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PART II

From the Coronation of Bimbisāra to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

SECTION 1. Foreword

The following pages deal with the political history of India from the time of Bimbisāra to that of the Guptas. For this period we are fortunately in possession of authentic historical materials in addition to literary tradition to which reference has already been made in the first part of the book. These materials are derived principally from the following sources: inscriptions, coins, accounts left by foreign observers and works of Indian authors of known date and authenticity.

Inscriptions engraved on stone and copper undoubtedly form the most copious and important source. Hardly less important are the coins which constitute almost the sole evidence of the history of certain dynasties and republican communities of the second and first centuries B.C. Foreign accounts, especially the records of Greek diplomats and navigators and of Chinese annalists and pilgrims, are especially valuable in connection with the vexed question of Indian chronology. Works of Indian writers of known epochs, that illumine the darkness of our period, and afford interesting ‘glimpses of political history, are extremely rare and comprise the Mahābhāshya (Great Commentary) of Patañjali, the
Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā of Kumāralāta, the Life of Vasubandhu by Paramārtha and the Harsha-charita (Deeds of Harsha) by Bāṇabhaṭṭa.

For the history of the period from Bimbisāra to Aśoka the writer of these pages cannot in some respects claim much originality. The subject has been treated by Rhys Davids and Smith, and a flood of new light has been thrown on particular dynasties by Geiger, Bhandarkar, Rapson, Jayaswal, Malalasekera, Jackson, Herzfeld, Hultzsch and others. Use has in some cases been made of the information contained in their works, and it has been supplemented with fresh data gathered mainly from epical, Jaina, Buddhist and classical sources. As instances it may be pointed out that attention to the name Haryaṅka, given to the Bimbisārid family by Aśvaghosha, was first drawn in these pages. The tradition recorded in the Harsha charita and Jaina works regarding the tragic end of Śiśunāga’s line and origin of the Nandas has been collated with the evidence of the Graeco-Latin writers. Epic data have been used largely to illustrate the dawn of Magadhan ascendency, locate tribes like the Kambojas and the Pulindas who figure in the Aśokan edicts, and to explain expressions like stryadhyaksha, bhihārayātra, anusamānyāna, etc. Old materials have also been presented in many cases in a new shape, and the author’s conclusions are often different from those of former writers.

In the chapter on the Later Mauryas the author has examined the causes of the dismemberment of the Maurya Empire, and drawn pointed attention to the Gārgī Śāṁhitā, the Hou Hanshu, etc. and has tried to demonstrate the unsoundness of the current theory that “the fall of the Maurya authority was due in large measure to a reaction promoted by the Brāhmaṇas.”

The treatment of the history of the Early Post-Mauryan and Scythian periods, though not entirely

---

1 The Chapter on the Later Mauryas was published in the JASB, 1920 (No. 18, pp. 305 ff.).
original, is different in many respects from that of previous authors. It has not been possible to accept the current views with regard to the lineage of Pushyamitra and the history and chronology of several dynasties, notably of the Early Śātavāhanas, the Greeks of Śākala, and the Śaka-Pahlavas of the Uttarāpatha or North-West India. As early as 1923 the writer of these pages assigned to the Nāgas of the Jumna valley and Eastern Malwa and the Bhāraśivas their proper place in the history of the post-Kushan period, a fact which has been ignored in some wellknown publications.

In the account of the Gupta period use has been made of the mass of fresh materials accumulated since the publication of the works of Bühler, Fleet, Smith and Allan. The notices of the most famous ruling family of the age in early epigraphs and literature, which are sometimes overlooked, have received due attention, its relations with southern dynasties like the Vākāṭakas have been discussed, and an attempt has been made to present a connected history of the so-called 'Later Guptas.'

SECTION II. LOCAL AUTONOMY AND IMPERIAL UNITY.

The chief interest of the political history of the post-Bimbisārian Age lies in the interplay of two opposing forces, one centrifugal, the other centripetal, viz., the love of local (Jānapada) autonomy and the aspiration for imperial unity. The former ideal is best expressed in the words of Manu—sarvam paravaśam duḥkham, sarvam ātmavaśaṁ sukham; "subjection to others is full of misery, subjection to self leads to happiness." The predilection for local self-rule was in part fostered by geographical conditions. The intersection of the land of India by deep rivers and winding chains of mountains.

1 The Chapter on the so-called Later Guptas was published in the JASB.
1920 (No. 19, pp. 319 ff).
2 Manusathāhita, IV. 160.
flanked by dreary deserts or impenetrable forests, developed a spirit of isolation and cleft the country asunder into small political units whose divergences were accentuated by the infinite variety of local conditions. But the vast riparian plain of the north and the extensive plateau in the interior of the Deccan Peninsula, decked with green by the life-giving streams that flow from the majestic heights of the Himalayas and the Western Ghats, fostered an opposite tendency—an inclination towards union and coalescence. The sands which choked the Sarasvati, the floods that swelled the Lauhitya, the dangers that lurked in the Mahatavī proved no effective bar to unity. The five hills of Girivraja could not permanently withstand the conquering heroes who were charged with an imperial mission. The head of the Vindhya bent in reverence before the sage who was bringing the culture of the Ganges valley to the banks of the Godavari and the Tāmraparṇī.

