

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

DEVANAMAPIYA AŚOKA'S BAIRAT EDICTS AS THE JURISPRUDENTIAL GRUNDNORM

AUTHORED BY - ADV. RAVINDRANATH C. WASE

Independent Researcher

Rashtrasant Tukadoji Maharaj Nagpur University, Nagpur, Maharashtra

Abstract

The Bairat Edicts of Devanamapiya Aśoka, dating to the third century BCE, may be examined as one of the earliest surviving written constitutional-normative instruments, expressing principles comparable to the Rule of Law. Dhamma-Vinaya provides the foundational normative framework, integrating moral obligation, ethical conduct, disciplinary norms, institutional responsibility, public accountability, governance and civilisational order. The study examines these principles through Natural Law, Historical Jurisprudence, Sociological Jurisprudence, Legal Positivism, Constitutionalism, Rule of Law, Virtue Jurisprudence, Communitarian Jurisprudence, Restorative Justice and Preventive Jurisprudence, with particular analytical reference to Kelsen's Grundnorm, Hart's Rule of Recognition and Fuller's Internal Morality of Law.

The Bairat Edict is significant because it publicly recognises, affirms and preserves an established normative order rather than merely expressing an arbitrary sovereign command. It identifies seven Dhamma-pariyāyā: Vinaya-samukkaṃsa, Ariya-vāsāni, Anāgata-bhayāni, Muni-gāthā, Moneyya-sutta, Upatissa-pañha and Rāhulovāda. Their identified themes include Vinaya, noble conduct, awareness of future dangers, restraint, ethical responsibility, inquiry and truthfulness. The identification of some passages remains uncertain; therefore, the study treats the seven identifications with appropriate scholarly caution.

These principles disclose a preventive moral-legal jurisprudence, in which ethical instruction, disciplinary regulation, self-restraint and awareness of consequences seek to prevent misconduct, institutional disorder and social harm. The wider Aśokan administrative system further connected Dhamma with public administration, including the Dhamma-Mahāmāttas, whose functions are evidenced in other Aśokan inscriptions rather than specifically in the Bairat Edict.

The study argues that the Bairat Edict may, by analytical analogy, be understood as a foundational Grundnorm of the normative order expressed through Dhamma-Vinaya. Kelsen's Grundnorm is used solely as a modern jurisprudential concept and is not historically attributed to Aśoka. The study does not claim direct historical influence on later jurists; rather, later jurisprudential theories provide comparative analytical frameworks for understanding the third-century BCE evidence. The Bairat Edict therefore provides significant early evidence for an integrated moral-legal jurisprudence linking normativity, discipline, responsibility, promulgation, administration, accountability, prevention and public governance.

Keywords: Moral-Legal Jurisprudence; Preventive Justice; Administrative Accountability; Normative Authority; Social Governance.

1. Introduction

Jurisprudence is concerned with the nature, authority, validity, purpose and operation of law. Questions about the source of normative authority, the relation between morality and law, the limits of public power, institutional responsibility and the prevention of social harm are not confined to modern legal systems. Ancient normative orders can also be examined through these questions, provided that modern legal concepts are used carefully and do not replace the historical evidence. The Bairat Edict of Devanamapiya Aśoka is particularly valuable for such an inquiry because it is a third-century BCE rock inscription that publicly identifies selected Dhamma teachings and connects their preservation with royal authority.

The central proposition of this article is not that Aśoka possessed a modern constitution, knew Kelsen's theory, or created a legal system identical with a contemporary state. Rather, the article argues that the Bairat Edict can be read as an early formal written moral-legal and jurisprudential document whose normative structure can be analysed through later theories of law. Its significance lies in the relationship between an established normative order, institutional discipline, public proclamation, royal recognition and the preservation of authoritative teachings.

The paper therefore uses the Bairat Edict as the primary historical object and the later schools of jurisprudence as analytical lenses. The sequence is deliberate: Natural Law addresses higher normative principles; Historical Jurisprudence addresses continuity; Sociological Jurisprudence addresses social regulation; Legal Positivism addresses validity and

authority; Kelsen, Hart and Fuller provide more specific analytical tools; Rule of Law and Constitutionalism address public power; Virtue, Communitarian, Restorative and Preventive Jurisprudence address character, community, correction and prevention. The resulting argument is that the Bairat Edict provides an early and unusually clear site for examining the interaction of morality, discipline, normativity, institutional authority and governance.

