

KAUTILYA'S ARTHAŚĀSTRA

TRANSLATED BY

DR. R. SHAMASASTRY, B.A., Ph.D., M.R.A.S.,

CURATOR, GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL LIBRARY, MYSORE;
DIRECTOR OF ARCHÆOLOGICAL RESEARCHES IN MYSORE; PERIODICAL LECTURER TO
THE POST-GRADUATES' CLASSES OF THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY; AND
B.B. R.A.S. CAMPBELL MEMORIAL MEDALIST

WITH

AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE BY THE LATE

DR. J. F. FLEET, Ph.D., C.I.E., I.C.S.

THIRD EDITION

MYSORE :

PRINTED AT THE WESLEYAN MISSION PRESS

1929

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THE Kauṭilya-Arthaśāstra, of which Mr. Shamasastri gives us here his translation, is a work of very exceptional interest and value. In the first place, it ascribes itself in unmistakable terms to the famous Brāhman Kauṭilya, also named Vishṇugupta, and known from other sources by the patronymic Chāṇakya, who, tradition tells us, overthrew the last king of the Nanda dynasty, and placed the great Maurya Chandragupta on the throne: thus, the two verses with which the work ends recite that it was written by Vishṇugupta, who from intolerance of misrule rescued the scriptures, the science of weapons, and the earth which had passed to the Nanda king, and that he wrote it because he had seen many discrepancies on the part of previous commentators; and, in conformity with a common practice of Indian writers, the name Kauṭilya figures constantly through the book, especially in places where the author lays down his own views as differing from others which he cites. The work accordingly claims to date from the period 321-296 B.C.: and its archaic style is well in agreement with the claim. Secondly, as regards its nature and value. Kauṭilya is renowned, not only as a king-maker, but also for being the greatest Indian exponent of the art of government, the duties of kings, ministers, and officials, and the methods of diplomacy. That a work dealing with such matters was written by him is testified to by various more or less early Indian writers, who have given quotations from it. But the work itself remained hidden from modern eyes until it was found in the text of which the translation is laid before us here. The topic of this text is precisely that which has been indicated above, in all its branches, internal and foreign, civil, military, commercial, fiscal, judicial, and so on, including even tables of weights, measures of length, and divisions of time. And it seems to be agreed by competent judges that, though the existing text is, perhaps, not absolutely word for word that which was written by Kauṭilya, still we have essentially a work that he did compose in the period stated above. The value of it is unmistakable: it not only endorses and extends much of what we learn in some of its lines from the Greek writer Megasthenes, who, as is well known, spent a long time in India as

the representative of the Syrian king, Seleucus I, at the Court of Chandragupta, but also fills out what we gather from the epics, from other early writings, and from the inscriptions, and explains statements and allusions in these last-mentioned sources of information which are otherwise obscure : in short, it throws quite a flood of light on many problems in the branch of Indian studies to which it belongs.

For our introduction to this work we are greatly indebted to Mr. Shamasastry. A manuscript of the text, and with it one of a commentary on a small part of it by a writer named Bhaṭṭasvāmin, was handed over by a Pandit of the Tanjore District to the Mysore Government Oriental Library. From these materials Mr. Shamasastry, who was then the Librarian of that Library, gave a tentative translation in the pages of the *Indian Antiquary* and elsewhere, in 1905 and following years. By the enlightened encouragement of the Mysore Durbar he was enabled to publish the text itself in 1909, as Vol. 37 of the *Bibliotheca Sanskrita* of Mysore. And under the same appreciative patronage he now lays before us a translation which has been improved in various details, in addition to being brought together in a connected and convenient form. His task has been no easy one. For the formation of his text, as for his translation of it, he has had only the one manuscript and the partial commentary which have been mentioned above : and the text is by no means a simple one ; it is laconic and difficult to a degree. In these circumstances, it could hardly be the case that anyone should be able to give us a final treatment of the work straight away. It seems that, as a result of the attention which Mr. Shamasastry's labours attracted at once, two or three other manuscripts of the work have now been traced. So it may be hoped that eventually another step may be made, by giving us a revised text, based on a collation of materials, which will remove certain obscurities that still exist. Meanwhile, it is impossible to speak in too high terms of the service rendered by Mr. Shamasastry, in the first place by practically discovering the work, and then by laying the contents of it before us so satisfactorily, in spite of the difficulties confronting him, which can only be appreciated by anyone who tries to understand the text without the help of his translation. We are, and shall always remain, under a great obligation to him for a most important addition to our means of studying the general history of ancient India.

PREFACE

LITTLE that is reliable is known of the author of the Arthaśāstra. He subscribes himself as Kauṭilya at the end of each of the hundred and fifty chapters of the work, and narrates in a verse at its conclusion the overthrow of the Nanda dynasty as one of his exploits. Another name by which the author is known is Viṣṇugupta, and it is used only once by the author himself, in the concluding verse of the work. A third name by which he is designated by later writers is Chāṇakya.

That Kauṭilya overthrew the Nandas and placed Chandragupta on their throne, is also evident from the following passage of the Viṣṇupurāṇa (IV, 24):

महापद्मः । तस्युत्राश्वकं वर्षशतमवनीपतयो भविष्यन्ति नवैव । ताचन्द्रा
न्कौटिल्यो ब्राह्मणस्तमुद्गरिष्यति । तेषामभावे मौर्याश्च पृथिवीं भोक्ष्यन्ति ।
कौटिल्य एव चन्द्रगुप्तं राज्येऽभिषेक्ष्यति । तस्यापि पुत्रो बिन्दुसारो भविष्यति ।
तस्याप्यशोकवर्धनः ॥

“(First) Mahāpadma; then his sons, only nine in number, will be the lords of the earth for a hundred years. Those Nandas Kauṭilya, a Brāhman, will slay. On their death, the Mauryas will enjoy the earth. Kauṭilya himself will install Chandragupta on their throne. His son will be Bindusāra, and his son Aśōkavardhana.”

From Indian epigraphical researches it is known beyond doubt that Chandragupta was made king in 321 B.C. and that Aśōkavardhana ascended the throne in 296 B.C. It follows, therefore, that Kauṭilya lived and wrote his famous work, the Arthaśāstra, somewhere between 321 and 300 B.C.

What Kāmandaka has stated about our author and his work in the introduction to Nītisāra supports the same view. He says:

यस्याभिचारवज्रेण वज्रज्वलनतेजसः । पपात मूलतश्श्रीमान्सुपर्वा नन्दपर्वतः ॥ ४ ॥
एकाकी मन्त्रशक्त्या यश्शक्त्या शक्तिधरोपमः । आजहार नृचन्द्राय चन्द्रगुप्ताय मेदिनीम् ॥ ५ ॥
नीतिशास्त्रामृतं धीमानर्थशास्त्रमहोदधेः । समुद्भूतं नमस्तस्मै विष्णुगुप्ताय वेधसे ॥ ६ ॥
दर्शनात्तस्य सुदृशो विद्यानां पारदृश्वनः । यत्किञ्चिदुपदेक्ष्यामः राजविद्याविदां मतम् ॥ ७ ॥

“To him who shone like a thunderbolt and before the stroke of the thunderbolt of whose witchcraft the rich mountain-like Nandas fell down, root and branch; who alone, with the power of diplomacy like Indra with his thunderbolt, bestowed the earth on Chandragupta, the moon among men; who churned the nectar of the science of polity from the ocean of political sciences—to him, the wise and Brahma-like Vishṇugupta, we make salutation. From the scientific work of that learned man who had reached the limits of knowledge, the favourite learning of the kings, brief yet intelligible and useful in the acquisition and maintenance of the earth, we are going to extract and teach kings in the manner acceptable to those learned in the science of polity.”

In I, 14, Kāmandaka speaks of the long reign of a benevolent Yavana king. It is possible that this refers to Kanishka. Rājendra-lāla-Mitra, in the Introduction to his edition of the Nīṭisāra, say that with the Hindu inhabitants of the island of Bali, who emigrate thither from Java somewhere about the fourth century of the Christian era, the Nīṭisāra is a favourite work next to the Mahābhārata.

Like Kāmandaka, Daṇḍi also ascribes the Arthaśāstra to Vishṇugupta, and quotes some passages from it in his Daśa-kumāracharita (II, 8) with the object of exciting the laughter of the womenfolk of the imaginary royal court. This is what he says :

अधीन्व तावद्दण्डनीतिम् । इयमिदानीमाचार्यविष्णुगुप्तेन मौर्यार्थे षड्भि-
 रश्लोकसहस्रैस्संक्षिप्ता सैवेयमधीत्य सम्यगनुष्ठीयमाना यथोक्तकार्यक्षमेति ॥

“Learn then the Science of Polity. Now this has been by the revered teacher Vishṇugupta abridged into six thousand ślokas in the interests of the Maurya (king) that, when learnt and well observed, it can produce the results expected from it.”

This statement appears to be supported by internal evidence from the Arthaśāstra itself; for the author says, in the concluding verse of the tenth chapter of the Second Book, that he collected the forms of writing in vogue in the interests of the king or kings (Narendrārthe), and it is probable that Vishṇugupta meant by the word “Narendra” the Maurya king Chandragupta.

The genuineness of the Arthaśāstra, as we now have it, is also supported by Daṇḍi ; for it is of about the same extent as stated by Daṇḍi, *i.e.* 6,000 *ślokas*, and this is also referred to at the close of the first chapter of this work.

