकीर्ति, दिगंबर जैनग्रंथमाला, कारंजा, १९३५.
50. भद्रबाहु-चाणक्य-चन्द्रगुप्त-कथानक : रङ्ग, सं. राजाराम जैन, श्री गणेश वर्णी, दि. जैन संस्थान, वाराणसी, १९८२.
51. भारतीय संस्कृति में जैनधर्म का योगदान : डॉ. हिरालाल जैन, मध्यप्रदेश शासन साहित्य परिषद, भोपाल, १९६२
52. Magadhan Literature : MM. Haraprasad Sastri, Sri Satguru Publication, Delhi, 1986.
53. मत्स्यपुराण : डॉ. श्रद्धा शुक्ला, नाग पब्लिशर्स, २००४.
54. मुद्राराक्षस : विशाखदत्त, अनु. गोविन्द केशव भट, महाराष्ट्र राज्य साहित्य-संस्कृति मंडळ, मुंबई, १९७४.
55. मूलाचार : वट्टकेर, सं. कैलाशचन्द्र शास्त्री, भारतीय ज्ञानपीठ प्रकाशन, १९८४.
56. वायुपुराण : सं. श्रीराम शर्मा, संस्कृति-संस्थान, बरेली (उ.प्र.), १९९७.
57. विविधतीर्थकल्प : जिनप्रभ, सिंघी जैन ग्रन्थमाला, शांतिनिकेतन (बंगाल), १९३४.

58. विशेषावश्यकभाष्य : मलधारि हेमचंद्र, शहा हरखचंद भूरभाई, बनारस, वी.सं. २४४१.
59. विष्णुपुराण : सं. श्रीराम शर्मा, संस्कृति-संस्थान, बरेली (उ.प्र.), १९९७.
60. व्यवहारटीका (प्रथम भाग): मलयगिरि, वृत्तिसहित, त्रिकमलाल उगरचन्द्र, तलियानी पोल, अहमदाबाद, १९२८.
61. व्यवहार-भाष्य : वाचनाप्रमुख-तुलसी, सं. महाप्रज्ञ, जैन विश्वभारती संस्थान, लाडनौ, १९९७.
62. संक्षिप्त-तरंगवती-कथा (तरंगलोला) : सं. भायाणी, लालभाई दलपतभाई भारतीय संस्कृति विद्यामंदिर, अहमदाबाद, १९७९.
63. समवायांग-सूत्र : सं. नेमीचन्द बांठिया, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २००९.
64. समवायांग-टीका : अभयदेवसूरि, आगमोदयसमिति, मेहसाना, १९१८.
65. सुखबोधा-टीका : नेमिचंद्र, शेठ पुष्पचंद्र खेमचंद्र, अहमदाबाद, निर्णयसागर मुद्रणालय, १९३७.
66. सूत्रकृतांग-सूत्र : अनु. अमोलकक्रषि, श्री अमोल जैन ज्ञानालय, धुलिया, २००२.
67. सूत्रकृतांग-सूत्र (प्रथम, द्वितीय श्रुतस्कन्ध) : सं. नेमीचन्द बांठिया, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २००९, २०१२.
68. सूत्रकृतांग-निर्युक्ति-चूर्णिसहित : भद्रबाहू, पुण्यविजय, प्राकृत ग्रंथ परिषद, अहमदाबाद, १९७५.
69. स्कन्दमहापुराण (पञ्चमो भागः) (उत्तरार्धम्) : गोपाल प्रिंटिंग वर्क्स, कलकत्ता, १९६२.
70. स्थानांग-सूत्र : सं. नेमीचन्द बांठिया, श्री अखिल भारतीय सुधर्म जैन संस्कृति रक्षक संघ, जोधपुर, ब्यावर, २०१०, २०११.
71. स्थानांग-टीका : अभयदेव, वेणिचंद्र सूरचंद्र, आगमोदयसमिति, निर्णयसागर मुद्रणालय, १९१८.