2. Research Problem and Questions

The Bairat Edict has usually been approached within the fields of Aśokan epigraphy, Buddhist history and ancient Indian history. Its potential contribution to jurisprudence requires a more focused legal analysis. The research problem is therefore whether the inscription contains sufficient evidence of normative recognition, disciplinary regulation, institutional responsibility and public authority to justify its interpretation as an early moral-legal jurisprudential document.

The article asks four principal questions: (i) what jurisprudential principles can be identified from the Bairat Edict itself; (ii) how does Dhamma-Vinaya function as a normative framework of conduct and discipline; (iii) how can later jurisprudential theories illuminate, without being projected historically onto, the inscription; and (iv) whether Kelsen's concept of Grundnorm can provide a useful analytical analogy for the foundational position of the normative order evidenced by the Edict?

3. Methodology and Scope

The research adopts a doctrinal, historical, epigraphic and comparative jurisprudential methodology. The Bairat Edict and other relevant Aśokan inscriptions constitute the primary historical evidence. Pāli canonical material is used to identify and interpret the Dhamma-pariyāyā where the identification is sufficiently supported. Modern jurisprudential literature is used comparatively to analyse concepts of normativity, validity, authority, accountability, publicity, prevention and governance. The scope is centred on the Bairat Edict; other Aśokan inscriptions are introduced only where they provide necessary contextual evidence, particularly concerning the Dhamma-Mahāmāttas.

4. The Bairat Edict as Primary Jurisprudential Evidence

The Bairat Edict is distinctive within the Aśokan corpus because it directly identifies

selected teachings and addresses the Buddhist community in relation to their continued study and reflection. The inscription invokes reverence for the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha and names specific Dhamma-pariyāyā that are to be heard and considered. It thereby demonstrates more than private royal belief: it records a public act of recognition and preservation.

From a jurisprudential perspective, the inscription may be analysed through a sequence of normative acts: recognition of an authoritative teaching; identification of specific normative materials; public proclamation; institutional transmission; and preservation through durable inscription. This does not transform the Edict into a statute in the modern sense. It demonstrates instead how an ancient ruler used public authority to recognise and preserve a pre-existing normative order.

The distinction between creation and recognition is fundamental. Aśoka does not present the seven teachings as inventions of royal command. The inscription gives them public recognition within an existing tradition. This feature permits comparison with jurisprudential theories in which legal or normative validity depends upon sources, recognition, institutional practice or higher principles rather than upon arbitrary personal will alone.

5. Dhamma-Vinaya as a Normative Order

Dhamma-Vinaya is the central normative concept for the present analysis. Dhamma provides principles concerning conduct and ethical responsibility, while Vinaya provides a detailed institutional disciplinary framework for the Saṅgha. The Vinaya tradition includes rules of conduct, procedures for communal acts, confession and correction, dispute settlement and institutional responsibilities. The Bairat Edict does not replace this disciplinary corpus. Rather, it evidences the public recognition of selected teachings within the wider normative tradition.

The jurisprudential importance of Dhamma-Vinaya lies in the combination of substantive norm and institutional discipline. A moral principle becomes institutionally significant when it is recognised, communicated, practised and preserved. The Bairat Edict therefore provides a historical point at which an established moral-disciplinary order is publicly connected with royal authority. The relationship can be represented as: Sakyamuni → Dhamma-Vinaya → Saṅgha → established normative practice → royal recognition → public inscription.

This structure is important for the paper's Grundnorm thesis. The argument does not identify Dhamma with a modern constitution or Vinaya with a modern statute. Instead, it identifies a foundational normative relationship in which moral obligation, institutional discipline and public authority are brought into a coherent order.

6. The Seven Dhamma-pariyāyā

The Bairat Edict names seven Dhamma-pariyāyā. Their identification with extant Pāli texts is a matter of scholarly reconstruction and is not equally certain in every case. The article therefore distinguishes the epigraphic evidence—the names recorded in the inscription—from later canonical identification.

Vinaya-samukkaṃsa is associated with the importance or exaltation of Vinaya. Its precise canonical identification remains uncertain. Jurisprudentially, however, the term is relevant to institutional discipline and the normative status of rules governing conduct.

