

# ASOKA AND HIS INSCRIPTIONS

Part II

**BENI MADHAB BARUA, M.A., D.Lit. (Lond.)**

Late Professor of Pali and Lecturer in Sanskrit and  
Ancient Indian History and Culture,  
Calcutta University



NEW AGE PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LTD.  
CALCUTTA-12 :: NEW DELHI-1

73

ASOKA AND  
COPYRIGHT DESCRIPTIONS

NEW AGE PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LTD.

Published by :  
J. N. Sinha Roy.  
New Age Publishers Private Ltd.  
12, Bankim Chatterjee Street,  
Calcutta-12

1st Edition—1946  
2nd Edition—1955  
3rd Edition—1969

BEHJI MADHAB BARUA, M.A. (D.Lit. Lond.)  
Late Professor of Sanskrit and Assistant to Professor and  
Head of Sanskrit Department, Calcutta University



4/1/82

934.04  
B288.2 A

PRINTED IN INDIA  
BY K. V. SACHDEVA — SKYLARK PRINTERS, NEW DELHI-55



Library IAS, Shimla



00039827

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTORY

1. Number and Classification of Inscriptions: The number of Aśoka's inscriptions discovered and deciphered so far has increased by seventeen within the last sixteen years. The present total stands at one hundred and fifty-four. These may be conveniently divided, according to the materials whereon and the manner in which they are engraved, under these seven heads: (1) Hill-cave, (2) Rock, (3) Separate Rock, (4) Minor Rock, (5) Stone-block, (6) Pillar, and (7) Minor Pillar. Conformably to this classification, the proposed figure can be worked out as follows:

1. Hill-cave: Barābar Hill-cave Inscriptions, I-III — 3
2. Rock: (a) ten Rock Edicts, I-VII, IX, X and XIV, each in seven recensions: Girnār, Kalsi, Yerraguḍi, Shahbazgarhi, Mansehra, Dhauli and Jaugada  $10 \times 7 = 70$   
(b) one Rock Edict, VIII, in eight recensions: Girnār, Sopārā, Kalsi, Yerraguḍi, Shahbazgarhi, Mansehra, Dhauli and Jaugada  $1 \times 8 = 8$   
(c) three Rock Edicts, XI-XIII, each in five recensions: Girnār, Kalsi, Yerraguḍi, Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra  $3 \times 5 = 15$
3. Separate Rock: two Edicts, separately incised on the Dhauli and Jaugada rocks, each in two recensions  $2 \times 2 = 4$
4. Minor Rock: one Edict in ten recensions: Brahmagiri, Siddāpura, Jaṭiṅga-Rāmesvara, Maski, Gavimath, Pālkiguṇḍu, Yerraguḍi, Rūpnāth, Bairāt and Sahasrām  $1 \times 10 = 10$

- |   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| 5. Stone-block : one Edict, the Bhābru or Calcutta-Bairāt, in one recension   | 1                 |
| 6. Pillar : (a) six Edicts, I-VI, each in six recensions : Delhi-Topra, Delhi-Mīrāth, Lauriya-Ararāj (Radhiāh), Lauriya-Nandangarh (Mathiāh), Rāmpūrva and Kauśāmbī (Allahabad-Kosām) | $6 \times 6 = 36$ |
| (b) one Edict, VII, in one recension  | 1                 |
| 7. Minor Pillar : (a) one Schism Pillar Edict in three recensions : Sārnāth, Kauśāmbī (Allahabad-Kosām), and Sāñchi   | $1 \times 3 = 3$  |
| (b) Queen's Edict in one recension  | 1                 |
| (c) Two Votive or Commemorative Inscriptions, one incised on a pillar at Lumbini (Rummindei) and the other on a pillar found near Nigāli Sāgar in the village of Niglīva              | 2                 |
| Total—  | 154               |

Presumably there was a complete set of Fourteen Rock Edicts at Sopārā, of which only one, namely, VIII, is taken here into consideration. The additional matters of the Brahmagiri, Siddāpura and Jaṭiṅga-Rāmesvara versions of M.R.E. are generally treated as those belonging to M.R.E. II. The additional matters of the Yerraguḍi copy, too, might be treated so. But here these are treated as contents of one and the same edict. The above figure excludes two missing inscriptions, one incised on the so-called Lāt Bhairo of Benares, smashed to pieces during a riot in 1809, and another on a pillar at Pāṭaliputra, numerous fragments of which were found by Purnachandra Mukherji (V. A. Smith's *Asoka*, 3rd Ed., p. 28, f.n. 1).

2. Discovery of other inscriptions anticipated : If the Yerraguḍi rock had not represented the Suvarṇagiri of the Northern Mysore (Isila) copies of M.R.E., and if the city of Suvarṇagiri which was the seat of the Southern Viceroyalty were situated somewhere in Southern Mysore, one can anticipate the discovery of a far southern set of Rock Edicts together with one or more copies of M.R.E. Similarly the discovery of an Isila set of Rock Edicts is not as yet beyond expectation. A few copies of M.R.E., engraved on pillars, instead of on rocks, ought to have been found out in Northern India. One copy of Rock Edicts, one copy of M.R.E., and one copy of the Schism Pillar Edict may

have vanished with the inscribed Pāṭaliputra pillar which is reported to have been destroyed in our days. The same catastrophe may have befallen a copy of Rock Edicts and a copy of M.R.E., that were, perhaps, engraved on the inscribed Benares pillar, smashed to pieces not long ago. The ancient site of Pāṭaliputra may yet keep concealed original drafts and inscribed copies of Aśoka's edicts. Some copies of P.E. VII, engraved on pillars as well as stone-slabs count still among new discoveries to be made. The stump of Aśoka's monolith which is being worshipped as a phallic emblem in the Bhāskareswar temple of Bhuvaneswar may still bear a copy of M.R.E., and Schism Pillar Edict together with a set of Pillar Edicts. A few copies of the Queen's Edict and some inscriptions recording the donations of the second queen Kāluvāki are still to be included in the list of future archaeological finds.

3. Location : The rocks bearing the eight sets of Rock Edicts are so situated as to make the general outline of Aśoka's domain proper. A full set, first noticed by Mr. Forrest in 1860, remains engraved "on a huge boulder of quartz on the northern bank of the Jumna just above her junction with the Tons river and about 15 miles to the west of Mussorie (Mausurī). The rock is situated about a mile and a half of Kalsi in the Dehra Dun District, U. P." The place itself, as Professor Bhandarkar thinks, lay close to the ancient and most prosperous city of Śrughna. Presumably the rock stood on the northern boundary of the northern portion of the empire under Aśoka's direct rule and the southern boundary of the semi-independent territory of the Nābhakas and Nābha-lines who were counted among the *aparāntas* or peoples who lived near about the terminus of the trade-route leading to Śrughna.

Two incomplete sets, each of eleven edicts, are to be seen engraved in the newly conquered country and newly created province of Kalinga. The northern set, discovered by Mr. Kittoe in 1837, is engraved "on a rock called Aswastama, situated close to village of Dhauli,....., about seven miles to the south of Bhuvaneswara, in the Puri District, Orissa." Though it is much easier to derive the name of Dhauli from Dhavali (a cow of the Vaishṇava fame), the phonetic change of Tosali into Dhauli through the intermediate *Tohali*, *Dohali* is not an impossibility. The southern set "(first copied by Sir Walter Elliot in 1850) is engraved on the

face of a picturesque rock in a large old fort called Jaugadā (Lack Fort), near the bank of Rishikulya river, about 18 miles to the west-north-west of the town of Ganjam." The rock was evidently situated close to the town of Samāpā, the official headquarters of the southern division of the Province of Kaliṅga. The Dhauli and Jaugadā rocks bear each a copy of two Separate Rock Edicts.

A full set, found out by Mr. A. Ghose in 1929, is engraved on a few boulders of a rock near the village of Yerraguḍi just below the Tuṅgabhadrā, "about 8 miles north by west from Gooty in the Karnul District, Madras Presidency." Obviously the rock formed the natural boundary of Aśoka's empire at a point where it adjoined on the independent territory of the Cholas, and was situated in the vicinity of the official headquarters of the Rajjuka mentioned in the Yerraguḍi version of M.R.E.

As the fragment of R.E. VIII, discovered by Pandit Bhagvanlal Indraji in 1882, goes to prove, one (presumably complete) set was engraved at Sopārā, which preserves the modern identity of Sūrpāraka (Pali Suppāraka, Periplus Suppara, Ptolemy Soupara), the capital and highly important port of the ancient country called Aparānta or Sūnāparānta. Modern Sopārā is situated in the Thāna District to the north of Bombay.

One full set, first noticed by Colonel Tod in 1822, is to be seen "on the north-eastern face of the large rock on the road to the Girnār hill, half a mile to the east of the city of Junāgaḍ in Kathiawar." Girnār is undoubtedly the modern name of Girinagara, which was once the capital of Surāshṭra. The same rock bears also the inscription of Rudradāman I and that of Skandagupta, both of which locate near it the Sudarśana Lake caused to be excavated by Chandragupta Maurya, grand-father of Aśoka.

Two other full sets are to be seen on two sides of the Indus. That on the eastern side is engraved on three boulders, the first two of which were discovered by Cunningham and the third was first noticed in 1889 by an Indian subordinate of the Punjab Archæological Survey. The rock itself is situated "at Mansehra in the Hazara District of the North-West Frontier Province, about 15 miles north of Abbotabad." Apparently it marked the boundary between the Province of Gandhāra under the direct rule of Aśoka's Viceroy and the semi-independent territory of the Kāmbo-

jas. The set on the western side of the Indus, first drawn attention to by General Court of Raja Ranjit Singh's service in 1836, is engraved on two separate boulders of a hill "with its western face looking down towards the village of Shahbazgarhi." This place is situated on the Makam river, "9 miles from Mardan in the Yusufzai subdivision of the Peshawar District of N. W. F. P., and about 40 miles from north-east of the town of Peshawar." It is just two miles distant from Kapurdagarhi. Evidently it marked the natural boundary between the Province of Gāndhāra under the direct rule of Aśoka's Viceroy and the semi-independent territory of the Gāndhāras.

The Separate Rock Edicts stand together with the Dhauli and Jaugaḍa sets of Rock Edicts on the same two rocks. Among the ten copies of the Minor Rock Edict, the one at Yerragudi goes together with a full set of Rock Edicts. Of the remaining nine copies that stand independently of Rock Edicts, three lie to the north of the Narmadā and the Godāvāri, three between the Kṛiṣṇā and the Tuṅgabhadrā, and four to the south of the latter. The three copies that lie to the north of the Narmadā and the Godāvāri, are engraved, one "on a rock in an artificial cave near the summit of the Chandanpir hill to the east of Sahasrām (Shahbad district, Bihār)", one "on the Rūpnāth rock (Jabalpur District, Central Provinces), lying at the foot of the Kaimur range of hills", and one, discovered by Carlleyle in 1872-73, "on a huge isolated block standing at the foot of a hill called Hinsagir hill near the ancient city of Bairāt (Jaipur State, Rajputānā)." The Bhābru Edict remained, before its removal to the Indian Museum, Calcutta, engraved on a small block of stone, which stood near the block bearing the Minor Rock Edict of Bairāt.

The three copies between the Kṛiṣṇā and the Tuṅgabhadrā are all to be found within the State of Hyderabad, which is to say, within the southern part of the old Mahārāshṭra area. The two northern versions belong to the town of Kopbal "situated on the left bank of the stream Hire Halla, an important tributary to the river Tuṅgabhadrā", its distance from Maski being 54 miles (as the crow flies) and from Hamphi 21 miles (Yazdani, Hyderabad Arch, Series, No : 10. p. 18). One of them, is engraved on the highest spur of a range of hills to the west of the town, called Palki-guṇḍu (Palanquin or Canopy Boulder, 76° 10 E), and the

other on a spur to the east of the town, called Gavimaṭh (15°21 N), attention to both being drawn by Mr. Narayan Rao Sastri in 1931. The third copy, discovered by Mr. C. Beadon in January, 1915, lies engraved on a rock "in the neighbourhood of Maski (*masgi*, *Masigi*, *Mosangi* of the Chalukya inscr. of Jayadevamalla), a village in the Lingsugur Taluk of the Raichur District of the Nizam's dominions."

The three copies, discovered by Mr. B. Lewis Rice in 1892, lie below the Tuṅgabhadra and are all to be found within the State of Mysore, probably within the ancient country of Vanavāsi (now identified with North Canara). They remain "incised in three localities, all close to one another, in the Chitaldrug District of Mysore, namely, Siddāpura, Jaṭiṅga-Rāmeswara and Brahmagiri, not far from the site of an ancient locality (probably Isila of the Edict)."

The range of Aśoka's Pillar Edicts and Inscriptions is confined to Northern India. Of the six monoliths bearing each a copy of the Pillar Edicts, three are to be seen *in situ* in the Champāran District of North Behār. The nearest of them from Aśoka's capital, Pātaliputra, is the pillar which is "situated close to the small hamlet of Lauriyā, at a distance of one mile to the south-west of the much frequented Hindu temple of Ararāj-Mahādev, two miles and a half to the east-south-east of the village of Rādhia and twenty miles to the north-west of the Kesaria Stūpa, on the way to Bettia."

The Lauriyā Nandangarh or Māthiah pillar stands next to the Lauriyā-Ararāj or Rādhiah on the road towards Nepāl. "It stands near the large village of Lauriyā, 3 miles north of Māthiah and very close to the ancient site of Nandangarh." Bloch (A.S.I., Annual Report, 1906-7, p. 119f.) has taken this pillar to mark the sacred site of the 'Charcoal Stūpa' (Aṅgāra-thūpa) of Pippalivana.

The third Champāran pillar is situated in the hamlet of Rāmpurva, about 20 miles north-east of the large village of Lauriyā and more than a mile north-east of the village of Piparia.

Of the remaining three monoliths, the so-called Allahabad Pillar which "stands near Ellenborough Barrack in the Fort" and bears a copy of the first six Pillar Edicts besides the Queen's Edict and one copy of the Schism Pillar Edict, must have been set up originally in the ancient city of Kauśāmbi



(modern Kosām) on the right bank of the Yamunā, "about 30 miles south of west of Allahabad." The so-called Delhi-Toprā or Delhi-Sivālik, popularly known as Firoz Shah's Lāt, was brought to Delhi in 1356 by Sultan Firoz Tughlak "from a place called Toprā, on the bank of the Jumna, which was at the foot of the mountains, ninety *kos* from Delhi, and was erected on the summit of Kothila on Firozabad."

The second of the Delhi pillars, called Delhi-Mirāth was also brought, according to Shams-i-Sirāj by the same Sultan from Mirāth and set up near his "Hunting Palace."

Of the three copies of the Schism Pillar Edict, one is inscribed on the Kauśāmbi (Allahabad-Kosām) pillar. The fuller version, discovered by Mr. Oertel in 1905, is engraved on a pillar at Sārnāth, about three miles and a half north of Benares. The stump of this pillar still stands immediately to the north of the Dharmarājikā built by Aśoka. The third copy remains engraved "on a fallen and broken pillar at the southern entrance to the Great Stūpa of Sāñchi in Bhopal State, Central India."

The Lumbini Pilgrimage inscription, commonly known as the Rummindei Pillar Inscription, is engraved on a pillar, which stands to this day "at the shrine of Rummindei, about one mile north of Paḍeria and 2 miles north of Bhagawanpur in the Nepalese Tahsil of that name situated to the north of the British District of Basti."

The second commemorative Pillar Inscription is one discovered on the western bank of a large tank called Nigāli Sāgar, "near the village of Nigliva in the Nepalese Tarai to the north of the Basti District." This pillar lies 'at a distance of about 13 miles to the north-west of' Lumbini.

The three Hill-cave Inscriptions are engraved each on the wall of the cave-dwelling dedicated by Aśoka to the Ājivikas in the Khalatika group of hills, now identified with the Barābar group, "situated sixteen miles due north of Gayā, or nineteen miles by the road." Close by is the Nāgārjunī group containing three caves excavated by king Daśaratha for the same sect of ascetics. The modern name Barābar is derived from Pravaraḡiri, a name by which the group of hills concerned was denoted in a mediæval Sanskrit inscription, while its earlier name, met with in the Mahābhārata, the Hāthigumphā Inscription of Khāravela and two

short inscribed labels, was Gorathagiri, Goradhagiri, its earliest name being, of course, Khalatika, meaning 'bald-headed'. The three caves inscribed with the first, the second and the third inscriptions are known now-a-days by the name of Karṇa Chaupar, Sudāmā, and Viśvājhopri (Viśvāmitra) respectively, while the fourth bearing no inscription of Aśoka is named after Lomaśa Rishi. The last-mentioned cave is really the third in order. Aśoka designates the first cave as *Nigoha-Kubhā* (Banyan Cave).

(b) Clue to the placing of Aśoka's Rock inscriptions from the tradition of Buddhist missions: According to the Pali *Chronicles* and *Samanta-pāsādikā*, Thera Majjhantika was sent to Kasmira-Gandhāra. In this region we have the Mansehra version of Aśoka's Rock Edicts. Thera Mahārakkhita was sent to the Yonaraṭṭha or Yonaloka. In this region we have the Shahbazgarhi version. Thera Majjhima was deputed to Himavanta or Himavantappadesa. Here we have the Kalsi version. Thera Mahādhammarakkhita was deputed to Mahāraṭṭha where we have the Kopbal copy of Aśoka's M. R. E. Thera Yonaka Dhāmmarakkhita went to Aparantaka where we have the Sopārā set of Aśoka's Rock Edicts. Thera Rakkhita was sent to Vanavāsa or Vanavāsī where we have the Isila copies of Aśoka's Minor Rock Edicts. Thera Mahādeva was sent to Mahisamaṇḍala or Mahisaraṭṭha where probably lies the Suvāṇḍagiri copy of M. R. E. The tradition of the Buddhist mission under the leadership of Soṇa and Uttara despatched to Suvannabhūmi, identified generally with Burma, is still open to dispute. According to the *Samanta-pāsādikā* and *Mahāvamsa*, Suvāṇḍabhūmi was a country which bordered on a sea and which was under the sway of a ferocious *rakkhasī*, who was evidently its presiding female deity. The text of the *Dipāvamsa*, as appears in Oldenberg's edition or in the *Samanta-pāsādikā*, preserves the earlier tradition which does not connect Suvāṇḍabhūmi with any sea or ocean and represents it as a place inhabited by the Piśāchas<sup>1</sup>. None need be surprised, therefore, if Suvāṇḍagiri were the intended name instead of Suvāṇḍabhūmi.

---

1. As quoted in the *Samanta-pāsādikā*, the verse reads :  
*Suvāṇḍabhūmiṃ gantvōna Soṇuttarā mahiddhikā |*  
*Pisāche maddayitvāna Brahma-jālam adesisuṃ ||*

4. Alphabets and orthography: Aśoka's inscriptions are found engraved in two different scripts or alphabets, viz., Brāhmī and Kharoshthī. All but the two sets of his Rock Edicts at Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra are written in Brāhmī, which is written from left to right and rightly regarded as the Parent Script of which the various local scripts of India as well as the Sinhalese, Siamese, Burmese and Tibetan alphabets are later offshoots or variations. The Kharoshthī script, written from right to left like the cuneiform or wedge-shaped script of the Achæmenian inscriptions of Ancient Iran, was confined to the Gandhāra region in the extreme north-western part of Northern India and to that part of Khotān which lay contiguous to Aśoka's province of Gandhāra. The right half of an Aramaic inscription, discovered at Taxila, is assigned by Dr. Herzfeld to the reign of Aśoka. Evidently many of the scribes (*lipikaras*), employed by Aśoka to engrave his records, were persons who hailed from Uttarāpatha and with whom the habitual form of writing was Kharoshthī. The Mysore scribe at least, who has signed his name in Kharoshthī as *Chapaḍa*, was such a person. The scribe engaged for 'Yerraguḍi must have been another such person to whose Kharoshthī proclivity we owe the abra cadabra of a piece of record with one line written left to right and another from right to left, I mean, written boustrophedon. The Girnār scribe, too, appears to have endorsed his signature, but unfortunately the portion of the rock containing his name is peeled off irrevocably. The scribe of Sahasrām, the initial of whose name is *Hi*, must also have been a habitual Kharoshthī writer, otherwise we would not have three letters, *ti le ke*, written from right to left.

I cannot agree with Bühler and Professor Bhandarkar in thinking that the inversion of certain letters, noticed here and there in some of Aśoka's inscriptions, lends weight to the theory of development of the Brāhmī characters from the Aramaic or some such Semitic script, written from right to left. The inverted letters in Aśokan records seem due to the old habit of the Kharoshthī scribes to write from right to left. The letters resembling some in Brāhmī are traceable in the numerous inscribed seals of the Indus Valley. We are not as yet aware of their orthographic values. The Lalita-vistara list of 64 scripts mentions Brāhmī, Kharoshthī

and Pushkarasāri as three parent scripts of India. None need wonder if by the third name was meant the script of Mohenjo-daro and Harappa.

As to orthography : All long vowels, including the two diphthongs, are of no use to the dialects of Sh and M. For the orthography of Dh, J, Barābar, Lumbini, Nigāli Sāgar and Pillar Edicts, *ri*, *li*, two diphthongs and *h* (*visarga*) among the vowels, and *ñ*, *ś*, *sh* and *ksh* among the Sanskrit consonants are unnecessary. The orthography of P.E. V. shows the use of both *d* and *l* in *dudi*, (A) *dulī*, while the orthography of all the copies of Rock Edicts makes use of *dh* in *vādham* (R.E. VII). The Ardhamāgadhī orthography is lacking in the use of *l*, which is a Vedic and Dravidian consonant, and the Pali orthography employs *d* and *dh* only in combinations, e.g., *niḍḍam* (*nīdam*) and *vuddhi* (*vriiddhi*), but nowhere alone. The orthography of G employs *ri* and *ai* as vowel adjuncts, e.g., *ristika* (R.E. V), *nisrito* (R.E. V), *thaira* (R.E. IV) and *traidasa* (R.E. V). Sh and M, too, make use of *ri* as a vowel adjunct in *driḍhabhatitā* (R.E. VII). The use of the diphthong *ai* as a vowel adjunct is met with in (M.R.E. (Bra)—*mai* (*me*), and also that of *ra* as a stop in *drahyitavyam*. All the three sibilants have their place in the orthography of K, Sh and M. The orthography of G provides for the use of *r* as a flag and of *ra* as a stop. The orthography of Sh and M has no need for *r* as a flag. Both *r* as a flag and *ra* as a stop are not found in the orthography of Ardhamāgadhī, but the Pāli orthography needs *ra* as a stop, e.g., for such words as *yatra*, *tatra*, *brahmā*, *brāhmaṇa*, *gadrabha*, *udriyati*. The orthography of G provides for such conjoint consonants as *mh*, *st*, *by*, *tp*, *db*, *st*, *st* and *sv*. Pali orthography, too, makes provisions for *mh*, *ky*, *vy*, *by*, *vh*, *st*, and *sm*. The Sh and M orthography makes room for a few more Sanskritic conjoint consonants.

5. Chronology : There still exists a sharp passage of arms over the vexed question of chronology of Aśoka's records. As regards the dated records, the pivot on which the dispute hinges is the question whether the recorded date is the date of engraving or it is the date of its codification or drafting. And as regards the undated records, the question of chronology rests entirely on the internal

evidence of a record or a set of records, correctly ascertained and carefully weighed. An interval of time, however short, must be allowed between the date of codification of a record and that of its engraving on a rock, or a slab, or a pillar. But the question still is—what should be our actual concern, the date of codification or that of engraving? The conventional phraseology of Aśoka is that something is ‘caused to be written’ (*likhāpitā, lekhāpitā*) in a particular year of *abhisheka*, something is caused to be erected (*usapāpīte*), or something is ‘dedicated’ (*dinā*). Did Aśoka mean by ‘written’ engraved or merely codified? Professor Bhandarkar opines that wherever a record is said to have been written with a view to its permanency, there the expression ‘caused to be written’ must be taken to mean ‘caused to be engraved.’ I have sought to show that wherever a *Dhammalipi* is said to have been written there are phrases to indicate Aśoka’s motive to see it long endure (*Inscr.*, ii, p. 223). Behind the very idea of causing something to be engraved in stone was the certainty of its durability (cf. Aṅguttara I., p. 283: *pāsāṇe lekhā chiratṭhitikā*). When Aśoka by way of an apology said (R.E. XIV) that it was not possible to cause *Dhammalipis* to be ‘written’ all over his empire owing to its vastness, he must have meant by ‘written’ engraved, promulgated.

This settled, we may easily proceed to put the dated records in their following chronological order :

- |    |  |                  |
|----|--|------------------|
| 1. | (a) Barābar Hill-cave Inscriptions, I-II | 12th year.       |
|    | (b) Rock Edicts, I-IV                    | .. .. "          |
| 2. | Barābar Hill-cave Inscription, III       | .. 19th year.    |
| 3. | (a) Lumbinī Pillar Inscription           | .. 20th year.    |
|    | (b) Nigāli Sāgar Pillar Inscription      | .. .. "          |
| 4. | Pillar Edicts, I-VI                      | .. .. 26th year. |
| 5. | Pillar Edict VII                         | .. .. 27th year. |

Here we have a clear-cut chronological scheme, workable in three stages of progress. In the first stage Aśoka started engraving his records in the 12th year of his *abhisheka*, in the second, in the 19th year, and in the third, in the 26th.

In his P.E. VI, Aśoka tells us that he caused the *Dhammalipi* to be engraved for the first time in the 12th year of his *abhisheka*. The data of chronology pertaining to the second and third stages go to show that the work of engraving was continued through a period of two years at least. The internal evidence of R. E. V, namely, the mention of the fact of the first appointment of the *Dharmamahāmātras* in the 13th year, is sufficient to prove that this and remaining records of the Rock series were not engraved in the 12th year, and that they must have been promulgated sometime after that, either in course of the 13th year, or later still. Thus we definitely know the *terminus ad quo* of each period of activity but not its *terminus ad quem*. As for the *terminus ad quem* or lower limit, we may take guidance from Aśoka's quinquennial system (R.E. III., S.R.E. I), which is borne out also by the Sarvāstivāda tradition in the Divyāvadāna (p. 45). Allowing an interval of 5 years between two successive stages or periods, the 14th year is found to be the *terminus ad quem* of the first period and the 21st year that of the second, while, in default of a dated record, referable to the fourth stage, the *terminus ad quem* of the third period must be left open. The presumed *terminus ad quem* of the first period is confirmed by the recorded date (14th year) of enlargement of the Stūpa of Buddha Koṇāgama (Nigāli Sāgar).

The first four Rock Edicts appear to have been despatched in two batches for engraving successively in the 12th year, the remaining edicts of this series were sent out in as many as five despatches from the capital, R.E. V alone in one despatch, R.E. VI, VII and VIII in another, R.E. IX and X in a third, R.E. XI, XII and XIII in a fourth, and R.E. XIV alone, last of all. R.E. V may be definitely referred to the 13th year and R.E. XIV to the 14th (*Inscr.* ii, p. 47). Over and above the introductory clause: *Devānampiye Piyadasi lājā hevaṃ āha* in R.E. XI, the reason for putting R.E. XI, XII and XIII in one despatch is clear from the fact of exclusion of them all at Dhauli and Jaugaḍa. R.E. XIII alone deserved on account of its allusion to the conquest of Kaliṅga to be withheld from promulgation in all parts of Kaliṅga, but neither R.E. XI nor R.E. XII. Their omission was undoubtedly due to their being in a bad

company. Obviously R.E. XII merited wide publication everywhere.

The Rock Edicts speak nowhere of the stone-pillars (*silā-thambhā*). The fact of their erection is recorded in the two commemorative inscriptions, one engraved on the Lumbinī pillar and the other on the Nigāli Sāgar, while their existence is presupposed by P.E. VII and M.R.E. (Ru, Sa). Both the commemorative Pillar inscriptions, dated in the 20th year of *abhisheka*, record the fact of Aśoka's pilgrimage, while of the two pillars, one was erected on the site of the village of Lumbinī because it was known as the sacred place of nativity of Buddha Sākyamuni, and the other on the site of the enlarged Stūpa of Buddha Koṇāgamana. The three Champāran pillars, inscribed each with a set of the first six Pillar Edicts dated in the 26th year of *abhisheka*, stand, as pointed out by Vincent Smith, on the road towards Nepāl, which is to say, towards Lumbinī and Niglīva, in short, towards Kapilavastu. In Bloch's opinion, one of them, namely, the Lauriya-Nandangarh pillar, stands on the ancient site of the 'Charcoal Stūpa' of Pippalivana. Thus the erection of these pillars may be associated with the course of Aśoka's pilgrimage to the Buddhist sacred places undertaken, according to the Divyāvādāna legend, under the guidance of his religious preceptor Upagupta. The king said to Upagupta: *Ayaṃ me manoratho ye Bhagabatā Buddhena pradeśā adhyushitās tān archeyaṃ, chihṇāni cha kuryaṃ paśchimasyāṃ janatāyāṃ anugrahārtham.* "This is my mental resolve that the places hallowed by the presence of Buddha, the Blessed One, I should worship and mark them out with tangible signs for the benefit of (lit., as a matter of favour to) posterity."

