

SECTION—HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

(61)

KAUṬILYA AND CĀṆIKYA

J. JOLLY

(Würzburg, Germany).

In discussing the question as to the time of the composition of the Arthaśāstra, a great deal of stress has been laid upon the spelling of the name of its reputed author, whether as Kauṭilya, with an *i* in the middle, or as Kauṭalya, with an *a* in the middle. Kauṭilya means crookedness or falsehood personified or Mr. Crooked (Winternitz) and is on a line with other nicknames quoted as Nīti authorities in the Arthaśāstra, such as Piśuna (Nārada), Viśālākṣa (Śiva), Bāhudantiputra (Indra), Kauṇapadanta (Bhīṣma), Vātavyādhi (Udbhava), Bhāradvāja (Droṇa), Kaṇiṅka Bhāradvāja (Kaṇi-ka), etc. Kauṭalya, on the other hand, is said to be derived from Kuṭala, and Kuṭala in Keśavasvāmin's Nānārthārṇava-saṃkṣepa is declared to be the name of a Gotra, also of an ornament. Its derivation from a Kuṭala Gotra has been adopted by Gaṇapati Śāstrī, who calls Kauṭilya a misnomer, a mistake handed down to us by scribes and readers.

Now manuscript authority is divided between the two readings and this division is reflected in the printed editions, the *ṛ* form appearing in the two Mysore editions of 1909 and 1919 and in the Lahore edition of 1923, whilst Gaṇapati Śāstrī has the same form up to p. 40 of his own edition in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series (1924), and the *ṛ* form in the rest of the work. The same scholar has discussed the relative merits of both readings in the Introduction and Preface to the first and second volumes of this edition, from which discussion it appears that he has found the *ṛ* in all the five Mss. of the text only, and in four Mss. of three different commentaries which have been used for the Trivandrum edition. Against this rather formidable array of Mss. and commentaries, to which the Munich Ms. Nro.

335 (B) should be added, we may quote as representatives of the ॢ form: (1) the Tanjore Ms. used as basis for Shamasastri's *editio princeps*; (2) the Munich Ms. Nro. 334, probably a transcript of Nro. 1, with which it closely agrees; (3) the Commentary of Bhaṭṭasvāmin, called Pratipadapañjikā, which has also been used for the Mysore edition, and is now being edited by K. P. Jayaswal for the Bihar and Orissa Research Society. It has the reading ॢ thrice in one Chapter (II, 10, p. 16 of the printed text); (4) the Commentary of Mādhavayajvan called Nayacandrikā, as printed by Udayavīra Śāstrī in the Lahore edition, has ॢ several times in the text (II, 70, 72, 91), and constantly in the colophons (नयचन्द्रिकायां कौटिलीयटीकायाम्).

Of Commentaries on other works than the Arthaśāstra, the standard Commentary of Śamkarāya on the Nītisāra, as printed by Gaṇapati Śāstrī himself, has कौटिल्य इति, कौटिल्यशास्त्रात् (I, 6,7) and कौटिल्येन (p. 65), कौटिलीये (pp. 157, 207, 236), कौटिल्याय (p. 226) and explains this name as referring to a Gotra (I,6). The Commentary printed in Rajendralal Mitra's edition of the Nītisāra has both Kauṭilya and Kauṭalya, also Kuṭāla (Hillebrandt). Two commentators of Amarasimha's Amarakośa, Kṣīrasvāmin and Sarvānanda, as quoted by Udayavīra Śāstrī in the Lahore edition, Vol. II, have the ॢ form only, which is preferred by Udayavīra himself, though his edition of the Nayacandrikā has the ॢ form, as pointed out before. Hemacandra's attitude is not clear, for though he certainly refers to the Ṛṣi Kuṭāla (Uṇādi-gaṇasūtra, 468, ed. Kirste),¹ his references to Kauṭalya are doubtful, as the recent Bhavnagar edition of his Abhidhānacintāmaṇi-Commentary has ॢ in six places against ॢ in one place only, whereas Abhidhānacintāmaṇi itself has ॢ in Bhavnagar edition (p. 140), but ॢ in Böhtlingk's edition and the Bombay edition of 1896.¹ The ॢ form is also found

¹ Prof. Th. Zachariae.

in Mallinātha's Commentary, in two texts of Yādavaprakāśa and Bhojarāja, as quoted in Shamasastri's Preface of 1919, and in Nilakaṅṭha's Commentary of the Mahābhārata and Cāritravardhana's Commentary of the Raghuvamśa, as quoted in K. Nag's *Théories diplomatiques*, p. 38 (1923). The Gaṇaratnamahodadhi (pp. 292, 293, 298, ed. Eggeling) has both Kuṭala, Kauṭalya and Kuṭila, Kauṭilya¹).

Of hitherto-printed works of fiction, the Purāṇas in their prophecies about the conqueror of the Nandas exhibit the *टि* form, and so does the Kādambarī in the severe criticism it passes on the cruel and wicked Kauṭilyaśāstram. In the field of the drama we find the Prastāvanā to the Mudrārākṣasa referring to Kauṭilya as meaning false-minded by its derivation from Kuṭila (कौटिल्यः कुटिलमतिः). Here the *ट* reading would be impossible. In the Buddhist literature of Ceylon, there are two references to Kocalla which is apparently wrong for Koṭalla and an equivalent for Kauṭalya. This was pointed out to me by Prof. W. Geiger. One of the Jaina canonical books, the Nandī, mentions the Koṭillayam, *i.e.*, Kauṭilīyam as a forbidden book, but another Jaina canonical book, the Anuyogadvārasūtram, quotes the Koḍal-layam, *i.e.*, Kauṭalīyam instead (A. Weber's *Cat.*, II, 677—697).