Further, the passages presented to humour the womenfolk run as follows :

- | | |
|--|--|
| (१) इयत ओदनस्य पाकयैतावदिन्धनम्. | (१) काष्ठपञ्चविंशतिपलं तण्डुलप्रस्थसाधनम्. II, 19. |
| (२) कृत्स्नमायव्ययजातमहः प्रथमेऽष्टमे भागे श्रोतव्यम्. | (२) दिवसस्याष्टमे भागे रक्षाविधानमायव्ययौ च शृणुयात्. I, 19. |
| (३) चत्वारिंशच्चाणक्योपदिष्टानाहरणोपायान्सहस्रधाऽल्मबुद्ध्यैव विकल्पयितारः. | (३) तेषां हरणोपायाश्चत्वारिंशत्. II, 8. |
| (४) द्वितीयेऽन्योन्यं विवदमानानां तृतीये स्नातुं भोक्तुं च चतुर्थे हिरण्यप्रतिग्रहाय. | (४) द्वितीये पौरजानपदानां कार्याणि पश्येत् । तृतीये स्नानभोजनं सेवेत । स्वाध्यायं च कुर्वीत । चतुर्थे हिरण्यप्रतिग्रहमध्यक्षांश्च कुर्वीत ॥ I, 19. |
| (५) भुक्तस्य च यावदन्तःपरिणामस्तावदस्य विषभयं न शाम्यत्येव. | (५) अग्नेर्ज्वाला धूमनीलता . . . इति विषयुक्तलिङ्गानि. I, 20. |
| (1) To cook this much rice this much firewood (is required). | (1) Twenty-five <i>palas</i> of firewood will cook one <i>prastha</i> of rice. |
| (2) The whole mass of receipts and expenditure should be heard in the first eighth part of the day. | (2) During the first one-eighth part of the day he shall post watchmen and attend to the accounts of receipts and expenditure. |
| (3) They (the officials) with the fabricating power of their mind can render into a thousand dubious ways the forty modes of embezzlement explained by Chāṇakya. | (3) Their means of embezzlement are forty. |

- (4) During the second one-eighth part of the day to those quarrelling with each other; during the third to bathe and dine; and during the fourth to receive gold.
- (4) During the second part he shall look to the affairs of both citizens and country people; during the third he shall not only bathe and dine, but also study; during the fourth he shall not only receive revenue in gold, but also attend to the appointment of superintendents.
- (5) Until the food eaten has undergone digestion, the fear of poison never leaves him.
- (5) When the flame and smoke turn blue and crackle, . . . the presence of poison shall be inferred.

Likewise what Bāṇa, the author of the *Kādambarī*, says, condemning the science of Kauṭilya, seems to strengthen the authenticity of the work and the identification of Kauṭilya as the author of it. This is what he says (p. 109, *Kāda*, Bombay Education Society Press):

किं वा तेषां साम्प्रतं येषामतिनृशंसप्रायोपदेशनिर्घृण कौटिल्यशास्त्रं प्रमाणं,
अभिचारक्रियाकर्गकप्रकृतयः पुरोधसो गुणवः, पराभिमन्थानपरा मन्त्रिणः उपदे-
ष्टारः, नरपतिसहस्रोञ्जितायां लक्ष्म्यामासक्तिः, मरणात्मकेषु शास्त्रेष्वभियोगः,
सहजप्रेमाद्रहदयानुरक्ता भ्रातर उच्छेद्याः.

“Is there anything that is righteous for those for whom the science of Kauṭilya, merciless in its precepts, rich in cruelty, is an authority; whose teachers are priests habitually hard-hearted with practice of witchcraft; to whom ministers, always inclined to deceive others, are councillors; whose desire is always for the goddess of wealth that has been cast away by thousands of kings; who are devoted to the application of destructive sciences; and to whom brothers, affectionate with natural cordial love, are fit victims to be murdered?”

Furthermore, the author of the Pañchatantra ascribes the authorship of the Arthaśāstra to Chāṇakya. He says in the Introduction to his work :

ततो धर्मशास्त्राणि मन्वादीनि, अर्थशास्त्राणि चाणक्यादीनि, कामशास्त्राणि वास्यायनादीनि.

“ Then the Dharmaśāstras are those of Manu and others, the Arthaśāstras of Chāṇakya and others, the Kāmasūtras of Vātsyāyana and others.”

Vātsyāyana also seems to have modelled his Kāmasūtra on the Arthaśāstra, as he has used, wherever possible, many of its phrases and sentences. The following are some of the phrases common to both :

- | | |
|--|---|
| (१) . . . काममूत्रमिदं प्रणीतम् । तस्यायं प्रकरणाधिकरणसमुद्देशः । . . . विद्यासमुद्देशः . . . औपनिषदिकम् । I, 1. | (१) . . . इदमर्थशास्त्रं कृतम् । तस्यायं प्रकरणाधिकरणसमुद्देशः । विद्यासमुद्देशः । . . . अपनिषदिकम् । I, 1. |
| (२) यथा दाण्डक्यो नाम भोजः कामाद्ब्राह्मणकन्यामभिमन्यमानस्सबन्धुराष्टो विननाश । . . . रावणश्च सीतामपरे चान्ये च बहवो दृश्यन्त कामवशगा विनष्टा इत्यर्थचिन्तकाः ।
I, 2. | (२) यथा दाण्डक्यो नाम भोजः कामाद्ब्राह्मणकन्यामभिमन्यमानस्सबन्धुराष्टो विननाश । . . . रावणः परदारानप्रयच्छन् . . . एते चान्ये च बहवः शत्रुषड्वर्गमाश्रिताः । सबन्धुराष्टौ राजानो विनेशुरजितेन्द्रियाः ॥ I, 6. |
| (३) पितृपतामहं . . . वश्यं . . . इति मित्रसम्पत् । I, 5. | (३) पितृपतामहं . . . वश्यं . . . इति मित्रसम्पत् ॥ VI, 1. |
| (४) कामोपधाशुद्धान्क्षिणोन्तःपुरे स्थापयेदित्याचार्याः । V, 6. | (४) कामोपधाशुद्धान् वाह्याभ्यन्तरविहाररक्षासु । I, 10. |
| (५) इतस्ततश्च स्वयमेवापसृन्योपजपति चेदुभयोर्गुणानपेक्षी चलबुधिरसन्धेयः. VI, 4. | (५) स्वदोषेण गतागतो गुणमुभयोः परित्यज्याकारणाद्गतागतश्चलबुधिरसन्धेयः ॥ VII, 6. |
| (६) अर्थो धर्मः काम इत्यर्थत्रिवर्गः । अनर्थोऽधर्मो द्वेष इत्यनर्थत्रिवर्गः. VI, 6. | (३) अर्थो धर्मः काम इत्यर्थत्रिवर्गः । अनर्थोऽधर्मश्शोक इत्यनर्थत्रिवर्गः ॥ IX, 7. |

(७) . . . अर्थोऽर्थानुबन्धः	(७) अर्थोऽर्थानुबन्धः
. . . अर्थो निरनुबन्धः	अर्थो निरनुबन्धः
. . . अर्थोऽनर्थानुबन्धः	अर्थोऽनर्थानुबन्धः
. . . अनर्थोऽर्थानुबन्धः	अनर्थोऽर्थानुबन्धः
. . . अनर्थोनिरनुबन्धः	अनर्थो निरनुबन्धः
. . . अनर्थोऽनर्थानुबन्धः	अनर्थोऽनर्थानुबन्धः
. . . अर्थोऽनर्थ इति संशयः
. . . धर्मोऽधर्म इति संशयः	अर्थोऽनर्थ इति
. . . कामो द्वेष इति संशयः	धर्मोऽधर्म इति
	कामश्लोक इति
	संशयत्रिवर्गः । IX, 7.

VI, 6.

Besides using the words Gavādhyaksha, Sūtrādhyaksha, Paṇyādhyaksha and Āyuktaka (V, 5) in the sense of a government officer, he has used the word "Arthachintakāh" (I, 2), professors of the Arthaśāstra. It may possibly refer to Kauṭilya among others, as the quotation preceding that word appears in the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya.

Mallināthasūri also has in his commentaries freely quoted from the Arthaśāstra to explain certain technical terms used by Kālidāsa, both in the Raghuvamśa and the Kumārasambhava. The passages quoted run as follows :

- | | |
|---|--|
| (१) भूतपूर्वमभूतपूर्वं वा जनपदं परदेश-
प्रवाहेन स्वदेशाभिव्यन्दवमनेन वा
निवेशयेत् ॥
Raghu. XV, 29.
Kumāra. VI, 37. | (१) भूतपूर्वमभूतपूर्वं वा जनपदं परदेशा-
पवाहनेन स्वदेशाभिव्यन्दवमनेन
वा निवेशयेत् ॥
Artha. II, 1. |
| (२) कार्याणां नियोगविकल्पसमुच्चया भव-
न्ति । अनेनैवोपायेन नान्येनेति
नियोगः । अनेन वान्येन वेति
विकल्पः । अनेन चेति समुच्चयः ॥
Raghu. XVII, 49. | (२) आपदां नियोगविकल्पसमुच्चया भ-
वन्ति । अनेनैवोपायेन नान्ये-
नेति नियोगः । अनेन वान्येन
वेति विकल्पः । अनेनान्येन चेति
समुच्चयः ॥ X, 7. |
| (३) क्षीणाः प्रकृतयो लोभं लुब्धा यान्ति
विरागताम् । विरक्ता यान्यमित्रं वा
भर्तारं घ्नन्ति वा स्वयम् ॥
XII, 55. | (३) क्षीणाः प्रकृतयो लोभं लुब्धा या-
न्ति विरागताम् । विरक्ता यान्य-
मित्रं वा भर्तारं घ्नन्ति वा स्व-
यम् ॥ VII, 5. |

- (४) समज्यायोभ्यां सन्धीत हीनेन विग्रहीयात् ॥ XVII, 56. (४) समज्यायोभ्यां सन्धीयेत । हीनेन विग्रहीयात् ॥ VII, 3.
- (५) मन्त्रप्रभावोत्साहशक्तिभिः परान्त-न्द्यात् ॥ XVII, 76. (५) उत्साहप्रभावमन्त्रशक्तीनामुत्तरोत्तराधिकोऽतिसन्धत्ते ॥ IX, 1.
- (६) दुर्बलो बलवत्सेवी विरुद्धान्छंकिता-दिभिः । वर्तेत दण्डोपनतो भर्त-येवमवस्थितः ॥ XVII, 81. (६) संयुक्तबलवत्सेवी विरुद्धान्छंकिता-दिभिः । वर्तेत दण्डोपनतो भर्त-येवमवस्थितः ॥ VII, 15.
- (७) धर्माधर्मौ त्रय्यामर्थानर्थौ वार्तायां न-यानयौ दण्डनीत्यामिति ॥ XVIII, 50. (७) धर्माधर्मौ त्रय्यां अर्थानर्थौ वार्तायां नयानयौ दण्डनीत्याम् ॥ I, 2.