One may take it that the tangible signs put up to mark the sacred sites were the monolithic pillars erected by Aśoka on the various sacred sites of the Buddhists at the second stage of his vigorous action which commenced in the 19th year of *abhisheka*. It is to this period of Aśoka's reign that the Pali tradition refers the episode of fresh troubles in the Buddhist Saṅgha threatening it with schism and heresy and necessitating the adoption of a drastic measure by the king. The erection of commemorative pillars at Sārṇāth, Kauśāmbī

and Sāñchi (and, maybe, also at Pāṭaliputra) must have preceded the engraving thereon of the Schism Pillar Edict, a copy on each pillar. In other words, the engraving or promulgation of Aśoka's special ordinance in the Schism Pillar Edict is to be dated shortly after Aśoka's piety-tour, probably undertaken in the 19th and completed in the 20th year of *abhisheka*, despite the fact that it is referable to the same period of activity. The edict in question was promulgated either towards the close of the 20th or in the 21st year. The relative position of the so-called Queen's Edict, engraved on the very same Kauśāmbī pillar, which is inscribed with a copy of the Schism Pillar Edict, seems to suggest that its engraving took place either at the time of Aśoka's visit to Kauśāmbī, anyhow earlier than the promulgation of the schism ordinance. The placing of the date of the Queen's Edict in between that of the Rock and that of the Pillar Edicts is justifiable also on the following three grounds :

(1) That the erection of Aśoka's monoliths is unthinkable previous to the second stage of activity, particularly Aśoka's systematic pilgrimage ;

(2) That for the first time the Queen's Edict introduces us to the young prince Tivala (apparently, a pet name), son of Aśoka by the second queen Kāluvāki, while the whole set of Rock Edicts is reticent on Aśoka's sons ; and

(3) That the existence of Aśoka's pillars, the donations made by his queens, and the charities on the part of his sons are all presupposed by P.E. VII, engraved in the 27th year.

All that now remains for me to do is to settle the date of engraving of the Minor Rock and two Separate Rock Edicts.

As regards the Minor Rock Edict, the opinion of scholars has swayed so far to two extremes, either that it is the earliest, or that it is the latest record of Aśoka. Hultsch inclines even to connect it with a stage, which commenced with Aśoka's pilgrimage to Sāmbodhi, undertaken in the 10th year of *abhisheka* and preceded the engraving of the *Dhammalipis* in the 12th year. He suggests further that by the clause, *athi saṃkhitena* in R.E. XIV Aśoka must have



meant the text of M.R.E. But as shown (*Inscr.* ii, p. 329), all the distinguishing clauses in R.E. XIV are applicable only to the set of Rock Edicts, previously published. There are, moreover, texts in the Rock series that are even smaller than M.R.E.

Professor Mookerji employs a much subtler argument to prove an early date of M.R.E., namely, that when it was promulgated, the engraving of a record on a rock or a stone-pillar was just an idea, and not a *fait accompli*. But this is falsified by the fact that the direction as to engraving on rock or pillar, occurring at the end of M.R.E. (Ru, Sa) is in language and effect the same as that at the end of P.E. VII, as will appear from the following citations :

1. M.R.E., Rūpnāth : *Iya cha aṭhe pavatisu lekhāpetavāyata, hadha cha athi sitāthabhe silāthambhasi lākhāpetavāyata.*
2. M.R.E., Sahasrām : *Ima cha aṭham pavatesu likhāpayātha, ya (ta) vā athi silāthambhā tata pi likhāpayātha.*
3. P.E. VII : *Iyam dhammalibi ata athi silāthambhāni vā silāphalakāni vā tata kaṭaviyā yena chilāhitike siyā.*

Comparing them, none can fail to notice that the direction appended to M.R.E. presupposes the existence of rocks and stone-pillars, while that appended to P.E. VII presupposes the existence of stone-pillars and stone-slabs as engraving materials. The direction in M.R.E. does not suggest the use of stone-slabs as engraving material, but that in P.E. VII does, and the reason undoubtedly is that already prior to the engraving of P.E. VII these were used as material for the engraving of the Bhābru Edict. Thus whatever the actual date of the *dhāmma-sāvana*, the date of its engraving is posterior to the erection of pillars by Aśoka, which, as I tried to show, is unthinkable before the second stage of activity. R.E. VI speaks indeed of giving verbal orders for announcement or proclamation (*srāvāpakam*), but not necessarily of the particular proclamation contained in M.R.E. The preamble of P.E. VII, on the other hand, reveals the process of thinking which led Aśoka to inculcate the principles

of piety and to proclaim the messages of piety. The proclamations of piety were, however, many, precisely like the formulations of the doctrine of piety—*dhamma-sāvanāni sāvāpitāni*, in which case the extant Minor Rock Edict records just one of the many. Fortunately, apart from a general statement concerning the proclamations, P.E. VII contains a specific statement regarding a particular proclamation made (*dhamma-sāvane kaṭe*), and the principles of piety emphasized in M.R.E. are obviously repeated in P.E. VII.

R.E. IV, promulgated in the 12th year, speaks of the wonderful result in the matter of promotion of the cause of piety by means of *dhammānusāthi*, and it was left to M.R.E. to proclaim the wonderful result in the same matter achieved by means of *parākrama*. R.E. VI and R.E. X tell us how and why Aśoka was exerting himself vigorously and with what ends in view his officer should be energetic, while the achievement of the desired result left to be boldly proclaimed in M.R.E.

In Professor Bhandarkar's opinion, the statements in M.R.E. conclusively prove that the proclamation is concerned just with the short period of one year or more when Aśoka stayed with the Saṅgha. The use of the present tense in the statement, *sumi ubāsake*, "when I am a lay worshipper", unmistakably suggests the fact of the case.

I am unable to accept this finding for this reason at least that in the Chariyā Piṭaka there are narrations, where *homi*, a Pali equivalent of *sumi* of the edict, is used as historical present, cp. Sachchatāpasa-chariyā (Chariyā Piṭaka, III. 8) :

*Punāparam yadā homi tāpaso sachchasavhayo|  
sachchena lokam pālesim, samaggam janam akās aham||*

Note that in the above stanza, *homi* (present tense) occurs in the first line, and *pālesim* (aorist past) in the second.

Without wrangling about the force of the expression, *iminā kālena* (by this time), or of its variants, *imāyam velāyam* (at this hour) and *etena āntalena* (at this interval of time) which may refer as well to the short period of one year or more when Aśoka was exerting himself strenuously, as to the *interim* period

between the commencement of strenuous effort and the formal promulgation of the edict, I may point out that the relative positions of R. E. and M. R. E. on the face of the same rock suggests at once a later date of engraving of the latter. It is quite possible that although the proclamation was made earlier, it was caused to be engraved later,—later even than the engraving of the Minor Pillar Edicts and Inscriptions and the first six Pillar Edicts, which is to say, in course of the 26th or 27th year.

The attention of all is focussed on the enigmatic phrase, *vyuthena, vivuthena*, 256. Happily with the elimination of the word *lati* from the Sahasrām text (*Inscr.*, ii, p. 107) the nightmare of night theory is gone off for ever. The contest at last remains between the correctness of equating Aśoka's *vyutha, vyūṭha, vivutha* with Kauṭilya's *vyuṣṭa*, a technical term meaning dating in terms of the regnal year, month, fortnight and day, and that of equating it with *vyavasita, vyuṣhita, vyuṣṭa* meaning 'something issued, sent out, despatched' or simply 'despatch', and having connection with Kauṭilya's *vyavasyanti* (*Arthaśāstra*, II. 10) : *vividham tam vyavasyanty*. To accept the first equation is to interpret *vyuthena* 256 as 'by date 256', 256 B. E., 256 years from the Buddha's demise. And to accept the second equation is to interpret the same as 'by despatch of 256 (missioners or copies)'. The date interpretation does not stand in the face of the explanatory clause—*256 sata vivāsata* (Ru), *duvesapaṁnā sata vivuthā ti*, "two hundred and fifty six (missioners or copies of the message, preferably the latter) were dispatched."

The two Separate Rock Edicts are undated like the Minor Rock Edict. Although one of them is addressed to the City-judiciaries and the other to his personal and official representatives at Tosali and Samāpā, the general tenor of the two records is the same. As a matter of fact, they form two cognate records, despatched at the same time and intended for the same places. From the manner of their engraving on the face of the same two rock bearing the Rock Edicts, it is evident that they were engraved later than the latter set of records. The Rock Edicts speak of households of Aśoka and of those of his brothers, sisters and other kinsfolk ranking with him in family relationship but nowhere of his sons

or children. The Queens Edict alone among the Minor Pillar Inscriptions introduces his second queen as the mother of Tivala, certainly then quite a young prince. In the Mysore copies of M. R. E. a brother or son of his figures as his Viceroy in the southern frontier province. For the first time in P.E. VII, engraved in the 27th year of *abhisheka*, we read of the charities of his sons who typified the princes of the blood (*devikumālas*). The Separate Rock Edicts, on the other hand, represent three of the *Kumāras* as his Viceroys, stationed at Tosali, Takasilā and Ujeni. Presumably these Kumāra Viceroys were appointed from among his grown up sons.

The Separate Rock Edicts must be dated later than the Rock also on the palpable ground of modification of the general five-year rule of official tours of inspection in the case of the three frontier provinces of Kalinga, Gandhāra and Avanti, with a view to the checking of miscarriage of justice and pacification of popular feelings, which must then have run very high against official tyranny. Professor Mookerji's argument other way about is untenable (*Inscr.*, ii p. 244 f). These also indicate signs of frontier troubles arising from the action of the independent 'frontagers' (*am̐tānam̐ avijitānam̐*). The Divyāvadāna legend refers the rise of frontier troubles to the closing period of his reign. So far as the Rock and Minor Rock edicts are concerned, they speak only of cordial relationship and peaceful intercommunication with all the important 'frontagers'. The only internal trouble to be dealt with then was that which arose from the mischievous action of the Aṭṭavikas.

These considerations cannot but lead us to the conclusion that the two Separate Rock Edicts were promulgated even later than P. E. VII. There is, however, no means as yet to ascertain the exact date of their engraving.

6. Forms, Merits and Defects : Kauṭilya ( *Arthaśāstra*, II. 10 ) distinguishes between the following seven forms of royal writs ( *sāsanāni* ) : ( 1 ) *prajñāpana-lekha*, public notification, 'writ of information'; ( 2 ) *ājñālekha*, 'writ of command', orders, official instructions ; ( 3 ) *paridāna-lekha*, 'writ of remission' ; ( 4 ) *nirīshṭilekha*, 'writ of licence' ;

(5) *prāvṛittika-lekha*, 'writ of guidance'; (6) *pratilekha*, 'writ of reply'; (7) *sarvatraga-lekha*, 'writ for wide circulation'.

The 'writ of information' is defined as an epistolary form of writing by which the person or persons concerned are informed of the contents of a message to be faithfully delivered with the words—"Thus saith the king" (*anena vijñāpitam 'Evam āha'*).

The 'writ of command' is a from, which contains the king's orders, either for rewards or punishments, particularly meant for the officers (*bhartur ājñā bhavet yatra nigrahāmu-grahau prati, viśeshena tu bhṛityeshu*).

The third is meant for 'the bestowal of honour for deserving merit,' either in the manner of a specific relief or as gifts.

The fourth denotes a form to be adopted in announcing to the classes of people or to the localities concerned certain special privilege (*anugraha*) by way of remission, granted in obedience to the king's orders (*anugraho yo nṛīpater nirdeśāt*).

This denotes rather a form meant for granting licence or permission by word or deed, which deserves therefore to be treated rather as a verbal order (*vāchika-lekha*).

The fifth is a from meant for timely giving guidance as to how to provide against or ward off possible and impending calamities.

The sixth is to be adopted in sending a suitable reply to a letter in accordance with the king's orders.

The seventh represents a form to be adopted in issuing general directions to all official agents concerned in matters of general welfare and public safety.

Going by Kautilya's classification and definition of the different forms of royal writs, the three Barābar Hill-cave Inscriptions must be put in the category of *paridāna-lekha*, and the second half of the Lumbini Pillar Inscription in that of *parihāra-lekha*. The concluding portion of P.E. IV granting as it does three days' respite to criminals condemned to death by court sentence deserves the name of

*paridāna* and *parihāra* as well as of *nispriṣṭi*. R.E. VIII and Lumbini Pillar and Nigāli Sāgar Inscriptions that are, on the whole, mere records of the king's pious tours and works carry no other force than that of writs of public 'information, even without the words "Thus saith the king."

The Schism Pillar Edict is typically an *ājñālekha* or writ of command, in so far as the Buddhist schismatics go, and a *sarvatraga-lekha* as regards the general directions issued to the *Mahāmātras* concerned. Similarly, though the Queen's Edict, when judged by its content, is just a *paridāna-lekha*, according to its technical form, it is just an example of *sarvatraga*.

The First Separate Rock Edict which is addressed to the city-judiciaries of Tosali and Samāpā is an *ājñālekha* beyond any doubt. As for S. R. E. II, it contains certain directions to his official representatives as to the general policy to be followed in dealing with the frontier peoples and 'frontagers', whence it deserves the name of Kauṭilya's *sarvatraga*.

The text embodied in the Minor Rock Edict is by Aśoka's own nomenclature *dhammasāvana* or proclamation of piety. R. E. II, R. E. XIV, P. E. VI and P. E. VII deserve the same appellation by their contents. They are *sarvatraga* in the literal sense of the term, though not according to Kauṭilya's definition.

According to Aśoka, P. E. V stands as a typical instance of his *dhamma-niyama* or regulation of piety. A regulation is in its substance an *ājñālekha* as well as a *sarvatraga* under Kauṭilya's definition. R. E. I, R. E. III, R. E. V, R. E. VI, R. E. VII, R. E. XII, R. E. XIII, P. E. IV and Bhābru Edict partake all of the character of a *dhamma-niyama*. R. E. IV, R. E. IX, R. E. X, P. E. I, P. E. II and P. E. III just inculcate Aśoka's *dhammanusathini* or principles of piety.

But all as engraved are *prajñāpana-lekha*, writs of information, or what Jayaswal would call 'public notification.'

Viewing Aśoka's records in the light of Kauṭilya's forms of royal writs, Jayaswal has reasonably doubted the propriety of the name of 'Edicts' applied by European scholars to them. Judged by Kauṭilya's prescriptions, they are either

of these two descriptions, public notifications and proclamations, but not edicts.

By definition an edict is an order proclaimed by authority. Strictly adhered to this definition, the name of edict is not applicable to the bulk of Aśoka's records. But liberally construed, most of the records are edicts in the sense that whether apparently moral instructions or public proclamations, they tacitly carry with them the will and authority of the sovereign to enforce obedience to the principles of piety as inculcated, emphasized and enforced by Aśoka.

Aśoka's edicts fulfil almost all the thirteen purposes (*arthāḥ*) of the royal writs mentioned by Kauṭilya, viz., *nindā* (condemnation), *praśamsā* (commendation), *prichchhā* (interrogation), *ākhyānam* (narration), *arthanā* (beseeching), *pratyākhyānam* (refusal), *upālambha* (censure), *pratishedha* (prohibition), *chodanā* (urging), *sāntvam* (conciliation), *abhyavapatti* (promise of help), *bhartsanam* (threat), and *anunaya* (persuasion). These may be illustrated as follows :

1. Condemnation : R. E. IX—"Womenfolk perform many, diverse, minor and meaningless rites."  
S.R.E. I—"Some one gets indeed at this (but) he, too, does a part, not the whole of it."
2. Commendation : R. E. I—"There are, however, certain festive gatherings approved of as good."  
R.E. III—"Good is respectful attention to mother and father."
3. Interrogation : P. E. II—*Kiyam̐ chu dhamme ti?*  
"What is piety?"
4. Narration : R.E. III—*Hevam̐ āha*, "Thus saith."
5. Beseeching : S.R.E. I—"You better see to this."
6. Refusal : S.R.E. I—"These propensities may not be mine."
7. Censure : P.E. III—"These are the things that lead to evil."  
S.R.E. I—"You do not get as far as this matter goes."

8. Prohibition : R.E. I—"Here no sacrifice shall be performed by immolating a living thing whatsoever, and no festive gathering held.
9. Urging : R.E. VI—"This is to be reported to me in all places, at all times."
10. Conciliation : S.R.E. I—"To me all men are like my progeny."
11. Promise of help : P. E. VII—"These and many other chief officers are occupied with the dispensing of charities.
12. Threat : R.E. XIII—"They shall be ashamed of their conduct and not get killed."
13. Persuasion : R.E. XIII—*ta pi anuneti anunijhāpeti*, "them, too, he entreats and persuades to think."

According to Kauṭilya, the qualities of composition of a writ (*lekhasampat*) consist in proper arrangement of subject-matters (*arthakrama*), relevancy (*sambandha*), completeness (*paripūrṇatā*), sweetness (*mādhuryam*), dignity (*audāryam*), and lucidity or clearness (*spasṭatvam*), and its faults or drawbacks (*lekhadoshāḥ*) lie in ugliness (*akāntiḥ*), contradiction (*vyāghātāḥ*), repetition (*punaruktam*), bad grammar (*apaśabdah*), and misarrangement (*samplava*).

The first quality, called *arthakrama*, is no other than what is held out as the essential feature of a discourse of the Buddha having a good beginning, a good middle, and a good end (*ādi, kalyāṇam, majjhe kalyāṇam, pariyosāne kalyāṇam*). Such texts of Aśoka as R. E. I, R. E. IV, R. E. V, R. E. VI, R. E. IX, R. E. XII, S. R. E. I, P. E. IV, P. E. V, and P. E. VII are conspicuous with this quality of presentation.

The second quality of *sambandha* is what the Buddha insisted on as *pubbāparāmusandhi*, consistency or harmonious linking of that which precedes with that which follows. Both relevancy of statements and consistency of thoughts are possessed in abundance by the texts of Aśoka. Sometimes a chain of argument on a particular question runs through consecutive texts, e. g., R. E. IX, R. E. X and R. E. XI.



The third quality of *paripūrṇantā* or completeness is just the opposite of what Aśoka regrets as being *asamati* (*asamāpti*), i.e., incompleteness (R.E.XIV). Kauṭilya's definition of completeness is fully brought out in the Pali Canonical description of the Buddha's mode of presentation of a text of Discourse : *sattham̐ savyañjanam̐ kevala-paripūṇnam̐ parisuddham̐ brahmachariyam pakāseti*—claiming that “It expresses an idea of unalloyed holy life through a statement, complete in all respects, replete with sense and well-articulated sounds.” The ten tests of well-articulated sounds, mentioned by Buddhaghosa, are :

*sithila-dhanitañ cha dīgha-rassam̐,  
lahuka-garukañ cha niggahitam̐,  
sambandham̐ va vavatthitam̐ vimuttam̐,  
dasadhā vyañjanabuddhiyā pabhedo ti.*

“There is maintained the tenfold distinction between high and low accents, long and short syllables, heavy and light measures, nasals, combined, properly placed and free sounds.”

The remaining three qualities of sweetness, dignity and lucidity are fully covered by those by which the Buddha sought to characterise a noble form of speech (Brahmajāla Sutta) : *Pharusa-vāchanam̐ pahāya...yā sā vāchā neḷā kaṃmasukhā pemaṇiyā hadayaṅgamā porī bahujana-kantā bahujanamanāpā*. “Avoiding harshness, that form of speech which is faultless, pleasant to the ears, captivating, appealing to the heart, urban, agreeable to many, charming to many.”

In this connexion Buddhaghosa points out the distinction between *kaṃmasukhā* and *pemaṇiyā* by the sweetness of expression (*vyañjana-madhuratā*) and the sweetness of sense (*atthamadhuratā*). Aśoka himself claims the sweetness of sense (*athasa madhuratā*, R. E. XIV) as a distinctive quality of his edicts.

As for the sweetness of expression and winning force, Aśoka records thus his preference for a person endowed with these qualities: *e akhakhase (aphalusam̐) acham̐de sakhinā-lambhe...hosati* (S. R. E. I.), “he who will be found to be not of harsh speech and fierce nature, but possessed of winsome cordiality.”

Kauṭilya's *agrāmya* corresponds to the Buddha's *porī*, meaning that which is urban, polite, dignified, chaste. Shama Sastri thinks that by *agrāmya* Kauṭilya banned 'colloquial words,' which is far from the case. All that he meant was a language avoiding that which is uncouth, ugly, vulgar, unpolished, slang. Aśoka's texts abound with colloquialisms or current popular idioms glowing with lucidity and dignity.

As for the use of colloquial words, the followers of the Buddha had a clear mandate from the Master in whose judgement it was sheer dogmatism to ban a local word or expression because it is not in vogue in another locality. There are various words, for instance, current in different localities for one and the same thing, say, "bowl : *pāti*, *patta*, *vittha*, *sarāva*, *dhāropa*, *poṇa*, and *pisila*. Each man thinks that his word is the only correct form of expression, whereas each local word is as good as another, provided that it denotes to a person precisely the thing for which it is meant. In this connexion, as pointed out by Winternitz (History of Indian Lit., II, p. 603) and myself (Old Brāhmī Inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri Caves), the Buddha's direction is "not to insist unduly on his own provincial dialect (*janapadanirutti*) and at the same time not to deviate from general linguistic usage" (Araṇavibhaṅga Sutta, Majjhima III, p. 234 f.). Consistently with this the Buddha disapproves the idea of putting his words in the *Chhandas* or Vedic Sanskrit, governed by the law of Metre and Rhythm, and enjoins that these should be studied by each follower "in his own dialect" (*sakāya niruttiyā*, "each in his own language" (Winternitz, *op. cit.* p. 603; Oldenberg and Rhys Davids. S. B. E. XX, p. 150 f.). Buddhaghosa understands by *sakanirutti*, 'Māgadhī, the language spoken by the Buddha,' as distinguished from 101 spoken dialects of the time. If the expression were *sakāya sakāya*, there would have been no ground of dispute over the interpretation of the Buddha's injunction. But from the context, it is clear that the Buddhist brethren who were recruits from different nationalities, different communities, different castes, and different families, were apt to corrupt the Buddha's words by going to reproduce or represent them each in his

own dialect (*sakāya niruttiyā Buddhavachanam dūsentī, Chullavagga, V. 33*).

The intelligibility, lucidity and dignity of Aśoka's language need no comment. He was certainly aware of repetition (*punarukti*) as a defect of composition. As for grammatical irregularities (*apaśabda*), we need not rigidly apply the canon of Pāṇini or the standard of Pali in adjudicating upon the composition of Aśokan texts which follows its own grammar and idiom.

As for drawbacks, Aśoka in his R. E. XIV, has offered explanations for three of them, noticed in the previously published Rock Edicts. These are : (1) the impossibility of their promulgation all over his empire on account of its vastness; (2) the repetition of the same thing over and over again, justifiable only on the ground of sweetness of its meaning ; and (3) the incompleteness of the records to be accounted for either by the comprehension of local circumstances, or by the consideration of other reasons, or by the fault of the *Lipikara*. R.E. XIII was precluded, for instance, from promulgation at Tosali and Samāpā owing to its unsuitability to Kalinga. But the preclusion of R.E. XI and R.E. XII, was certainly due to an error of judgement on the part of the *Lipikara* in Pāṭaliputra and his instructor.

The consideration of other reason as an explanation of incompleteness is unintelligible otherwise than on the supposition that the engraving of the Rock Edicts was thought unnecessary in those parts of his empire where he had not to reckon with ruling peoples, alien and hostile to the Indo-Aryan religion and social system.

The errors due to the fault of the *Lipikara* consist generally in omissions of a few words, clauses, or sentences, or in mis-spellings. The omissions in one copy may now be easily supplied from another, which is fuller. The spelling mistakes may be rectified by means of a comparative study of the phonetic system and orthography of the language of a particular set. The usual Gīrnār word for *iha is idha*, but accidentally we have *iloka* for *idhaloka* in R.E. XI. Here *iloka* is palpably a mis-spelling. In the case of Shahbazgarhi, the word is *hida* (R.E.I) or *iha* (R.E. XIII), but in several edicts

we get *ia*, which is undoubtedly a mis-spelling of *iha*. In discussing the phonetic distinction and orthography of each set, the philologist must beware of these minor errors due to the scribe-engraver's faults.

7. Problem of Variants : The problem of variants arises in connection with the edicts that are found in copies more than one, such as Rock, Separate Rock, Minor Rock and Schism Pillar. As regards the first six Pillar Edicts, barring the omissions and commissions committed by the king's agents responsible for drafting, editing and engraving, the variations in spellings are confined to the lengthening of the final vowel *a* in the Delhi-Toprā, Delhi-Mirāṭh and Allahabad-Kosam copies, e.g., *chā*, *chevā*, *ahā*, *jevā*, *agāyā*, *asvasā*, *gonasā*, which is a marked tendency of the Kalsi version of the Rock Edicts, and to the shortening of the final vowel *a* in the remaining three copies, e.g., *lāja*, *likhāpita*, *vadhita*, which is a marked tendency of the Lumbinī and Nigāli Sāgar Pillar Inscriptions. The variations suggest only a slight phonetic difference in one and the same Prakrit dialect as it prevailed in the western and eastern halves of the Buddhist Middle Country. It is imaginable that two separate drafts had to be made, one for the western half and the other for the eastern ; two additional copies for each half were left to be made from each draft. The *Yukta* entrusted with the duty of drafting for any half was competent to draft the text of P.E. VII (DT) despite its greater resemblance with the first six edicts of the western half.

As regards the Rock Edicts, the Dhaulī and Jaugada versions were either one a copy from the other or both copies from one and the same original draft. The clause containing the name of the rock on which one of the two versions was inscribed (R.E.I) must have been inserted by the local editor. The few variants, *drakhati* (R.E. I), *Piyadrasine* (R.E. I), *savatra* (R.E. II), and *drasayitu* (R.E. IV), that occur in J, were apparently due to the unconscious influence of the Shahbazgarhi copy on the *Yukta* who prepared the copy for Jaugada. Here one is to imagine that one and the same *Yukta* did the copying from drafts for both the places. From the instance of *drakhati* (J), *dakhati* (Sh), it is evident that the *Yukta* concerned made a confusion between the two places.

The Kalsi and Yerragudi texts so closely resemble each other that they may be regarded almost as based upon two copies from one and the same draft intended originally for Kalsi.

In one or two places, a grammatical form which befits M, occurs in Sh, and a form which befits Sh, occurs in M, such as *dhramanisite* (R.E.V, Sh), *dhramanisito* (M); in one or two places the Sh form occurs also in M, e.g.; *mukhato* (R.E.VI); and in one or two places the M form occurs in Sh, e.g.; *mokshaye* (R.E. V), and even the same Māgadhi form *apalibodhaye*, in both. These may be accounted for by the fact that one *Yukta* prepared both the drafts with habitual or unconscious predilection for the Eastern dialect.

The Girnār texts agree generally with the Dhauli and Jaugada, and occasionally with Yerragudi, and yet, on the whole, they appear to have an originality or distinct individuality of their own.

It is difficult to say anything definitely regarding the Soparā texts. The small fragment of R.E. VIII, which now survives, goes to show that they were just local phonetic adaptations from Yerragudi. The Dhauli and Jaugada versions of Separate Rock Edicts exhibit some variations here and there, which cannot be accounted for otherwise than by the fact that they were based on two slightly different drafts, and not simply copies from one and the same draft.

With regard to the Minor Rock Edict, one may observe that the three Mysore texts were based on three copies from one and the same draft. The same remark holds true of the two Hyderabad versions found at Govimath and Palkigundu. The Maski text has a distinct form of its own. The same remark applies equally to the Yerragudi text which in the wealth of its contents compares favourably with the Mysore copies. The Rūpnāth, Bairāṭ and Sahasrām texts appear to have been based upon similar but not identical drafts.

The variations in the three texts of the Schism Pillar Edict, too, presuppose three similar but not identical drafts.

It will be somewhat bold to think with Professor Mookerji that just one draft in the official language of Pāṭaliputra was prepared in the Imperial Secretariat, from which translations were made in preparing copies suiting different provinces or localities in India.

R. E. III goes to show that the *Yuktas* of the Imperial Secretariat codified the king's orders or messages under the instruction from the *Parishad* or *Purushas* acquainted, according to P.E. IV, with the king's desires (*chandaṁnāni*). And it is clear from R.E. VI. that these orders and messages were issued verbally at first by the king. The drafts prepared on the basis of the king's verbal orders and dictations by the different personal agents were bound to vary. We are, moreover, to presume that among the *Yuktas*, some were considered competent to prepare the draft for Shahbazgarhi, some for Mansehra, some for Dhaulī, some for Kalsi, some for Yerragudi. In the case of the Minor Rock and Schism Pillar Edicts, the king's instruction was to have copies made from those supplied from the capital for wide circulation.

8. Canon of interpretation : The scientific approach to a subject implies a dispassionate attitude of mind towards all things that concern it. Such a mental attitude is not in itself a great thing unless it results from a readiness of the self to leave no stone unturned in exploring all avenues of information and truth, a courage to view facts as they are, an intellectual equipment for discriminating facts in reference to their proper contexts, the preparedness of reason to consider all suggestions and all view-points with an open mind, and no less the capacity of the scholar or investigator for pronouncing sound judgements and arriving at a rational conclusion. There is no hide and seek policy, no concealment of facts, all cards, all available materials being laid on the table for inspection, consideration and adjudication. The question is not so much whether Chandragupta Maurya or Aśoka is the greater hero, the question is not so much whether Aśoka was Buddhist or Jaina by his religious faith as how far the progressive trend of Indian and world thought found a tangible expression through his records and various

actions, how far he succeeded in fulfilling the cherished ideals of political administration, or how far and in what ways he was able to direct the course and advance the cause of Indian and world civilization.