Ariya-vāsāni is generally associated with the noble modes of living. Its relevance lies in the connection between normative character and conduct: a legal order is not merely external regulation but can also establish standards of responsible behaviour.

Anāgata-bhayāni concerns future dangers. It is especially important for Preventive Jurisprudence because the normative objective is to anticipate foreseeable danger and alter conduct before harm occurs.

Muni-gāthā is associated with the Muni material and is commonly connected with restraint and disciplined conduct. Moneyya-sutta likewise concerns the conduct appropriate to a Muni. Together these themes strengthen the argument that the Edict promotes self-regulation rather than relying exclusively upon external coercion.

Upatissa-pañha is generally understood as a question-and-answer text associated with Upatissa, although its precise identification remains debated. Its inclusion demonstrates the importance of inquiry and reasoned engagement with normative teaching.

Rāhulovāda is associated with the instruction to Rāhula concerning truthfulness and examination of conduct. Its jurisprudential significance lies in personal responsibility: the actor

is required to examine conduct and consequences rather than merely await external punishment.

Taken together, the seven names provide a coherent field of jurisprudential themes: discipline, noble conduct, anticipation of danger, restraint, inquiry, responsibility and truthfulness. They are therefore particularly suitable for examining a preventive and virtue-oriented normative order.

7. Natural Law Jurisprudence

Natural Law provides the first comparative lens. Classical Natural Law traditions generally distinguish a higher moral or rational order from rules that are merely commands of a human authority. Aristotle connects justice and political order with virtue and the common good; later thinkers such as Thomas Aquinas develop a more systematic relationship between higher law, natural law and human law.

The Bairat Edict offers a useful comparative structure because the normative order is not presented as simply created by Aśoka's personal will. The ruler recognises and promotes teachings belonging to an established tradition. The analytical parallel is therefore: higher normative principle → ethical conduct → institutional discipline → legitimate governance. This does not establish that Aśoka possessed Natural Law theory; it shows that the inscription can be meaningfully examined through the question of whether public authority is subject to principles that it does not itself create.

8. Historical Jurisprudence

Historical Jurisprudence, especially in the work of Savigny, stresses the historical development of law through social institutions and inherited practices. The Bairat Edict strongly invites this kind of analysis because it is not an isolated normative proclamation. It belongs to an established Dhamma-Vinaya tradition maintained through the Saṅgha.

The jurisprudential sequence is therefore continuity rather than invention: teaching, transmission, institutional practice, recognition and inscription. The Edict records one stage in that process. Historical Jurisprudence thus helps explain why the legal significance of the inscription should be assessed not only by its wording but also by its institutional and historical setting.

9. Sociological Jurisprudence

Sociological Jurisprudence examines law in relation to social interests, institutions and social ordering. Roscoe Pound's approach is particularly useful because it asks what social functions legal norms perform. The Bairat framework can be examined in this way: disciplinary norms regulate institutional conduct; ethical norms shape individual behaviour; public proclamation communicates expectations; and administrative mechanisms connect normative principles with governance.

The question therefore moves beyond "What is the rule?" to "What social order does the rule seek to produce?" The Bairat Edict supports an interpretation of normativity directed toward disciplined institutions, responsible individuals and social harmony.

10. Legal Positivism

Legal Positivism provides a contrasting framework because it asks about the sources and validity of law rather than assuming that moral merit determines legal validity. John Austin's command theory identifies law with the commands of a sovereign backed by sanctions. The Bairat Edict does not fit neatly within that model because the ruler publicly recognises an existing normative tradition rather than presenting the named teachings simply as newly created commands.

The comparison becomes more complex in Kelsen and Hart. Both move beyond simple command theory, but they do so differently. Their theories allow the researcher to ask how a normative order acquires validity, how authority is recognised, and how institutions maintain continuity. The Bairat Edict is valuable precisely because it provides an ancient case in which moral authority, institutional practice and royal authority interact.

11. Kelsen's Grundnorm

Kelsen's Grundnorm is the central analytical concept of this article. In the Pure Theory of Law, the Grundnorm is a foundational presupposition within a hierarchy of norms and serves as the ultimate point of normative validity for the legal order. The present paper does not claim that Aśoka knew or employed Kelsen's twentieth-century theory.