Of these quotations, the first is intended to explain the word "Svargābhishyandavamana," which occurs both in the Raghuvamśa and the Kumārasambhava; the second to expound the words "niyōga" and "vikalpa"; the third "Prakṛtivairāgya"; the fourth "śakyeshu yātrā"; the fifth "Parābhisandhāna"; the sixth "daṇḍopanatacharitam"; and the seventh to point out the three branches of knowledge, "tisro vidyāh."

Again, in defence of hunting as a good sport for kings, Kālidāsa uses in the "Śākuntala almost the same words that are used by Kauṭilya for the same purpose :

मेदश्छेदकृशोदरं लघु भवत्युत्थान-
योग्यं वपुः सत्वानामपि लक्ष्यते
विकृतिमिच्छित्तं भयक्रोधयोः । उ-
त्कर्षस्त च धन्विनां यदिष्वस्ति-
ध्यन्ति लक्ष्ये चले मिथ्या हि व्य-
सनं वदन्ति मृगयामीदृग्विनोदः
कृतः ॥ Śāku. II, 5.

मृगयायां तु श्लेष्मपित्तमेदस्त्वेद-
नाशश्चले स्थिरं च काये लक्षपरि-
चयः कोपस्थानं हि तेषु च मृ-
गाणां चित्तज्ञानमनित्ययानं चे-
ति ॥ VIII, 3.

A few of the words are evidently peculiar to works on political science, and the author has himself stated in the last chapter of the work that the use of the word "Prakṛti," in the sense of an element of sovereignty, has been his own; and has also said in VI, 1, that each sovereign state must contain seven members (aṅga), such as the king, the minister, the country, the fort, the treasury, the army, and the friend; and eight elements (prakṛtis) with these and the

enemy. Amarasimha calls (II, 8, 17) them seven members (rājyān-gāni) or elements (prakṛtis), and to designate the enemy or enemies he has not used the word prakṛti. So Kauṭilya may be credited with having coined the word prakṛti to designate an element of sovereignty, and to have extended the denotation of it so as to cover enemies also, as "prathamā prakṛti," first inimical element; "dvitīyā prakṛti," second inimical element; and "tṛtīyā prakṛti," third inimical element, and so on, as stated by him. Likewise, Kāmandaka calls (I, 16, 17) them members, and uses the word prakṛti to designate these seven members and also enemies (VIII, 4, 20, 25). It would appear, therefore, that writers on political science before Kauṭilya used the word "aṅga," member, as a general term to designate any of the seven constituents of a state, and had no such general term as "prakṛti," element, to denote the seven constituents as well as the inimical elements. It follows, therefore, that the use of the word "prakṛti" in the sense of an element of a sovereign state including enemies also is a proof that the author using that word must be posterior to Kauṭilya. In the Manusmṛti, now extant, the word "prakṛti" is used (VII, 156) in the general sense, as in Kauṭilya, and it can therefore be taken to be posterior to Kauṭilya. It follows also that Kālidāsa must have been indebted to Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra for the political technical terms noted above, and that Mallināthasūri could find their explanation in no other political work than that of Kauṭilya. If this holds good, it follows that Kālidāsa must also be posterior to Kauṭilya.

Yāgñyavalkya, however, seems to use (I, 344, 352) the word "prakṛti" as synonymous with "aṅga," and has not extended its sense like Kauṭilya to denote also an inimical element of a sovereign state. But a comparison of his Vyavahāra-kāṇḍa with the Third and Fourth Books of the Arthaśāstra, as pointed out in footnotes both in the text and translation, will not fail to raise the question whether Yāgñyavalkya borrowed from the Arthaśāstra or whether Kauṭilya from the Smṛti, or both from a common source. As Yāgñyavalkya uses the word Arthaśāstra, and Kauṭilya the word Dharmaśāstra, all the three alternatives are possible. But considerations of style and phraseology seem to point to the indebtedness of Yāgñyavalkya to Kauṭilya. The following passages deserve to be considered in this connection:

- (१) महोत्साहस्थूललक्षः कृतज्ञो वृद्धसे-
वकः । विनीतस्सत्वसम्पन्नः कुलीन-
स्तयवाकच्छ्रुचिः । अदीर्घसूत्रस्समृ-
तिमानशुद्रोऽपरुषस्तथा । धार्मिको-
ऽव्यसनश्चैव प्राज्ञश्शूरो रहस्यवित् ॥
स्वरन्म्रगोप्ताऽऽस्नीक्षिक्यां दण्डनी-
त्यां तथैव च । विनीतस्त्वथ वार्ता-
यां त्रय्यां चैव नराधिपः ॥
Y. I, 308-310.
- (२) अयुक्तं शपथं कुर्वन् अयोग्यो योग्य-
कर्मकृत् ॥ II, 233-235.
- (३) क्वपाददतो भंगे छेदने कर्णनासयोः ।
मध्ये दंडो व्रणोऽद्रेदे मृतकल्पहते
तथा ॥ II, 217.
- (१) महाकुलीनो देवबुद्धिः सत्वसम्प-
न्नो वृद्धदर्शी धार्मिकः सत्यवाग-
विसंवादकः कृतज्ञस्थूललक्षो म-
होत्साहोऽदीर्घसूत्रश्शक्यसामन्तो
दृढबुद्धिरशुद्रपरिषत्को विनयका-
मः ॥ Artha. VI, 1.
- (२) शपथवाक्यानुयोगमनिस्पष्टं कुर्वतो
युक्तकर्मणि चायुक्तस्य ॥
III, 20.
- (३) पाणिपाददंतभंगे कर्णनामाच्छेदने द्र-
णविदारणे चान्यत्र दृष्टव्रणेभ्यः ।
III, 19.

Here the three important points to be considered are the style and commission and omission, if any, on the part of the two writers. While Kauṭilya, following the Sūtra style, prefers prose to verse, and uses words some of which are obsolete and a few against the rules of Pāṇini, Yāgñyavalkya uses verse with words modern and in accordance with the rules of Pāṇini. While Kauṭilya uses a single compound word, "akshudraparishatka," "having a council of ministers of no mean magnitude," Yāgñyavalkya uses two different words, "akshudra" and "aparusha," meaning "neither mean," "nor cruel." This may be accounted for as due to the discontinuance of the council of ministers by the kings of his time or as due to the copyist having erroneously transcribed "parishad" as "parusha." While Kauṭilya uses the word "Śapathavākyānu-yoga" in the technical sense of "the trial of a criminal on oath," Yāgñyavalkya interprets and uses it in the modern sense of "an improper oath." Again, while Kauṭilya uses the words "yukta," "a government officer"; and "ayukta," "one other than a government officer," as used in the inscriptions of Aśoka,¹ Yāgñyavalkya translates them by the modern words "yogya" and "ayogya," meaning "proper" and "improper," and his commen-

¹ P. 383, *J.R.A.S.*, 1914.

tator, Vigñāneśvara, interprets them likewise. Also while Kauṭilya makes (death due to) surgical operation of a boil other than dangerous boils punishable, Yāgñyavalkya makes operation on boils in general a punishable offence. I presume that these points indicate a later time, and place Yāgñyavalkya far later than the time of Aśoka.

Furthermore Kauṭilya does not seem to have been aware of the planets and of the belief in their influence over the destinies of men and kings, and in the concluding verses of IX, 4, he refers only to stars, condemning the frequent consultation of the sidereal astrology (uḍudaśā) on the part of the kings, and does not make even a remote reference to the use of the zodiac in measuring time; but Yāgñyavalkya makes a distinct reference to the planets (grahas I, 295, 307) and asks the kings to worship them, since, in his opinion, their prosperity depends upon the planets.