His own records being the first-hand and most trustworthy source of information, a canon of their interpretation in their true historical and linguistic bearings is a *desideratum*. The best method of interpretation is to make one record explain the other, which means an interpretation of any single word, term or statement in the light of a concordance of all available records. In case the records themselves suffice to establish a definite interpretation, it may be strengthened by the exact literary parallels from the texts bearing upon the age. In case these in themselves are insufficient for the purpose, the aid may be sought from either contemporary literature or works that stand near about the age, as well as from the available traditions of Aśoka or the Mauryas in general, the subsequent inscriptions of India and the Greek writings and other foreign accounts. But in all circumstances the first and main reliance must be placed on the records themselves.

It will be seen that Aśoka himself has suggested some keys to the understanding of his records. He tells us that all that he did was to promote the cause of piety or duty amongst all within his empire, outside his empire, nay, all the world over, if possible. Two were the means whereby he sought to achieve this end, namely, the regulations (*dharmamānīyamāni*) and moral persuasion (*nijhati*). The inculcation of the principles of piety (*dharmānusathis*), the proclamations of piety (*dharmasāvanāni*), and the monumental acts of piety (*dharmathambhāni*) were the three distinct modes of moral persuasion (P.E.VII). Thus in the light of the main purpose and the two chief means and their modes we are to view and evaluate his records. Secondly, it will be noticed that he has adopted throughout the conventional literary *uddesa-niddesa* method of the age of presenting first a thesis and then elaborating or elucidating it. Thus there runs a chain of argument through his records, which may be more easily followed up and better appreciated by setting them in their chronological

order. That is to say, one must understand the textual connection of R.E. II, which reads like a proclamation, with R.E. III, that of R.E. IV with R.E. III, the chain of argument through R.E. VII, R.E. IX and R.E. XI, R.E. V, R.E. VII, R.E. XII, R.E. XIII and P.E. VII, through R.E. X, P.E. I and M.R.E., so on and so forth. Thirdly, his records, containing as they do certain general statements, are not meant to be exhaustive. The general statements go on typifying things and ideas and the definition is suggested in terms of its illustrative instances. Thus there is no wonder that the banyan trees (*nigohāni*, P.E. VII) typify all shade-trees (*vraçhhā*, *lukhāni*, R.E. II) ; the wells, (*kāpā*, *udupānāni*), all artificial reservoirs of water, tanks, ponds and the rest ; the antelopes (*magā*, R.E. I), all eatable quadrupeds, the peafowls (*morā*, R.E. I), all eatable birds ; the mango-groves (*aṃbavaḍikā*, Queen's Edict), all orchards, while the celestial mansions, elephants and clusters of luminaries, typify all celestial forms (*divyāni rūpāni*, R.E. IV); the *Dharmamahāmatras* typify all high officials entrusted with the duty of distribution of royal charities (R.E. V, P.E. VII), P.E. V and M.R.E. typify respectively all Regulations and Proclamations of Piety (P.E. VII).

Lastly, the sentences and clauses in Aśoka's statements must be properly punctuated so as to avoid all possibilities of misinterpretation. The difficulty of punctuation confronts us particularly in R.E. III, R.E. IV, R.E. V, R.E. VIII, S.R. E. I, M.R.E. and P.E. VII.



## CHAPTER II

### BEARINGS ON LITERATURE

The inscriptions of Aśoka have their bearings on Indian literature in general and on Buddhist literature in particular. As regards their bearings on the latter, the seven *Pariyāyas* or Pieces selected from a then known corpus of *Buddhavachana* and strongly recommended in the Bhābru Edict for constant study and comprehension by the monks, nuns and laity loont large in our view. As a devout Buddhist, Aśoka upheld the traditional belief: "All that is said by the Master is well said". His pronouncement on this point is nothing but a verbatim reproduction of a dictum now traceable in the Aṅguttara Nikāya (IV, p. 164).

His own word for the doctrinal tradition of each sect is *āgama* (R.E.XII : *kalyāṇāgamā*), while *āgatāgamā* ("masters of the received tradition") is an oft-recurring Pali epithet applied to early *Theras*. Thus the Buddhist doctrinal tradition was nothing then but a growing corpus of *Subhāshitas* or *Pravachanas* of the Buddha (cf. Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, vi : *Sattlu-pāvachanakāṇi*). But *Pravachanam* is the name by which the whole of Vedic tradition was being honoured in the earlier Upanishads (cf. Taittiriya, I. 11.1. : *svādhyāya-pravachanābh-yām*; Kāṭha, I. 2.22 : *nāyam ātmā pravachanena labhyaḥ*). The words of Mahāvīra, too, passed as *pāvayaṇāni* (*Pravachanam*).

The name *Pariyāya* was suggested by the Buddha himself for a connected discourse or reasoned statement on a point of his Doctrine or Discipline. This has been replaced in the extant Pali Canon by *sutta* which matches with *sūkta* ('well-said something') as well as *sūtra* ('threaded or aphoristic something'). In the Sarvāstivāda Canon we have *paryāya sūtra* instead of a mere *paryāya* or a mere *sūtra* which, to say

the least, is an overdoing of things. A *Pariyāya* with its methodical setting of propositions and logical sequence of thoughts bears out the true textual significance of the term Pāli.

To see the Good Faith long endure (*hevaṃ sadhānime chilaṭhitike hosatī ti*) is the pronounced Buddhist motive which actuated Aśoka to suggest seven texts as the best of all, according to his own idea, from his own point of view. Whatever a Buddhist did, it was in the interest of his religion, the stability or stabilisation of the Good faith (*Sadhammatṭhiti*) was invariably his main motive, and whatever the Master himself set out or laid down for the guidance of his disciples or followers was inspired by the same motive.

The selections from the then known corpus of *Buddhavachana* proposed by Aśoka served as models for similar selections recommended by the Pali commentators. The Bharhut sculptures of the 2nd century B.C., with or without labels, presuppose selections from the traditional texts, made from the point of view of Buddha's biography. Similarly selections are listed in the *Milindapañha* and *Mahāvaiṃsa*. A selective process was at work in Buddhist literature, even from earlier times, and it tended to attach a ritual value in chanting to a single *Sutta* or a group of select texts from the corpus of *Buddhavachana*. The Pali *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana* groups of sixteen poems were hot favourites with the immediate disciples of the Buddha. Later on the *Munigāthā* was combined with the former and the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* with the latter. The Buddhist missions reported to have been despatched to different countries and localities in Aśoka's time found it expedient to base their first discourse on a select text or a group of texts, and put together, all the texts used by them go to make a handy book of selections (*Mahāvaiṃsa*, xii, xiv, 22, 58, 63). Similar selections are mentioned by name in the *Milindapañha* (p. 349 f.) and the *Mahāvaiṃsa* (xxx, 82, 83, etc.). Attention might here be drawn to a smaller list of six in the *Sutta-nipāta Commentary* (*Paramatṭha-jotikā*, II). But much seems to have been made of Buddhaghosa's list of four passages in the *Visuddhimagga*, *Kammaṭṭhana-gahaṇa-niddesa*, viewed as one having common texts with Aśoka's list (*Bhandarkar, op. cit.*, p. 89 f. ; *Kosambi, I. A.*,

XL, p. 40). The passages are catalogued as Rathavinitapaṭipadaṁ (identified with Aśoka's Upatisapasine), Nāḷaka-paṭipadaṁ (identified with Aśoka's Moneya-sute), Tuvataka-paṭipadaṁ (sought to be identified with Aśoka's Vinaya-samukase), and Mahā-ariyavainsapaṭipadaṁ (identified with Aśoka's Aliyavasāni).

The same selective process is in fact much earlier, and it is clearly traceable through the Gṛihya Sūtras. There, too, it has served to set ritual values on certain select hymns, the list varying with authorities in spite of a basic agreement. The list swelled up with the addition of such later works as the Bhāraṭa of Jaimini and the Mahābhārata of Vaiśampāyana.

The ritual side is absent in Aśoka's selections. He conceived them on a rational consideration of their use or utility in terms of stability of the Good Faith. The first piece is called Vinayasamukase, "The Vinaya Exalted", "The Vinaya Extolled." With Oldenberg and Rhys Davids (S.B.E., XIII, p. xxvi f.) we may take the title to mean "Abstract of Vinaya." In P.E.I, *ukasa* is used in the sense of "the exalted;" the Buddha's teaching of the Four Noble Truths is praised in Pali as *sāmuḷḷakāṁsika dhammadesanā* (Vinaya Mahāvagga, I. 7. 6; Udāna, V. 3), meaning "the most excellent sermon" (Winternitz) or "the essential teaching". But the Pali scholiasts explain *sāmuḷḷakāṁsika* as "self-seized", "self-discovered" (*attanā va uddharitvā gaṇitā*), which is far-fetched. To the ancients, as Buddhaghosa points out, the Anumāna Sutta (Majjhima—N. I.) was known as Bhikkhu-vinaya, and the Siṅgālovāda Sutta (Dīgha—N. III.) as Gihi-vinaya. Whether Aśoka's piece is "The Vinaya Exalted" or "The Vinaya Outlined", with Mr. Sailendranath Mitra I agree in thinking that its Pali counterpart is no other than the Vinaya passage in the Aṅguttara Nikāya, I. p. 98 f., inasmuch as this is the only Canonical tract in which the Vinaya is both exalted or extolled in terms of its purposes and outlined or crystallized as regards its topics. One of the main purposes in terms of which the Vinaya is extolled is the stabilisation of the Good Faith.

The second piece is Aliyavāsani. Rhys Davids identifies this with the passage dealing with Dasa-ariyavāsā, ("The ten abodes of the elect"), and Dharmananda Kosambi, with

the passage dealing with *Chattāro Ariyavaṃsū* ("The four-fold heritage of the elect"). Presumably Asoka's passage does not refer to a bare enumeration of the four *Ariyavaṃsas* but to a regular Discourse on the subject which is found embodied in the Aṅguttara Nikāya and to which Buddhaghosa applies the name of Mahā-ariyavaṃsa Suttanta. The text is described by Buddhaghosa as one which is edificatory of the practice of contentment as to the four requisites of a *bhikshu* and delight in meditation. The Pali title, as explained by Buddhaghosa, signifies the uninterrupted, long-continued tradition of the elect (*Ariya-tanti*, *Ariyappaveni*). But Aśoka's title presupposes a neuter word *vaṣaṃ*, meaning 'control', 'habitual practice.' Accordingly the Pali equivalent of Aśoka's title is *Ariyavasā* or *Ariyavasāni*, which is more appropriate to the subject-matter of the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa Suttanta.

As to *ariyavaṣaṃ* being the word presupposed by the Aśokan title, one may cite here the corroborative evidence from the Tonigala inscription of Ceylon of Meghavaṃṣa's time (E.Z., III, p. 182) in which the word *Ariyavaṣa* occurs twice—*Ariyavaṣa vaṭavi*, *Ariyavaṣa karaṇa*. In Aśokan dialects the neuter : plural suffix *āni* is nowhere used in the declension of masculine stems but in accusative plural or nominative plural when the voice is a passive one. Dr. Paranavitana himself is not sure of the equation of the inscriptional *vaṣa* with *vaṃsa* or *vassa*. For "the significance of Ariyavaṃsa," the reader is referred to Rev. Rahula's informative article in the University of Ceylon Review for April, 1943, p. 59ff.

The third piece called Anāgatabhayāni is found to be a conglomeration of four cognate Discourses, each enumerating the five future dangers of the Good Faith. The first two of them categorise the five dangers keeping which in view a *bhikshu* should immediately start a life of energetic effort for the attainment of that which has not yet been attained, and the last two enumerate them in such a manner that the right-thinking *bhikshus* should strive to avoid after apprehending them. The future dangers anticipate the prevalence of food-scarcity or famine, and of fear of life and property due to internecine feuds, the split in the *Saṅgha*, the moral, intellectual and spiritual degradation, deterioration or degeneration of the *bhikshus*, the wilful neglect of the study

of the Buddha's profound Discourses and preference for the study of the skilfully composed poetical works of other schools of thought, the lack of earnestness in the right cause, the growth of ease-lovingness and of fondness for personal requisites, and constant association of the *bhikshus* with the *bhikshunis* and women learners or with the resident householders waiting for ordination.

The stress laid on a life of exertion, wakefulness, watchfulness or alertness, the fear of schism in the *Saṅgha*, the emphasis laid on a life of moderation, patience and forbearance, etc., are all in keeping with Aśoka's edicts.

The fourth piece is entitled Munigāthā, precisely as in the Divyāvadāna ( pp. 20,35 ) which is a Mūlasarvāstivāda work in Sanskrit. The Pali poem in the Sutta-nipāta bears the name of Munisutta. Like the Khaggavisāna, the Munisutta stands out prominently as an early type of didactic Buddhist ballad poetry, couched in easy-flowing but vigorous language, characterised by the sublimity of thought, filled with genuine religious sentiment, singing of the glory of the life of lonely meditation, free from worldly cares and anxieties, and contrasting the same with the care-worn life of a householder. The recommendation of such a piece as this even to the laity for constant study and comprehension goes direct as an evidence against the theory that Aśoka was opposed to the idea of turning a monk, severing connexion with the world.

The next piece, called Moneyasute, has been identified by Rhys Davids with a short Sutta on *moneyyas* in the Itivuttaka, and by Kosambi with the Nālaka Sutta in the Sutta-nipāta. The Itivuttaka Sutta giving as it does a bare enumeration of the three *moneyyas* ( modes of quietude ), does not match well with Aśoka's intended passage. It is obviously a larger Discourse such as one presented in the Nālaka Sutta of which the Lokottaravāda version is cited in the Mahāvastu. Aśoka's title leads us, no doubt, to think that the Discourse in its earlier stage was called Moneyya, and that at that stage it stood without the first stanza introducing Nālaka as interlocutor. The elimination of this stanza does not impair the wholeness of the Discourse.

The consensus of opinion is in favour of identifying the

sixth piece, called Upatisa-pasine ( "The Questions of Upatishya" ), with the Rathavinīta Sutta in the Majjhima Nikāya. This Sutta might indeed go by the name of Upatisa-pasine, inasmuch as the questions answered in it were all put by Śāriputra who, according to his own declaration, was generally known by the name of Upatishya. His questions anticipating the replies received from the interlocutor set out the seven successive modes of purity, all ultimately leading up to *Nirvāna*. Thus the Sutta contains the *mātikā* or ground plan of such later exegetical works as the Abhidhammāvatāra, the Vimuttimaggā and the Visuddhimaggā. But the choice lies yet between this and the Śāriputta Sutta (Suttanipāta, iv. 16 ), the latter, too, being a Discourse in reply to a question of Śāriputta. The Milinda list of select texts includes the name of the Śāriputta Sutta (ib., p. 349 ), and by the Therapañha Sutta the Mahāvaiṣa ( XXX. 82 ) probably meant this very Discourse.

The seventh piece, called Lāghulovāde, is accurately identified by Senart with the Ambalaṭṭhika Rāhulovāda Sutta ( Majjhima-N., II ). Aśoka specifies it as that particular text of Rāhulovāda which contains the Buddha's admonition on falsehood, addressed to Rāhula ( *musāvādanā adhiḡichya bhagavatā budhena bhāsita* ). Obviously his intention is to distinguish this particular admonition from other texts bearing the same title. As placed in the Majjhima Nikāya, the three texts of Rāhulovāda are distinguished from one another as Mahā ( Greater ), Chūla ( Lesser ), and Ambalaṭṭhika ( with reference to the place ). The Mahā-Rāhulovāda was one of the popular Discourses, as evidenced by the Milindapañha ( p. 349 ) and the Mahāvaiṣa ( XXX. 83 ). Thus from the way in which Aśoka refers to the particular Rāhulovāda, we can easily infer that he was acquainted with a corpus of *Buddhavachana*, which contained more than one Rāhulovāda.

These are not all. Aśoka in his R. E. IX ( G, Dh, J ), has quoted a dictum ( *asti chu pi vutani : sādhu dāna iti, dāne ti* ), which is traceable in the Sādhu Sutta ( Saṃyutta-N. I, p. 20 ). Not only that. Another dictum ( *pāṇesu sayamo sādhu* ), which occurs in the same edict, is traceable to the same source. Aśoka's pronouncement on the superior value

of *dharmadāna* ( the gift of the Doctrine ), which occurs in R. E. IX and is repeated in R. E. XI, is to be found in the same Sutta, as also in a verse of the Dhammapada ( verse 354 : *sabbadānaṃ dhammadānaṃ jināti* ). A similar adage can indeed be traced in Manu, iv. 233, but here the word is *brahmadānaṃ*. The protocol of the Bhābru Edict cannot but remind us of similar conventional expressions in the Suttas of the Dīgha and Majjhima Nikāyas.

The words, *athā pitā* etc. ( S. R. E. II ), expressing the desired mutual relationship between the ruler and the ruled, have their exact counterpart in a *gāthā* of the Mahāsutasoma Jātaka. The parallels cited from the Arthaśāstra, Mahābhārata and Buddhacharita ( II. 97 ) are one-sided, wherefore these do not fully fit in with Aśoka's statement.

*Anuposathanī* in P. E. V and Schism Pillar Edict ( Sārnāth ) is a Buddhist technical term, which is met with in the Vinaya Mahāvagga, II. *Anāvāsasi āvāsayaīye, vāsāpetaviīye* ( Schism Pillar Edict ) is also found to be a Vinaya technical phrase. As a matter of fact, the whole text of the ordinance in the Schism Pillar Edict has behind it a Vinaya injunction in the Mahāvagga, which reads : *Samghabhedako upasampanno nāsetabbo*, and the precise nature of the measure adopted by Aśoka is faithfully described in the Samantapāsādikā and Pali Chronicles ( Inscr. ii, p. 154 ).

Pilgrimages to Lumbinī and Sambodhi ( Bodhgayā ) were undertaken by Aśoka in accordance with the Buddha's express opinion ( Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, Dīgha-N. II, p. 140 ), and the expression, *hida Budhe jāte*, or *hida bhagavaṇṇ jāte ti* ( Here the Blessed One was born ), which occurs in the Lumbinī Pillar Inscription with reference to the village of Lumbinī, has *idha Tathāgato jāto ti* ( Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta ) for its Pali parallel.

Aśoka's claim, *mayā bahukalāṇaṇi kataṇi* ( R. E. V ), *me bahuni kayāṇāni kaṭāni* ( P. E. II ), is just an echo of the Bodhisattva's declaration, *katā me kalyāṇā anekarūpā* ( Mahāsutasoma Jātaka, No : 437 ).

The purposes of *anusamjyāna*, as stated in R. E. III ( read with reference to R. E. II ) and in S. R. E. I,

correspond to those mentioned by Buddhaghosa ( Inscr. ii, p. 12 ). The public works, mentioned in R. E. II, P. E. II, P. E. VII and Queen's Edict, may be supposed to have been inspired by the Ārāmaropa Sutta ( Inscr. ii, p. 157 ). The duties of a pious householder stressed by Aśoka throughout his edicts fall all within the scheme of the Siṅgālovāda Suttanta ( Dīgha-N. III ). The phrase, *porāṇā pakitti*, is met with only in the Pali Jātakas ( Inscr. ii, p. 113 ). Aśoka's *āsulope* ( S. R. E. I ) is peculiarly Buddhistic ( ib., p. 90 ). The same holds true of ( *sainvaṭṭa-kappa* ( R. E. IV, V ), *sukataṃ dukataṃ* ( R. E. V ), *svage* ( R. E. VI, IX, M. R. E. ) and *apāye* ( S. R. E. I ). For the popular significance of the *vimānas*, *hastins*, *agniskandhas*, and other celestial forms, mentioned in R. E. IV, one must in the first instance look into the Vimāna stories in the Vimānavatthu and those interspersed in the Jātakas.

Even behind Aśoka's idea of causing his edicts to be permanently engraved on *pavata* ( a rock ), *silāthambha*, ( a stone-pillar ), or a *silāphalaka* ( a stone slab ) was the Buddha's opinion that a writing in stone is not easily delible, that it endures long ( Aṅguttara N. I, p. 283 : *pāsāṇe lekḥā na khippaṃ lujjati...chiratṭhitikā hoti* ).

The instances need not be multiplied. The Bhābru Edict distinctly presupposes a traditional corpus of *Buddha-va-chana*, constituted of Discourses in prose as well as those in verse. Out of the seven recommended texts, four are found to be prose Discourses, two to be poems or poetical Discourses, and one to be a Discourse in prose or verse. The Rāhulovāda on *musāvāda* suggests the existence of other Rāhulovādas. These texts are embodied in the Majjhima Nikāya ( the Sarvāstivāda Madhyamāgama ), the Aṅguttara Nikāya ( the Sarvāstivāda Ekottarāgama ), and the Sutta-nipāta. The Sādhu Sutta, presupposed by R.E. IX, is contained in the Sainyuta Nikāya ( the Sarvāstivāda Sainyuktāgama ). The idea of *Sainvaṭṭa-kappa*, the protocol of the Bhābru Edict, and the undertaking of pilgrimages to the places of importance to the Buddhists presuppose some *Suttas* in the Dīgha Nikāya ( the Sarvāstivāda Dīrghāgama ). Several parallel dicta and idioms lead us back to the Jātaka gāthās. The main text and appendix of the Schism Pillar Edict ( Sārnāth )



cannot but have in its background the Vinaya Mahāvagga and Chullavagga which in their turn presuppose the existence of the two books of the Vinaya Suttavibhaṅga. The serial Discourse on Anāgata-bhayāni refers to Abhidhamma-kathā and Vedalla-kathā. The latter is embodied in the two *Suttas* of the Majjhima Nikāya, called Mahāvedalla and Chūlavedalla. By the former, too, we shall not perhaps be justified in thinking of the books of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka; it probably denoted certain special *Suttas* like those canonised by the Sarvāstivāda sect as Abhidharma treatises, standing as these do half way between the *Suttas* proper and the Pali Abhidhamma books. The Vinaya Mahāvagga and Chullavagga, taken together, outline the Buddhist ecclesiastical history from Buddhahood to the Second Buddhist Council, held in 100 B.E., and present a systematic account of the origin and development of the Vinaya rules and conventions. All accounts but those of the First and Second Councils fall within the life-time of the Buddha, while the two Councils enclose between them just a century, which elapsed after the Buddha's demise. The account of the First Council speaks of the canonisation of the two books of the Vinaya Sutta-vibhaṅga, and the five Nikāyas without, however, the enumeration of the books of the then known Khuddaka Nikāya. The Vinaya passages cited in the account of the Second Council are mostly from the Suttavibhaṅga, while two of them are now to be found in the Mahāvagga. Of the two passages, the first is cited as a *samyutta* and the second as a *vatthu* instead of as Khandhakas. The naming of the first as Uposatha-samyutta is important as indicating that it originally formed an integral part of the Samyuttāgama. Besides the account of the Second Council assigned to 100 B.E., the Serissaka story in the Vimānavatthu claims to have been a composition of the same time (*vide* B.C. Law's History of Pali Literature, I).

Aśoka uses the word *nikāyā* to denote either the bodies or classes of officers (R.E. XII, of. Arthaśāstra, II.4. *śreṇipravah-aṇīnikāya*), or religious bodies or sects (R. E. XIII), or species of living beings (*jīvanikāyāni*, P. E. V), but nowhere applies it to mean separate collections of texts. As noted, his word for the literary tradition of a sect is *āgama*. The Theravāda

is the only Buddhist sect which replaced *āgama* by *nikāya* in the case of the Sutta collections. The Dīpavaṃsa which is the oldest among the Pali Chronicles designates the Sutta Piṭaka as *Āgama Piṭaka*. But once used, *Nikāya* continued to be used as a textual title by the Theriyas, and *Pañchānekāyika* (one who knows the five Nikāyas by heart) is even met with as a personal epithet in some of the donative inscriptions at Bharhut (more accurately Berhut<sup>1</sup> from Virahotra) and Sāñchī (2nd century B. C.). The Mūla Sarvāstivāda sect, on the other hand, retained the name *Āgama*. But in connection with the Pali expression, *āgatāgamā*, Buddhaghosa points out : *eko Nikāyo eko Āgamo, ... pañcha Nikāyā pañcha Āgamā nāma*.

The growing corpus of *Buddhavachana*, precisely like Vedic literature, was being handed down as an oral tradition from teacher to teacher until its commitment to writing, and there were regular institutions of *Bhāṇakas* or Reciters of the Sacred Texts, charged with the twofold duty of preservation and transmission by methodical and periodical chanting (Barua and Sinha, Barhut Inscriptions, *sub voce* bhānaka). The Sutta and Vinaya text were being regularly chanted at different places by the *bhikshus* even while the Buddha was alive and facilities were given for the purpose (Mahāvagga, iv.15. 4; Chullavagga, iv 4.4.). As regards the Theravāda tradition, the corpus underwent some six redactions prior to its commitment to writing, three in India and three in Ceylon, and at least two books were added to it after that. The Pali Canon, as is now preserved in Sinhalese, Burmese and Siamese MSS., is wanting in certain passages and stories cited in the later exegetical works and commentaries or otherwise preserved in the scriptures of other sects. The history of its development, as far as we can envisage it, shows the processes of reshuffling or permutation and combination, amplification, annotation, adaptation, and affiliation.

As regards other Buddhist doctrinal traditions, the Dīpavaṃsa rightly points out that each sect or school with its rise appreciably modified the Theravāda corpus by the reshuffling as well as elimination of texts, by additions and alterations, by textual distortions and novel interpretations, and no less by changes in nomenclatures, phraseologies, phonetics, and

Sarvāstivāda is the main sect whose Canon closely resembles the Theravāda minus some texts and portions of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka. But judged text by text by the evidence of the edicts of Aśoka and other Indian inscriptions, the extant Canons of other Buddhist sects are chronologically later than the Theravāda.

As for bearings on Indian literature in general, there are certain things in the inscriptions of Aśoka that cannot be wholly accounted for by the Canon of Theravāda and Sarvāstivāda. For instance, the three words, *parisrave*, *aparissrave*, and *āsinaṇe* (= *aṇhaya* ), of which the first two occur in R. E. X and the third occurs in P. E. II, III, are peculiarly Jaina. The citation from the Āchārāṅga Sūtra : *je āsavā te parissavā, je parissavā, je aṇāsavā te aparissavā*, is a traditional Jaina dictum, which may easily be supposed to have been at the back of Aśoka's opinion : *eshe tu parisrave yaṇi apuṇāni*.

Aśoka's interesting list of birds, fishes and quadrupeds in P. E. V. in short, of creatures as *abhakshyas* is on a par with those in the Law-books of Bodhāyana and Vasishṭha which in their turn presuppose the works of Gautama and Vṛiddha Manu. In the background of the lunar days and half months specified by Aśoka in the same edict as those to be strictly observed for abstinence from certain acts of cruelty to animals are the injunctions in the Vinaya Mahāvagga as well as the prescriptions in the Gṛihya Sūtras. But as regards his list of creatures as *avadhyas* ( P. E. V ), its substantial agreement is with that in the Arthaśāstra ( Inscr. ii, p, 360 ff. ).

The popular maxim, *evaṃ samavāyaḥ kartavyaḥ* (Pañchatantra, I.15), is echoed by Aśoka's dictum : *samavāyo eva sādhu* R.E. XII), which does not, however, prove the greater antiquity of the Sanskrit text Pañchatantra wherein the maxim is embodied. It suggest only the priority of the fable conveying the maxim with its Pali counterpart in the Sammodamāna Jātaka illustrated in the Bharhut sculpture ( Barua, Barhut, Bk. III, Pl. LXXII. 93 ).

Among the ancient grammatical works, Kātyāyana's Vārttika notices the word *Devānāṃpriya* (Pali *Devatānampiyo*), and Patañjali's Mahābhāshya discloses its significance as a

personal epithet or mode of address. The Mahābhāshya makes also mention of the *Khalatika parvata* which figures in two of Aśoka's Barābar Hill-cave inscriptions. Pāṇini's *ādikaraḥ* (Jaina *āigare*), *lipikaraḥ*, *livikaraḥ* (III. 2. 21) are presupposed by Aśoka's *ādikaro*, *ādikare* (R.E.V.), and *lipikara* (R.E. XIV).

As regards the Smṛiti literature, lists of non-eatable or forbidden animals, birds, beasts and fishes (*abhakshyas*), contained in the older Law-books, are certainly in the literary background of Aśoka's list of *avadhyas* (P.E.V). In this respect the Dharmasūtras of Bodhāyana and Vasishṭha deserve special notice, particularly for the reason that both the works prohibit the eating of the flesh of rhinoceros and allow the eating of the meat of peafowls. Furthermore, Vasishṭha's *pāṇḍukapota* is the same species of birds as the *setakapota* in Aśoka's list. It is again in the treatises of Bodhāyana and Vasishṭha that we come across the phrase *kāmanī* or *kāmanī tu* corresponding to Aśoka's *kāmanī chu* (S. R. E. II). Manu's text, which in its extant form is later than Aśoka's time, has a distinct saying in verse corresponding to a dictum in Pali and in *Aśokavachana*.

Aśoka's insistence on the middle course (*majha*, S.R.E.I) is quite in keeping with Kauṭilya's wisdom (Arthaśāstra, I.4). Without sidelights from the Arthaśāstra we are helpless in accounting for the importance attached by Aśoka to the two asterisms of Tishya and Punarvasu (S. R. E. I, II, P. E. V.). The human treatment of slaves and servants, the grounds of release of prisoners before they have served out the full term of court sentence, the king's obligations to the aged, the destitute, the orphans, etc., and the consultation of the Council of Ministers in connection with urgent matters are common, more or less, to the edicts and the Arthaśāstra. Both emphasize the need of practice of *utthāna* (exertion) as secret of success in administration.