The term is used by analytical analogy. The Bairat Edict can be viewed as evidence of a

foundational normative structure because it brings together authoritative teachings, institutional discipline, public recognition, durable promulgation and royal authority. The proposed relationship is: foundational Dhamma principles → Vinaya and conduct norms → institutional practice → public recognition → royal proclamation and preservation.

This is a jurisprudential interpretation, not a claim that the inscription is literally a Kelsenian Grundnorm. The distinction is essential. Kelsen's theory explains the modern concept of foundational normativity; the Bairat Edict supplies the ancient historical evidence from which a comparative normative structure can be reconstructed.

12. Hart's Rule of Recognition

H. L. A. Hart's Rule of Recognition concerns the social criteria by which a legal system identifies valid rules. Hart's emphasis on social acceptance and institutional practice provides a useful contrast with Kelsen's theoretical model.

The Bairat evidence raises a related question: how were authoritative teachings recognised within the institutional community? The Saṅgha's established disciplinary tradition, together with royal recognition and public inscription, illustrates a complex interaction between social acceptance, institutional authority and public recognition. The Bairat Edict cannot be equated with Hart's Rule of Recognition; rather, Hart provides an analytical vocabulary for examining recognition and institutional continuity.

13. Fuller's Internal Morality of Law

Lon L. Fuller's Internal Morality of Law highlights requirements such as publicity, clarity, consistency and congruence between declared rules and official action. The Bairat Edict is especially relevant to publicity because normative material is placed in a durable public medium.

The inscription therefore demonstrates a basic jurisprudential principle: norms intended to guide conduct require communication. Public inscription makes the ruler's normative position visible and durable. Fuller's later theory provides a useful framework for explaining why promulgation is legally significant, without suggesting that Aśoka followed Fuller's theory.

14. Rule of Law

The Rule of Law is concerned with non-arbitrary government, publicly knowable norms, accountability and the subjection of public authority to established principles. The Bairat Edict is not a modern Rule-of-Law constitution, but it can be examined for a comparable normative principle: public authority is exercised in relation to an established moral and disciplinary order.

The distinction between power and normativity is central. A ruler may possess coercive authority, but the Bairat model presents governance as connected with Dhamma rather than with arbitrary command alone. This provides a historically significant comparative basis for the proposition that legitimate governance should be norm-governed.

15. Constitutionalism

Modern Constitutionalism concerns the organisation and limitation of public power through higher norms. The Bairat Edict does not establish separation of powers, judicial review, representative institutions or a modern catalogue of fundamental rights. It should therefore not be described as a constitution in the modern technical sense.

Nevertheless, the inscription has constitutional-normative significance as an analytical category because it links public authority with principles regarded as higher than arbitrary personal preference. The phrase “constitutional-normative instrument” is therefore used cautiously to describe the relationship between foundational values, institutional discipline and public authority rather than to claim identity with a modern constitution.

16. Virtue Jurisprudence

Virtue Jurisprudence examines the role of law in cultivating responsible character. The Bairat themes of restraint, noble conduct, truthfulness, ethical responsibility and self-examination fit naturally within this framework.

The objective is not merely to secure obedience through fear of punishment. A person is expected to develop the capacity for self-regulation. This creates a jurisprudential sequence in which normative instruction contributes to character, character contributes to responsible conduct, and responsible conduct contributes to institutional and social stability.

17. Communitarian Jurisprudence

Communitarian jurisprudence emphasises shared values, collective responsibilities and the relationship between individual conduct and community life. The Bairat Edict addresses the Saṅgha and also recognises the role of lay followers in hearing and considering the teachings.

The normative order therefore operates at several levels: individual conduct, institutional discipline and wider social responsibility. The community is not merely the recipient of law; it is part of the social environment through which norms are transmitted, accepted and maintained.

18. Restorative Justice

Restorative Justice focuses on responsibility, correction, reconciliation and restoration rather than punishment alone. The Bairat Edict is not a modern restorative-justice statute, but its emphasis on ethical reflection and correction provides a useful conceptual comparison.

The Rāhulovāda material is especially relevant because it emphasises examination of conduct and consequences. The jurisprudential movement is from awareness of conduct to recognition of responsibility and correction. Such an approach complements a punitive model by placing prevention and moral correction before or alongside sanction.