What still more strikingly proves the priority of the Arthaśāstra to the Smṛtis of Manu and Yāgñyavalkya, as now extant, is the marked difference between the states of societies presented in them. The state of society portrayed in the Arthaśāstra is in the main pre-Buddhistic, though Kauṭilya wrote long after the time of Buddha, while the Smṛtis depict the ideal of the Hindu society as reconstructed and reformed consequent on its struggle for existence against the all-victorious, but just then decadent, Buddhism. The Smṛtis allude to the previous existence of the state of society described by Kauṭilya, either by condemning some of its political, social and religious practices, or by discrediting the Arthaśāstra and other Smṛtis which authorised the practices characteristic of it. Owing partly to the influence of the highly moral and philanthropic teachings of the Buddhists, and partly to the precepts of the Dharmaśāstra and the Vēdānta of the reviving or reformed Brāhmanism, a number of practices and customs previously existent seem to have gradually disappeared between the birth of Buddha and the close of the third or fourth century of the Christian era. The political practices which disappeared during this period appear to be the institution of espionage with its evil consequences;¹ the vices of the harem life resulting in the cold-blooded murder of kings, princes, ministers and other high officers;² the evils of the passport system;³ the taking of census of men, women, children and

¹ I, 11, 12.² I, 17, 18, 20; VIII, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.³ II, 34.

beasts;¹ the levy of a number of taxes, benevolences and special taxes to replenish empty treasuries;² oppressive taxes on trade;³ the exaction of religious taxes and the robbing of temple money by imposing upon the credulity and superstition of the people;⁴ the confiscation of the property of the rich under the plea of embezzlement or of tiding over famine and other national calamities;⁵ the slaughter of beasts on a large scale for the supply of flesh to the people, including even the Brāhmans;⁶ state-owned drinking saloons to supply liquor to men, women, and children of all castes;⁷ torture of criminals to elicit confession;⁸ deceitful treaties and treacherous battles;⁹ the evils wrought by spies in creating distrust between man and man and man and woman;¹⁰ and the use of destructive gases, medicines and poisons to murder people or to render them infirm either in war or in peace.¹¹

The social customs that fell out of practice seem to be divorce due to enmity between husband and wife;¹² re-marriage of women whose husbands had long been absent abroad or had died;¹³ marriage of maidens at their own option after puberty;¹⁴ marriage of a Śūdra-wife by a Brāhman in addition to the three wives chosen from the upper castes;¹⁵ flesh-eating and drinking of liquor among Brāhmans;¹⁶ the embracing of the military profession by Brāhmans.¹⁷

Among religious observances, the worship of Vaiśravaṇa, Mahākachchha, and Sankarshaṇa, and the practices of Atharvaṇic witchcraft and sorcery, seem to have been given up.¹⁸ These appear to be the practices and customs which Bāṇa has succinctly condemned in the six pregnant sentences of his Kādambarī quoted above.

The next author in point of date who refers to Vishṇugupta is Varāhamihira. He ascribes a verse (Bṛhatsamhitā II, 4) advocating superstitious reliance on the influence of the planets to Vishṇugupta. But it does not occur in the Arthaśāstra, nor can it find a place in a work given to the condemnation of the auspicious or inauspicious influences of the stars. The verse runs as follows:

¹ II, 35.	² II, 6, 12, 16, 21; V, 2.	³ II, 21; IV, 2.	⁴ V, 2.
⁵ II, 9; IV, 3.	⁶ II, 26.	⁷ II, 25.	⁸ IV, 8.
⁹ VII, 17; X, 3.	¹⁰ XII, XIII.	¹¹ XIV.	¹² III, 3.
¹³ III, 4.	¹⁴ IV, 12.	¹⁵ III, 6.	
¹⁶ II, 25, 26; IV, 13.	¹⁷ IX, 2.	¹⁸ II, 4; IV, 3.	

उक्तंचाचार्यविष्णुगुप्तेन. तथाह—

अप्यर्णवस्य पुरुषः प्रतरन्कदाचिन् आसादयेदनिलयोगवशेन पारम् ।

न त्वस्य कालपुरुषाख्यमहार्णवस्य गच्छेत्कदाचिदनृषिर्मनसापि पारम् ॥

It is likely, therefore, that there was another person bearing the name Vishṇugupta. This is also evident from what Bhaṭṭōtpala says regarding Vishṇugupta in his commentary on two other verses of Varāhamihira in the Bṛhajjātaka. The verses, together with their commentary, run as follows :

न कुम्भलग्नं शुभमाह सत्यः न भागभेदाद्यवना वदन्ति ।

कस्यांशभेदो न तथास्ति राशेः अतिप्रसंगस्त्विति विष्णुगुप्तः ॥

अत्र विष्णुगुप्तचाणक्यावाहतुः—कस्यांशेति. Bṛhaj. XXI, 3.

आयुर्दायं विष्णुगुप्तोऽपि चैवं देवस्वामी सिध्दसेनश्च चक्रे ॥

किन्तु विष्णुगुप्तेनापि चाणक्यापरनाम्नैवमुक्तम्. Bṛhaj. VII, 7.

Here, in his commentary on the first verse, Bhaṭṭōtpala says that *both* Vishṇugupta and Chāṇakya say, “ which sign of the zodiac has no similar divisions,” etc., and in the commentary on the second verse he says that Vishṇugupta, bearing the other name “ Chāṇakya,” has said as stated in the verse.

The Arthaśāstra is noticed by Jaina writers also. Somadevasūri, who flourished at the time of King Yaśodhara, as stated by himself at the conclusion of his work, seems to have based his Nītivākyaṃṛta on the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, and mentions Chāṇakya in the following passage of his work :

श्रूयते हि किल चाणक्यस्तीक्ष्णदूतप्रयोगेणैकं नन्दं जघानेति.

Nīti. 13 (page 52).

The following are a few parallel passages found in the two works :

(१) उद्धृतेष्वपि शस्त्रेषु दूतमुखा वै
राजानः । तेषामन्यावसायिनोऽ
प्यवध्याः किमङ्ग पुनर्ब्राह्मणाः ॥

XXIII, 52.

(१) दूतमुखा वै राजानस्त्वं चान्ये च ।
तस्मादुद्धृतेष्वपि शस्त्रेषु यथोक्तं
वनारस्तेषामन्तावसायिनोप्यव -
ध्याः । किमङ्ग पुनर्ब्राह्मणाः ॥

I, 16.

(२) राजाऽऽमदैवद्रव्यप्रकृतिसम्पन्नः क्रम-
विक्रमयोरधिष्ठानं विजिगीषुः ।
अनपाश्रयो दुर्बलाश्रयो वा शत्रु-
च्छेदनीयः । विपर्यये पीडनीयः
कर्षणीयो वा ॥
ज्ञानबलं मन्त्रशक्तिः । शशकेनेव
सिंहव्यापादनमत्र दृष्टान्तः । क्रोश-
दण्डबलं प्रभुशक्तिः । शूद्रकशक्तिः
कुमारा दृष्टान्तः । विक्रमबलमु-
त्साहशक्तिः । अत्र रामो दृष्टान्तः ॥

XXIX, 114-115.

(३) यावत्परणोपहतं न चेतोऽधिकमप
कृत्य सन्धिमुपेयात् । न तसलोह-
मतसलोहेन सन्धत्ते । तेजो हि
सन्धानकारणम् ॥
समस्य समेन सह विप्रहोऽनिश्चितं
मरणं जये च सन्देहः । आमं हि
पात्रमामेनाभिहतमुभयतः क्षयमेव
करोति । ज्यायसा सह विप्रहो ह-
स्तिना पादयुधमिव ॥

(२) राजा आत्मद्रव्यप्रकृतिसम्पन्नः न-
यस्याधिष्ठानं विजिगीषुः ।
व्यसनी यातव्य अनपाश्रयो दुर्ब-
लाश्रयो वोच्छेदनीयः । विपर्यये
पीडनीयः कर्षणीयो वा ।
ज्ञानबलं मन्त्रशक्तिः । कोशदंडबलं
प्रभुशक्तिः । विक्रमबलमुत्साह
शक्तिः ॥

(३) यावन्मात्रमपकुर्यात्तावन्मात्रमस्य
प्रत्यपकुर्यात् । तेजो हि सन्धानका
रणम् । नातसं लोहं लोहेनस-
न्धत्ते ॥
विग्रहीतो हि ज्यायसा हस्तिना पा-
दयुधमिवाभ्युपैति । समेन चाम
पात्रमामेनाभिहतमिवोभयतः क्ष-
यं करोति ॥

Next the Nandisūtra refers to Chāṇakya and the Arthaśāstra as follows:

खमए अमच्चपुत्ते चाणके चैव धूलभदेय^१ । भारहं रामायण भीमसूरकं कोडिलयम्^२ ॥

“ Kshapaka, Amātyaputra, Chāṇakya and Sthūlabhadra
(are personages famous for their keen intellect).

“ The Bhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa, the Bhīmasūriya and the
Kauṭilya (are false sciences).”

Finally it has to be noted that the civil and constitutional laws explained in the work are strikingly similar to those recorded by Megasthenes and other Greek writers, as ably pointed out by Mr. Vincent Smith in the second and third editions of his *Early History of India*.

As regards the style and vocabulary of the Arthaśāstra: the

^१ Nandi, p. 133.

^२ Nandi, p. 391.

style of the author follows that of Āpastamba, Baudhāyana and other Sūtra writers. The author himself says, in the concluding verse of the work, that he made his own Sūtra and commentary. What he calls the Sūtra appears to be enigmatical phrases placed as the title of each of the hundred and fifty chapters, the chapters themselves being a commentary upon the Sūtras. The commentary also does not much differ from the Sūtra style in many places, while in a few places it approaches the diction of the Upanishads and later Brāhmaṇas. Many of the words used in the Arthaśāstra are now obsolete, and a few violate the canons of Pāṇini. This is not the place to elaborate the point, as it will suitably find a place in the Word-Index which is under preparation.

The following may be cited as instances :

Obsolete—

युक्त,	a government officer.
उपयुक्त,	a subordinate official.
तत्पुरुष,	a servant.
परिघ,	a tax.
व्याजी,	a tax or commission.
रूपिक,	a tax or commission.
पारीक्षिक,	a cess on coins.
परोक्त,	an offence.
निवेशकाल,	time of re-marriage.
उच्छुल्क,	free from toll.
औपनिषदिक	for औपनिषत्क.
सर्वज्ञत्व्यापन	for सर्वज्ञत्वख्यापन.
रोचयन्ते	for रोचन्ते.
चतुर्थपञ्चभागिकाः	for चातुर्थपञ्चभागिकाः.
नस्तः कर्म	for नस्यकर्म.
चतुरश्रिका	for चातुरश्रिका.