But the prose treatise of the Arthaśāstra, as we now have it, is not only post-Aśokan but post-Sūṅga in date. Its mode of dating a record in terms of the regnal year, month, half-month and day (*rājavarshaḥ māsaḥ pakshaḥ divasaḥ*) tallies with that in the Kushāṇa, Ikshvāku and other later Indian inscriptions and differs appreciably from that in the inscriptions of Aśoka.

Its list of about ten kinds of slaves stands, as pointed out by Dr. Atindranath Bose, midway between that of Manu and that of Nārada.

It counts the seasons as six and defines each of them ( II. 20 ), while Aśoka's phrase *tīsu chātummasīsu* ( P. E. V. ) clearly suggests the adherence of his inscriptions to the tradition of three seasons. The tradition of six seasons may be shown, however, to be a pre-Buddhistic one.

The *Lekhaka* of the Arthasāstra is not the same functionary as the *Lipikara* of Aśoka. The leaves ( *patra* ) are the writing material contemplated by the Arthasāstra ( II. 10 ) and writing meant the employment of some sort of an ink, while with Aśoka the writing material was a hard substance like stone, and writing meant engraving of letters on such a material. The Arthasāstra suggests the wisdom on the part of the king of consulting sometimes his ministers by sending letters ( *patra-preshaṇena*, I. 15 ), a procedure which is inconceivable much before the birth of Christ. The Arthasāstra classification and rules of royal writs ( II. 10 ) may be made applicable to the inscriptions of Aśoka, but the records of Aśoka fall far below the standard of perfection in epistolary correspondence as set up in the Arthasāstra.

The difference in spite of general agreement between the two lists of *avadhyas*, one offered in Aśoka's P. E. V and the other in the Arthasāstra ( II. 16 ) is remarkable. Whilst Aśoka's list is prepared on the twofold ground that the creatures included in it are those which were neither eaten by men nor came into men's use, the Arthasāstra list is based on the consideration that the creatures included in it were sacrosancts in the people's eye ( *maṅgalyāḥ* ).

Some of Aśoka's *Mahāmātras* ( R. E. XIII ) were indeed like the *Adhyakshas* of the Arthasāstra, but on this ground it cannot be held that all the *Adhyakshas* ( Superintendents ) of the Arthasāstra were Aśoka's *Mahāmātras*. It is only by *suggestio falsi* that one may seek to identify wholly Aśoka's *Stryadhyaaksha Mahāmātras* with the *Gaṇikādhyaaksha* of the Arthasāstra.

The *Rajjukas* and *Prādeśikas* who were the highly important but not newly appointed officers of Aśoka are

rather missed in the Arthaśāstra. Even the Maurya capital Pāṭaliputra is not mentioned in it. It has moreover nothing to say about the Greek contemporaries of the Mauryas. Its hostile attitude towards the Śākya (Buddhists), Ājivakas, and other so-called *ṛishala pravrajitas* suggests its partiality to the Brāhmins and Brahmanical ascetics, and its predilections for the *rājasūya* and horse sacrifices suggest its connection with a post-Mauryan age of Brahmanical reaction against Buddhism, Jainism, and Ājivikism. The Pali tradition represents, no doubt, Bindusāra, father and predecessor of Aśoka, as a votary of the Brahmanist and a lay supporter of the Brāhmins and Brahmanical ascetics. But there are at the same time traditions in Pali and Sanskrit to show that the Ājivikas at least among the Indian ascetics, banned in the Arthaśāstra, had some amount of influence in the court and household of Bindusāra.

The *Dharmasthas* of the Arthaśāstra correspond neither to the *Rajjukas* nor to the *Dharmamahāmātras* of Aśoka, although it may be shown that their duties coincided in some respects with those assigned to the *Rajjukas* and in some respects with those assigned to the *Dharmamahāmātras*.

The connexion or difference between the *Amātyas* and *Mahāmātras* is not quite clear from the Arthaśāstra. They do not find mention in the list of Government servants receiving subsistence ( V. 3 ). Although distinguished from the *Mantrins*, it would seem that some of the *Amātyas* were members of the *Mantriparishad*. In Chapter 6 of Bk. V, *Amātya* and *Mahāmātra* seem to have been employed as one and the same designation. In adopting *Mahāmātra* as a common designation of the members of the *Parisā* ( R. E. VI ) and all high officers of the State, Aśoka appears to have followed the tradition of Magadha and Kośala as represented in the older stratum of the Pali Canon, whereas the prose treatise of the Arthaśāstra appears to have been the compilation of a time when the designation *Mahāmātra* tended to pass out of use. Like *Sachiva*<sup>1</sup>, *Amātya* was evidently a general designation for all classes of officers.

---

1. Arthaśāstra, I. 7. Amarakosha, IX. 89.

The prose treatise of the Arthaśāstra is compiled in strict conformity to a textual and exegetical methodology ( *Tantrayukti* ) defined in its concluding chapter ( XV. 1 ). This methodology with its 32 terms is presented in the same language and in the same manner as in the concluding chapter of the *Suśrutasaṁhitā*, whereas the textual form and *uddesa-nirdeśa* method of the edicts of Aśoka are on a par with that in the Pali Suttas.

The extant prose treatise of the Arthaśāstra presupposes an anthology of 6,000 ślokas, which is ascribed to Kauṭilya, and the ślokas in this earlier *kārikā*, as may be judged by those still preserved in the prose treatise, were mostly, if not wholly, verses in the *Śloka* or *Anuṣṭubh* metre. The anthology was *ex hypothesi* in the nature of a *Niti* work, a treatise containing moral maxims on the conduct and duties of the king, his ministers, councillors and officers as well as on the art of administration,—in short, a work on *Dandanīti* or *Rājadharma*. Asoka's first Separate Rock Edict, too, presupposes such *nītis* or moral maxims. The Canonical Jātaka Book and the Mahābhārata abound in such *Niti* anthologies that are traditionally ascribed to different teachers and sages noted for their wisdom. Thus the extensive anthology which had formed the literary basis of the prose treatise of the Arthaśāstra was just one of the many such treatises. None need therefore be surprised that counterparts of or parallels to some of these maxims are traceable as much in the edicts of Asoka as in the *gāthās* of the Jātaka and the *ślokas* of the Mahābhārata.

Even apart from the occurrence of certain common maxims and phrases and idioms, we cannot, without keeping some of the earlier Arthaśāstra verses in the immediate historical back ground of Asoka's edicts, account for the reason behind Asoka's insistence on the quinquennial tour of official inspection (R.E. III, S.R.E. I) and the inspection tour to be undertaken within the third year (S.R.E. I). According to one of the earlier Arthaśāstra verses (II. 20), an additional month (*adhimāsa*) occurs periodically in the middle of every third year and at the end of the fifth, and in instituting the quinquennial and triennial tours Asoka's plan was to fully utilise the additional months so that the usual

administrative duties of the officer concerned would not be unduly interfered with. The Arthasāstra verse reads :

*Evam ardha-tṛitīyānām abdhānām adhimāsakam |  
grīshme janayataḥ pūrvam, pañchabdānte cha paśchimam ||*

Similarly behind Aśoka's ordinance compelling a monk or nun found guilty of the offence of dividing the Saṅgha to live in a non-monastic residence is the prescription in the following Arthasāstra verse (IV. 8) for either banishing from the country or compelling a Brāhman offender to reside in a non-residence like a mine :

*Brāhmaṇam pāpakarmāṇam udghushān kukṛitavarṇam |  
kuryān nirvishayanī rājā vāsayed ākareshu vā ||*

Similarly the verses may be cited from the Arthasāstra (II. 36) to show what was the customary practice of earlier times as regards jail-deliveries .

*Divase pañcharātre vā bandhanasthān viśodhayet |  
karmanā kāyadaṇḍena hiraṇyānugraheṇa vā | |  
Apūrvadesābhigame yuvarājābhishhechane |  
putrajanmani vā moksho bandhanasya vidhīyate<sup>1</sup> | |*

The anthology presupposed by the prose treatise of the Arthasāstra and ascribed to Kauṭilya is just one of the many such anthologies, large or small, that dealt with the subject of *nīti*, *daṇḍanīti* or *rājadharmā*. The Pali Jātakas contain several examples of them associated with the name of different teachers noted for their worldly wisdom. Even other books of the Pali Nikāyas are not wanting in such words of wisdom in verse. Here attention might be particularly drawn to the verses in the Siṅgālovāda Sutta, the Lakkhaṇa Suttanta, the Kurudhamma Jātaka, the Dasa-rājadhama Jātaka, the Mahāhamṣa Jātaka, the Mahāsutasoma Jātaka, the Mahābodhi Jātaka, and the Vidhurapaṇḍita Jātaka. But the

---

1 For a detailed consideration of the chronological position of the Arthasāstra in Indian literature, the reader is referred to Dr. Shama Sastri's Preface to the third edition of his translation of the Arthasāstra.



great storehouse of Nīti anthologies was the Mahābhārata ascribed to Vaiśampāyana in some of the Grihya Sūtras<sup>1</sup> and referred to by Pāṇini ( VI. 2. 38 ). This pre-Pāṇinian Great Epic is equally presupposed by the Pali Jātakas, the Rāmāyaṇa ascribed to Vālmīki, the edicts of Aśoka and no less by the Arthaśāstra as a whole.<sup>2</sup> The Rājadharmā section of the Śāntiparva offers us an extensive anthology on royal polity, which contains many striking parallels to the principles inculcated by Aśoka and emphasized in the Arthaśāstra. The phrases, idioms and adages, cited from the Brahmanical works other than the Mahābhārata as parallels to those occurring in Aśoka's edicts are inadequate to indicate the literary and linguistic development of India prior to Aśokavachana.

It is in the Mahābhārata ( XII. 207. 43 ) alone that we have the Sanskrit name *Yauma* corresponding to the Pali and Aśokan *Yona*. It is again here that the *Yaumas*, *Kāmbojas* and *Gāndhāras* are grouped together as socially and politically allied peoples precisely as in Pali and Aśokavachana ( R. E. V ). The word *anusamyāna*, too, is met with in the Great Epic ( I. 2. 123 ) *punya-tūrthānusaṃyānam*, though not in the technical sense of Aśoka. The *Mahāmātras* mentioned in it are no other than those called *Senāpati Mahāmātras* in Pali. The Mahābhārata ( Bhīshmaparva, 6. 13 ) locates the four Great Continents, Jambudvīpa included, precisely in the same way as in Pali.

1 Aśvalāyana Grīhya-Sūtra, III. 4.4. where we have mention of both Jaimini and Vaiśampāyana, and of the Bhārata and the Mahābhārata.

2 For the date of compilation of the Arthaśāstra, see my article—*The Arthaśāstra—a blend of old and new* published in the *Bhārata-Kaumudī*, I pp. 84—119. Here I must rectify three mistakes that appear in this article and which I had not the opportunity of correcting : P. 109 : Read “though the prose treatise of the Arthaśāstra does not depart from the earlier literary tradition when it counts the seasons as six” for “the prose treatise of the Arthaśāstra departs from.....”

P. 118 : Read “takes no notice of *dināras* that find mention in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions” for “takes no notice of *dināras* that find mention in the Junāgaṛh inscription of Rudradāman I”. P. 118 : Read “*Sachivas*, distinguished into two classes, *Mati* and *Karma*,—a distinction which is met with in some passages of the Mahābhārata but not in the Arthaśāstra ( cf. I. 7 )” for “*Sachivas*, distinguished into two classes, *Mati* and *Karma*, but this is conspicuous by its absence in the Arthaśāstra”.

In point of chronology Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa is later than the bulk of the Pali Jātakas and the pre-Pāṇinian Mahābhārata. Professor Raychaudhuri seems inclined to treat it as a Maurya epic, which like the edicts of Aśoka is characterised by the remarkable simplicity of diction and the loftiness of the moral ideal. In both we notice the upsetting of the human mind at the sight of cruelty. But, in spite of the fact that the Sanskrit name *Riṣṭika* corresponding to Aśoka's *Riṣṭika* (R.E. V, G) is met with in the Rāmāyaṇa (IV. 41. 8-11), or that certain parallels to the moral maxims and principles of Aśoka may be cited from it, chronologically it is rather post-Aśokan than pre-Aśokan.

Aśoka in his S.R.E.I, propounds certain maxims of conduct for the guidance of government servants (*suvihitā nītiyam nūtiyam*), certain principles of judicial administration, of *daṇḍanīti*, as held by Hultsch. This he must have done either by way of an improvement on the pre-existent and current maxims. If, on the other hand, we take him at his word, he himself had made and enforced several regulations of piety (*bahukāni dhammaniyamāni yāni me kaṭāni*, P.E. VII), as typified by that embodied in P.E.V. If all of them were preserved, no wonder that we would have before us a highly important and instructive treatise on politics by Aśoka. Even the solitary example preserved to us is sufficient to indicate the line of advance attempted to be made in the method and ideal of administration and the fulfilment of the king's obligations to men and animals. Thus it remains still to be seen how far the advanced ideas of governmental duties as found embodied in the subsequent Indian literature on law, polity and general morality were influenced by Aśoka's principles.

### CHAPTER III

#### BEARINGS ON DIALECTS

The official language of Aśoka presents five main dialectical varieties, namely, those at Gīrnār, Shahbazgarhī, Kalsi, Brahmagiri, and Dhāuli. The dialectical peculiarities of the language of the remaining inscriptions of Aśoka tend to belong to this or that among these five types.

The Dhāuli and Jaugada versions of the Rock Edicts, for instance, represent one identical type except for a few irregular spellings in J, e.g., *drakhati* (R.E.I), *savatra* (R. E. II) standing midway between *savata* in Dh and *savratra* in M, and *drasayitu* (R.E. IV) standing midway between *dasayitu* in Dh and *drasayitu* in Sh. In respect of dialectical peculiarities, the Dhāuli and Jaugada versions of the two Separate Rock Edicts belong to the same Dhāuli type, and as for themselves, only three phonetic discrepancies are detectable, viz., *saṃpaṭipāda*, *vipaṭipāda* (Dh), *saṃpaṭipāta*, *vipaṭipāta* (J); *desāvutike* (Dh), *desa-āyutike* (J); *hidaloka-palalokaṃ* (Dh), *hidalogam palalogam* (J), although in one instance, apparently by mistake somewhere, we get *hidalogika-pālalokikāye* in J.

Despite certain omissions, certain minor variations, and some phonetic differences the Kalsi and the Yerragudi may justly be treated as the northern and the southern version respectively of one and the same text of the Rock Edicts. The phonetic differences between the two versions lie in the marked tendency of K to lengthen the final vowel *a*, e.g., *chā* for *cha*; to spell *ke* as *kye*, e.g., *nātikye* (R.E. V); and to change sometimes the intervocal *k* into *g*, and *t* into *d*, e.g., *Aṃtiyogasa* (R.E. II, K), *pasopagani* (R. E. II, K), *hidasukhāye* (R.E. V, K). K, however, retains, the intervocal *t* unchanged in *savalokahitena* (R. E. VI). In some instances we have *g* for *k*, e.g., *Aṃtiyogasa* (R. E. II). In R. E. X, K has *palitiditu* for *palitijitu*, cf. Pali *Pasenadi*, Bharhut *Pasenaji*, *naji*, Sk. *Prasenajit*.

If we ignore, as we should, the few phonetic irregularities due to the influence of K, the dialect of Ye is the same as that of Dh and J. The same holds true even of the dialect of K barring its distinctive phonetic peculiarities. The phonetic distinction of K becomes increasingly manifest from the latter half of R. E. IX in its tendency to replace *s* by *ś* or *sh*,—a characteristic which connects its dialect with Sh and M, and lingers also in *Devānampiyashā* of the Queen's Edict on the Kauśāmbī pillar.

It will, however, be a mistake to suppose that the Rock Edicts fully represent the phonetic distinction of the dialect of Ye. On looking into the Yerraguḍi text of M. R. E., we find that it differs entirely in one respect from those of the Rock Edicts, namely, that it nowhere substitutes *l* for *r*. So far as the use of *r* goes, e. g., in *savacharam*, *ārādhetave*, it fully agrees with all the copies of M. R. E. but those at Bairāṭ and Sahasrām. It agrees also with the Sopārā version of the Rock Edicts. In *mahātpaneva* (Ye) we have an important link between the Yerraguḍi and three Mysore texts of M. R. E., while the change of *m* of *tm* into *p* is a phonetic peculiarity of the dialect of Shahbazgarhi and Manshra. In one point the three Mysore and two Hyderabad texts (Ga, Pa) differ from those of Ye and Ru, namely, that these cerebralise the dental nasal in the word *pakamanīṇena*; Ga and Pa cerebralise the dental nasal even in such words as *mānusehi* and *dāṇi*. Ignoring these few phonetic variations, the dialect of the Sopārā version of the Rock Edicts and the Mysore, Hyderabad, and Yerraguḍi versions of the Minor Rock Edict may be shown to be in agreement with that of Dhauli and Jaugaḍa. Strictly speaking, the dialect in question stands, in respect of its phonetic peculiarities, midway between the Girnār and Dhauli types.

The dialect of the Sahasrām text of M.R.E., as also that of the Bairāṭ copy, belongs entirely to the Dhauli type. The remark may apply equally to the dialect of the Bhābru or Calcutta-Bairāṭ Edict in spite of the trace of *r* in *Priyadasi*, *prasāde*, *sarve*, and doubtful *abhipretam*.

The Dhauli type covers the entire field of the dialect of the Pillar, Minor Pillar and Barābar Hill-cave inscriptions may be totally ignored. The word *vigaḍa* for *vikāṭa*,

*vikṛita* in the Lumbini pillar Inscription<sup>1</sup> is traceable in Ardhamāgadhī, and so also *chīṭhitu* for G *tīṣṭanto*, which occurs in R.E. IV (K, M, Dh).

The Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra texts of the Rock Edicts show some common phonetic peculiarities, the most striking of which is the absence of the long vowels, *ā*, *ī* and *ū*, in their orthography. All the three sibilants occur, precisely in the words that tend to keep to Sanskrit spellings. The palatal sibilant *ś* is generally substituted for *sh*, e. g., *arabhiṣaṁti*, *manuṣa*, *hapeṣati*, *hapeṣadi*. In an exceptional case *sh* is retained, e. g., *kashaṁti*=*karishyanti* (R.E. V). The Sanskrit letter *ksh* is retained in such words as *kshanati* (R.E. XII, Sh), *kshamanaye*, *kshamitaviyamate* (R.E. XII, Sh), *vraکشamiti* (R.E.V. Sh), while in the Mansehra dialect it is represented by *chh*, e. g., *ruchhani* (R.E. II), *chhanati* (R.E. XII), *chhamitave* (R.E. XIII), the exception being *mokshaye* (R.E. V).

Turning to conjoint consonants, we notice that unless there are lapses into the Dhauri *si* (which are frequent), the seventh case ending *smi* changes into *spi* in both Sh and M, e. g., *samayaspi* (R.E.I, Sh), *vraکشaspi vinitaspi uyanaspi* (R.E. VI, Sh, M); that the initial *sva*, too, changes into *spa*, e. g., *spasana* (R.E.V, Sh), *spasuna* (M), *spafra* for *svarga* (R.E. VI, Sh, M), *spamikena* for *svāmikena* (R.E. IX, Sh, M); that *st*, *śr*, and *sr* remain unchanged; that *shth* is assimilated and reduced to *ṭh*, rarely to *th*. The consonant *r*, whether employed alone or in combination with another consonant, remains unchanged. The *r* as the flag of a consonant changes into a stop, e. g., *athraye*, *savratra*, or is shifted back to be conjoined as a stop with the preceding consonant, e. g., *draśi* for *darśi*, *dhrama* for *dharma*, while the vowel *ṛi* is either changed into *ri* or *ru* or shifted on to be conjoined as *ra* with the succeeding consonant, or represented by *a*, *i*, or *u* as in the Dhauri type, e. g., *mrugo* (Sh), *mrige* (M) for *mṛigaḥ* (R.E.I); *kiṭram* for *kṛtam* (R.E. V, Sh); *viyapuṭa* for *vyāpṛita*.

All the distinctive phonetic characteristics of *Sh* but the tendency to dispense with the long vowels, *ā*, *ī*, and *ū*, are

1. It is more probable that Aśoka's *vigaḍabhī* is the old Māgadhī equivalent of Sk. *vigīatabhī* meaning 'free from fear', 'free of danger'.

scant in M, which latter shows constant learnings to the Dhauli type. In rare instances where there are vestiges of the Dhauli dialect, e. g., in R. E. V, we detect at once that the draft for M was despatched to Sh and that for Sh to M. And in instances where the two texts read alike, we are to understand that one and the same draft was prepared by mistake for both the places. Ignoring these irregularities, we may safely premise that without losing its integrity as a dialect type Sh has a greater affinity to the dialect of Girnār, and M to that of Dhauli.

There is no gainsaying the fact that the Sanskrit phonetic system has a greater hold on the dialect of Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra than on that of Girnār. But on this ground alone one should not maintain with Mookerji that "the dialect of the Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra redactions is much nearer to Sanskrit than the dialects of the other versions of the fourteen edicts." The phonetics must not be mistaken for the whole of a language. In the opinion of Michelson this dialect cannot be regarded "as a mere lineal descendant of Sanskrit, inasmuch as it presents certain forms that go to establish its affinity to Avestan rather than Sanskrit". The Avestan legacy extends as far as Girnār, and it is detectable in the hardening of *v* into *p*. Michelson offers for comparison G *susrūsā*, *susrūsātām* with Avestan *susrusemmo*, and G *srūṇāru*, *Sh* and M *srūṇeyu* with Avestan *surunaoiti*.

The Girnār type effects at first sight a happy compromise between the Shahbazgarhi and the Brahmagiri. It systematically retains the consonant *r*, and optionally *r* as a stop, e.g., *priyena*, *priyadasi*, *prajūhi*, *dhruvo*, *sarvatra*, *vrachhā*, *prādesike*, *srāvāpakam*, *mahāmātresu*, *brahmaṇa-sramaṇa*, as well as *r* as a flag e.g., *sarvatra*, *sarve*, *dasavarsābhisito*. Even the Shahbazgarhi tendency to change *r* as a flag into *r* as a stop and to conjoin it with the preceding consonant is traceable in G *bhutapruvam* (R.E. V, VI). Although in agreement with the Dhauli and Brahmagiri types it does away with the palatal and cerebral sibilants, *ś* and *sh*, in its orthography, the vestige of *sh* lingers in the conjoint consonant *st*, e.g., *tistamto* (R.E. IV), *seṣte* (R.E. IV), *uṣṭānam* (R.E. VI). The Shahbazgarhi tendency to harden *v* and *m* into *p*, undoubtedly through the intermediate *b*, is detectable in K *tpa* for *tva* and *ima* for *tpa*, e.g., *ārabhitpā* (R.E. I), *das-*

*ayitpā* (R.E. IV), *dbādasa* (R.E. IV), *ātpapāsamṇḍa* (R.E. XII). The uses of the dental and cerebral nasals are governed by the rules of Sanskrit spellings. It differs entirely from the Shahbazgarhi type as regards the tendency of the latter to dispense with the long vowels, *ā*, *ī*, and *ū*.

The language of the inscriptions of Aśoka is Prakrit, the phonetic variations of which may be broadly distinguished in terms of the following local areas: (1) Gāndhāra or North-Western, typified by Shahbazgarhi; (2) Saurāshṭra or Western, typified by Girnār; (3) Mahārāshṭra typified by Brahmagiri; (4) Haimavata Madhyadeśa or Northern Central, typified by Kalsi; and (5) Kālinga or Eastern, typified by Dhaulī.

From the grammatical point of view, however, the Eastern area extends as far north as Dehra Dun and Nepāl Terai, as far north-west as the eastern side of the Indus, as far west as Rājputānā, as far south-west as Sopārā, as far south as Northern Mysore, and as far east and south-east as Crissa. Thus viewed, such phonetic areas as the North-Western to the east of the Indus, the Western, the South-Western, the Northern Central, and the Eastern may justly be regarded as so many sub areas of the grammatical eastern area. From the phonetic point of view the Gāndhāra or North-Western area is co-extensive with the region where Kharoshṭhī was the prevalent form of alphabet. From this point of view, just as the region to the east of the Indus was the eastern extension, so Khotan was the Central Asian extension of the same area, particularly that part of Khotan where was founded a colony of the people from Gandhāra. Here indeed, in this part of Khotan and in the midst of the ruins of the Gośiṅga Vihāra, was discovered a Kharoshṭhī MS. of a recension of the Dhammapada in the Gāndhāra Prakrit influenced to certain extent by the Iranian dialects. The language of this version of the Dhammapada bears all the fundamental traits of the dialect of Shahbazgarhi despite its being three or four centuries later in age. It shows, however, a great option for interchanges between *i* and *e*, *u* and *o*, *j* and *y* to meet the exigency of metre. In it, as to some extent also in the dialect of Shahbazgarhi, one may trace certain elements of what is termed Paisācī or Apabhraṁśa Prakrit by Hemachandra.

The phonetic affinity between the dialects of Shahbaz-

garhi and Mansehra is conceivably the closest. But as one steps eastward, the further the area reached, the less marked is the vestige of the phonetic influence of Shahbazgarhi. The same linguistic phenomenon is bound to strike a person when he travels further and further south from Shahbazgarhi to Girnār and from there to Sopārā, Maski, Yerragudi, and Brahmagiri. Whilst thus the phonetic influence of Shahbazgarhi may be shown to have extended as far east and south-east as Kalsi and Kauśāmbī, the grammatical preponderance of the Eastern Prakrit goes up to Mansehra. Similarly the dialect of Shahbazgarhi may be shown to have followed the grammatical system of Girnār in the matter of declension, the few instances of irregularity having been due to confusion with the Mansehra forms.

The phonetic influence of the dialect of Girnār extends over the whole of the Mahārāshṭra area, bounded on the north by Sāñchī and Rūpnāth, on the south by Yerragudi, Brahmagiri and Gavimāth, on the west by Sopārā, and having in its centre Maski, while the dialect of the latter area follows the grammatical system of Dhauli in the matter of declension. On the eastern side Bairāt stands as the meeting place of the phonetic systems of Girnār and Dhauli with the predominance of that of the latter place.

Thus through the portals of the inscriptions of Aśoka one may have just a peep into the geographical distribution of the dialectal peculiarities of Aśokan Prakrit as well as into the interesting picture of the fluidity of the linguistic situation in which one area encroached on or partly overlapped another either in respect of the predominance of its grammatical system or in that of its phonetic influence. And it may be legitimately asked—is the nomenclature of the classified Prakrits of the Prakrit grammarians applicable to the dialectal varieties of Aśokan Prakrit ?

The linguistic date afforded by the inscriptions of Aśoka are not sufficient for the identification of any of the dialectal varieties of Aśokan Prakrit with any of the classified Prakrits of the later age.

The nominative singular case-ending *e* of all masculine and neuter stems or bases of *a* declension is the most striking grammatical characteristic of Māgadhi. Judged by



this characteristic alone, all the dialectical varieties of Aśokan Prakrit but those at Shahbazgarhi and Girnār might be termed Māgadhi. The domain of Māgadhi is apt to become narrower or more limited in area as soon as we apply its fundamental phonetic characteristic, namely, the substitution of *l* for *r*, which is missed in the dialects of Mansehra, Rūpnāth, Yerragudi (M.R.E.), Brahmagiri, Maski, Gavi-maṭh, Pālkiguṇḍu, and Sopārā. Similarly the substitution of *ś* for *s* which is another important phonetic characteristic of Māgadhi is wanting in all the inscriptions of Aśoka but those at Kalsi, Shahbazgarhi, Mansehra, Bairāt and Maski, where, too, it is rather an exception than a rule, e.g., *śe=se* (K, R.E., XI), *śiyā* (K, R.E. XII), *pāśaḍa=pāśamḍa* (K, R.E. XII); *manuśanaṃ* (Sh, R.E. II), *muniśanaṃ* (M, R.E. II) : *anapeśamti* (Sh, R.E. III), *anapayīśati* (M, R.E. III), *anuśasiśamti* (Sh, M, R.E. IV) ; *śvage=svage,=svargaḥ* (Bai, M.R.E.); *budhaśake=budha (upā)śake* (Maski, M.R.E.). I say rather an exception, because from the latter half of R.E. IX the prevailing tendency of Kalsi is to cerebralise the dental and palatal sibilants, the general tendency of Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra being to employ all the three sibilants precisely as in Sanskrit; the instance cited from Maski is doubtful, and that from Bairāt solitary.

In Māgadhi *dy* and *dhy* invariably become *yy* and *yyh* respectively. As for the change of *dy* into *yy*, it nowhere occurs in the dialect types of Aśokan Prakrit but in words where *dy* happens to be preceded by *u*, e.g., *uyānesu* (G, R.E. VI), *uyānasi* (Dh, J, K, Ye), *uyanaspī* (Sh, M.), and *uyāma=udyama* (K, R.E. XIII). But, as a rule, *dy* and *dhy* become *j* (*jj*) and *jh* (*jjh*) respectively in Aśokan Prakrit e.g., *aja=adya* (R.E. I, R.E. IV), *majham=madhyam* (S.R. E. I), *majhamena, majhimena=madhyamena* (R.E. XIV).

In Māgadhi *ry* and *rj* invariably become *yy*. In Aśokan Prakrit the change of *rj* into *yy* is exemplified by *ayaputasa=āryaputrasya* (M.R.E., Bra, Si, Ja), which is however, a solitary instance. The Aśokan texts are wanting in words indicating the phonetic change of *rj*.