19. Preventive Jurisprudence

Preventive Jurisprudence is a central contribution of the present analysis. Its basic proposition is that a sound normative order should prevent foreseeable misconduct and social harm rather than depend exclusively upon punishment after the event.

Anāgata-bhayāni, concerned with future dangers, provides the clearest conceptual basis for this argument. Vinaya supplies disciplinary regulation; Muni and Moneyya themes emphasise restraint; and Rāhulovāda places responsibility on the individual to examine conduct and consequences. Together they support a model expressed as: awareness → restraint → self-regulation → prevention → social order.

This preventive model has clear contemporary jurisprudential relevance. Modern legal systems use preventive regulation, compliance mechanisms, administrative supervision and

risk reduction in many fields. The Bairat comparison does not claim equivalence with modern regulatory law; it identifies an ancient normative logic in which prevention is preferable to the exclusive reliance on punishment.

20. Dhamma-Mahāmāttas and Administrative Implementation

The Dhamma-Mahāmāttas should be treated as evidence from the wider Aśokan administrative system rather than as officials specifically created or described by the Bairat Edict. Their importance is that they provide institutional context for the relationship between normative proclamation and administrative implementation.

Aśoka's Rock Edict V refers to the Dhamma-Mahāmāttas and their work among different groups. This allows a broader jurisprudential sequence to be examined: norm → proclamation → administrative communication → implementation → supervision → accountability. The evidence does not justify equating the Dhamma-Mahāmāttas with modern police, courts or regulatory agencies. It does, however, demonstrate that Aśokan Dhamma had an administrative dimension extending beyond private moral instruction.

This wider system strengthens the Bairat analysis because a normative order is more effective when principles are publicly communicated and institutionally supported. The combination of inscriptional publicity and administrative activity provides an early example of the relationship between normative communication and governance.

21. Promulgation, Compliance and Public Accountability

Promulgation is a fundamental legal concept because rules cannot effectively guide conduct if they remain unknown. The Bairat Edict's durable inscription can therefore be analysed as a form of public promulgation. The royal act makes the selected teachings publicly visible and connects them with a stated intention that the Dhamma endure.

The paper should not assert universal compliance by the population, because the surviving evidence does not establish that every person obeyed every Aśokan directive. A more defensible proposition is that the proclamations were intended to be communicated, observed and implemented, with administrative structures supporting their dissemination. This distinction between intended compliance and demonstrated universal compliance is essential

to legal-historical accuracy.

22. Comparative Jurisprudential Matrix

Theory	Core Legal Concept	Bairat Analytical Parallel
Natural Law	Higher moral norm	Dhamma as a normative standard beyond arbitrary command
Historical Jurisprudence	Continuity of legal tradition	Dhamma-Vinaya and institutional transmission
Sociological Jurisprudence	Law and social order	Conduct, discipline and social responsibility
Legal Positivism	Validity and sources of law	Recognition and public authority
Kelsen	Grundnorm	Foundational normative structure by analogy
Hart	Rule of Recognition	Recognition of authoritative norms and institutional practice
Fuller	Internal morality and publicity	Public inscription and normative communication
Rule of Law	Non-arbitrary government	Public authority connected with established norms
Constitutionalism	Limitation of public power	Authority operating within Dhamma-based norms
Virtue Jurisprudence	Formation of character	Restraint, truthfulness and ethical responsibility
Communitarianism	Shared community obligations	Saṅgha and wider social responsibility
Restorative Justice	Correction and restoration	Reflection, responsibility and correction
Preventive Jurisprudence	Prevention of harm	Future dangers, restraint and self-regulation

The table demonstrates that the later theories are not being treated as separate ancient doctrines. They are analytical categories that illuminate different dimensions of the same historical evidence. The Bairat Edict remains the primary object of interpretation.

23. Moral-Legal Jurisprudence: Integrated Structure

The strongest contribution of the Bairat analysis is the integration of moral and legal dimensions. Moral obligation supplies the substantive direction; disciplinary norms supply institutional structure; public proclamation supplies publicity; administrative mechanisms supply implementation; accountability supplies responsibility; and preventive principles supply a forward-looking function.

The resulting model can be expressed as: moral principle → disciplinary norm → conduct standard → institutional norm → public promulgation → administrative implementation → supervision → accountability → prevention → governance. This is not a modern legislative hierarchy, but it is a useful analytical model for understanding how an ancient normative order could connect ethical values with public administration.