These and a number of other words to be noticed in the Index are against the canons of Pāṇini, and raise the presumption that Kauṭilya was not aware of Pāṇini.

While, as admitted by Kauṭilya himself, he may be credited with the composition of the Sūtras and the prose commentary on them, some doubt has been raised as regards the authorship of many

of the verses that as a rule are appended to each of the hundred and fifty chapters, and in a few cases are found in the middle of the chapters also. The metre is almost always śloka (Anushtubh). An Indravajrā and Upajāti of Indravajrā and Upendravajrā appear on page 70 ; two Upajātis of the same kind on page 73, and an Indravajrā on page 74 ; and two more Upajātis of the same kind on page 365-66. The following verses occur also in the works noted against each :

- १ कालश्च सकृद्भ्येति . . . Page 253, Pañchatantra.
- २ यान्यज्ञसर्घस्तपसा च विप्राः Page 365, Nāṭaka of Bhāsa. 1
- ३ नवं शरावं सलिलस्य पूर्णं Page 366, Nāṭaka of Bhāsa.
- ४ एकं हन्यान्न वा हन्यादित्युः Page 375, Mahābhārata, V, 1013.

I do not propose to discuss how far the doubt is justified, but I trust the foregoing pages contain overwhelming evidence in favour of the genuineness of the Arthaśāstra as I have published it, and of Kauṭilya's authorship thereof. Some scholars, have, however, doubted his authorship on the ground that Kauṭilya is made to speak in the third person, to refute the views of writers of adverse political thought, in many places in the body of the work. But this is a common practice with all Indian writers, and is frequently explained by commentators as such. In support of this may be cited what Yaśodhara, the commentator on the Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana, says in his commentary on one of the Sūtras wherein Vātsyāyana for the first time introduces his own name.

सा चोपायप्रतिपत्तिः कामसूत्रादिति वात्स्यायनः ॥

उपायपरिज्ञानं च कामसूत्रान्, तेनोपदिश्यमानेनवात् । वात्स्यायन
इति स्वगोत्रनिमित्ता समाख्या । मङ्गनाग इति सांस्कारिकी ॥ 1, 2.

“Vātsyāyana says that the knowledge of the means (is to be got from the Kāmasūtra).

“Commentary.—The knowledge of the means from the Kāmasūtras, because they are taught there. Vātsyāyana is the name due to his Gotra and Mallanāga is what is given to him during the Consecration.”

So much about the work and its author. As regards my translation, I am conscious of the fact that it is far from being perfect. Beset as the work is with difficulties, it would be sheer presumption

on my part to hope that my translation presents a correct interpretation of the text in all cases. Still I shall feel highly rewarded for my labours, if it proves a stepping-stone for others to arrive at a correct interpretation. For want of necessary diacritical marks, the transliteration of the Sanskrit words could not be made as thorough as it ought to be.

After this tedious discussion, it is a relief to acknowledge my obligation to Western scholars, who have made it a pleasure for me to undertake the present work. First and foremost, my grateful thanks are due to Dr. Fleet for constant advice and encouragement, and for the valuable Introduction he has contributed. Dr. Jolly, Mr. Vincent Smith, Dr. F. W. Thomas, of the India Office Library ; and Dr. L. D. Barnett, have also ungrudgingly given me help and suggestions. My cordial thanks are also due to Mr. C. H. Yates, the Superintendent of the Government Press, for help in seeing the proofs through the Press.

Bangalore, 15th January, 1915.

R.S.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

It is nearly three years since copies of the first edition of this work have gone out of print, and demand for the book has been on the increase. Meanwhile a second edition of the text, based upon two more manuscripts secured from the Oriental Manuscripts Library at Madras, has been published by me in the Oriental Library Sanskrit Series of the University of Mysore. A word-index has also since been prepared, and is now in the press. All along it has been my earnest endeavour to revise my translation with the aid of two more commentaries on the work since discovered. One of them is *Nayachandrikā* by Mādhavayajvan, and the other a translation, or rather paraphrase, by an unknown author, in a mixture of Tāmil and Malayālam languages. Unfortunately, both of them are as incomplete as Bhaṭṭasvāmi's commentary. The first extends from the seventh chapter of the Seventh Book to the end of the third chapter of the Twelfth Book. It is neither a word-by-word commentary like Bhaṭṭasvāmi's, nor a paraphrase like the Tāmil-Malayālam commentary. Mādhavayajvan, its author, satisfies himself by supplying some connecting links between successive chapters and successive paragraphs in each chapter. The Tāmil-Malayālam paraphrase is, on the other hand, very copious, but omits to notice obscure passages here and there. It extends from the beginning to the end of the Seventh Book. Written as it is in a mixture of dialects, it is not very easy to understand it. It seems to be quite recent and is not free from misinterpretation of a few words. The word "Pravahāṇa," for example, is taken to mean a drinking bout instead of a shipping company. There is, however, no doubt that, as they cover almost the whole of the text, when put together, they will be of great help in clearing obscurities with which the text abounds. Under these circumstances it will be a great boon to the readers of the *Arthaśāstra* if Mahāmahopādhyāya T. Gaṇapati Śāstri, Curator of the Oriental Library in Trivandram, publishes the long-advertised Sanskrit commentary, which he is said to have been writing with the aid of the three commentaries. As I could not get in time a copy of the Tāmil-Malayālam commentary on the first two Books, the most important portion of the work, and as demand for the translation

was on the increase, I had to hurry on the second edition without comparing my own translation with that of the Tāmil Commentator.

A word on my recent interpretation of the word "Vyushṭa" used in the Arthaśāstra¹ seems to be necessary, inasmuch as it throws a great deal of light on the obscure Vēdic hymns on the Ushas (dawn). The word Vyushṭa, synonymous with Vyusṭi, Vyusha, Ushas, and cognate with Vyauchchhat, seems to signify a new year's day, but not an ordinary dawn, as usually interpreted. The Vārāha Śrauta Śūtra² divides the night into four parts, and calls them (1) pradoshā, (2) niśi, (3) upavyusha,³ and (4) Vyushṭa.⁴ The literal meaning of the word Vyushṭa is "lighted" or "dawned." The Vēdic people seem to have called the fourth division of the night, light or dawn (ushas or vyushṭa), when early sunrise during the midsummer drove out darkness an hour or two earlier than usual; and nakta, when darkness lingered longer in winter. They seem to have also called the five longest days of midsummer Vyusṭis, and the sixth day Vyushṭa or Ushas, as recognised by their length. There can be no doubt that during the time of Chāṇakya, Vyushṭa, the new year's day, began with the first lunar day of the white half of Śrāvaṇa (July-August), and the year ended with the new moon of Āshāḍha.⁵

In my paper on "Vyushṭa, the Vēdic New Year's Day," read by me in the Second Oriental Conference in Calcutta, I have discussed the question at length, citing necessary authorities, the repetition of which is, I think, out of place here.

Attention may also be drawn to my preface in Sanskrit to the second edition of the text, in which I have extracted some stories from the sacred books of the Jainas illustrative of the meaning of some enigmatic passages at the close of chapter V, Book V.

I have much pleasure in expressing my thankfulness to Mr. Thos. Gould, Superintendent of the Wesleyan Mission Press, for the neat get-up and quick despatch of the work; and to Mr. A. R. Krishnasastri, M.A., Kannada Specialist, and Mr. K. Rangaswami Iyengar, First Pandit, and Librarian of the Oriental Library, Mysore, for going through the proofs.

Mysore,
10th July, 1923.

R. SHAMASASTRY.

¹ Text, p. 60, line 19; p. 64, lines 16, 17, 19.

² See Tait. Brah. I, 5, 2.

³ P. 63, line 8; p. 64, line 1.

⁴ Ākulapāda Khaṇḍa, III.

⁵ See Kāṭhaka, S. 34, 17.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

SINCE the second edition of this work in 1923, and J. J. Meyer's publication of his German translation with critical notes and introduction in Leipzig in 1926, the chronological question of this epoch-making work has been engaging the attention of scholars.

Relying on the traditional account given in the Purāṇas that Kauṭilya destroyed the Nandas and installed Chandragupta Maurya on their throne, and accepting the statement made at the colophon of the Arthaśāstra by its author, that "This Śāstra has been made by him who, from intolerance (of misrule), quickly rescued the scriptures and the science of weapons and the earth which had passed to the Nanda king," the work has been assigned by some scholars to the fourth century B.C., and regarded as a genuine work of Kauṭilya himself. Recently, however, Dr. J. Jolly, Dr. R. Schmidt, and Prof. Winternitz came forward with what, in the absence of reliable evidence to the contrary, appear to be weighty reasons for assigning a later date to the Arthaśāstra. The reasons put forward by them as summarised in the Introduction to the edition of Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra in the Punjab Sanskrit Series are :

(1) As the date of the importation of the Kāmandakīya Nīṭisāra into the island of Bali is not definitely determined, mere priority of the Arthaśāstra to the Nīṭisāra is not enough to settle the date of the former.

(2) The striking correspondences between the Arthaśāstra and the Smritis, especially the Smṛiti of Yājñavalkya may as well be taken to lead to the inference that Kauṭilya turned the metrical rules of the Dharmaśāstra into prose.

(3) References to Greek Astrology and Greek Coins found in the Smritis of Yājñavalkya and Nārada may be later interpolations.

(4) As the date of the Kāmasūtra may be fixed to lie somewhere in the fourth century A.D., the Arthaśāstra may be taken a century earlier and placed somewhere in the middle of the third century A.D.