In Māgadhi the initial *y* remains and replaces *j*. The Aśokan Prakrit affords no instance where the initial *j* is re-

placed by *y*. *Y* is represented by *e* invariably at Sahasrām and Sārnāth and optionally at Dhauli, Jaugada, Kalsi, Yeragudi, Bairāt, Delhi, Mīrāth, Kausāmbī, Lauriya Ararāj, Lauriya Nandangarh, Rāmpūrva, and Mansehra, e.g., *am*=*yam* (M.R.E., Sa), *ya*, *am*=*yam* (Bai), *e*=*yaḥ* (Sārnāth), *adā*=*yadā* (R.E.I, Dh, J), *e*=*yaḥ* (R. E. II, Dh, J), *am*=*yam* (R.E. IV, K, M), etc. In the solitary instance of *āva*=*yāvat*, the initial *ya* is represented by *a* or *ā* in all the versions of the Rock Edicts.

In Māgadhi *ny*, *ny*, *jñ*, and *ñj* become *ññ*. The change of *jñ* into *ñ* (*ññ*) is a distinctive feature of the dialects of Gīrnār and Brahmagiri, and occasionally of those of Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra, e.g., *rāññā*=*rājñā* (R. E. I, G), *rañno*=*rājnah* (R.E. I, Sh), *ñatika*, *ñatika*=*jñatikaḥ* (R. E. V, G, Sh), *ñatika*=*jñatikaḥ* (R.E. V, M), *ñatikesu* (M.R.E., Bra), *kataññatā*=*kṛitajñatā* (R. E. VII, G), *kitrañata* (Sh) *kitāñata* (M).

Gīrnār and Shahbazgarhi invariably change *ny*, and *ex hypothesi* also *ny*, into *ñ* (*ññ*) ; Mansehra does so mostly.

In Māgadhi *shṭa*, *shṭh* become *ṣta*. or *ṣta*. These Māgadhi characteristics are paralleled nowhere in Aśokan Prakrit but at Gīrnār, e.g., *Riṣṭika* (R.E. V) for *Riṣṭika*, and *nistānāya* (R.E. IX) for *nishṭhānāya*, *tistānto* for *tishṭhantaḥ* (R.E. IV).

In Māgadhi, precisely as in Sanskrit and all other classified Prakrits but Ardhamāgadhi, the only infinitive suffix is *tum* or its Prakrit equivalent, while it is invariably *tave* in Aśokan Prakrit.

In Māgadhi *rth* becomes *st* or *st*, which is nowhere the case with Aśokan prakrit.

The predominant tendency of Māgadhi is to cerebralise the dental nasal, while just the opposite is the tendency of Aśokan prakrit at all places with the exception of Gīrnār, Shahbazgarhi, Mansehra, Mysore and Hyderabad. The general tendency of Gīrnār, Shahbazgarhi, Mansehra, Hyderabad and Mysore is to use the cerebral nasal *ṇ* in the right place precisely as in Sanskrit. The only exception to be noted at Gīrnār is *darsana*, *dasane* for *darsana* (R.E.IV). A similar exception is met with in the Mysore and Hyderabad copies of M.R.E., and that in the word *pakamamiṇena*, *pakamamīnena*.

The Māgadhī locative singular suffix is *ssim*, while the Aśokan Prakrit makes use of *mhi* at Girnār, of *spi* at Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra, and *si* at all other places.

The instances cited above may suffice to establish that none of the Aśokan dialects is wholly identical with the Māgadhī of the Prakrit grammarians.

Ardhamāgadhī of the verse portions of the Śvetāmbara Jaina Canon agrees fully with the dialect of Girnār and mostly with that of Shahbazgarhi in the nominative singular in *o*, while that of the prose portions of the same Canon agrees with the rest of Aśokan dialects in the nominative singular in *e*.

On the whole, Ardhamāgadhī agrees with the Aśokan dialects at Girnār, Shahbazgarhi, Mansehra, Sopārā, Brahmagiri, Maski, Gavīnaṭh, Rūpnāth, and Yerragudi ( M. R. E. ) in the retention of *r*. It is, however, wanting in the use of *r* as a flag and *r* as a stop.

The gerund *tūna* or *ūna* which is frequently used in the Ardhamāgadhī verses is paralleled only in the word *abhivādetūnam* of Aśoka's Bhābru Edict found at Bairāt.

The Ardhamāgadhī use of *ttu* or *ṭtu* as a gerund is a common characteristic of all the Aśokan dialects but that at Garnār e.g., *kaṭu=kr̥itvā* (S.R.E.I, Dh), *palitijitu=parityaktvā* (R.E.X, Dh, J, Ye), Ardhamāgadhī prefers *ttae* to *um* (*tum*) as an infinitive suffix, while *tave* is the only suffix for the infinitive in Aśokan Prakrit. Both *ttae* and *tave* correspond undoubtedly to the Vedic suffix *tave*, *taveṅ* or *taven* (Pāṇini, III. 4.9.)

The Ardhamāgadhī locative singular suffix *ṃsi* is missed in Aśokan Prakrit. The *si* of Aśokan Prakrit corresponds better to *ssi* of Śauraseni and *ssim* of Māgadhī.

The Ardhamāgadhī dative in *āe* (*āye*) is abundantly used in all the Aśokan dialects but those at Girnār, Mysore and Hyderabad.

Ardhamāgadhī does not sometimes retain the initial *y*, e. g., *ahā=yathā*. But its predominant tendency is to replace the initial *y* by *j*, e. g., *jahā=yathā*, *jāva=yāvat*. It also changes *yy* into *jj*, e. g., *sejja=sayya*, Pali *seyya*.

Ardhamāgadhī not only retains the dental sibilant *s* but replaces by it the palatal and cerebral sibilants, precisely as in Pali. This is paralleled in all the Aśokan dialects but

those at Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra; certain exceptions to the rule are to be noticed also at Kalsi and Kauśāmbi, e. g., *Devānāmpiyashā* ( R. E. XIII. K, Queen's Edict ), *shumeyu*, *shamavāye* ( R. E. XII, K ), *siyā - syāt* ( R. E. XII, K ).

Aśoka's *chīḥṭitu* (R.E. IV, Dh, J, K, M) corresponds to the Ardhamāgadhī *chīḥṭhittā*. The Ardhamāgadhī *damsaṇa* for *darśana* has its parallel in the Gīrnār *darśaṇā*, *dasāṇā* (R.E. IV).

The Ardhamāgadhī retention of *r* is a common characteristic of the Aśokan dialects at Gīrnār, Sopārā, Mysore, Hyderabad, Rūpnāth, Shahbazgarhi, and Mansehra, as also in the dialect of the Yerragudi copy of M.R.E. But Ardhamāgadhī dispenses with *r* as a flag and *r* as a stop.

The dominant tendency of Ardhamāgadhī to cerebralise the dental nasal is lacking in all the Aśokan dialects but those at Gīrnār, Mysore and Hyderabad; even at the last mentioned three places, the cerebralisation of *n* is rather an exception than a rule.

Aśokan Prakrit agrees with Ardhamāgadhī in so far as the latter language retains *v* in all cases of assimilation, e. g., *save = sarve*, Pali *sabbe* (R.E. VII, G, K, Dh, J).

Like Ardhamāgadhī and Pali, Aśokan Prakrit, employs *siya*, *siya* (Sh, M), *shiyā*, *siyā* for *syāt*.

Ardhamāgadhī has its future form in *hiti* for *syati*, and in *hisi* for *syasi*. These two as archaic forms occur in Pali *gāthās*, e. g., in *hohiti*, *hohisi*. The future form in *siti* for *syati* is met with in the Mysore, Hyderabad, Rūpnāth and Yerragudi dialects of M.R.E., e. g., *vaḥhisiti = vaḥhisati* (Sa, Bai).

The instances cited above are enough, I think, to establish that the phonetic and grammatical characteristics of any of the Aśokan dialects are not wholly identical with those of Ardhamāgadhī.

Turning to Śauraseni, we may note that it agrees with Ardhamāgadhī of the verse portions of the Jaina Canon in its retention of *r*, in having the nominative singular in *o*, in the use of the single sibilant *s*, in the cerebralisation of even the initial *n*, and in the replacement of the initial *y* by *j*. So far as these characteristics go, the reader is referred

to the observations made in connexion with Ardhamāgadhī.

The Śaurasēnī and Magadhī *idha* for *iha* is a phonetic peculiarity of the dialect of Gīrnār.

The Śaurasēnī tendency to change the intervocal hard mute *t* into *d* is accidentally met with in the dialects of Kalsi, Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra in the word *hidasukhāye*, *hidasukhaye* (R.E. V). Elsewhere, even these three dialects have *hita* for *hita*.

The locative singular in *si* which occurs in all the Aśokan dialects but those of Gīrnār and Shahbazgarhi is identical with the alternative Śaurasēnī suffix *ssi*.

In Śaurasēnī *vāvuḍa* stands for SK. *vyāpṛita*, a characteristic which is missed in Aśokan Prakrit, cf. *vyāpaṭa* (R.E. V, G), *viyapuṭa* (R.E. V, Sh), *viyāpaṭa* (R. E. V, K, Dh; P. E. VII, DT).

The Śaurasēnī change of *stha* into *chitṭha*, is paralleled by the Aśokan *chitṭhitu* (R.E. IV, K, Dh). But nowhere in Aśokan dialects *eva* changes into *jjeva*.

The instances need not be multiplied. Those cited above are enough to indicate that none of the Aśokan dialects is wholly identifiable with Śaurasēnī.

In Pāisāchi *hī jñ* and *ny* become *ññ*, e. g., *viññāna* = *vijñāna*, *kaññā* - *kanya*. These two special characteristics of Pāisāchi are traceable in the Aśokan dialects of Gīrnār and Shahbazgarhi. The change of *ch* into *j*, such as in *rāchā* for *rājā*, may be illustrated by the Aśokan *Kambocha* for *Kamboja* (R. E. V, Dh). Similarly *tāna* as a substitute for the gerund *kṛtvā* has its Aśokan parallel in *abhivādetuñam* for *abhivādetvā* (Bl. 5.10). But nowhere in Aśokan dialects *iva* becomes *piva* or *rji* (as in *rjkhara*) becomes *chchh*.

Just as in Mahārāshṭrī, so in the Aśokan dialects of the Mahārāshṭra, Gīrnār and Shahbazgarhi areas *l* is not substituted for *r*. The first case in *o* of *a*-declension is the usual form of declension at Gīrnār, Sopārā and Shahbazgarhi. The Mahārāshṭrī tendency to use *n* in the right place as in Sanskrit is also the characteristic of the Aśokan dialects of the above areas. But there is no instance in Aśokan Prakrit where the initial *n* is cerebralised as in Mahārāshṭrī. Simi-

larly there are several other characteristics of Mahārāshṭrī that are missed.

The historical position thus made out of Asokan dialects in relation to later Prakrits is in no way new. It has been elaborately discussed by Senart and clearly outlined by Woolner. The new point stressed in the foregoing discussion is the broad demarcation of five phonetic subdivisions within two main grammatical divisions.

It will be seen that the typical Asokan Prakrit as an official language is standardised in the diction of the Seven Pillar Edicts. This Prakrit diction was developed evidently within that portion of Northern India which is known to the Buddhists as the Middle Country. Call it Eastern Dialect or Prakrit if you please. It cannot be wholly identified with the Māgadhī of the Prakrit grammarians, and yet one cannot help thinking that it is a form of Old Māgadhī, which is presupposed by the Pali Canonical texts, I mean, that form which the Pali Canon preserves while reproducing certain philosophical doctrines, particularly those ascribed to the six Tittihas or Tirthaṅkaras including Mahāvīra.<sup>1</sup> Ardhamāgadhī, the language of the Śvetāmbara Canon, shows a grammatical as well as a phonetic blending of the standard Aśokan Prakrit and the Aśokan dialect of the Mahārāshṭra area as defined above. Whether or no there ever existed a Buddhist Canon in that Old Māgadhī is still problematical. No inference should be definitely drawn as to the existence of such a Canon from the titles of seven texts (Bhābru Edict), though they are accidentally all in Old Māgadhī. As the Vinaya Chullavagga attests, the *Buddhavachana* was being studied, preserved and orally handed down at different centres, even in the life-time of the Buddha, by his followers recruited from different localities, races, social grades and families. There was reason for apprehension that the *Buddhavachana* might become distorted unless it was put in Vedic language (to *Chhandas*, Lit., language of the Vedic hymns). From a significant statement of the Buddha occurring in the Aranavibhaṅga Sutta (Majjhima-N., III), it is clear that different provincial words

---

1. Barua, *The Ājivikas*, Journal of the Department of Letters, G. U., Vol. II. pp. 46-49.

were used, such *patta*, *vittha*, *poṇa*, *dhūropa*, *sarāva*, to denote one and the same thing or object, such as a pot or bowl. Affiliated into a single language, they would serve as synonyms. The local variants in Aśokan Prakrit, such as *mahidāyo* (R. E. IX, G), *ithi* (Dh), *striyaka* (Sh), *abakajanika* (M), *abakajaniyo* (K), suggest not only the local currency of a certain word but also the local phonetic variation of one and the same word.

Thus, in spite of the received common traditional formulations of the Buddhavachana, it is most probable that there existed several local recensions of texts showing variations in matter, diction, grammar and phonetics. In the matter of codification and antiquity the Pali Canon is certainly entitled to highest respect. The language of this authoritative recension has not only the Vedic Sanskrit in its background but also presupposes a definite dialectical basis. One may hold without much fear of contradiction that a clear idea of the main dialectical basis of Pali may be formed from the diction of the Girnār version of Aśoka's Rock Edicts. I am not prepared to call that basis either Śaurāsenī,<sup>1</sup> Paisāchī<sup>2</sup> or Mahārāshṭrī, for to do so would be to put the cart before the horse. In order to get a true insight into what was in the background one must not argue back but forward : given such a dialectical basis, we can account for the possibility of the development of Pali, and subsequently of the development of Śaurāsenī, Paisāchī and Mahārāshṭrī.

---

1. Professor S. K. Chatterji inclines to think that in respect of morphology and phonology there is a good deal of similarity between Pali and Śaurāsenī. *Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*. p. 54.

2. Dr. N. Dutt argues in favour of Paisāchī. *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism*, p. 256ff.

## CHAPTER IV

### PHRASEOLOGY AND STYLE

The records of Aśoka are remarkable for their homely diction in prose. It follows a law of rhythm and cadence of its own and combines the sincerity of purpose with the dignity of expression. It is enlivened throughout by the noblest sentiment of a wellmeaning heart, and vivid with the grandest vision of a righteous world of ceaseless activity promoting the cause of piety and promising the attainment of the desired object here and of a grand heaven hereafter. It conveys the lofty message of an enlightened seer of eternal good and happiness, and serves as a fitting vehicle of sparkling thoughts of a highly sensitive and practical mind. Its pathos is well-suited to its theme, and its appeal goes direct into the heart. The epigraphs read as so many autobiographical sketches of Aśoka. In going through them one is apt to feel that they were written either to his dictation or, at any rate, under his direction. Thus they are intended to reproduce and preserve the very words of the Maurya emperor. So far as their phraseology and style go, they are very closely related to the Pali Discourses of the Buddha. There is no other recorded literary tradition which so wonderfully fits in with them. And this alone may suffice to indicate that none was, perhaps, more steeped in the knowledge of the *Buddhavachana* than Aśoka, that none drank deeper at that fountain of inspiration.

The first point of similarity between the Buddha's Pali Discourses and Aśoka's Prakṛit Epigraphs is the race between the statement in first person and that in third. The redactor's or editor's part in both is to substitute third person for first for converting a direct narration into an indirect one. The first person remains intact in both where the received words of mouth are sought to be faithfully reproduced or preserved. In both, the stress is laid on the authoritative *vachana*, *sāsana*, and *anusathi* (Pali *anusatthi*, *anusitthi*) :



## Buddhavachana

## Aśokavachana

mama vachanena te bhikkhū āmanteli  
( Majjhima, I, pp. 258, 321 )

Tathāgato āha, Bhagavā etad avo-  
cha ( Dīgha, III, p. 181 )

Bhagavato arahato sammāsambud-  
dhassa.

Devānañpiyashā vachanena savata  
mahāmātū vataviyā (Queen's Edict )

Devānañpriyo...hevañ āha, etañ  
Devānañpiye hevañ āha. (R. E. III,  
P.E. VII).

iyañ sāsane (Schism Pillar, Sārnāth )  
Devānañpriyasa priyadasino rāñō  
(R. E. I).

The protocol of the Bhābru Edict literally conforms to the conventional form of courtesy met with in Pali :

Rājā Māgadho Ajātasattu Vedehi-  
putto Bhagavantañ abhivādetvā  
Bhikkhusaṅghassa añjaliñ pañāmetvā  
appābhadhañ...phāsuvihārañ puch-  
chati, also appābādhatāñ (Kaka-  
chupama Sutta, Majjhima I).

Piyadasi lājā Māgadhe Sañghañ  
abhivādetūnañ āha apābādhatāñ cha  
phāsuvihālatañ cha ( Bhābru ).

In M. R. E. (Bra), Aśoka directs the Viceroy-in-Council to observe the conventional courtesy in officially forwarding a copy of his proclamation to the *Mahāmātras* of Isila. Here the form is implied in the order : *ārogyaṃ vataviyā*, "health is to be inquired of, health is to be wished." The inquiry of health and comfort and welfare was made, as a matter of course, in all greetings of civility exchanged between two persons of distinct social rank or religious status. The oft-recurring Pali description is : *sammodaniyañ kathaṃ sārāṇiyañ vitisāretvā*, "having exchanged the greetings of civility." This corresponds to the Sanskrit *kuśalapraśnam uktvā* ( Rāmāyaṇa, Araṇya, XII. 26 ). Buddhaghosa explains the word *sammodi* (greeted) as meaning such personal inquiries as *kachchi bhoto.. appābādhañ...phāsuvi- hāro ti*. But exactly corresponding to Aśoka's *ārogyaṃ vataviyā*, we have in Buddhaghosa's *Papañchasūdanī* : *mama vachanena punappunañ ārogyaṃ pucchhitvā 'rājā tumhehi saddhiñ mittabhavañ ichchhatī 'ti vadatha*.

One must note that *arogyo preseti*, *arogyā pariprochati* is the usual conventional form of courtesy with the Kharo-shthī documents of Khotan. Strangely enough, Kauṭilya's *śāsanādhikāra* prescribes no such convention.

The *Buddhavachana* and *Asokavachana* show a very close correspondence as regards the construction of sentences, so much so that one cannot help regarding the former as the literary basis of the latter :

BV	AV
'Idha Tathāgato jāto' ti saddhassa kulaputtassa dassanī- yam thānam ( Dīgha, II, p, 140 ).	'Hida Budhe jāte Sakyamunī' ti silā vigaḍabhi chā kālāpita.  'Hida Bhagavaṃ jāte' ti. ( Lum- binī Pillar ).
Asmīn pradese Bhagavaṃ jātaḥ ( Divyā., p. 390 ).	Esa me huthā:...se kinasu jane anupaḥipajeyā, kinasu jane anulū- pāyā dhammavaḍḍhiyā vaḍḍheyā ti. P. E. VII ).
Tassa mayham etad ahoṣi : Kin nu kho aham aññadatthu bhaya- pāṭikankhī viharāmi...tathābhūto va bhayabheravaṃ paṭivineyyan ti ( Majjhīma, I, Bhayabherava ( Sutta ).	

The influence of the Pali *gāthās* on the diction of *Asokavachana* is traceable in the mannerism of the latter in inculcating the principles of piety. The *Sādhu Sutta*, quoted in R. E. IX, is undoubtedly the main Canonical authority. But the mannerism is not restricted to the stanzas of this Sutta, as will appear from the following citation from the *Dhammapada* :

BV	AV
kāyena saṃvaro sādhu sādhu vāchāya saṃvaro ( Dh. p. 361 ).	sādhu mātrai cha pitari cha susūsā, bṛāhmaṇa- s(ri)amaṇānam sādhu dānam, prāṇānam sādhu anārambho, apavyayatā apabhamdatā sādhu
dhammaladdhassa pi sādhu dānam ( Saṃyutta, I, p. 21 )	

The Pali prose discourses typified by the *Kinti Sutta* ( R. E. III, Majjhīma-N. III ) may be shown to have influenced the mannerism of *Asokavachana* in stating the purpose of an action by *kinti* ( Sk. *kimiti* ), 'what for', put in the middle of a sentence :

BV

*Yam pi Tathāgato . . . .*  
*pubbe manusabhūto*  
*samāno bahuno*  
*janassa atthakāmo*  
*ahosi hitakāmo*  
*. . . . kinti me saddhāya*  
*vaddheyyum. dhammeṇa*  
*vaddheyyum (Dīgha, III, p. 164)*

AV

*Ya cha kiṃchi*  
*parākrāmāmi ahaṃ*  
*kiṃti bhūtānaṃ*  
*ānaṃnaṃ gacchheyaṃ,*  
*idha cha nāni*  
*sukhāpayāmi paratra*  
*cha svagaṃ*  
*ārādhayaṃtu (R.E. VI.)*

The *Aśokavachana* employs several technical terms that are characteristically Buddhist and were evidently drawn from the *Buddhavachana* :

BV

*saṃvaṭṭa-kappā (Dīgha, I, p. 81)*  
*sukata-dukkaṭa (Dīgha, I, p. 55)*  
*apalibodha*  
*vītagedho, agiddho*  
*dhammādhiṭṭhānaṃ (Netti)*  
*sambodhi (J. IV, p. 236)*  
*dhammadānaṃ (Dhp. 354)*  
*dhammānuggaho (Ang. I, p. 78)*  
*samachariyā (Ang., I, p. 55)*  
*dhammena abhivijīya (Dīgha, III,*  
*p. 51)*  
*suvihitānaṃ (Thera., p. 75)*  
*majjhena,*  
*majjhimā paṭipadā*  
*assuropa (Vibhanga, p. 357)*  
*kilamatho*  
*saṃghaṃ saraṇaṃgato*  
*saṃghaṃ upayantu*  
*(Dīpava, VI. 58)*  
*porāṇiyyā pakati (J. VI. p. 151)*

AV

*saṃvaṭa-kapā (R.E., IV, V)*  
*sukataṃ dukataṃ (R.E. V)*  
*apalibodha (R.E. V)*  
*aparigodha (R.E. V)*  
*dhammādhiṭṭhāne (R.E. V)*  
*sambodhi (R.E. VIII)*  
*dhammadānaṃ (R.E. IX, XI)*  
*dhammānuggaho (R.E. XI)*  
*samachaliyaṃ (R.E. XIII)*  
*dhammavijayo (R.E. XIII)*  
  
*suvihitānaṃ (R.E. XIII)*  
  
*majhaṃ paṭipādayema (S. R. E. I)*  
*āsulope (S.R.E. I)*  
*kilamathe (S.R.E. I)*  
*saṃghe upayite (M. R.E.)*  
  
*porāṇā pakiti (M.R.E., Ye)*

*yoggūchariyo* (Majjhima, I p. 12.)  
*Satthu-gāravatā*

*Dhamma-gāravatā*  
*Saṅgha-gāravatā*  
(Ang., IV, p. 28)

*Buddhe Dhamme*

*Saṅghe avechchappasādo*

(Ang., I, p. 222)

*saddhammo chiratthitiko hoti* (Ang.,  
III, p. 247)

*dhamma-pariyāyo*

*Vinaya* (Ang., I, p. 98f.)

*Ariyavaṁsā* (Digha, III, p. 224)

*Anāgata-bhayāni* (Ang., III, p. 103ff.)

*bhikkhu bhikkhūṇi*

*upāsaka upāsikā*

*dhammaniyāmatā*

*anuposathe* (Vinaya Mahāvagga, II.,  
4. 36)

*pachchuggamanam* (J. IV, p. 321)

*saddhāpadāna* (Ang., V, p. 337)

*saṅgham samuggam karoti* (Ang., V,  
p. 74)

*saṅgham bhindati* (Vinaya, II, p.  
198)

*yūgyāchariyāni* (M. R.E., Ye)

*Budhasi Dhammasi Saṅghasi*  
*gālāve chaṁ pasāde cha* (Bhābru)

*sadhamme chilaṭṭhitike hosati*  
(Bhābru)

*dhammapaliyāyāni* (pl.) (Bhābru)

*Vinaya-samukase* (Bhābru)

*Aliyavasāni* (Bhābru)

*Anāgata-bhayāni* (Bhābru)

*bhikkhu bhikkhuni* (Bhābru, Schism  
Pillar)

*upāsaka upāsikā* (Bhābru)

*dhammaniyame* (P.E. VII)

*anuposatham* (P.E. V, Schism Pillar,  
Sārṇāth)

*pachupagamanam* (P.E. VII)

*dhammāpadāna* (P.E. VII)

*saṅghe samage kaṭe* (Schism Pillar)

*saṅgham bhākhati* (Schism Pillar)

In many instances Aśoka's sentence or clause just puts in prose order a Pali saying in verse :

BV

*devatānam piyo ahuṁ*

(Apadāna, Pilindavachcha)

*Dhamme ṭhito ajjave*

*maddave sato* (Sutta-nipāta, 250)

*Yo pubbe katakalyāṇo akā lokesu*

*dukkaram* (j. III, p. 12)

*pubbangamo sucharitesu*

(Digha, iii, p. 169)

AV

*Devānampiyo* (R. E. III)

*Dhammamhi silamhi*

*tiṣṭanto* (R.E. V).

*Yo ādikaro kalāṇasa so dukkaram*  
*karoti* (R.E.V).

*Ta mayā bahukalāṇaṃ katāṃ; me*

*Katā me kalyāṇā*

*anekarūpā* (J. V. p. 491)

*pāpaṃ pāpena sukaraṃ*

*sādhuṃ pāpena dukkaruṃ*

(Chullavagga. vii)

*ṣaddhāya pi sādhu*

*dānaṃ* (Saṃyutta. I, p. 21)

*Dhammaladdhassa pi*

*sādhu dānaṃ* (Saṃyutta. I, p. 21)

*Pāṇesu sādhu saṃyamo* (Saṃyutta,

I, p. 21)

*Sabbadānaṃ dhammadānaṃ*

*jināti* (Dhp. 354)

(*No hi mangale kiñcanaṃ*)

*atthi saccaṃ* (J. V. p. 78)

*Yasmiṃ kataññutā natthi*

(Javasakuṇa J.)

*Yathā pitā athavā pi mātā*

*anukampakā atthakāmā pajānaṃ |*

*Evameva no hotu ayaṃ cha rājā,*

*mayam pi hessāma tatheva puttā ||*

(J. V. p. 504)

*Nattano samakaṃ kiñchi*

*atirekaṃ cha maññisaṃ*

(Theragā., 424)

*Esā te porāṇiyā pakati*

(J. VI, p. 151)

*Yaṃ kiñchi subhāsitaṃ*

*sabbaṃ taṃ (paṇ) assa |*

*Bhagavato vachanaṃ sammā-*

*sambuddhassa ||* (Ang., IV, p. 164)

*bahuni kayānāni katāni*

(R.E. V, P.E. II).

*Sukaraṃ hi pāpam,*

*Papaṃ hi sukaraṃ* (R.E.V.)

*Kalāṇaṃ dukaraṃ* (R.E.V.)

*sadhu d(ā)na iti, dāne sādhu*

*ti* (R.E. IX).

*B(r)āhmaṇānaṃ*

*sādhu dānaṃ* (R. E. III).

*Pāṇesu sayamo sādhu* (R.E. IX).

*Na tu etārisaṃ asti dānaṃ*

*yārisaṃ dhammadānaṃ* (R.E. IX).

*nirathaṃ maṅgalaṃ* (R.E. IX)

*Yasa nāsti. . . kataññatā* (R.E. VII).

*Athā pi(ā) hevaṃ ne lājā*

*ti, atha atānaṃ*

*anukampati hevaṃ apheni*

*anukampati; athā pajā*

*hevaṃ maye lājine*

(S. R. E. II).

*Duāhale imasa kammaṃ sama, kute*

*mane atileke* (S. R. E. I, J).

*Esā porāṇā pakiti* (M.R.E. Ja, Ye)

*E kechi Bhagavatā*

*Budhena bhāsīte sarve*

*se' subhāsīte va* (Bhābru)

*Tañ cha arahāmi vattave*

(J. III, p. 309)

*vaḍḍha'eva suve suve* (J. V, p. 507)

*Sachche cha dhamme cha dame*

*cha saṃyame |*

*socheyya-silālayuposathesu cha||*

*Dānaṃ silaṃ paṛichchāgaṃ*

*ajjavaṃ maddavaṃ taṇṇaṃ*

(Dīgha, III, p. 147)

*sussūsā cha garūnaṃ* (Theragāthā,  
verse 369)

*Alahāmi hakaṃ taṇṇaṃ*

*vāṭave* (Bhābru).

*suve suve vaḍḍhitā* (P.E., I)

*Dāya dāne sachche sochave*

*mādave sādhave* (P.E., VII).

*guruna sūrusa* (R.E., XIII).

The legacy of the older Pali gāthās is palpable in the diction of *Aśokavachana*. First, the use of *re* as an *ātmanepada* verbal suffix (3rd person, plural) is one of the archaisms met with in the Pali gāthās. This occurs as a regular form in the dialect of Gīrnār :

## PG

*dissare, vijjare, jāyare,*  
*miyyare bhavissare, vinibujjhare*

## GD

*ārabhare, ārabhisare* (R.E.I.);  
*anuvatare* (R.E., XIII), *anuvatisare*  
(R.E., V).