The model also explains why the title uses “Jurisprudential Grundnorm.” The term refers to the foundational position of the normative order in the paper’s analysis, not to a claim that the Bairat inscription was literally a Kelsenian basic norm.

24. Findings

1. The Bairat Edict is an important early epigraphic source for the study of written normativity.
2. It publicly recognises and preserves selected teachings within an established Dhamma-Vinaya tradition.
3. The seven Dhamma-pariyāyā provide themes of discipline, noble conduct, future danger, restraint, inquiry and truthfulness, although some canonical identifications remain uncertain.
4. The Edict supports a jurisprudential analysis of moral obligation, disciplinary regulation and institutional responsibility.
5. The inscription provides a strong basis for analysing publicity and promulgation.
6. The wider Aśokan administrative evidence concerning Dhamma-Mahāmāttas supplies a context for implementation and supervision.
7. Preventive Jurisprudence is a particularly useful analytical framework because the evidence emphasises anticipation, restraint and self-regulation.

8. Kelsen's Grundnorm provides a useful modern analytical analogy but must not be projected historically onto Aśoka.
9. The Bairat evidence can be compared with Natural Law, Historical, Sociological and Positivist jurisprudence without claiming direct intellectual influence.
10. The strongest conclusion is that the Bairat Edict provides early evidence of an integrated normative relationship among morality, discipline, responsibility, public authority and governance.

25. Conclusion

The Bairat Edict of Devanamapiya Aśoka provides an important early primary source for examining jurisprudential questions concerning moral normativity, institutional discipline, public authority and governance. Its significance does not depend upon treating the inscription as a modern constitution or upon attributing modern legal theories to the third century BCE. Its importance lies in what the inscription actually demonstrates: an established normative tradition was publicly recognised, selected teachings were identified, the teachings were preserved through durable inscription, and royal authority was brought into relationship with Dhamma-Vinaya.

The seven Dhamma-pariyāyā provide a particularly valuable field for this analysis. Their themes of Vinaya, noble conduct, future dangers, restraint, ethical responsibility, inquiry and truthfulness support a model in which the prevention of misconduct begins with normative instruction and self-regulation. Preventive Jurisprudence therefore offers one of the strongest modern analytical frameworks for understanding the inscription.

The wider Aśokan administrative evidence, especially concerning the Dhamma-Mahāmāttas, adds an institutional dimension. It demonstrates that Dhamma was not confined to private morality but could be connected with public communication and administrative activity. The appropriate legal conclusion is not that the Dhamma-Mahāmāttas were modern enforcement agencies, but that Aśokan governance included mechanisms for communicating and administering normative objectives.

The comparison with Natural Law, Historical Jurisprudence, Sociological Jurisprudence, Legal Positivism, Kelsen, Hart, Fuller, Rule of Law, Constitutionalism, Virtue Jurisprudence, Communitarianism, Restorative Justice and Preventive Jurisprudence demonstrates the breadth

of the Bairat material. Each theory illuminates a different dimension: higher normativity, continuity, social function, validity, foundational authority, recognition, publicity, non-arbitrary governance, limitation of power, character, community, correction and prevention.

The final proposition is therefore carefully limited but jurisprudentially significant: the Bairat Edict may, by analytical analogy, be understood as a foundational Grundnorm of the normative order expressed through Dhamma-Vinaya. Kelsen's Grundnorm remains a modern analytical concept and is not historically attributed to Aśoka. On this basis, the Bairat Edict can be regarded as significant early evidence of an integrated moral-legal jurisprudence linking normativity, discipline, responsibility, promulgation, administration, accountability, prevention and public governance.