It will appear from this collection of references, incomplete as it is, that both forms are ancient and well established. As regards their relative value, it cannot be doubted that the contents of the Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra fully bear out its ascription to a minister surnamed Mr. Crooked, if we consider all the duplicity and falsehood enjoined or countenanced in it. The transformation of this ominous name into the innocent name Kauṭalya, and the invention of a Gotra called Kuṭala, may be due to those who wished to do away with the reproach naturally adhering to a work which though

¹ Prof. Th. Zachariae.

² Edited by Nāthurāma Premi, Bombay, 1923.

excellent in its way was fathered on an author of avowedly loose principles. If Kauṭalya was the original name, for which Kauṭilya was substituted by popular etymology, we obtain an indifferent designation of uncertain origin and import for a highly characteristic one, which moreover is quite in keeping with the other characteristic nicknames of writers quoted as authorities on Nīti in the Arthaśāstra.¹

The bearing of these facts on the question of the authenticity of the Arthaśāstra needs no pointing out. Is it likely, says Prof. Winternitz, that Candragupta's minister should have called himself Mr. Crooked or *Crookedness* personified? I doubt it. The name of Kauṭilya, declares Prof. Keith, is suspicious, and it seems a curious name for him to bear in his own work.

The evidence in favour of the *ṛ* form may be strengthened perhaps by considering an analogous interchange between *i* and *a* forms existing in the case of Cāṇakya, Kauṭilya's other name. The *i* form (Cāṇīkya) in this case, it is true, is only found in four passages of the recently published old Commentary of Somadeva's Nītivākyāṃṛatam.² In the first passage Cāṇīkya is identified with Viṣṇugupta of the text (p. 107). In the three other passages Cāṇīkya is quoted as the author of certain Nīti texts hitherto unknown (pp. 131, 149, 286). This Commentary abounds in citations of old and little known Nīti writers, and its antiquity is moreover guaranteed by the existence of a fifteenth century copy. It does not matter that Somadeva himself writes Cāṇakya, with an *a* in the middle (p. 177). It may be that Cāṇīkya *alias* Cāṇakya, is identical with, or rather a patronimic derivation from, the wise minister Kaṇika of the Mahābhārata, which identification has been proposed simultaneously by Professor Winternitz in his History of Indian Literature, III, 135, and by Kalidas Nag in his Théories diplomatiques

¹ See V. Kane, The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, in Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, 1925, p. 9.

² Edited by Nāthurāma Premī, Bombay, 1923.

de l'Inde ancienne, where he has extracted from the Great Epic an entire Kaṇika-Nīti closely resembling the doctrines of the Arthaśāstra, even to the use of the same technical terms, such as the 18 *Tirthas*.

Cāṇikya-Cāṇakya might be a legendary personage altogether, formed upon the model of the astute Kaṇika of the Epic.

In spite of the fabulous character of its author, the Arthaśāstra contains some very ancient elements which are traceable to the Aśoka Inscriptions even. This was pointed out by such scholars as Dr. F. W. Thomas, Professor Hultzsch and others, but it does not seem to have been noticed that the list of specially protected animals in the slaughter-house Chapter of the Arthaśāstra (2, 26) has a counterpart in the inviolable animals (avadhiyāni) mentioned in the fifth pillar edict of King Aśoka, notably the animals called suke, sālikā, cakavāke, haṁse, samḍake.¹

(62)

MAYA ASURA AND AHURA MAZDA

P. K. ĀCHĀRYA, I.E.S., M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt.
(*Professor of Sanskrit, Allahabad*).

Maya has been claimed by at least three nations, namely, the Hindus, the Parsis, and the Americans.

- (i) According to the Hindu traditions he was a Daitya. His genealogy is drawn thus : by Danu, the mother of the Dānavas, the sage Kāśyapa had a son named Viprachitti ; Maya was son of Viprachitti ; he had two daughters, named Vajrakāmā and Mandodarī, the latter of whom was the chief queen of Rāvaṇa and mother of

¹ Hultzsch, Inscriptions of Asoka, p. 126.

de l'Inde ancienne, where he has extracted from the Great Epic an entire Kaṇika-Nīti closely resembling the doctrines of the Arthaśāstra, even to the use of the same technical terms, such as the 18 *Tirthas*.

Cāṇikya-Cāṇakya might be a legendary personage altogether, formed upon the model of the astute Kaṇika of the Epic.

In spite of the fabulous character of its author, the Arthaśāstra contains some very ancient elements which are traceable to the Aśoka Inscriptions even. This was pointed out by such scholars as Dr. F. W. Thomas, Professor Hultzsch and others, but it does not seem to have been noticed that the list of specially protected animals in the slaughter-house Chapter of the Arthaśāstra (2, 26) has a counterpart in the inviolable animals (avadhiyāni) mentioned in the fifth pillar edict of King Aśoka, notably the animals called suke, sālikā, cakavāke, haṁse, samḍake.¹

(62)

MAYA ASURA AND AHURA MAZDA

P. K. ĀCHĀRYA, I.E.S., M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt.
(*Professor of Sanskrit, Allahabad*).

Maya has been claimed by at least three nations, namely, the Hindus, the Parsis, and the Americans.

- (i) According to the Hindu traditions he was a Daitya. His genealogy is drawn thus : by Danu, the mother of the Dānavas, the sage Kāśyapa had a son named Viprachitti ; Maya was son of Viprachitti ; he had two daughters, named Vajrakāmā and Mandodarī, the latter of whom was the chief queen of Rāvaṇa and mother of

¹ Hultzsch, Inscriptions of Asoka, p. 126.