The Vedic infinitive *tave* which is met with here and there in the ancient Pali gāthās is found to be a regular form in Aśokan Prakrit. This suffix is totally discarded in Pali prose and in all later Prakrits. The correspondence in this respect between the *Buddhavachana* in verse and the *Aśokavachana* in prose may be illustrated as follows :

## BV

*vattave, netave,*  
*dātave, pahātave*

## AV

*vātave* (Bhābru), *bhetave*  
(Schism Pillār), *nijhapayitave*  
(P.E. IV), *chhamitave, khamitavo*  
(R.E. XIII).

The two archaic forms of expression are met with alike in the old Pali gāthās and the *Aśokavachana* :

<i>kenassu nivuto loko</i>		<i>kinasu jane (su=suid) (P.E., VII).</i>
(Sutta-nipāta, verse 1032)		
<i>kimchchhando kimadhippāyo</i>		<i>kimchhamde, kichhamde (S.R.E., II).</i>
(J.V, p. 3)		
<i>samūhatāse (Sutta-nipāta, verse 4)</i>		<i>viiyāpaṭāse (P.E. VII).</i>

Certain archaic future forms of the verbs *kṛi* (to do), *hu* (to be), and *dā* (to give) are features of both the old Pali gāthās and the *Aśokavachana* :

(1) √*kṛi* (to do)

<i>kāhati, kāhanti, kāhasi,</i>		<i>kāsati (R.E., V), kachati (P.E., II),</i>
<i>kāhatha, kāhāmi, kāhāma</i>		<i>kachhamti (R.E., V), kachhāmi,</i>
		<i>kashami (R.E., IX).</i>

(2) *hu* (to be)

<i>hessati (hohiti), hessanti (hohinti),</i>		<i>hosati (Bhābru), hōsāmi (S.R.E., II),</i>
<i>hessasi (hohisi), hessatha (hohitha),</i>		<i>hohamti (P.E., VII).</i>
<i>hessāmi (hohimi), hessāma (hohima)</i>		
<i>hessam (Theragāthā, verse 1100)</i>		<i>husam (M.R.E.)</i>

(2) √*da* (to give)

<i>padāhisi (Theragāthā, verse 303)</i>		<i>dāhamti (P.E., IV)</i>
---	--	---------------------------

As for the correspondence in phrases and idioms, the following instances may be cited for comparison .

BV

*Chha kho ādinavā samajjābhicharaṇe*  
(Dīgha, III, p. 183)  
*ekachcho samaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā*  
(Brahmajāla Sutta)  
*sādhusammato bahujanassa*  
(Dīgha, I, p. 49)

AV

*bahukam hi dosam samājamhi*  
(R.E., I).  
*ekachā samājā* (R.E., I).  
*sādhumatā Devānampriyasa* (R.E., I)

*mago vā moro vā;*

(Majjhima, I, p. 20)

*so nichcho dhuvo*

*vijite* (J., I, p. 262)

*Brahmadatto nāma Kāśīrājā* (Vinaya Mahāvagga, Ch. X)

*osadhā* (Sutta-nipāta, verse 296)

*Rajjuko* (J., II, p. 367)

*anusaññāyamāna,*

*anusaññātum* (Ang. I, p. 68)

*babubhaṇḍa* (Vinaya, III, p. 138)

*atthato cha byanjanato cha*

*tīni saṁvachchharāni atikkantāni*

(J., II, p. 128)

*digham antaram* (Pctav., I, 10)

*bījagāma-bhūtagāmasamārambha,*

*pasūnam cha samārambho* (Dīgha, I,

P. 5)

*pasūnam samārambhā* (Sutta-nipāta, 311)

*gihino vā pabbajitassā vā sammāpaṭi-*  
*patti* (Saṁyutta, XLIV, 24)

*vihimsā, avihimsā* (Dīgha, III, p. 215;

Vibhanga, 86, 363)

*ahimsā sabbabhūtesu*

*vimānadassi* (Sutta-nipāta, 887)

*visūka-dassana* (Dīgha-N. I)

*dhammaghosako* (Dhp. A., III, p. 81)

*dhammabheri* (Milinda, p. 21)

*aggikkhandha* (Vinaya, I, p. 26)

*dibbāni rūpāni* (Dīgha, I, p. 153)

*dussilassa* (Dīgha, III, p. 235)

*kāmesu yuñjatha* (Theragāthā, 346)

*hāni* (Ang., I, p. 434)

*mā saṅghabhedo ruchchiltha* (Bhik-  
khu Pātimokkha)

*dvo morā eko mago* (R.E., I)

*so pi mago na dhruvo* (R.E., I)

*vijite* (R.E., II)

*Amūtiyoko nāma Yonalājā* (R.E., II).

*osadhāni* (R.E., II)

*Rajjuko* (R.E., III, P.E., IV, P.E., VII,  
M. R. E. Ye)

*anusaññānam* (R.E., III)

*apubhaṇḍatā* (R.E., III)

*hetuto cha byañjanato cha* (R.E. III)

*atikātaṁ añitarāni* (R.E. IV)

*prāyārambho* (R.E. IV)

*nātināni saṁpaṭipati br(ā)mhaṇa-*  
*samañānam saṁpaṭipati* (R.E. IV)

*vihimsā, avihimsā* (R.E. IV)

*avihimsā bhūtānam* (R.E. IV)

*vimāna-darsana* (R.E. IV)

*dhammaghosō* (R.E., IV)

*bherighosō* (R.E. IV)

*aggikkhandhāni* (R.E., IV)

*divyāni rūpāni* (R.E., IV)

*aṣīlāsa* (R.E., IV)

*vadhi yuñjantu* (R.E., IV)

*hini* (R.E., IV)

*hini cha mā alochayisu* (R.E., IV)



*moneyyam dukkaram* (Sutta-nipāta, 701)

*ādikammiko, pubbakāri, pubbaṅgamo*  
*sucharitesu* (Vinaya, III, p. 116)

*silālayuposathesu* (Dīgha, III, p. 147)

*Yona-Kambojesu* (Majjhima, II, p. 149)

*raṭṭhikassa pettanikassa*  
*Yona-Kambojesu aññesu cha pach-*  
*chantimesu janapadesu* (Majjhima,  
II, p. 149)

*brāhmaṇibbhesu* (J. VI, p. 229)

*hitāya sukhāya*

*katādhikāro* (J. I, p. 56, VI, p. 251)

*theresu, mahallako*

*ratha-vinīta* (Majjhima, I, p. 149)

*atthakaraṇam* (Dīgha, II, p. 20)

*rājino paṭivedayi,*

*rañño paṭivedesi*

*achchāyikam karaṇiyam*

(Majjhima, I, p. 149)

*bhuñjamāne* (Theragāthā)

*vādo te āropito* (Dīgha, I, p. 81),

*rajjam amachchesu āropetvā* (Peta-  
vatthu—A., p. 154)

*kalaho viggaho vivādo, yassam pari-*  
*sāyam . . . . saññattim upagach-*  
*chhanti . . . nijhattim upagach-*  
*chanti* (Ang., I, p. 66)

*ānantarikam* (Vinaya, I, p. 32)

*idaṇ cha mūlam kusalābhivuḍḍhiyā*  
(Saṃyutta—N. I)

*anaṇo nātinam* (J. VI, p. 36)

*pāsāna-lekhā chiratṭhikkā hoti* (Ang.,  
*aññatra bhikkhu-sammutiya, aññatra*  
*tiriyantaranāya*

*kalāṇam dukkaram* (R.E., V)

*ādikaro kalāṇasa* (R.E., V)

*pāpe hi nāma supadālaye* (R.E., V)

*Yana-Kamboja-Gaṇdhārānam*

(R.E., V)

*Yona-Kāmbhojesu* (R.E., XIII)

*Rathikānam Pitinikānam* (R.E., V)

*Yona-Kambocha-Gaṇdhālesu . . . .*

*c vā pi amne apalaṃtā* (R.E., V)

*brahmaṇibbhesu* (R.E. V)

*hitasukhāye* (R.E. V)

*kaṭābhikkale, kiṭabhiikaro* (R.E. V)

*thairesu mahalake* (R.E. V)

*vinīta* (R.E. VI)

*athakamme, aṭhakarimme* (R.E. VI)

*me paṭivedetha* (R.E. VI)

*achāyike, atiyāyike* (R.E. VI)

*bhuñjamānasa* (R.E. VI)

*mahāmātresu achāyike*

(ā)ropitam (R.E. VI)

*vivādo vā nijhati v (ā)*

*saṃto parisūyam* (R.E. VI)

*ānaṃtaliyam* (R.E. VI)

*tasa cha esu mūle* (R.E. VI)

*bhūtānam ānaṃnam* (R.E. VI)

*chilāṭhitikā hotu* (R.E. VI)

*aññatra agena parākramena* (R.E. VI);

*aññatra. . . agāya palikkhāya*

*agena bhayena* (P.E. I)

*āhārasuddhi, saṃsārasuddhi* (Maj-  
*dalha-parakkamo,*  
*dalha-dhammo, dalhabhattikā*  
 (Dīpavaṃsa, XI. 25)  
*migavam nikkhamitvā*  
 (Samanta-pā., I, p. 55).  
*tena taṃ madhuram*  
*samaṇānam cha dassanam*  
 (Mangala Sutta)  
*bhiyyo no arati siyā. suklā*  
*uppajjati bhiyyo somanassam*  
*aññabhāgiyam* (Bhikkhu  
 Pātīmokkha)  
*uchāvachā paṭipadā* (Sutta-  
 nipāta, 714)  
*mangalam karoti* (Dhp-A, I. p. 184)  
*ābādhesu*  
*āvāha-vivāhesu*  
*itthi, mahilā, mahilā,*  
*ambakā janikā* (Vinaya, I, p. 232;  
 Samanta-pā., I. p. 385)  
*mātari pitari*  
*na cha khuddam,*  
*nirattham va*  
*apaphalam, mahapphalam*  
*tatridam*  
*etāriso satthā*  
  
*mittasanthavam, santhutena*  
*itivuttam, vuttam h' etam*  
*Bhagavatā* (Itivuttaka)  
*ñāti-mitta-sakhā, mitto*  
*suhado, mitto sahāyo*  
 (Singālovāda Sutta)  
*ovaditabbā*  
*dhammo akāliko* (Dīgha, II, p. 93)  
*sukham nibbatteyyā* (Milinda . 276)

*bhāvasudhi* (R.E. VII)  
*dadhabhatitā* (R.E. VII)  
  
*nikkhamisu heta migaviyā* (R.E. VIII)  
  
*tena sā dhammayātā* (R.E. VIII)  
*thairānam dasane cha* (R.E. VIII)  
  
*tadōpayā esū bhuya*  
*rati bhavati* (R.E. VIII)  
*bhāge unñe* (R.E. VIII)  
  
*uchāvacham mangalam* (R.E. IX)  
  
*mangalam karoti* (R.E. IX)  
*ābādhesu* (R.E. IX)  
*āvāha-vivāhesu* (R.E. IX)  
*itthi, mahidā,*  
*abak (a)janik (ā)* (R.E. IX)  
  
*mātari pitari* (R.E. III)  
*chudam (khudam) cha*  
*nivattham cha* (R.E. IX)  
*apaphalam mahāphale* (R.E. IX)  
*lateta (m)* (R.E. IX)  
*etārisam dhammamangalam*  
 (R.E. IX)  
*mita-samthutena* (R.E. IX)  
*asti iti vuttam,*  
*atthi hevam vute* (R.E. IX)  
*mitrena va suhodayena vā*  
*ñātikena va sahāyena va* (R.E. IX)  
  
*ovādītavayam* (R.E. IX)  
*dhammamangale akālike* (R.E. IX)  
*attham nivateti* (R. E. IX)

*bahuṃ puññaṃ*

*prasavati* (Saṃyutta, I, p. 182)

*āyatiṃ, āyatiḱe*

*yaso kitti cha* (Sutta-nipāta, 817)

*ussaṭṭāya* (Majjhima, II, p. 15)

*etaṃ dukkaraṃ*

*paṭipatti, sammāpaṭipanno*

*sabba-pāsaṇḍa-gaṇa*

(Milinda P., j. 359)

*etasmiṃ nidāne etasmiṃ*

*pakarāṇe dhammiṃ*

*kathaṃ katvā* (Vinaya Mahā-

vagga, VI)

*attānam khaṇati* (Majjhima, I,

p. 132)

*vachiguti*

*eke samaṇa-brāhmaṇā sakaṃ yeva*

*vādaṃ dīpenti jotenti paravādaṃ.*

*pana khumsanti* (Ang., I, p. 88)

*upahaññati*

*bahussutā āgatāgamā*

*samavāyo* (Saṃyutta, IV, p. 68)

*tatra-tatrābhinandini,*

*pasannā Buddha-sāsane*

*huveyya* (Majjhima, I, p. 171)

*khattiyassa muddhabhisittassa*

*dhammakāmo*

*tibbaṃ chhandaṃ cha pemaṃ cha*

(Sāriputta theragāthā)

*samaṇa-brāhmaṇa-sabba-pāsaṇḍa-*

*gaṇa* (Milinda, p. 359)

*paṭibhāgo* (Majjhima, I, p. 304)

*anantaṃ puññaṃ prasavati*

(R.E. IX, XI)

*āyatiye* (R.E. X)

*yaso va kitti va* (R.E. X)

*ussaṭṭena* (R.E. X)

*dukkaraṃ tu kho etaṃ* (R.E. X)

*sammāpaṭipati* (R.E. XI)

*sava-pāsāṇḍāni* (R.E. XII)

*atpapāsāṇḍa-pūjā. lahukā*

*vā asa tamhi tamhi prakaraṇe*

(R.E. XII)

*atpapāsa(m)ḍaṃ chhaṇati, atpra-*

*shamḍaṃ khaṇati* (R.E. XII)

*vachiguti* (R.E. XII)

*yo hi kochi atpapāsāṇḍaṃ*

*pūjayati parapāsāṇḍaṃ*

*va garahati. kiṃti atpapāsāṇḍaṃ*

*dīpayema iti* (R.E. XII)

*upahanati* (R.E. XII)

*bahusrutā cha kalāṇāgamā*

*samavāyo* (R.E. XII)

*ye tatra-tat (ṛ)a prasāmnā*

(R.E. XII)

*huveyu* (R.E. XII)

*aṭṭhavasābhisitasa* (R.E. XIII)

*dhammakāmatā* (R.E. XIII)

*tīvo dhammavāyo dhammakāmatā*

(R. E. XIII)

*bābhanā va samaṇā va amne*

*pāsāṇḍā* (R. E. XIII)

*paṭibhāgo* (R. E. XIII)

*sahassabhāgo te maraṇaṁ*

*aṭaviyo samuppannā ratṭham  
viddhamsayanti te.*

*tass'eva anuvidhiyyati (=anusik-  
khati, J. No. 48)*

*aparādham khamati*

*vajanti dhīrā (Dhammapada)*

*ghaṭṭissam (Theragāthā)*

*ghaṭṭitam (Bodhicharyāvatāra, V)  
saṁkhittena bhāsitaṣṣa vitthārena  
attham*

(Theragāthā, verse, 570)

*mahallakam vihāram (Bhikkhu  
Pātimokkha)*

*ayaṁ mahāpaṭhavī dighā āyatā*

*. . . . visālā vitthinṇā vipulā*

*mahantā (Milinda, p. 311)*

*atthamadhuratāya pemaṇiyā*

(Sumangala vilā., I, p. 75)

*punappunam*

*saṁkhāya*

*ekato ghaṭṭitam*

*āchariyupajjhāyānaṁ anusatthi*

(Milinda—P., p. 397)

*atthassa dvārā pamukhā (J. I, p.  
366)*

*samachariyā dalhā dhiti (J. VI)*

*akakkasam aphaṇusam (j. III, p. 282)*

*vadho cha bandho cha parikkilesa*

(Petavatthu)

*dakkhanti, dakkhim*

*khaṇe khaṇe (Dhp., 239)*

*etadantika, maranantikam*

(*saha*)*svabhāgo va garumato*

(R.E. XIII)

*yā cha pi aṭaviyo Devānaṁpiyasa  
pijite (ho)ti (R.E. XIII)*

*dhvamaṁ anuvidhiyamti (R.E. XIII)*

*khamitave (R. E. XIII)*

*dūtā na vrachamti (R.E. XIII)*

*ghatitam (R. E. XIV)*

*asti eva saṁkhittena . . . asti vis-  
tat(e)na (R. E. XIV)*

*mahālake hi vijitam (R. E. XIV)*

*mahaṁte hi vijaye (R. E. XIV)*

*athasa madhuratāya (R.E. XIV)*

*punapuna-vutam (R. E. XIV)*

*sachhāya, saṁkhāya (R. E. XIV)*

*na sarvaṁ sarvata ghaṭṭitam*

(R.E. XIV)

*aṁ tuphesu anusatthi (S.R.E. I)*

*esa me mokkhamata-duvālaṁ*

(S.R.E. I)

*dhiti paṭimnā achalā (S.R.E. I)*

*akkhase achamḍe, achamḍam*

*aphalusam (S.R.E. I)*

*baṁdhanam vā*

*palikilesam vā (S.R.E. I)*

*dekhatha, dekhata (S.R.E. I)*

*khaṇasi khaṇasi (S.R.E. I)*

*ba (m)ghanantika (S.R.E. I)*

*imam tesam pāpūnātū ti* (Milinda,

p. 294)

*sassatisamam, sassati samā*

*antavā chu Rājagaham*

*asambhito anubbiggo* (Milinda,

p. 340)

*attānam anukampāmi* (J. IV, p. 320)

*adḍhatiyāni yojanasatāni*

*hessam* (J. I, p. 49)

*Jambudīpe*

*missam bālehi paṇḍitam* (J. V, p. 599)

*missibhūtā, missibhāvaṃ gato*

(J. V, p. 86, Dīgha, II, p. 267)

*tassa suchiṇṇassa ayam vipāko*

(Serissaka-vimānavatthu)

*hatam pūṇṇaphalam mayham*

(Buddhāpadāna)

*vipulam sukham* (Dhp., 27)

*evameva kho kusalam bhiiyo bhiiyo*

*pavaddhati* (Milinda., p. 297)

*diyaddham*

*yāvatako assa kāyo*

*sacham bhaṇe nālikam*

*dhammaguṇā* (J. IV, p. 321)

*jeṭṭhāpachāyana* (J. V, p. 326)

*chakkam pavattemi*

*so dāni* (Theragāthā, 291)

*yoggāchariyo* (Majjhima, I, p. 124)

*abhikkham, abhikkhamam*

*hina-m-ukkaṭṭha-majjhima*

(Vinaya, IV, p. 7)

*omakā majjhimā ukkaṭṭhā* (J. III,

p. 218)

*alam gilānam upaṭṭhātum* (Ang., III,

p. 142)

*param cha samādapeti* (Ang., II,

p. 253)

*amtesu pāpunevu te iti* (S. R. E. II)

*sasvatam samam, sasvatam samayam*

(S. R. E. I, II)

*amṭalāpi Tisena* (S. R. E. II)

*anuvigina* (S. R. E. II)

*atānam anukampati* (S. R. E. II)

*adḍhatiyāni vasāni* (M. R. E.)

*husam* (M. R. E.)

*Jambudīpasi* (M. R. E.)

*munisā misā devehi* (M. R. E.)

*misibhūtā* (M. R. E.)

*pakamasa hi ayam phale* (M. R. E.)

*vipule svage* (M. R. E.)

*iyam cha athe vadhisati*

*vipulam pi cha vadhisati* (M. R. E.)

*diyadhiyam* (M. R. E.)

*yāvataka tupaka ahāle* (M. R. E.)

*sacham vataviyam* (M. R. E.)

*dhammaguṇā* (M. R. E.)

*apachāyanāya* (M. R. E.)

*dhammaguṇā pavatitaviyā* (M. R. E.)

*se dāni* (M. R. E., Yc)

*yūgyāchariyāni* (M. R. E.)

*abhikkhinam* (Bhābru)

*ukasā gevayā majhimā* (P. E. I.)

*alam cha palam*

*sumādapayitave* (P. E. I)

*pachchantavāsino mahāmattā*  
 (Atthasā., p. 245)  
*dhammena gutto* (J. V, p. 222)  
*ālokadā chakkhudadā* (Theragā., 3)  
*attano pana (vajjaṃ)*  
*duddasam* (Dhp., 176)  
*uddhagāmini, adhogāmini,*  
*dukkhanirodha-gāmini*  
*bodhiyā yeva kāraṇā* (Chariyā-  
 Piṭaka); *yena kāraṇena* (Milinda,  
 p. 255)  
*issā mānena vañchito* (Theragāthā,  
 375)  
*mā akkosatha paribhāsatha*  
*rosetha vihesatha* (Māratajjanīya  
 Sutta, Majjhima I)  
*abhihāro*  
*na kareyya parapattiyāṃ* (Petava., II.  
 1. 32)  
*paṇḍito byatto medhāvī paṭibalo*  
*sukha-parihaṭo* (Majjhima, II, p. 60)  
*dhātusamatā Milinda, p. 351)*  
*sattame divase*  
*kālaṃ dammi* (Mūlapariyāya Jātaka)  
*dāna-saṃvibhāga-rata* (Saṃyutta, I,  
 Sakka-Saṃ, II.,)  
*seyyathā*  
*suka-sāḷī, suva-sāḷikā*  
*chakkavākhā haṃsā*  
*ambaka-maddari, ambaka-*  
*pachchari*  
*anaṭṭhikālaṃ*  
*ukkapiṇḍakā (pl.)*  
*palasatā (pl.)*  
*paribhogāṃ, paṭivātaṃ eti,*  
*enti Māravasāṃ* (Saṃyutta-N. I)

*aṃta-mahāmātā* (P.E. I)  
*dhammena goti* (P.E. I)  
*chakkhudāne* (P.E. II)  
*dupaṭivakkhe chu kho esa* (P.E. I)  
*imāni āsinavagāmini* (P.E. III)  
*isyā kālanena va* (P.E. III)  
*māne isyā kālanena* (P.E. III)  
*hakāṃ mā palibhāsayaṃ* (P.E. III)  
*abhihāle* (P.E. IV)  
*atapatiye kaṭe* (P.E. IV)  
*viyatā* (R.E. IV)  
*sukhaṃ parihāṭave* (P.E. IV)  
*daṇḍasamatā* (P.E. IV)  
*tiṇṇi divasāni*  
*yole diṇṇe* (P.E. IV)  
*dāna-saṃvibhāge* (P.E. IV)  
*seyyathā* (P.E. V)  
*suke sāḷika* (P.E. V)  
*chakavāke haṃse* (P.E. V)  
*ambā kapilikā* (P.E. V)  
*anaṭṭhika-machhe* (P.E. V)  
*okapiṇḍe* (P.E. V)  
*palasate* (P.E. V)  
*paṭibhogāṃ no eti* (P.E. V)

*ajeḷakā sūkarā*

*ajakā eḷakā sukālī* (P.E. V)

*anattḥāya*

*anattḥāye* (P.E. V)

*chātuddasī pañchadasī*  
*aṭṭhamī cha pakkhassa* (Majjhima I,  
Bhayabherava Sutta)

*chāvudasañ pañchada(sañ)*  
*aṭṭhamipakkhāye* (P.E. V)

*sattanikāyā* (Majjhima, I, p. 49)

*ḷivanikāyāni* (P.E. V)

*pāṭihāriyapakkhassa*

*chātumṃāsī-pakkhāye* (P.E.V.)

*bandhanamokkhañ* (Dīgha, I, p. 73)

*bañdhanamiokkhāni* (P.E.V.)

*sukkhāñ āvahati* (Samyutta I,

*sukkhāñ āvahāmi* (P.E. VI)

Yakkha, 12)

*pachchuggamañ* (J. IV, p. 321)

*pachupagamane* (P.E. VI)

*abbhunnameyyñ* (Dīgha, I, p. 126)

*abhyuññāmayehañ* (P.E. VII)

*dhammānusatthiñ*

*dhammānusatthiñi*

*anusāsīyati* (Milinda, p. 186)

*anusāsāmi* (P.E. VII)

*bahuna janassa* (Dīgha, III, p. 167)

*bahunc janasi* (P.E. VII)

*kataññūtañ pekkhāmāno* (J. III,  
p. 109)

*etam eva anuvekhanāne* (P.E. VII)

*lahukā eṣā* (Chariyā-piṭaka, I, 9)

*la(huke cha eṣa* (P.E. VII)

*etadatthā* (Vinaya, V, P. 164)

*etadathā* (P.E. VII)

*gahaṭṭha-pabbajitānañ*

*pavajitānañ cheva gihithānañ*  
(P.E. VII)

*Ājivikesu, Nigaṇṭhesu*

*Ājivikesu, Nigaṇṭhesu* (P.E. VII)

*vayomahallākānañ*

*vayomahālakānañ* (P. E. VII)

*kaṇaṇa-varākesu*

*kaṇaṇa-valākesu* (P.E. VII)

*saṅghāñ samaggāñ karoti* (Vinaya,  
I, p. 355)

*saṅghe samage kaṭe* (Schism Pillar)

*saṃsaraṇaṇaṃ* (Vinaya, III.)

*saṃsalaṇasi* (Schism Pillar)

*andhakāre nikkhitto* (Ang., III,

*saṃsalaṇasi nikkhitā* (Schism Pillar)

p. 233)

*aññañ viññāpeyya* (Bhikkhūñi-

*viññāpayitaviye* (Schism Pillar)

*pāti, Nissaggiya, 4)*

*bhikkhūnañ bhikkhūnañcha*

*bhikkhūnañ cha bhikkhūnañ cha*

(Theragāthā, 125)

(Schism Pillar)

*posatham* (J. IV, p. 332)  
*byañjanena*  
*mahita, mahāhivāna* (Majjhima, II,  
 p. 110. J. W, p. 236)  
*dhajam ussāpesi*  
*suvanṇatthambham ussāpesi* (J. IV,  
 p. 236)  
*Lumbinī*  
*aṭṭhabhāgika, atthabhāgiya*  
*Indasālaguhā* (Dīgha, II, p. 263)  
*jalūkā* (Milinda, p. 405)  
*sabbaseto maṅgala-hatthi* (J. VI,  
 p. 487)  
*sabbaseto. gajuttamo* (Vimānavatthu)  
*Seto* (Ang., III, p. 345)

*posathāye* (Schism Pillar)  
*viyañjanena* (Schism Pillar)  
*mahiyyite* (Lumbinī Pillar)  
  
*silāthabhe usapāpīte* (Lumbinī P.)

*Lumbinī* (Lumbinī Pillar)  
*aṭṭhabhāgiye* (Lumbinī Pillar)  
*Nigoha-kubhā* (Barabar I)  
*Jalūghā* (Barabar III)  
*sarvasveto hasti, seto, gajatame*  
 (Misc. III).