Footnotes

1. International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA), current call for papers: Articles are stated as 3,000–6,000 words inclusive of footnotes, and manuscripts are to be submitted in MS Word format.
2. John Strong, *The Legend of King Aśoka: A Study and Translation of the Aśokāvadāna and Related Materials* (Princeton University Press, 1983). Used here for historical context rather than as evidence for the inscription itself.
3. Jules Bloch, *Les Inscriptions d'Aśoka* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950).
4. E. Hultzsch, *Inscriptions of Asoka, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925).
5. Vincent A. Smith, *Asoka: The Buddhist Emperor of India* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901).
6. On the Bairat/Bhabru Edict and identification of the named passages, see the scholarly discussion in the Cambridge archive; the identification of some items is expressly treated as uncertain.
7. Sutta Nipāta, Muni Sutta, for the Muni material traditionally associated with the inscription.
8. Majjhima Nikāya, Ambalaṭṭhika-Rāhulovāda Sutta (MN 61), for the Rāhulovāda material concerning truthfulness and examination of conduct.
9. Aṅguttara Nikāya material concerning Anāgata-bhayāni (future dangers), used here to support the preventive jurisprudential analysis.
10. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics and Politics*, especially the relationship among virtue, justice and the common good.
11. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I–II, q. 90–97, on law and natural law.
12. Friedrich Carl von Savigny, *Of the Vocation of Our Age for Legislation and Jurisprudence* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1831).
13. Roscoe Pound, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Law* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922).
14. John Austin, *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined* (London: John Murray, 1832).
15. Hans Kelsen, *Pure Theory of Law*, 2nd ed., trans. Max Knight (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967).
16. H. L. A. Hart, *The Concept of Law*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

17. Lon L. Fuller, *The Morality of Law*, rev. ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969).
18. Brian Z. Tamanaha, *On the Rule of Law: History, Politics, Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
19. Martin Loughlin, *Foundations of Public Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
20. Lawrence B. Solum, "Virtue Jurisprudence: A Virtue-Centred Theory of Judging," *Metaphilosophy* 34 (2003): 178–213.
21. Howard Zehr, *The Little Book of Restorative Justice* (Intercourse, PA: Good Books, 2002).
22. Émile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society*, trans. W. D. Halls (New York: Free Press, 1984).
23. Asoka's Rock Edict V provides the relevant inscriptional evidence for the Dhamma-Mahāmāttas; it should not be conflated with the Bairat Edict.
24. Romila Thapar, *Asoka and the Decline of the Mauryas*, rev. ed. (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997).
25. Upinder Singh, *Political Violence in Ancient India* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017), for wider discussions of Asokan political and normative thought.

References

- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics and Politics*. Standard scholarly editions.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae*. Treatise on Law, I–II, Questions 90–97.
- Austin, John. *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined*. London: John Murray, 1832.
- Bloch, Jules. *Les Inscriptions d'Asoka*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950.
- Durkheim, Émile. *The Division of Labor in Society*. Translated by W. D. Halls. New York: Free Press, 1984.
- Fuller, Lon L. *The Morality of Law*. Revised edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.
- Hart, H. L. A. *The Concept of Law*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Hultzsch, E. *Inscriptions of Asoka*. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Kelsen, Hans. *Pure Theory of Law*. 2nd ed. Translated by Max Knight. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Loughlin, Martin. *Foundations of Public Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Pound, Roscoe. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Law*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922.
- Savigny, Friedrich Carl von. *Of the Vocation of Our Age for Legislation and Jurisprudence*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1831.
- Singh, Upinder. *Political Violence in Ancient India*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.
- Smith, Vincent A. *Asoka: The Buddhist Emperor of India*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.
- Solum, Lawrence B. "Virtue Jurisprudence: A Virtue-Centred Theory of Judging."

Metaphilosophy 34 (2003): 178–213.

Strong, John S. The Legend of King Aśoka: A Study and Translation of the Aśokāvadāna and Related Materials. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Tamanaha, Brian Z. On the Rule of Law: History, Politics, Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Thapar, Romila. Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas. Revised ed. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Zehr, Howard. The Little Book of Restorative Justice. Intercourse, PA: Good Books, 2002.

Aṅguttara Nikāya. Pāli Text Society edition.

Majjhima Nikāya. Pāli Text Society edition.

Sutta Nipāta. Pāli Text Society edition.

Vinaya Piṭaka. Pāli Text Society edition.

Bairat/Bhabru Edict of Devanampiyasa Aśoka. Epigraphic text and scholarly translations.

Submission Note

The current IJLRA call for papers states that Articles are ordinarily 3,000–6,000 words inclusive of footnotes and that manuscripts should be submitted in MS Word (.doc/.docx) format. The journal also requires author details and proper acknowledgement of sources. This manuscript has been prepared as a Word research article with a title page, author details, abstract, keywords, numbered sections, notes, references, justified body text, Times New Roman typography and one-inch margins.

IJLRA