As regards the authorship of the Arthaśāstra, it might, say the editors, be questioned whether the prime minister of Sandrakottos is not a figure of pure mythology, as he is not mentioned in the Greek reports and as Hemachandra relates very marvellous stories about him.

Even granting that Kauṭilya was a historic figure, his asserted authorship of the Arthaśāstra is rendered highly improbable for the following reasons :

(1) Reference to alchemy, a science of later growth.

(2) The use of the words Śulba and Surangā in the sense of copper and mine.

(3) The numerous references to the opinions of Kauṭilya in the body of the work lead to the inference that it is not the work of Kauṭilya himself.

(4) The geographical knowledge of the author tends to prove that he was rather a southerner than a northerner.

(5) Considering the unity of plan and structure of the work, it may be taken as the work of a single person, probably a pandit, as presumed by Professor Winternitz, for the reason that it is filled with pedantic classifications and puerile distinctions like all the śāstras composed by pandits.

(6) The absence of any reference in the work to Chandragupta, his capital Pāṭaliputra, and his ambassador, Megasthenes points to the conclusion that the author was not a contemporary of the king.

(7) The silence of Patañjali about Kauṭilya and his work, though he had occasion to refer to Chandragupta-sabhā and the Mauryas is also taken as an additional proof to disprove the priority of the Arthaśāstra to the Mahābhāshya.

(8) The political and economic institutions and social conditions described in the Arthaśāstra are of a far more advanced and complicated type than those recorded or alluded to by Megasthenes about 300 B.C. and Aśoka inscriptions. The description of metallurgy and industries in a developed state, the state-monopoly of metals, and the use of writing, are such as are not mentioned by Megasthenes. The differences between the accounts furnished by the Arthaśāstra and by Megasthenes outweigh by far the coincidences both in number and importance.

A close consideration of these and other reasons set forth by the learned scholars will show that instead of establishing a later date to the Arthaśāstra they tend to involve it in considerable doubt. As nothing is positively known regarding the date of Kāmandaka, the first reason may be left out of consideration.

The second reason fares no better, as there is no positive evidence to prove or disprove that Yājñavalkya versified the rules of Kauṭilya. The third is one of the most important reasons, and it

will be shown how the dates of the Arthaśāstra and the Smritis of Yājñavalkya and Nārada can be determined on the basis of the currency system of their times beyond dispute. The question of interpolation, in the absence of a positive evidence to prove it, is a matter of personal opinion.

Regarding the age of the Kāmasūtra, there is no evidence to disprove that it was written about the commencement of the Andhra empire.

As no celebrated Indian writer or reformer of antiquity has escaped from the fate of being represented in a supernatural garb, there is no reason why Kauṭilya should be classed among mythic personages while Pāṇini, Patañjali, and a host of other writers and reformers whose lives are described in no less supernatural terms, pass for historical figures. There are no accepted data to assert that alchemy, metallurgy, and industries, as described in the Arthaśāstra, are the phenomena of the third century A.D. and not of the fourth century B.C.

Whether the author was a southerner and changed his home to the north, and whether he was a pandit or statesman, are points which have nothing to do with the question at issue. Had there been a specimen of the style of writing of Kauṭilya or of a statesman, this objection would have had some bearing on the question at issue. There does not appear any logical necessity to compel either the author of the Arthaśāstra to mention the names of Chandragupta, his capital and his companions, or the author of the Mahābhāshya to speak of the Arthaśāstra and its author, much less of Buddha and Aśoka.

As to the question of Kauṭilya speaking of his own opinion in the third person, it is an ancient custom with Indian writers to speak of themselves in the third person in their literary works. Even Patañjali has followed this custom. While commenting on Pāṇini's sutra, VII, 2, 101, he mentions his view by stating "Gonardīya āha," "Gonardīya says."

Again, while commenting on the introductory verse of the Paribhāshenduśekhara, in which Nāgeśa, the author of the work, has used his own name in the third person, Bhairavamiśra says in defence of the custom as follows :

"The prohibition that no one should use one's own name in speaking of oneself or of one's own view is not applicable here ; for that prohibition is applicable only to those cases in which a person

attempts to speak of himself by using the name given to him by his father." Here Nāgeśa, like Gonardīya used in the expression "Gonardīya āha," is a Yogarūḍha word and not a name given by his father.

That Gonardīya is a name of Patañjali, the author of the Mahābhāshya, is clearly stated by Nāgeśa in his Śabdendusekhara under the Sutra, VI, 1, 94, explained in the Siddhāntakaumudī. Again, Hari Pandita, in his commentary called Vākyaarthachandrika, on the Paribhāshendusekhara says, while commenting on the introductory verse, as follows :

"In connection with the use of one's own name, respectable writers say that it is no sin to use one's own name in the third person in connection with the statement of one's own view, following the example set by Patañjali, who has used the expression, 'Gonardīya āha,' in stating his view."

Patañjali, however, makes mention of an ancient system of currency, consisting of a paṇa of four pādas and of sixteen māshas, obsolete in his own time. It seems to refer to the system of currency described in the nineteenth chapter of the second Adhikaraṇa of Arthaśāstra. It is as follows :

10 seeds of Māsha (<i>Phaseolus Radiatus</i>)					
or 5 seeds of Gunja (<i>Abrus Precatorius</i>)					1 Suvarṇa Māsha.
16 Suvarṇa Māshas	1 Suvarṇa or Karsha.
4 Karshas	1 Pala.
88 White mustard seeds	1 Silver Māsha.
16 Silver Māshas or 20 Saibya seeds	1 Dharāṇa.

The names of the several coins are also stated in II, 12, of the same work. As Pāṇini has also mentioned the names of these coins, Kārshāpaṇa in V, 1, 29; paṇa, pāda, māsha (V, 1, 34), it follows that this system of currency was current during the time of Pāṇini and continued to be so during the reign of Chandragupta, till it was replaced by dīnāra, and its sub-divisions, some time before Patañjali. That during the time of Patañjali, dīnāra and its sub-divisions were prevalent is evident from the Smritis of Kātyāyana (Vararuchi?), quoted in the Smritichandrikā (Vyavahāra Kānda, Part I, p. 231). This system is stated as follows :

4 Kākaṇis	1 Māsha or Paṇa.
20 Māshas	1 Kārshāpaṇa.
4 Kārshāpaṇas	1 Dhanaka.

12 Dhanakas	1 Suvarṇa.
3 Suvarṇas	1 Dīnāra.

In the passages quoted from Kātyāyana it is also stated that this system of currency was in use in the Punjab. It is well known to historians that the word dīnāra is the same as denarius, the name of a Greek coin (264 B.C.). It goes without saying that the introduction of denarius and its sub-divisions into the north-west provinces of India was due to the Bactrian principalities, established to the west of the Indus after the departure of Alexander the Great from India. That during the time of Patañjali the currency system of 16 māshas forming a paṇa or kārshāpaṇa was not in existence, is clearly stated in the Mahābhāshya (1, 2, 3). While commenting on I, 2, 64, he says as follows :

“Vyartheshu sāmānyātsiddham; Vibhinnārthesu cha sāmānyātsiddham. Sarvatra aśnoterakshāh padyateh pādah mimīteh māshah tatra kriyāsāmānyātsiddham. Aparastvāha purā kalpa etadāsīt shoḍsa māshāh kārshāpaṇam shoḍasa palāh māshasamvadyah. Tatra sankhyāsāmānyātsiddham.”

“The retention of only one word in a compound of many similar words differing in meaning is made possible by finding some idea common to all the different meanings. The word aksha is derived from the root ‘aś,’ to pervade; pāda, from pad, to move; māsha, from mā, to measure. Here (in the several ideas or objects signified by each of the words, aksha, pāda, and māsha) what is common is the root-meaning.” But another (teacher) says :

“It was in times past that sixteen māshas made one kārshāpaṇa, and sixteen palas one māshasamvadya. Here what is common in different meanings is to be found in number.”

What is meant in the above passage is this :

It is a rule (I, 2, 64) of Pāṇini that in forming a compound of many words which have the same form in all the numbers of any single case-ending, only one word is to be retained, whether the words mean the same or different things. Example :—Vrikshah + vrikshah + vrikshah = vrikshāh. Rāmah (son of Daśaratha) + Rāmah (son of Vasudeva) + Rāmah (son of Jamadagni) = Rāmāh.

Since it is possible to use a word in plural when many similar things are meant, Patañjali came to the conclusion that the rule was unnecessary. But the difficulty lay in the case of words of different meaning, though of the same form, as in the case of aksha, pāda, and māsha, each meaning coins of different standard. Here, too,

taking the root meaning of the words, it is possible, says Patañjali, to find something that is common to all different ideas signified by the words similar in form. Instead of finding what is common to different ideas in the root-meaning, another teacher went so far as the number to find some identity in the conception, particularly in the case of the word *māsha*. Formerly a *kārshāpaṇa* meant 16 *māshas*; but in the time of the teacher it meant something else (*i.e.* 20 *māshas*). Even here it is number that is common to both. Hence there is identity in meaning.