## MR. S. N. MITRA'S LIST OF PARALLELS

*sūpavyañjanatthāyu mige*  
*māressāmi* (J. III, p. 438)  
*pupphupago phalupago rukkhō*  
 (Dhp. A., p. 189)  
*anusamīyāyitvā* (Majjhima, III,  
 p. 174)  
 = *anupariyāyitvā, anuyāyato*  
 (Milinda, p. 391)  
*Rājā dhammaghosakam alankata-*  
*hatthipiṭṭhim āropetvā ghosanam*  
*kāreti* (J. IV, p. 264)  
*dhammaghosakā hutvā gāmāgāmaṃ*  
*nagarānagaram vīcharissāma*  
 (Paramatthajotikā, II, p. 216)  
*aho dhammasavaṇam* (Sumangala-  
 vilā., I, p. 214)  
*vimānam disvā* (J. V, p. 165)  
*ākāsa-vimānāni dassetvā* (J. VI, p.  
 124)

*prāṇa-sata-sahasrāni*  
*āvabhisu sūpāthāya* (R. E. I)  
*osadhāni munisopagāni pasu*  
 — *opagāni* (R. E. II)  
*anusamīyānam niyātu* (R. E. III)

*dhammaghoso* (R. E. IV)

*aho dhammaghoso* (R. E. IV)

*vimāna-dursuṇā... dasayitpā*  
 (R. E. IV)



*anika-dassanañ*

= (*hat<sup>h</sup>*)*ānikassa dassanañ*  
*dibbāni pi rūpāni passato* (Suman-  
 gala-vilā., I, p. 215)  
*atthāpāye* (J. III, p. 387).—the op-  
 posite of

*parihīne* (J. III, p. 387)  
*desañ* (Saṅgīyuttā, II, p. 15)  
*pāpañ pāpena sukarañ* (Udāna,  
 V. 8)  
*padvāra* (J. V, p. 433, J. VI, p. 627)

*anubaddhā* (Sumangala-vilā. I. p.  
 39)=*anugatā*

*dukkarañ karoto* (Ang., IV, p. 37)  
*vinichchhaye nisīditvā aṭṭe tīresi*  
 (J. III, p. 292)

*bahu aṭṭaṃ me tīritaṃ* (j. III, p. 334)

*attham karissam* (J. III, p. 394)

*kāyena vāchā cha yo saññato,*  
*Yo ve kataññū katavedī dhiro*  
*kalyāṇamitto dakkabhaddi cha hoti,*  
*dukkhitassa sakkachcha karoti kich-*  
*cham* (J. V, p. 146)

*tassa ayañ ch'eva loko āradhho*  
*hoti paro cha loko* (Dīgha, III, p.  
 181)

*uchchāvache yaññe* (Theragāthā,  
 verse 34)

*sāhu dānaṃ ti* (Ang., IV, p. 43)

*āevamangalikā* (J. III, p. 145).  
*chattamangalañ,*

*vivāha-mangalañ* (J III, p. 407)

*kotūhala-mangaliko* (Sumangala-  
 vilā., I, p. 226)

*etadaggañ bhīyyo dānaṃ yadidaṃ*  
*dhammadānañ* (Ang. IV, p. 364)

*hasti-dasaṇā* (R. E. IV)

*diriyāni rūpāni dasayitpā*  
 (R. E. IV)

*athasa vadhi* (R. E. IV)

*hini* (R. E. IV)

*desañ* (R. E. V)=a part, a portion  
*sukarañ hi pāpañ, pāpañ hi*  
*sukarañ* (R. E. V)

*supadavave* (R. E. V)—*supadvārañ*  
 (well-entranced)

*anubadhā pajāva* (R. E. V)

*dukkarañ karoti* (R. E. V)

*aṭṭha-saṃtīraṇā* (R. E. VI)

*athe karomi* (R. E. VI)

*sayame bhāvasuhitā va kataññatā va*  
*dadhabbhatitā* (R. E. VII)

*ubhe ladhe hoti* (R. E. IX,  
 cf. R. E. VI)

*hidata-pālāte āladhe hoti* (R. E. VII)

*uchchāvache maṅgale* (R. E. IX)

*sādhū dānaṃ iti* (R. E. IX)

*uchchāvacham maṅgalaṃ āvāha-vivā-*  
*hesu* (R. E. IX)

*na tu etārisaṃ asti dānaṃ yārisaṃ*  
*dhammadānaṃ* (R. E. IX)

*yaso kitti cha* (J. III, p. 106)  
*mahatthiyam* (J. III, p. 376)  
*dhamma-samvibhāgo* (Theragāthā,  
 V, 9)  
*itthāgārassa amachchhā* (J. III, p. 371)  
*anuwidhiyeyyam* (Samyutta, IV, p.  
 131)

*tumhākam khamitabham tāva*  
*khamāmi* (Dhp. A., I, p. 495)

*na cha sakkā āghātāmānena* (Thera-  
 gāthā, V, 513)

*kammadvāra* (J. IV, p. 14)  
*dinna-naya-dvāre* (J. IV, p. 341)  
*nāttano samakam kiñchi atirekañ cha*  
*maññisam* (Theragāthā, V, 424)  
*kuto pana kāyena* (Ang. IV, p. 66)  
*anumajjhān samāchare* (J. IV,  
 p. 192)

*vippaṭipajjitvā* (J. III, p. 116)  
*rañño chittam arādhenti* (J. III,  
*vājānam ārādhentum asakkonto*  
 (Milinda, p. 6)

*apāye* (J. III, p. 387)  
*apāye = apagamane, parithine*

*attham aññāya dhammānudhamma-*  
*paṭipanno* (Ang., IV, p. 296)  
*assuropo* (Itivuttaka, VI, 122)  
 = *anattamanatā chittassa* (Comy.),  
 "mental distemper"

*kammam . . . karontassa kāye kila-*  
*missati* (Anguttara, IV, p. 332)  
*ekam samvachchharam* (J. III,  
 p. 440)  
*missibhūtā* (J. V, p. 86)

*yaso va kiti va* (R. E. X)  
*mahāthāvahā* (R. E. X)  
*dhamma-samvibhāgo* (R. E. X)

*ithijhaka-mahāmātā* (R. E. XII)  
*anuwidhiyare* (R. E. XIII)

*khamisati e sakiye khamitave*  
 (S. R. E. II)  
*khamitaviyamate yam sakiye khami-*  
*tave* (R. E. XIII)  
*na cha sarvatra ghaṭitam* (R. E. XIV)

*kammanā . . . duvālam*  
*am tu phesu anusathi* (S. R. E. I)  
*duāhale etasa kammasa same*  
*kute mane atileke* (S. R. E. I, J)

*majham paṭipādayema* (S. R. E. I)

*vipaṭipajjamine* (S. R. E. I)  
*lājaladhi* (S. R. E. I)  
*yena mam lajukā chaghamti ālādha-*  
*yitave* (P. E. IV)  
*maha-apāye* (S. R. E. I)

*atham jānitu tathā kalamṭi athā*  
*anusathi* (S. R. E. I)  
*āsulope* (S. R. E. I)

*kilamṭe siyā* (S. R. E. I)

*ekam savachcharam* (M. R. E.)

*missibhūtā* (M. R. E.)

*hatthena hattham gahetvā kāya-*  
*missibhāvaṃ upagatā*  
*pakkamate bhusam* (Saṃyutta, I,  
 p. 69)  
*dalham enaṃ parakkame* (Dhp. 313)  
*mahantāni khudakāni*  
 (Dhp. A., I, p. 282)  
*kāmaṃ* (J. III, p. 368)  
 = *ekamsena*, 'verily'  
*na sukaraṃ akkhānena pāpunitum*  
 (Majjhima, III, p. 167)  
*dhama-pariyāyo* (Ang. IV, p. 166)  
*param cha samādapeti* (Ang., II,  
 II, p. 253 f)  
*yāva nābhito* (J. IV. p. 149) up to  
 the pivot.  
*na kareyya parapattiyam* (Peta-  
 vatthu, II. I. 32)  
*dhāti parihārena*  
*abhihāram* (J. V, p. 58) = *pūjam*  
*te (purisā) parichārayissanti*  
 (Saṃyutta, I, p. 79)  
*janapadassa hitasukhāya* (J. V,  
 p. 116)  
*(aṅke) nisidāpetvā* (Dīgha. II, p. 20)  
*pattadaṇḍa* (Theragāthā. V. 449)  
*niruddha-velāyam* (Dhp. A. I, p. 207)  
*niruddho*=*mato* (J. IV. p. 109)  
*dāna-samvibhāgassa* (J. III, p. 409)  
*nilachchhesi* (Therigā, 437)  
*pachchuggamanam* (J. III,  
 pp. 330, 388)  
*bandhanamokkham katum* (J. III,  
 p. 429)

*amisā devā samānā*  
*te dāni misibhūtā* (M.R.E.)  
*pakamte husam* (M.R.E.)  
*husam*=*bhṛīsam* (?)  
*bāḍham me pakamte* (M.R.E.)  
*khudakā cha mahatpā* (M.R.E.)  
*kāmaṃ tu kho* (M. R. E.)  
*na hīyam sakye mahātpeneva pāpo-*  
*tave* (M. R. E.)  
*dhama-paliyāyāni* (Bhābru)  
*palam samādapayitave* (P.E. I)  
*ava ite* (P. E. IV) meaning not  
 'henceforth' but 'up till now.'  
*atapatiye kaṭe* (P. E. IV), *atapatiye*  
 opp. of *parapatiye*  
*dhāti . . . palihatave* (P. E. IV)  
*abhihāle* (P. E. IV)  
*pulisām paṭichalisanti* (P. E. IV)  
*Janapadassa hitasukhāye* (P. E. IV)  
*nisijitu* (P. E. IV)  
*tilitadamānānam patavadhānam*  
*niludhasi kālasi* (P. E. IV)  
*dāna-samvibhāge* (P. E. IV)  
*nilakhiyati* (P. E. V)  
*pachupagamanam* (P.E.VI)  
*bandhana-mokkhāni kaṭāni* (P.E. V)

*dhammayuttam katham* (J. III.  
p. 365)  
*ovadam dentena yutta-janass' eva*  
*databbo, na ayuttajanassa* (J. III,  
p. 231)  
*dānavisagge* (Petavatthu, II. 7)  
= *dānagge, parichchāgatthāne*  
*daṭṭhu* (Sutta-nipāta, verse 424)  
= *disvā*  
*paṭipādayāmi* (J. IV, p. 19)  
= *dadāmi*  
*saddhamma-niyama* (Ang., III,  
p. 185)  
*dhamma-niyāmatā* (Ang., I. p. 286)  
*anurūpāyam paṭipattiyam* (J. III,  
p. 368)  
*avāsesi* (J. V, p. 33)  
*kammāyatanāni* (J. III, p. 542)  
= *kammāni*  
*tushṭadānam* (Arthaśāstra, I. 11)  
*rājā (mātiposikassa hatthissa)*  
*samānarūpaṃ*  
*silā-paṭimam kāretvā* (J. IV. p. 95)  
*anāvāsa* (Vinaya, II, 22. 33, J. II,  
p. 77)  
*ussāpento dhammayūpaṃ* (Milinda:  
p. 21)  
*thūpaṃ vaḍḍhāpesi* (Mahāvamsa,  
35. 32)  
*dutiyam pi balam vaḍḍhāpesi* (J. III,  
p. 9)  
*dutiyam meaning 'for the second*  
*time'*  
*Konāgamana-buddhassa maṇḍapo*  
(Theragāthā A., p. 6)  
*khalita* (Petavatthu. p. 46)

*viyovadisamti janam dhammayutam*  
(P. E. VII)  
*dānavisagasi* (P.E. VII)  
*sutu* (P. E. VII)  
*paṭi(pādayamti)* P.E.VII.  
*dhamma-niyamāni* (P. E. VII)  
*anulupāyā dhammavaḍḍhiyā* (P. E.  
VII)  
*āvāsaiye* (Schism Pillar)  
*tushṭāyatanāni* (P. E. VII)  
*silāvigaḍa-bhīchā kālāpita* (Lumbinī)  
*anāvāsasi* (Schism Pillar)  
*silāthabhe usapāpīte* (Lumbinī)  
*Konākamanasa thube dutiyam*  
*vaḍḍhite* (Nigāli Sāgar)  
*Khalatika* (Barābar)

*sabbasetam hatthiratanam* (J. III,  
p. 460)  
*sabbaseto silavā hatthirājā* (J. IV,  
p. 91)

*Seto, gajatame, sarvasueto hasti*  
(Dhauri, Kalsi, Girnār Rocks).

Rigveda

INSCRIPTIONS

*pileva sūpāyano* (I. 1)

*pāpe hi nāma supadālaye* (R. E. V)

Rāmāyaṇa

INSCRIPTIONS

*saptarātroshitaḥ* (II, 73. 16)

*dive sapanna-lāti-sata*  
*vivāsāta* (M. R. E., Sa)

*paura-jānapadam janam* (II, 43. 13)

*janam jānapadam* (P. E. IV)

*anunīta* (II, 61. 28. 30)=

*anuneti* (R. E. XIII)

*anusishṭa*

*kim syāt priyam janasyāsya*

*kinam kāni sukham āvahāmī ti*

(P.E. VI)

*kānkshitam kim sukhāvaham |*

*iti chintayitā tena jano'yaṁ*

*paripālitaḥ* (II, 57. 14)

*esa me huthā—se kinasu jane*

... *anulupāyā dhammavaḍḍhiyā*

*vadḍheyā ti, kinasu kāni abhyuṁ-*

*nāmayeham dhammavaḍḍhiyā ti?*

(P. E. VII)

*idha cha nāni sukhāpayāmi*

(R.E. VI)

*etad aupayikam* (II. 53. 37)

*yajñabhāgaḥ* (II, 46. 15)

*tadōpayā* (R. E. VII)

*bhāge amṇe* (R. E. VII).

The *Buddhavachana* alone can satisfactorily account for some of the most striking and interesting variants in the *ASoavachana*. R. E. IX offers *mahidā*, *abakajanika*, *abakajaniyo* and *striyak(a)* as variants of Dh *ithi*. Corresponding to them we have in Pali *itthī*, *mahilā* (*mahilā*), *ambakā* and *itthiyikā* (Buddha-

ghosa). In lieu of *J alam*, Dh offers us *paṭibalā* (S.R.E. II), and these very words are employed as synonyms in the *Āṅguttara Nikāya*, *Pañchaka-nipāta*, *Gilāna-vagga*: *alam gilānam upaṭṭhātum, paṭibalo hoti bhesajjam samvidhātum*. Corresponding to the two variants, *mahālake* and *mahānte* in R.E. XIV, we have in Pali *mahallakam* and *mahantam*.

The specimen of dialectical style offered by the four versions of R.E. IX (K, Sh, M) closely resembles those which may be gathered from all sections of the *Kathāvatthu*:

## Kathāvatthu IV (I. 1)

*Hañchi puggalo upalabbhati  
sachchhikaṭṭha-paramaṭṭhena,  
tena vata re vattabbe yo sach-  
chikaṭṭho paramaṭṭho tato so  
puggalo upalabbhati sachchhikaṭṭha-  
paramaṭṭhenā ti. Yam tattha  
vadesi vattabbe kho puggalo  
upalabbhati . . sachchhikaṭṭha-  
paramaṭṭhenā ti michchhā.*

## R. E. IX

*Hañche pi tam aṭham no  
nivaṭeti hida, aṭham  
palata anantam punā pasava-  
vati. Hañche puna tam aṭham  
nivateti hidā tata ubhaye  
samladhe hoti-hida chā se aṭhe  
palatā cha anantam punā  
pasavati tena dhammamam-  
galenā.*

The *Aśokavachana* contains but a very few traces of what may be called the distinctive Jaina phraseology, now preserved in the *Ardhamāgadhī Canon* of the *Śvetāmbaras*. The *Nirgrantha-pravachana* or *Jinavachana*, too, employs such technical terms as *samaṇa māhaṇa*, *bhikkhu*, *bhikkhunī*, *uvāsaga*, *uvāsiga*, *samaṇovāsagā*, *gihatthānam*, *pavvaiyānam*, *Nigganthā*, *Ājiviyā*, *posaham* (*posatham*), (*posatha-upavāso*), *puṇṇa* (*punya*), *pāva* (*pāpa*), *kallāṇa*, *sukade dukkade*, *parakkame*, *vihimsā*, *avihimsā*, *vahabandha-parikilesā*, *bandha-mokkha*, *samkhāya*, *koha* (*koḍha*), *māṇa* (*māna*), *dayā*, *dāṇa*, *sachcha*, *soya* (*śauchā*), *bhaya*, *ajjava*, *maddava*, *chauddas*, — *aṭṭham'-uddiṭṭha-puṇṇamāsīnisu*, *ihaloga-paraloga*, *dūya* (*dūta*) and *parisā* (*Āchārāṅga* and *Aupapātika Sūtras*).

Besides the technical terms listed above, the *Jinavachana* makes use of the following idioms corresponding to those in BV and AV:

JV	BV	AV
<i>hiyāe sukhāe</i>	<i>hitāya sukhāya</i>	<i>hitasukhāye</i> (R. E. V, P.E. IV)
<i>jārisa tārisa</i>	<i>yārisa tārisa, yādisa tādisa</i>	<i>yārise tārise</i> <i>ādise tādise</i> (R. E. IV)
<i>puno puno</i> (Achārāṅga) <i>chaṇaṃ chaṇaṃ</i> (ib)	<i>punappunaṃ</i> <i>khāṇe khāṇe</i>	<i>puna-puna</i> (R.E. XIV) <i>khanasi khanasi</i> (S.R.E. I)
<i>puḍhavi-nissiya</i> (ib) <i>amma-piu sussūsaga</i> (Aup. 71)	<i>dhamma-nissita</i> <i>mātā-pitu-</i> <i>upaṭṭhānaṃ,</i> <i>āchariya</i> <i>pachchupaṭṭhātabbā</i> <i>sussūsāya</i>	<i>dhamma-nisita</i> (R.E. V) <i>mātā-pitu-susūsā,</i> <i>mātā-pitusu</i> <i>sususā. mātari</i> <i>cha pitari cha</i> <i>susrūsā</i> (R. E. III)
<i>nālaṃ tāṇāe</i> (Achā- rāṅga)	<i>alaṃ dārābharaṇāya</i>	<i>alaṃ asvāsanāye</i> (S.R.E. II)
<i>atihi-saṃvibhāgo</i> (Aup. 57)	<i>dāna-saṃvibhāgo</i>	<i>dāna-saṃvibhāge</i> (P. E. IV)
<i>posahovavāso</i> (Ib. 57)		<i>pālatikaṃ upavāsaṃ</i> (P.E. IV)
<i>chiraṭṭhitiyā</i> (Ib. 56) <i>dhamme daḍḍhā paiṇṇā</i> <i>patiṇṇā</i> (Ib. 105)	<i>chiraṭṭhitikā</i>	<i>chiraṭṭhitikā</i> (M.R.E.)  <i>paṭimnā achalā</i> (S.R.E. II)
<i>gevejja-vimāna</i> (Ib. 163) <i>Bhagavaṃ</i> (ib. 21)	<i>Bhagavā</i>	<i>pulisā gevayā</i> (P. E. I) <i>Bhagavaṃ</i> (Lumbinī Pillar)
<i>āigare</i> (ib. 38) <i>dupayam chauppayaṃ</i>	<i>ādikammiko</i> <i>dipadānaṃ</i> <i>chatuppadānaṃ</i>	<i>ādikale, ādikaro</i> (R.E. V) <i>dupada-chatupadesu</i> (P. E. I)
<i>tīva-dhammānurāga</i> (Aupa. Sec. 54)	<i>tibbo gāravo</i>	<i>tivo dhammavāyo</i> (R.E. XIII)

## JV

*je ya maṇe sāvajje sakirie  
sakakkase kaḍue (kaṭuke)  
niṭṭhure pharuse aṇhayakare  
chedakare bhedakare (Aupapātika  
Sūtra, Sec. 30)*

*je āsavā te parissavā  
je parissavā te āsavā ;  
je aṇāsavā te aparissavā,  
je aparissavā te aṇāsavā (Achāraṅga)*

## AV

*imāni āsinava-gāmini nāma  
atli(ā) chamḍiye niṭṭhūliye  
kodhe māne isyā (P. E. III)*

*sakale apaparistrave siyāti  
eshe tu paristrave yaṃ apuṇaṃ  
(R.E. X)*

In the *Jinavachana*, too, *koha* and *māṇa*, *sachcha* and *soya* (*śauchha*), *ajjava* and *maddava* are grouped together.

Certain phrases and idioms in *Aśokavachana* agree almost *verbatim* with those in the *Rājadharmā* Section of the *Sāntiparva* of the *Mahābhārata*. As the following instances will increasingly show, the statements of *Aśoka* were nothing but a faithful reproduction in prose of the *Rājadharmapravachana* in verse :

## MBH

*Aushadhāni cha sarvāṇi  
mūlāni cha phalāni cha/  
chaturvidhāṃś cha vaidyān  
vai saṃgrihṇīyād viśeshataḥ ||  
(XII. 68. 64)*

*ahimsārthāya bhūtānāṃ dharmā-  
pravachanaṃ kṛitaṃ (XII. 109. 15)*

*Yauna-Kāmbōja-Gāndhārāḥ  
(XII. 207.49)*

*mātāpitror hi susrūshā  
kartavyā sarvadasyubhiḥ /  
āchārya-guru-śusrūshā  
tailhaivāśramavāsināṃ ṛ  
(XII. 64.17)*

*utthānaṃ hi narendrāṇāṃ*

## AV

*osadhāni cha . . . mūlāni cha . . .  
phalāni savata ata ata  
nathi hālāpitā cha lopāpitā cha  
(P.E. II)*

*nijhatiyā . . . dharmavaḍḍhi  
vaḍḍhitā avihimsāye bhūtānāṃ  
(P.E. VII)*

*Yona-Kāmbōja-Gāndhārānaṃ  
(R.E. V)*

*brāhmaṇa s(r)amaṇānaṃ saṃpaṭipati,  
mātari pitari susrusā thaira-  
susrusā (R.E. IV), agabhuti-susūsā,  
mātā-pitu-susūsā ,gulu-susūsā  
(R.E. XIII)*

*tasa esa mūle usṭānaṃ cha*



*rājadharmasya yan mūlam*  
(XII. 57.13)

*hitārthaṁ sarvalokasya*  
(XII. 36.26)

*sarvalokahitaṁ dharmam*  
(XII. 63.5)

*ānṛiṇyaṁ yāti dharmasya*  
(XII.13.14)

*ārādhayet svargaṁ imaṁ cha*  
*lokam* (XII. 27.57)

*kṛitajño dṛiḍhabhaktiḥ syāt*  
*samvibhāgi jiteṅdriyaḥ* (XII. 65.39)

*bhāvasuddhir dayā satyaṁ*  
*samnyamaś chātmasampadaḥ*  
(XV. 167.5)

*viharayātrāsu* (XII. 1. 18)

*uchchāvachāni vittāni* (XII. 96.23)

*dānam eke praśmsanti* (XII. 21.9)

*dharmayuktaṁ prasastam*  
*āyatyān cha tadātve cha* (XII. 16.6)

*kshamā kartuṁ samartho* (XII. 72.1)

*varjanīyaṁ sadā yuddham*  
(XII. 68.25)

*kshudra-pipilikāḥ as abhakshyas*  
(XII. 50. 21)

*Yathā putrās tathā paurā*  
*drashṭavyāḥ* (XII. 68.29)

*yo'nvakampatu vai nityaṁ*  
*prajā putrān ivaurasān* (XII. 28.51)

*vadha-bandhaparikleśo* (XII. 68. 19)

*dharmāpekshī* (XII. 55. 29)

*dharmakāṅkshatā* (XII. 67. 48)

*samyābhīhāraṁ kurvīta*  
(XII. 68. 39)

*sattvaih sattvā hi jīvanti*  
(XII. 115. 20)

*athasamtiraṇā cha* (R.E. VI)

*anuvataṛaṁ sa(r)valokahitāya*  
(R.E. VI)

*bhūtānaṁ ānaṁnaṁ gachheyaṁ*  
(R. E. VI)

*idha cha nāni sukhāpayāmi paratra*  
*cha svagaṁ ārādhayaṁtu* (R.E. VI)

*sayame bhāvasudhitā va kataṁnātā*  
*va daḍhabhatitā* (R.E. VII)

*vihārayātāṁ* (R.E. VII)

*uchāvacham maṅgalaṁ* (R.E. IX)

*dāne sādhu ti* (R.E. IX)

*dhammayutaṁ anuvidhiyatu*  
*tadatvāye āyatiyaṁ cha* (R.E.X)

*sakiye khamitave* (R.E. XIII)

*(na)vaṁ vijayaṁ mā vijetavyaṁ*  
*maṁnā* (R.E. XIII)

*aṁbākāpilikā* (P.E. V)

*athā pit(ā) hevaṁ ne lājā ti,*  
*ath(ā) atānaṁ anukaṁpati hevaṁ*  
*apheni anukaṁpati* (S.R.E. I)

*baṁdhanam vā parikilesaṁ vā*  
(S.R.E. I)

*dhammāpekkhā* (R.E. XIII)

*dhammakāmatā cha* (P.E. I)

*abhihāle* (P.E. IV)

*jīvena jīve no pusitaviye* (P.E. V)

<i>dhārmikam dharmayuktam</i> (XII. 19. 11)	<i>janam dharmayutam</i> (P.E. VII)
<i>dhārmika-janaḥ</i> (XII. 19.5)	
<i>puṇyatīrthānusamyānam</i> (I. 2.123)	<i>anusamyānam</i> (R.E. III, S.R.E. I)
<i>vigatabhī</i> (Bhag. G. VII.)	<i>vigaḍabhi</i> (Lumbinī)
<i>dharma-saṁsthāpanārthāya</i> (Bhagavadgītā, IV. 8)	<i>dharmādhiṭhānāye</i> (R.E. V)
<i>sarvadharmān parityajya</i> (Bhagavadgītā, XVIII. 66)	<i>savam parichajitpā</i> (R.E. X)

It is in the Mahābhārata (XII. 20.7.43) alone that we have the Sanskrit name *Yauna* corresponding to *Yona*. It is again here that the Yaunas, Kāmbojas and Gāndhāras are grouped together, precisely as in Pali and *Aśokavachana*. The word *anusamyāna*, too, is met with in the Great Epic (I. 2. 123) *puṇyatīrthānusamyānam*, though not in the technical sense of Aśoka. The *Mahāmātras* mentioned in it are no other than the *Senāpati Mahāmātras* in the *Buddhavachana*. The location of the four Great continents including Jambudvīpa (*ibid*, Bhīshmaparva 6. 13) is almost on a par with that in Pali.

As regards the Smṛiti literature, the lists of non-eatable or forbidden animals, birds, beasts and fishes, contained in the older Dharma Sūtras and Śāstras are certainly in the immediate literary background of Aśoka's list of *avadhyas* (P. E. V). In this respect the Dharmasūtras of Bodhāyana and Vasishṭha deserve special notice, particularly because both prohibit the flesh of rhinoceros and allow the meat of peafowls. Further, Vasishṭha's *pāṇḍu-kapota* is the same species of birds as the *seta-kapota* of Aśoka.

Legal, Popular and  
Grammatical Works.

AV

*kāmaṁ, kāmaṁ tu* (Bodhāyana.  
Vasistha)

*kāmaṁ tu kho* (M.R.E., Bra.)

*pāṇḍukapota* (Vasishṭha)

*setakapote* (P.E. V)

*pārāvata* (Vasishṭha)

*gūmakapota* (P.E. V)

=*grāmaṁsī kapotaḥ* (Kulluka)

*abhakshyāḥ* (Bodhāyana, Vasishṭha)

*ye na cha khādiyati* (P.E. V)

*Sarveshāmeva dānānām*

*nāsti etārisaṁ dānaṁ*

*brahmadānaṁ viśishyate*

*yārisaṁ dhammadānaṁ* (R.E. IX,

(Manu, IV. 233)

XI)

*evaṁ samavāyaḥ kartavyaḥ* (Pāñcha-  
tāntra, I. 15)

*samavāyo eva sādhu* (R.E. XII)

*ādikaraḥ* (Pāṇini. III. 2.21)

*ādikaro* (R. E. V)

*lipikaraḥ, livikaraḥ* (Pāṇini, III.

*lipikara* (R.E. XIV)

2. 21)

*lipikareṇa* (M.R.E., Ja)

*avarārdhāt* (Pāṇini, V. 4. 4.57)

*avaradhīyā* (M.R.E., Bra.)

*putrapautram* (Pāṇini, V. 2.10)

*putāpapotike* (P.E. VII)

*Tishya-Punarvasoḥ* (Pāṇini, I.

*Tisāya Punāvasune* (P.E. V)

2.63)

*tad gachchhati pathidūtayoḥ*

*yata pi dutā no yaṁti* (R.E. XIII)

(Pāṇini, V. 3.85)

*Devānāmpriya* (Kātyāyana)

*Devānāmpriyo, Devānāmpriyo*

(R.E. III)

*khalatikasya parvatasya* (Patañjali)

*Khalatika-pavatasi* (Barābar, II)

The highly important Sanskrit text which is still left for comparison in this connexion is the Arthaśāstra containing Kauṭilyavachana. In accordance with its two forms, earlier and later, we must consider it both as a Kārikā of verses in śloka metre and as a treatise of the Sūtra-Bhāshya type. The earlier form will be referred to simply as Kārikā, and the later one as Prose Treatise.

The following instances may indicate the nature of correspondences between the *Kauṭilyavachana* in the Kārikā on the one hand and the *Aśokavachana* on the other, as regards their phrases and idioms :

## KV (Kārikā)

*putrapautrānuvartinaḥ* (VII. 16)  
*anyatrāpadā* (I. 17), *anyatra*  
*guptisthānebhyaḥ* (II. 26)  
*praṇayād rakshyate* (VII. 9)  
*praṇayena* (VIII. 5)  
*āṭaviṣhu* (VII. 6)  
*pratyante* (VII. 6)  
*sāmantaṃ* (VII. 6)  
*niruddho deśakālābhyaṃ* (VII. 3)  
*ekadeśaṃ* (V. 4)  
*āyatyāṃ cha tadātve cha* (V. 1)  
*uchchhulkaṃ* (II. 21)  
*abhirāmaṃ* (II. 13)  
*ātyayikaṃ kāryaṃ* (I. 12)  
*arthasya mūlaṃ utthānaṃ,*  
*rājño hi vrataṃ utthānaṃ,*  
*yajñāḥ kāryānuśānaṃ* (I. 12)  
*anuśaya* (in a different sense) . . .