It is clear from this that the *Arthaśāstra* is a work of the age when a *māsha* equalling one-sixteenth of a *kārshāpaṇa* was current, and that during the time of Patañjali, a *māsha* did not mean one-sixteenth of a *kārshāpaṇa*, but something else. The other thing it meant was probably one-twentieth of a *kārshāpaṇa*, as stated in the *Kātyāyana-Smṛiti*. Whatever might be the other sense in which that word was used in the time of the *Mahābhāshya*, one thing is certain, that long before Patañjali and the other grammarian referred to by him, a *māsha* equalling one-sixteenth of a *kārshāpaṇa*, as stated in the *Arthaśāstra*, ceased to be current. It follows, therefore, that the *Arthaśāstra* of *kauṭilya*, describing as it does the prevalence of the *kārshāpaṇa* of sixteen *māshas*, must necessarily have been in existence before Patañjali; for the *Arthaśāstra* is a lifelike picture of the commercial history of the times to which it belongs, but is not, like the *Smritis*, devoted to the description of the currency of the Vēdic times merely in consideration of its sanctity. Even the *Smṛiti*-writers could not be free from the influence which the commercial condition of their time had exerted on them. Hence it is that they are found to make use of the *dīnāra* and its sub-divisions in their rituals, instead of the Vēdic *śatamāna*, *śalka*, *harita*, and *nishka*. They could not help it, since the Vēdic currency was long extinct. Such being the case, how can it be expected that the *Arthaśāstra* would refer to currency of bygone ages without any attention to that of its own times. If it had been written in the third or the fourth century A.D. it would certainly have related the currency system of the Śakas, Āndhras or the Guptas, and never at all that referred to in the *Sūtras* of Pāṇini. Hence it follows that the *Arthaśāstra* is a work of the Maurya period, and particularly, as tradition says, of the time of Chandragupta Maurya. The name of Chandragupta, or of any other person, however celebrated he might be, has no logical connection with a

literary work meant to be of universal application. It is a painful truth that Indian writers cared more for logic than for history.

Regarding the difference between the accounts of Megasthenes and Kauṭilya, as pointed out by O. Stein, Dr. Bernhard Breloer has made a close study of the two works and published the results of his scholarly research in two volumes under the title *Kauṭilya Studien*.¹ He says (Part I, p. 47) that the difficulty of comparison between the two works is greatly increased by the fact that out of the four books of Megasthenes' *Indica* only a fragment is available, and that on the other side the Arthaśāstra is full of original terminology bristling with philological difficulties. As a specimen of error in the method pursued by O. Stein and others, the doctor points (Part II, p. 14) to the Indian word "dāsa," which O. Stein equated with the Greek word "doulas." The word "dāsa" is met with in Indian literature, and permits itself to cover "slavery." What is overlooked here is that, before examining a foreign institution of rights in its originality, a word used in a different sphere of rights is taken to signify that foreign institution of rights. To say that a word "covers" the whole institution of rights as if it were a proper name or grammatical technical term will not hold good. Such method must certainly result in error. With "covering" nothing is proved. We must know the nature of "dāsa," and also what is meant by a slave, before we can ascertain whether it denotes a slave or a different kind of institution of rights. A slave has no personal rights: his person is dead. But in all cases of "dāsyā" what is meant is some relation of service under certain conditions. A "dāsa" has his personal rights, reduced though they be for the time. In the words of Kauṭilya, no Āryan shall be reduced to slavery except at his own option and dire necessity.

In addition to the above, I may point out, as an instance of the difficulty of understanding the original terminology of the Arthaśāstra, the general statement made by Kauṭilya regarding the constitution of administrative departments. He says (II, 9 and II, 4) that each department shall be officered by many temporary heads, meaning thereby that each department shall be under the management of a board which is periodically revised or reconstituted. Failing to notice this, the late Vincent Smith and others went so far

¹ *Kauṭilya Studien I Das Grundeigentum in Indien*, 1927; *II Altindisches Privatrecht bei Megasthenes and Kauṭilya*, Bonn, 1928.

as to say that management of departments by boards, as stated by Megasthenes, was unknown to Kauṭilya.

The learned scholar goes on to say that, instead of equating words and phrases, one must endeavour to compare the fundamental principles underlying the social and political institutions mentioned in the two works. If this is done on the lines chalked out by him, there will be found more of agreement than difference between the two works. Thus finding agreement between them in respect of (1) non-existence of slavery in Mauryan India in the sense in which it prevailed in Greece and Rome, (2) state-ownership of land with right of occupancy and transfer by sale, mortgage etc., vested in the people for fiscal purpose, (3) the laws of debt, deposit and upanidhi, and (4) rules regulating labour and trade, the doctor comes to the conclusion that the two works are of the same period and anterior to Manu, Nārada and other Smṛiti works, inasmuch as the latter exhibit traces of development of the social and political institutions mentioned in the former. While the Arthaśāstra mentions only four kinds of a "dāsa," Manu makes it seven and Nārada fifteen kinds.

In conclusion he says as follows:—(p. 170) "In the first volume we have made it clear that during the time of Chandragupta Maurya, the first emperor of India, the country has attained a new development. During those stirring times there was advance set in motion all round. We scarcely believe that between the Vēdic and the Mauryan periods there must lie an unconditioned interval of time and that it was suitably yet suddenly marching on. As any sudden military revolution is followed by an equally great statesman's work, a warlike figure like that of Chandragupta demands a statesman-like wisdom like that of Kauṭilya, who alone can render the new unique empire secure, with its administrative machinery and fiscal management well founded.

"A glance at similar aspects of forms in antiquity points to us that the relation which the Kauṭilya period bears to the Vēdic is quite similar to what the Grecian period bears to the Homeric period, and the period of the Etruskans to ancient Italy.

"Though in the matter of revolutions in ancient times the Grecian colonization after the Persian war and the march of Alexander the Great points to some corresponding event on the Indian soil after Alexander's expedition to India, what that great event can possibly be is scarcely thought of. The golden age of Hellenism, culminating in Rome's ascendancy, corresponds to the empire of the

Mauryas over Gandhara, Ara and so forth. What, however, must be borne in mind is that, while our knowledge of India makes a halt before the Indus, we should not think that India is therefore outside the world. The more we free ourselves from the prepossessed ideas, the greater is the impetus given to the advance of our knowledge of Indian history. First, if we have to get accession to the great stream of time's history, if the Indian problem is to be also the problem of the world's history, if research into Indian history is to be promoted by the knowledge of the world's historical method, in short, if the dam, dexterously set up, is forceably broken asunder, then alone will the flowing stream fertilize the life in that province. To the time in which it is evolved the methods of classical philology on the rising knowledge have to be employed, and all other influences excluded. Only in the intervention of the results of our thousand years' knowledge, our great inheritance of antiquity, can lie the solution of our proposition relating to the Orient."

I have great pleasure in expressing my thankfulness to Mr. Thos. Gould, Manager of the Wesleyan Mission Press, and Mr. F. McD. Tomkinson, the Assistant Manager, for going through the proof and for the neat get-up and quick despatch of the work.

Mysore,
5th August, 1929.

R. SHAMASASTRY.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY NOTE, BY DR. J. F. FLEET, PH.D., C.I.E., I.C.S. (RETD.)	v
TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE	ix
PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION	xxii
PREFACE TO THIRD EDITION	xxv

FIRST BOOK

THE LIFE OF A KING	1
THE END OF SCIENCES	5, 6, 8
ASSOCIATION WITH THE AGED	9
RESTRAINT OF THE ORGANS OF SENSE	10
THE LIFE OF A SAINTLY KING	11
CREATION OF MINISTERS	12
THE CREATION OF COUNCILLORS AND PRIESTS.. .. .	14
ASCERTAINING BY TEMPTATIONS PURITY OR IMPURITY IN THE CHARACTER OF MINISTERS	15
THE INSTITUTION OF SPIES	17
CREATION OF WANDERING SPIES	19
PROTECTION OF PARTIES FOR OR AGAINST ONE'S OWN CAUSE IN ONE'S OWN STATE	22
WINNING OVER FACTIONS FOR OR AGAINST AN ENEMY'S CAUSE IN AN ENEMY'S STATE	24
THE BUSINESS OF COUNCIL MEETING	26
THE MISSION OF ENVOYS.. .. .	29
PROTECTION OF PRINCES	32
THE CONDUCT OF A PRINCE KEPT UNDER RESTRAINT AND THE TREATMENT OF A RESTRAINED PRINCE	35
THE DUTIES OF A KING	36
DUTY TOWARDS THE HAREM	39
PERSONAL SAFETY	41

SECOND BOOK

FORMATION OF VILLAGES.. .. .	45
DIVISION OF LAND	48
CONSTRUCTION OF FORTS	50
BUILDINGS WITHIN THE FORT	53
THE DUTIES OF THE CHAMBERLAIN	55
THE BUSINESS OF THE COLLECTION OF REVENUE BY THE COLLECTOR-GENERAL	57
THE BUSINESS OF KEEPING UP ACCOUNTS IN THE OFFICE OF ACCOUNTANTS	61
DETECTION OF WHAT IS EMBEZZLED BY GOVERNMENT SERVANTS OUT OF STATE REVENUE	65

	PAGE
EXAMINATION OF THE CONDUCT OF GOVERNMENT SERVANTS	68
THE PROCEDURE OF FORMING ROYAL WRITS	71
EXAMINATION OF GEMS THAT ARE TO BE ENTERED INTO THE TREASURY	75
CONDUCTING MINING OPERATIONS AND MANUFACTURE	83
SUPERINTENDENT OF GOLD IN THE GOLDSMITH'S OFFICE	89
THE DUTIES OF THE STATE GOLDSMITH IN THE HIGH ROAD	94
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF STOREHOUSE	99
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF COMMERCE	104
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF FOREST PRODUCE	107
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE ARMOURY	109
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES	113
MEASUREMENT OF SPACE AND TIME	117
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF TOLLS	121
REGULATION OF TOLL-DUES	124
SUPERINTENDENT OF WEAVING	125
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF AGRICULTURE	127
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF LIQUOR	131
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SLAUGHTER-HOUSE	135
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PROSTITUTES	136
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SHIPS	139
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF COWS	142
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF HORSES	146
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF ELEPHANTS	151
TRAINING OF ELEPHANTS	153
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF CHARIOTS
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF INFANTRY
THE DUTY OF THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PASSPORTS	157
THE DUTY OF REVENUE COLLECTORS; SPIES IN THE GUISE OF HOUSEHOLDERS, MERCHANTS AND ASCETICS	158
THE DUTY OF A CITY SUPERINTENDENT	160