## AV

*putāpapotike* (P.E. VII, Schism  
 Pillar Edict, Sanchi)  
*añatra Yonesu* (R. E. XIII)  
*añnata agāya dhammakāmatāya*  
 (P.E. I)  
*panayaṃ gachema*  
*su munisānaṃ* (S.R.E. I)  
*aṭaviyo* (R.E. XIII)  
*prachamtesu* (R.E. II)  
*sāmañtā lājāno* (R.E. II)  
*niludhasi kālasi* (P.E. IV)  
*ekadesaṃ* (R.E. VII)  
*tadatvāye āyatiye cha* (R.E. X)  
*ubalike* (Lumbini Pillar)  
*abhilāmāni* (R.E. VIII)  
*atiyāyike* (R.E. VI)  
*tasa esa mule usṭānaṃ*  
*cha athasamtirana cha* (R.E. VI)  
 (R.E. VI).  
*anusaye* (R.E. XIII, in the Amara-  
 kosa sense of *anuśochanā*,  
*anutāpa*)

Though the prose treatise of the Arthaśāstra is a post-Aśokan compilation, it employs or preserves several phrases and idioms showing correspondence with those in Aśokavachana, as will appear from the following tables :

## Arthaśāstra (PT)

*anyatra mātuh* (II. 1),  
*anyatra vyapadeśena* (II. 25).  
*anyatra pratishedhāt* (IV. 13), etc.  
*anyaṃ pratipādayishyāmaḥ* (I. 10)  
*mahānase* (II. 27)

## AV

*añatra Yonesu* (R.E. XIII),  
*añnata agāya*  
*dhammakāmatāya*  
*agena bhayena.* etc. (P.E. I)  
*majham paṭipādayema* (S.R.E. I)  
*mahānasamhi* (R.E. I)

*rājñah prabhāvaḥ*

- dvipada-chatushpadānām* (III. 15)  
*putradāraṁ ātmānaṁ*  
*pratyāsannam* (III. 20)  
*anarthyaḥ* (V. 4)  
*hastivanabhogaḥ* (VIII. 11)  
*nāgavana* (II. 2)  
*shāṇmāsikīm* (II. 29)  
*sukaro hi mitreṇa sandhiḥ* (VII. 13)  
*viśvāsayet* (VII. 14)  
*Pushyena* (XIV. 3)  
*kṛishṇa-chaturdaśyām*  
*paurṇamāsyām Pushya-*  
*yoginyām* (XIV. 3)  
*chāturmāsyeshvardha-*  
*māsikam aghātam* (XIII. 5)  
*anugrahaṁ dīnānātha-*  
*vyādhitānām* (XIII. 5)  
*śāsanamuktaṁ*  
*mukhājñaptam* (II. 6)  
*dāpaka* (IV. 6)  
*mahāntaṁ saṅghaṁ* (IV. 4)  
*yātrāvihāragato* (V. 1)  
*ātyāyike kārye* (1. 15)  
*āvāsacyuḥ, āvaseyuḥ* (II. 4)  
*vāsacyuḥ* (II. 36)  
*ayam parihāpayati* (II. 8)  
*mādhuryam* (II. 10)  
*punaruktam* (II. 10)  
*uchchhulkam* (II. 21)  
*prāptavyavahārānām* (III. 5)  
*apraṇṛittavadhānām* (II. 26)  
*yogyāchāryāḥ* (II. 30)  
*āsannebhyaḥ parebhyaś cha* (L. 17)  
*deyavisargo* (IX. 6)

*pabhava Devānampiyasa* (R.E.

XIII)

- dupada-chatupadesu* (P.E. II)  
*atānaṁ* (S.R.E. II)  
*paṭiyāsānnesu* (P.E. VI)  
*anathāye* (P.E. V)  
*kevaṭabhogasi* (P.E. V)  
*nāgavanasi*  
*ā-saṁmāsike* (P.E. V)  
*sukaraṁ hi pāpaṁ* (R.E. V)  
*visvaṁsayitave* (Sarnath)  
*Tisena* (S.R.E. I)  
*chāvudasaḥ paṁnadasāye*  
*Tisāye, Tisāyaṁ puṁnamāsiyaṁ*  
 (P.E. V)  
*chāturmāsīye pakhāye*  
*lakhane no kaṭaviye* (P.E. V)  
*anāthesu vudhesu*  
*hitasukhāye* (R. E. V)  
*yam kiñchi mukhato*  
*āṇipayāmi dāpakaṁ vā*  
*srāvāpakaṁ vā* (R.E. VI)  
*mahaṁte vijaye* (R.E. XIV)  
*viharayātāṁ nāyāsu* (R.E. VIII)  
*atīyāyike* (R.E. VI)  
*āvāsāyīye, vāsāpetaviye*  
 (Schism Pillar)  
*desaṁ hāpayisati* (R.E. V)  
*madhuratāya* (R.E. XIV)  
*puna-puna-vutaṁ* (R.E. XIV)  
*ubalike* (Lumbinī Pillar)  
*patavadhānaṁ* (P.E. IV)  
*yugyāchāriyāni* (M.R.E.)  
*paṭiyāsānnesu hevaṁ*  
*apakāthesu* (P.E. VI)  
*dānavisagasi* (P.E. VIII)

*abhikshnam upajapet* (IX. 6)  
*yathārham* (IX. 9)  
*alpavyayah* (IX. 4)  
*mahābhāṇḍena* (II. 28)  
*sāmāntātavikān* (IX. 3)  
*pratividhānam* (VII. 16)  
*mitravargah* (VIII. 15)  
*utsāhayukta* (VIII. 4)  
*kumāra* (V. 3)  
*devikumārāṇām* (VII. 15)  
*pauravyavahārika* (V. 3)  
*rāshtrāntapāla, antapāla* (V. 3)  
*mṛiga-paśu-pakshi-byāla-*  
*maṣyārambhān* (IV. 3)  
*paribhoga* (IV. 6)  
*apavāhayanti* (IV. 9)  
*mahāmātrāḥ* (II. 9)  
*bhakta-samvibhāgam* (IV. 3)  
*paribhāṣaṇam* (IV. 11)  
*pāshaṇḍā* (III. 16)  
*parichareyuh* (I. 21)  
*dharmadānam* (III. 16)  
*samavāyah* (III. 12)  
*asampratipattau* (III. 11)  
*ghaṭetu* (VI. 2)  
*hiraṇyadānam* (III. 10)  
*hiraṇyānugraham* (II. 36)  
*dṛiḍhabhaktitvam* (I. 9)  
*avadhyāḥ* (II. 26)  
*ashlabhāgikam* (II. 12)  
*dharmavijayī* (XII. 1)  
*dūtā* (I. 16)  
*abhikshṇya-śravaṇam* (I. 5)

*abhikshinam upadhāleyu* (Bhābru)  
*yathārahām* (M.R.E.)  
*apavyayatā* (R.E. III)  
*apabhamdatā* (R.E. III)  
*sāmānta-lājāne* (R.E. II)  
*paṭivividhāne* (R.E. VIII)  
*vage bahujane* (S.R.E. I)  
*usāhena* (P.E. I)  
*kumāle* (S.R.E. I)  
*devikumālānam* (P.E. VII)  
*nagalaviyohālaka* (S.R.E. I)  
*amta-mahāmātā* (P.E. I)  
*prānārambhō* (P.E. IV)  
  
*paṭibhogam* (P. E V)  
*apavudhe* (R.E. XIII)  
*mahāmātā* (Queen's Edict)  
*dāna-samvibhāge* (P.E. IV)  
*palibhāsayasam* (P.E. III)  
*save pāsamḍā* (R.E. VII)  
*paṭichalisanṭi* (P.E. IV)  
*dhammadānam* (R.E. IX, XI)  
*samavāyo* (R.E. VII)  
*asampratipati* (R.E. IV)  
*ghaṭitam* (R.E. XIV)  
*hiraṇnapaṭivividhāno* (R.E. VIII)  
  
*dadhbhatitā* (R.E. VII)  
*avadhiyāni* (P.E. V, VII)  
*athabhāgiye* (Lumbini Pillar)  
*dhammavijayo* (R.E. XII)  
*dūtā* (R.E. XIII)  
*abhikshinam suneyu* (Bhābru)

## CHAPTER V

### GRAMMAR AND PHONOLOGY

We have seen that the style or diction of *Aśokavachana* in Prakrit is closely akin to that of *Buddhavachana* in Pali. The phrases and idioms were mostly prose adaptations from *gāthās* and *ślokas*, in short, traditional verses, such as those preserved in the Pali Nikāyas including the Jātakas, the Rājadharmā Section of the Śāntiparva of the Mahābhārata, and the Kārikā presupposed by the extant prose treatise of the Arthaśāstra. The prose texts of *Buddhavachana* in Pali and those of *Jinavachana* in Ardhamāgadhī, too, supply parallels to many a phrase and idiom in *Aśokavachana*. If similar phrases and idioms as well as technical terms occur also in the prose treatise of the Arthaśāstra, we are not to infer from it that *Aśokavachana* derived them directly from it. It is equally true that the extant Pali Canon and Jaina Āgama, too, presuppose an earlier stage of development when their linguistic affinities with *Aśokavachana* were still closer. Even the Sanskrit diction of that stage of literary and linguistic development bore many traits in common.<sup>1</sup>

Minute analysis of the grammatical forms and phonetic peculiarities of *Aśokavachana*, offered by Hultzsch, edict by edict and inscription by inscription, and subsequently by Professor Turner in respect of the Gavīmāth and Pālkigunḍu versions of M. R. E., has made easy the path of "A Comparative Grammar of Asokan Inscriptions" by Mr. M.A. Mahendale, the phonology part of which is already published in the Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, Vol. III. In the face of these important publications, full of objective data of scientific research, there is hardly anything to add except by way of certain correctives. The unscientific feature of the scientific procedure adopted by Hultzsch and Mahendale is that in citing instances from

---

1. Barua in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Tenth All-India Oriental Conference*, p. 209f.

any particular inscription or set of records they have not taken into their consideration the errors due to Aśoka's Lipikaras' oversight, carelessness, incapacity or idiosyncrasy, in short, omissions and commissions. A few instances may make the point clear.

DT (P.E.) reads *āhā* or *ahā* instead of *āha* of LA, LN and R. A, too, reads *āhā*. K (R.E.) invariably reads *āhā*, and we meet with the same reading also in Ye, Dh and J. One may justify this reading for K, DT, DM and A by the general tendency of the dialect of that area to lengthen the final *a*. But what about Ye, Dh and J? Here the presumption must be that the intended reading was *āhā ti*, and this is corroborated by Sh (R.E. XI) *haha ti*. DT *ahā* is the scribe's mistake for *āhā*. The omission of *ti* (*iti*) after *āhā* may easily be treated as a case of oversight. In P. E. III all the versions read *nāmā ti*. When DT reads *paṇatayevū* and remaining versions *paṇatayevū ti*, the inference should be that the omission of *ti* in DT is due to the scribe's error.

The G equivalent of *iha* is *idha*. But in R.E. XI one has *iloka* instead of *idhaloka* and in R.E. XIII *ilokika* for *idhalokika*. Here the scribe is responsible for the dropping of *dh*. The Sh and M equivalents of *iha* are *hida* and *ia*, the first occurring more frequently in M and the second in Sh. And yet it is improbable that *ia* was precisely the Sh spelling of *iha*; had it been the case, we would have *aa* instead of *aha*. The reading *iha*, met with in R.E. XIII, confirms the suspicion about the scribe's error in *ia*.

In R.E. VII, all the six versions read *sayame* for *saṃyamah*. In R.E. XII the Sh spelling is *sayamo*, while in R.E. XIII Sh reads *saṃyamaṃ* (Acc.). Similarly in R.E. IX, K reads *saṃyame* and Sh *saṃyamo*. From these data, the inference is irresistible that the omission of *m* (*anusvāra*) is just an instance of the scribe's oversight.

G has *rājūke* and *prādesike* for *rājūko* and *prādesiko* in R.E. III, *sayame* for *saṃyamo* in R.E. VIII, *athakamme* for *athakam-mam* in R.E. VI, and *mūle* for *mūlam* in R.E. VI. These, as we know, are not the *bonafide* grammatical forms of the dialect of Gīrnār.

Such instances need not be multiplied. Those cited above



are sufficient, I think, to convince us of the reasonableness of fixing the grammatical and phonological standard of each dialect by typical forms only, and not by any and every form on record.

In connection with orthography and phonology, the question is apt to arise—were all the words pronounced as written? An extremist like the late Dr. Fleet will maintain that they were not pronounced as written. Take, for instance, the word *dukkaram*, *dukkare*, or *dukkale* which is written as *dukaram* (G), *dukara* (Sh), *dukare* (M), *dukale* (K, Dh, J, R.E. V) The debatable point is whether the word was meant to be pronounced as *dukkaram*, *dukkare*, *dukkale* or as *dukaram*, *dukare*, *dukale*. Though nothing can be said dogmatically on this point, the reader may have his guidance in forming his opinion from the fact that the Prakrit dialects of Aśoka do nowhere show the tendency to what is called phonetic decay. Guided by the Law of Mora (Metre), they retain in tact the phonetic values of all words. We are not to think of any loss of sound without some compensation provided against it. In default of the compensation in spellings on record, the presumption ought to be that something is wrong somewhere. Consider, for instance, the case of Dh *kichhaṁde*, J *kimchhāṁde* (S.R.E. II) for the Pali *kimchhando*. In J, *ā* in *chhaṁde* is redundant. In Dh, *ki* ought to have been spelt as *kī*. In default of the compensating feature, the presumption must be that the spelling *ki* with the omission of *ṁ* after it or without the lengthening of *i* is due to the scribe's ignorance or oversight.

As to R.E. III, G offers *vāsesu*, and K, Dh and J *vasesu* for the Pali *vassesu*. In the former, there is a compensating feature in the lengthening of *a* in *va*; in the latter, there is no such feature. In metrical measure *vāsesu* and *vassesu* are of an equal phonetic value, and *vasesu* and *vassesu* are not so. So in the case of *vasesu*, the presumption should be that it was meant to be pronounced as *va(s)sesu*.

There are a few special cases, where compensation is sought to be effected by the shifting of emphasis. Take, for instance, the Sh and M *Priyadraśi* for Sk. *Priyadarśi*, Pali *Piyadassi*, *dhramam* for G *dhammam*, Sk. *dharmanī*, and G *bhūtapruvam* for

Sk *bhūtapūruam*. Here the emphasis is shifted, in the case of *Priyadrāsī*, from the fifth to the second syllable ; in the case of *bhūtapruvam*, from the third to the second. In Pali, for instance, one may choose to adopt the spelling *vīriyam* or *viriyam* for Sk. *vīryam*. In adopting *vīriyam*, he will be putting the emphasis on the first syllable, while in adopting *viriyam*, he will be shifting the emphasis on to the third syllable.

One may go indeed so far as to premise that there is no instance of phonetic decay in any dialect or language, which is not accompanied by a compensating feature. Let us consider, for instance, the language of the Prakrit Dhammapada having all the main important features in common with the Sh Prakrit of Aśoka. It shows a good deal of phonetic decay, as will appear from the comparison of the following stanza with its Pali counterpart :

Prakrit :— *ujuo namo so magu, abhaya namu sa diśa |*  
*radho akūyano namu dhamatrakehi sahato ||*

Pali :— *ujuko nāma so maggo, abhayā nāma sā diśā |*  
*ratho akūjano nāma dhammachakkehi saṃyuto ||*

It is easy to guess that the manner of chanting behind the Prakrit verse is different from that behind the Pali gāthā, — that, in other words, the phonetic decay took place in the Prakrit Dhammapada of Khotan so as to adapt its verses to local and racial needs. One has got to chant the Prakrit stanza, quoted above, in the manner of the Tibeto-Chinese people, by swaying one's head to and fro. Here the compensation is effected by means of gesticulation and intonation.

In many an instance the system of spelling and grammatical forms have been determined by the Law of Rhythm and Cadence or the Law of Euphony governing the construction of sentences :

R.E.X. : *Etakāya Devānaṃpiyo Piyadasi rājā yaso vā kiti vā*  
*ichhati, yaso for yasam, kiti for kitim.*

S.R.E.I. : *Save munise pajā mamā, mamā for mama.*

P.E.I. (LA) *Devānaṃpiye Piyadasi lāja hevaṃ āha : sadavī-*  
*sati-vasābhisitena me iyaṃ dharmmalipi likhāpita, Piyā-*

*dasi* for *Piyadasī*, *lāja* for *lājā*, *lipi* for *lipī*, *likhāpita* for *likhāpitā*.

Provided that the rhythm is maintained, the cadences are all right, the sounds are sweet and appropriate in rhyming, and the cæsuras come spontaneously, it is immaterial whether certain rules of number and gender are obeyed or infringed :

M.R.E. (Bra, Si) : *Pakamasa hi iyaṃ phale, no hīyaṃ sakye mahātpeneva pāpotave kāmam tu kho khudakena pi pakamaminena vipule svage sakye āūdhetave. Etāyathāya iyaṃ sāvane sāvāpityathā khudakā hca mahātpā cha imaṃ pakameyu ti, amṭā cha mai jāneyu, chirathitike cha iyaṃ pakame hot(u). Iyaṃ cha aṭhe vadhisiti vipulaṃ pi cha vadhisiti avaradhiyā diyadhiyaṃ vadhisiti.*

Thus the text of *Aśokavachana* is skilfully composed so as to be suitable not so much for reading as for chanting, and in this respect we cannot fail to notice a striking similarity between the Pali and *Aśokan* texts. Though the words of the Buddha are in prose, they follow a law of rhythm and cadence, if not exactly that of metre, and the sentences spontaneously come to their natural stops in course of chanting :

*Evam me sutam : Ekam samayaṃ Bhagavā viharati jetavane Anāthapiṇḍikassa ārāme. Atha kho aññatarā devatā kevalakappaṃ Jetavanam obhāsetvā yena Bhagavā tenupasaṅkami; upasaṅkamitvā Bhagavantam abhivādetvā ekam antam atthāsī. Ekamantam thitā kho sā devatā Bhagavantam gāthāya ajjhabhāsī.*

The old *Gāthā* tradition or Vedic mode of chanting lingers even in the texts of *Jinavachana* in *Ardhamāgadhī*. But these texts often lack the spontaneity and vigour of *Buddhavachana* in Pali. Even the verses in such old *Āgama* texts as the *Āchārāṅga* seem to be on a par with some in the extant treatise of the *Arthaśāstra* :

*Āchārāṅga, Uvahāṇa-suyam, ix. 2-3 :*  
*Āvesaṇa-sabhā-pavāsu paṇiya-sālāsu egayā vāso*  
*adu vā paliyatthānesu palālapuñjesu egayā vāso*

*Āgantare ārāmāgāre nagare vi egayā vāso.  
susāṇe sunṇāgāre vā rukkkhamūle vi egayā vāso.*

Arthaśāstra, III. 19.

*Kalahe dravyam apaharato daśapaṇo daṇḍaḥ  
kshudraka-dravya-hiṃsāyām tachcha tāvachcha daṇḍaḥ  
sthūlaka-dravya-hiṃsāyām tachcha dviguṇaś cha daṇḍaḥ.*

Among the Buddhist brethren, those who were master reciters of *Buddhavachana* are claimed in the *Milīndapañha* (p. 344) to be adepts in the discrimination of high and low accents, long and short syllables, heavy and light measures of letters: (*bahussutā āgatāgamā dhammadharā . . . sithila-dhanita-dīgharassa-garuka-lahukakkhara-parichchheda-kusulā*). It is in respect of this discrimination of accents, etc., that Buddhaghosa has sharply distinguished the language of *Buddhavachana* from Tamil and other non-Aryan speeches of Ancient India (*Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī*, I, p. 276). The texts of all other Buddhist sects but the Theravāda are found lacking in the distinctive characteristics of the language of the Pali Canon. Their so-called "Gāthā dialects", saturated with Prakrit elements, show resemblances to the Sanskritic Prakrits of the Śaka, Kushāṇa, Kshaharāta, Śātavāhana and Ikshvāku inscriptions. Their prose texts betray only imperfect Sanskritisations from those in some earlier language, allied to Pali. So far as the rhythm, cadences and cæsuras are concerned, the records of Aśoka fully maintain the literary and linguistic tradition of Pali. In Aśokavachana, too, the syntax of words in a sentence is governed by the law of rhythm and cadence :

R. E. III : *sādhu mātari cha pitari cha susrūsā,  
mitra-saṃstuta-ñātinam bāmhana-  
samaṇānaṃ sādhu dānaṃ, prāṇānaṃ  
sādhu anāraṃbho, apavyayatā apa-  
bhaṃdatā sādhu.*

Here the word *sādhu* is put first in one clause, in a penultimate position in the second clause, in the middle of the third clause, and last in the fourth clause.

## Barābar Hill-Cave I :

*Lājinā Piyadasinā duvādasa-vasābhisitenū  
iyam kubhā dinā Ājīvikehi, instead of  
Ājīvikehi dinā.*

To do full justice to a comparative grammar of *Aśokavachana* from the historical point of view as distinguished from the merely analytical or scientific standpoint, one has got to return a definite answer to the question as to which of the three languages, Old Classical Sanskrit, Old Pali and Old Ardhamāgadhī, has the greatest share in the phonetic peculiarities and grammatical forms of *Aśokavachana*. The real tug of war lies between the claims of Old Pali and Old Ardhamāgadhī, the languages that in their maturity kept clear of the eighteen *Mlechchhabhāshās* or *Deśi-bhāshās* (Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 109), Tamil, Telugu, and the rest. By the consensus of expert opinion the Ardhamāgadhī of the extant Śvetāmbara Canon is junior in age to the Pali of the extant Buddhist Canon, preserved in Ceylon, Siam and Burma (Preface to Jacobi's edition of the Āyāraṅga, P.T.S.). According to the Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 56, Mahāvīra loudly, distinctly and forcibly chanted his doctrine in Ardhamāgadhī, a language, which is claimed as the super-excellent language comprising in its wide scope all idioms (*sarva bhāsūṅugāminīe . . . sareṇam Addhamāgadhae bhāsāe bhāsai*). The examples of formulations cited in illustration, *atthi loe, atthi aloe, evam bandhe makkhe*, etc., we see that *e* stands as the first sing. case-ending for the *a*-declension, precisely as in Māgadhī of the Prakrit grammarians.

The Ardhamāgadhī of the Jaina Canon presupposes the Māgadhika or bardic songs, ballads and moral verses (*Māgahiyam gāham gīyam silogam*, Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 107).

In such texts as the Āchārāṅga Sūtra there is throughout a hopeless blending of Māgadhī and Ardhamāgadhī elements : it is difficult in places to discriminate which is which. Pali shows a conscious tendency to get rid of Māgadhism and to keep it distinct from it. The philosophical views of some of the elder contemporaries of the Buddha are represented in Old Māgadhī as well as in Pali. By comparison of the two ways of representation, we can understand the difference between Pali and Old Māgadhī for-

mulations of Indian thought, e.g., *n'atthi attakāre, n'atthi parakāre, n'atthi purisakāre*; *sukhe dukkhe jīvasattame* (Sāmāññaphala Sutta). In the Ariyapariyesana Sutta (Majjhima-N. I) and the Mahāvagga, I, the very word of Upaka, the Ājīvika, is faithfully reproduced: *hupeyya āvuso', 'huveyya āvuso.'* This Old Māgadhi verbal form is met with in *Aśokavachana*; *huvevūti hveyū* (S.R.E. II). The Vedic *tave* which occurs as a regular infinitive suffix in *Aśokavachana* is occasionally met with in Pali *gāthās*. But for the Aśokan Gerund *tu* for *tvā* (Dh, J, etc.), one must refer to the Māgadhi *gāthās* in the Jaina Canon; *vinaittu soyam* (Āchārāṅga, Logasāra), *jānitta dukkham* (*ib.* Loga-vijao). Just as in Aśokan Eastern dialects, so in Ardhamāgadhi, *dupada* is the equivalent of Sk *dvipada*. The *āye* as the Dative sing. case-ending has its counterpart in *āe*: *viosaraṇāe*. The Girnār *darsana* (R.E. IV) corresponds to the Ardhamāgadhi *daṁsaṇa*. But the phonetic peculiarities and grammatical forms, particularly those of Girnār, correspond mostly to those in Pali.

== Subham astu ==

## INDEX TO PART II

- abhakshyas, 41f  
 abhisheka, 11f, 18  
 abhyavapatti, 21  
 adhimāsa, 45  
 Adhyakshas, 43  
 āgama, 31, 39f  
 āgatāgamā, 31  
 agrāmya, 24  
 Ajīvikas, 7, 44  
 ājñā-lekha, 18, 20  
 akāntiḥ, 22  
 ākhyānam, 21  
 Aliyavasāni, 33  
 Allahabad - Kosam pillar, 6f  
 Amātyas, 44  
 Ambalaṭṭhika Rāhulovāda  
     Sutta, 36  
 Anāgatabhayāni, 34, 39  
 Antā avijitā, 18  
 anugraha, 19  
 Anumāna Sutta, 33  
 anunaya, 21  
 anuposathan, 37  
 anusamyāna, 47  
 Apabhraṃśa Prakrit, 53  
 aparāntas, 3f, 8  
 apaśabda, 25  
 Aramav inscription, 9  
 Ardhamāgadhi, 51, 56f,  
     orthography, 10  
 arthāh, 21  
 arthakrama, 22  
 arthana, 21  
 asamati, asamāpti, 23  
 Aśokan Prakrit, 55f, 59f  
 Aṣavrkas, 18  
 arthamadhuratā, 23  
 audāryam, 22  
 avadhyas, 41f  
 Avanti, 18  
 Bairāt, 5, 27, 50, 54f  
 Barābar Hill cave  
     inscriptions, 11, 19, 42, 50  
 Barua, 40f, 47n, 60, 89n  
 Basti, a district, 7  
 Beadon, C., 6  
 Bethia, 6  
 Bhābru Edict, 5, 20, 31, 37f., 57, 60;  
     63  
 Bhandarkar, D.R., 3, 9, 11, 16, 32,  
     40  
 bhartsana, 21  
 Bhikkhu Pātimokkha, 70  
 Vinaya, 33  
 Bindusāra, 44  
 Bloch, 6, 13  
 Bodhāyana, 37, 41f, 88  
 Bose, Atindra Nath, 43  
 Brahmagiri, 6, 49, 52f  
 Brāhmaṇas, 44, 46  
 Brāhmī, 9f  
 Buddha Konāgamana, Stupa of, 12f  
 Buddha Śākyamuni, place of the  
 nativity of, 13  
 Buddhavachana, 31f, 38, 40, 60f, 65,  
     68f, 93  
 Buddhism, Brahmanical reaction  
 against, 44  
 Buddhist ballad poetry, 28, 31, 35,  
     38, 60  
     Council, 39, literature, 31f, Mid-  
     dle Country, 26, Missions, 32,  
     sacred places, 13, Sangha, 13,  
     Schismatics, 20, sects, 40, tradi-  
     tion, 31, 40  
 Bühler, Hofrāth, 9  
 Burmese alphabet, 9  
 Carlleyle, 5  
 Champāran, a district, 6, pillars, 13  
 Chandragupta Maurya, 4, 28  
 Chapāḍa, a scribe, 9  
 Chatterji, S. K., 61n  
 Chhandas, Vedic language, 24, 60  
 Cholas, 4  
 Cuneiform script, 9  
 Cunningham, 4

- daṇḍanīti, 45f  
 Daśaratha, 7  
 Delhi, 7, 56, - Mirāṭh copy, , 26  
     Sivalik, 7, - Topra, 7  
 Devānampriya, 41  
 dhamma, - anusathi, 16, 20, 29, - dāna,  
 37, - lipi, 11f, 14, - nīyama, - sāvana,  
 15f, 20, - thambhāni, 29  
 Dharmasthas, 44  
 dharmarājikas, 7  
 Dhauli, 1, 3f, 12, 16f, 27f, 49f. 51f. 56  
 Dutt, N, 61n  
  
 Eastern dialect, 27, Prakrit, 54  
 Elliot, Walter, 3  
  
 Firoz Shah Lāt, 7  
 Forrest, 3  
 Frontagers, 18, 20  
  
 Goradhagiri, 2, 8  
 Gośringavīhāra, 53  
  
 Haimavata Madhyadeśa, 53  
 Harappa, 10  
 Hemchandra, 53  
 Herzfeld, 9  
 Hultzsch, 14, 48  
  
 Indrajī, Bhagawanlal, 4  
 Indus, 4, 53, - Valley, 7  
 Inscriptions, Achaemenian, 9,  
 Barābar Hill-cave, Commemorative,  
 13, Hill Cave, 1, Minor Pillar, 1,  
 Pillar, 1, Rock, 1, Separate Rock, 1,  
 Stone-block, 1  
 Iranian dialect, 53  
 Isila, 6, copies of M. R. E., 8,  
     Mahāmātras, 63  
  
 Jaimini 47ii, Bhārata of, 33  
 Jaina, 28, 41, Canon, 57f, dictum, 41  
 Jainism, 44  
 Jambudvīpa, 47  
 Jaṅga - Rāmeswara, 6  
 Jaugaḍa, 1, 4, 12, 26f, 49f  
 Jayaswal, K. P., 20  
  
 Kalinga, 3f, 12, 18, 25, 53  
 Kalsi, 1, 3, 8, 27f, 49, 53f, 59  
 Kāluvāki, 3, 14  
 Kamboja, 4f, 47  
 kaṇṇasukhā, 23  
 Kapilavastu, 13  
 Kapurdagarhi, 5  
 Karṇa Chaupar, 8  
 Karnul, 4  
 Kasmīra - Gandhāra, 8  
 Kauśāmbī, 2, 6, 14, 54, 56,  
     pillar, 7, 14, 50  
 Kauṭilya, 17f, 21, 23f, 45f, - Vachana,  
 Khalatika Hills, 7f, 42  
 Kharoshthī alphabet, 9f,  
     documents, 64, Ms., 53,  
     scribes, 9  
  
 Kittoe, 3  
 Kopbal, 5  
 Kośala, 44  
 Kosambi, Dharmananda, 33  
 Kumāras, 18  
 Kushāṇa, 42  
  
 Lāghulovāda, 36  
 Lāt Bhaīro, 2  
 Lauriya, Ararāj, 56,  
     Nandangarh, 26, 56  
 Law, B. C., 39  
 Lekhaka, 43  
 lekhadoshāh, 22  
 Lekhasampat, 22  
 Lipikara, 9, 25, 42f  
 Lokottaravāda, a Buddhist sect, 35  
 Lomaśa Rishi cave, 8  
 Lumbini, 7, 13, 26, 37,  
     pillar, 13, 64,  
     inscription, 11, 19f, 37, 50f  
  
 mādhyam, 22  
 Maga, 30  
 Magadha, 44  
 Māgadhi, 24, 27, 54f, 58, 60  
 Mahā-Ariyavaṃsa Suttanta, 34  
 Mahādeva, a thera, 8  
 Mahādhammarakkhita, a thera, 8  
 Mahā-Rāhulovāda, 36  
 Mahārakkhita, a thera, 8