THIRD BOOK

DETERMINATION OF FORMS OF AGREEMENT
DETERMINATION OF LEGAL DISPUTES
CONCERNING MARRIAGE; THE DUTY OF MARRIAGE; THE PROPERTY OF A WOMAN AND COMPENSATIONS FOR RE-MARRIAGE	167
THE DUTY OF A WIFE; MAINTENANCE OF A WOMAN; CRUELTY TO WOMEN; ENMITY BETWEEN HUSBAND AND WIFE; A WIFE'S TRANSGRESSIONS; HER KINDNESS TO ANOTHER AND FORBIDDEN TRANSACTIONS	172
VAGRANCY, ELOPEMENT AND SHORT AND LONG SOJOURNMENTS	175
DIVISION OF INHERITANCE	178
SPECIAL SHARES IN INHERITANCE	181
DISTINCTION BETWEEN SONS	184
BUILDINGS	186
	188

	PAGE
SALE OF BUILDINGS; BOUNDARY DISPUTES; DETERMINATION OF BOUNDARIES AND MISCELLANEOUS HINDRANCES	190
DESTRUCTION OF PASTURE LANDS, FIELDS AND ROADS AND NON-PERFORMANCE OF AGREEMENTS	194
RECOVERY OF DEBTS	197
CONCERNING DEPOSITS	201
RULES REGARDING SLAVES AND LABOURERS	205
RULES REGARDING LABOURERS; AND CO-OPERATIVE UNDERTAKING..	209
RESCISSION OF PURCHASE AND SALE	212
RESUMPTION OF GIFTS, SALE WITHOUT OWNERSHIP AND OWNERSHIP	213
ROBBERY	216
DEFAMATION	218
ASSAULT	219
GAMBLING AND BETTING AND MISCELLANEOUS OFFENCES ..	222

FOURTH BOOK

PROTECTION AGAINST ARTISANS	227
PROTECTION AGAINST MERCHANTS	232
REMEDIES AGAINST NATIONAL CALAMITIES	234
SUPPRESSION OF THE WICKED LIVING BY FOUL MEANS ..	237
DETECTION OF YOUTHS OF CRIMINAL TENDENCY BY ASCETIC-SPIES	239
SEIZURE OF CRIMINALS ON SUSPICION OR IN THE VERY ACT ..	241
EXAMINATION OF SUDDEN DEATH	245
TRIAL AND TORTURE TO ELICIT CONFESSION	247
PROTECTION OF ALL KINDS OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS ..	250
FINES IN LIKU OF MUTILATION OF LIMBS	254
DEATH WITH OR WITHOUT TORTURE	256
SEXUAL INTERCOURSE WITH IMMATURE GIRLS.. ..	258
PUNISHMENT FOR VIOLATING JUSTICE	261

FIFTH BOOK

CONCERNING THE AWARDS OF PUNISHMENTS	267
REPLENISHMENT OF THE TREASURY	271
CONCERNING SUBSISTENCE TO GOVERNMENT SERVANTS ..	276
THE CONDUCT OF A COURTIER	279
TIME-SERVING.. ..	281
CONSOLIDATION OF THE KINGDOM AND ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGNTY ..	283

SIXTH BOOK

THE ELEMENTS OF SOVEREIGNTY	287
CONCERNING PEACE AND EXERTION	289

SEVENTH BOOK

THE SIX-FOLD POLICY, AND DETERMINATION OF DETERIORATION, STAGNATION AND PROGRESS	293
--	-----

	PAGE
THE NATURE OF ALLIANCE	296
THE CHARACTER OF EQUAL, INFERIOR AND SUPERIOR KINGS; AND FORMS OF AGREEMENT MADE BY AN INFERIOR KING ..	298
NEUTRALITY AFTER PROCLAIMING WAR OR AFTER CONCLUDING A TREATY OF PEACE, MARCHING AFTER PROCLAIMING WAR OR AFTER MAKING PEACE; AND THE MARCH OF COMBINED POWERS	301
CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT MARCHING AGAINST AN ASSAILABLE ENEMY AND A STRONG ENEMY; CAUSES LEADING TO THE DWINDLING, GREED, AND DISLOYALTY OF THE ARMY; AND CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT THE COMBINATION OF POWERS	303
THE MARCH OF COMBINED POWERS; AGREEMENT OF PEACE WITH OR WITHOUT DEFINITE TERMS; AND PEACE WITH RENEGADES	308
PEACE AND WAR BY ADOPTING THE DOUBLE POLICY	312
THE ATTITUDE OF AN ASSAILABLE ENEMY; AND FRIENDS THAT DESERVE HELP	315
AGREEMENT FOR THE ACQUISITION OF A FRIEND OR GOLD ..	318
AGREEMENT OF PEACE FOR THE ACQUISITION OF LAND	321
INTERMINABLE AGREEMENT	324
AGREEMENT FOR UNDERTAKING A WORK	327
CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT AN ENEMY IN THE REAR	329
RECRUITMENT OF LOST POWER	333
MEASURES CONDUCTIVE TO PEACE WITH A STRONG AND PROVOKED ENEMY; AND THE ATTITUDE OF A CONQUERED ENEMY ..	335
THE ATTITUDE OF A CONQUERED KING	338
MAKING PEACE AND BREAKING IT	341
THE CONDUCT OF A MADHYAMA KING, A NEUTRAL KING, AND OF A CIRCLE OF STATES	344

EIGHTH BOOK

THE AGGREGATE OF THE CALAMITIES OF THE ELEMENTS OF SOV- EREIGNTY	349
CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT THE TROUBLES OF THE KING AND OF HIS KINGDOM	352
THE AGGREGATE OF THE TROUBLES OF MEN	354
THE GROUP OF MOLESTATIONS, THE GROUP OF OBSTRUCTIONS, AND THE GROUP OF FINANCIAL TROUBLES	357
THE GROUP OF TROUBLES OF THE ARMY, AND THE GROUP OF TROUBLES OF A FRIEND	361

NINTH BOOK

THE KNOWLEDGE OF POWER, PLACE, TIME, STRENGTH AND WEAK- NESS; THE TIME OF INVASION	367
THE TIME OF RECRUITING THE ARMY; THE FORM OF EQUIPMENT; AND THE WORK OF ARRAYING A RIVAL FORCE	370
CONSIDERATION OF ANNOYANCE IN THE REAR; AND REMEDIES AGAINST INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL TROUBLES	374

	PAGE
CONSIDERATION ABOUT LOSS OF MEN, WEALTH, AND PROFIT ..	377
EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL DANGERS	379
PERSONS ASSOCIATED WITH TRAITORS AND ENEMIES ..	381
DOUBTS ABOUT WEALTH AND HARM; AND SUCCESS TO BE OBTAINED BY THE EMPLOYMENT OF ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIC MEANS ..	385

TENTH BOOK

ENCAMPMENT	391
MARCH OF THE CAMP; AND PROTECTION OF THE ARMY IN TIME OF DISTRESS AND ATTACK	392
FORMS OF TREACHEROUS FIGHTS; ENCOURAGEMENT TO ONE'S OWN ARMY, AND FIGHT BETWEEN ONE'S OWN AND ENEMY'S ARMIES	394
BATTLEFIELDS; THE WORK OF INFANTRY, CAVALRY, CHARIOTS, AND ELEPHANTS	397
THE DISTINCTIVE ARRAY OF TROOPS IN RESPECT OF WINGS, FLANKS, AND FRONT; DISTINCTION BETWEEN STRONG AND WEAK TROOPS; AND BATTLE WITH INFANTRY, CAVALRY, CHARIOTS, AND ELE- PHANTS	400
THE ARRAY OF THE ARMY LIKE A STAFF, A SNAKE, A CIRCLE, OR IN DETACHED ORDER; THE ARRAY OF THE ARMY AGAINST THAT OF AN ENEMY	403

ELEVENTH BOOK

CAUSES OF DISSENSION, AND SECRET PUNISHMENT	407
---	-----

TWELFTH BOOK

THE DUTIES OF A MESSENGER	411
BATTLE OF INTRIGUE	413
SELECTING THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF AND INCITING A CIRCLE OF FATES	415
SPIES WITH WEAPONS, FIRE, AND POISON; AND DESTRUCTION OF SUPPLY, STORES AND GRANARIES	417
CAPTURE OF THE ENEMY BY MEANS OF SECRET CONTRIVANCES OR BY MEANS OF THE ARMY; AND COMPLETE VICTORY.. .. .	419

THIRTEENTH BOOK

SOWING THE SEEDS OF DISSENSION	423
ENTICEMENT OF KINGS BY SECRET CONTRIVANCES	425
THE WORK OF SPIES IN A SIEGE	429
THE OPERATION OF A SIEGE	433
RESTORATION OF PEACE IN A CONQUERED COUNTRY	437

FOURTEENTH BOOK

MEANS TO INJURE AN ENEMY	441
WONDERFUL AND DELUSIVE CONTRIVANCES	445

	PAGE
THE APPLICATION OF MEDICINES AND MANTRAS 449
REMEDIES AGAINST THE INJURIES OF ONE'S OWN ARMY 455
FIFTEENTH BOOK	
PARAGRAPHICAL DIVISIONS OF THIS TREATISE 459
APPENDIX 465
INDEX 467