The desire for union under one political authority became manifest as early as the Brāhmaṇa period and found expression in passages like the following:

"May he (the king) be all-encompassing, possessed of all the earth, possessed of all life, from the one end up to the further side of the earth bounded by the ocean, sole ruler (ekaraṭ)."

The ideal persists throughout our period and inspired poets and political philosophers who spoke of the thousand yojanas (leagues) of land that stretch from the Himalayas to the sea as the proper domain of a single universal emperor (chakravarti-kshetra) and eulogised monarchs who protected the earth decked with the Ganges, as with a pearl necklace, adorned with the Himavat and the Vindhya, as with two earrings, and robed with a swinging girdle in the shape of the rocking oceans.

The imperial ideal had to contend with the centrifugal tendencies of Jānapada (provincial and tribal) autonomy. The two forces operated in successive epochs almost with
the regularity of the swing of the pendulum. The aspiration for a unity that transcended local boundaries owed its success not a little to the presence of another factor in Indian politics—the danger threatening from foreign invaders. It was only when the “earth was harassed by the barbarians” (*Mlechchhairudvejyamānā*) that she sought refuge in the strong arms of Chandra Gupta Maurya, the first great historical emperor of India—whose dominions undoubtedly overstepped the limits of *Āryāvarta*. Among the early empire-builders of the south was a prince who rid his country of the Scythians, Greeks and Parthians (*Saka-Yavana-Pahlava-nishūdana*). And the rulers who revived the imperial glory of the Gangetic Provinces in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., were warriors who humbled the pride of the Scythian “Son of Heaven” and braved the wrath of the Saka king in his own city. According to sacred legends *Vishṇu* in the shape of a Boar had rescued the earth in the aeon of universal destruction. It is significant that the worship of the Boar Incarnation became widely popular in the Gupta-Chalukya period. The poet Viśākhadatta actually identifies the man in whose arms the earth found refuge when harassed by the *Mlechchhas*, who “shook the yoke of servitude from the neck” of his country, with the *Vārāhītanu* (Boar form) of the Self-Existent Being. Powerful emperors both in the north and the south recalled the feats of the Great Boar and the mightiest ruler of a dynasty that kept the Arabs at bay for centuries actually took the title of *Ādivarāha* or the Primeval Boar. The Boar Incarnation then symbolized the successful struggle of Indians against the devastating floods issuing from the regions outside their borders that threatened to overwhelm their country and civilisation in a common ruin.
CHAPTER II

THE RISE OF MAGADHA

Sarvamūrddhābhishiktānāmesha mūrddhini jvalishyaṭi prabhāharo' yaṁ sarveshām jyotishāmvā bhāskarāḥ enamāsādyo rājānāḥ samśiddha-balavāhanā vināśamupayāsyanti śalabhḥ iva pāvakam.

—Mahābhārata.

SECTION I. GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE PERIOD
C. 544 B. C. to 324 B. C.

The most remarkable feature of the age that commenced with the coronation of Bimbisāra c. 545—44 B.C., and ended with the retirement of Alexander from India and the accession of Chandra Gupta Maurya (324 B.C.), is the rise of a New Monarchy in the Eastern part of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent which is already heralded by a Brāhmaṇa passage cited above:

"In this eastern quarter (prāchyaṁ diśi), whatever kings there are of the eastern peoples, they are anointed for supreme kingship (Sāmrājya); 'O supreme king (Samrāṭ) they style them when anointed."

The eastern peoples, prāchyas, are not enumerated in the same manner as those of the southern, the northern and the central regions. But it may be safely assumed that the name used in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa stands for the Prasii of the Graeco-Roman writers. The most famous nations of the east in the Brāhmaṇa-Upanishad period were the Kāśis, the Kosalas and the Videhas. But a new star was soon in the ascendant. Under the vigorous kings of the race of Bimbisāra and Nanda Magadha played the same part in ancient Indian politics as Wessex did in pre-

1 II. 19 10-11.
2 See below, Section VII
3 Pp. 156-7.
Norman England and Prussia in Hohenzollern Germany. Several circumstances contributed to the pre-eminence of the new aspirant for imperial power—its position of vantage between the upper and lower parts of the vast riparian plain of Northern India, the possession of an almost unassailable stronghold amidst five hills, and another at and near the confluence of several rivers, the arteries of commerce and navigation in those days, a superbly rich and fruitful soil, and resources including a powerful elephant corps which greatly impressed the classical writers and writers in polity.

But strategic position and material wealth cannot suffice to raise a nation to greatness. As Burke says, it is the quality and spirit of the people 'that give all their life and efficacy to them'. As in several Atlantic lands, so in Magadha, we have a fusion of folks and cultures. Kīkaṭas mixed here with enterprising clans coming from upper India as Celts did with Latins and Teutons in Mediaeval France and some adjoining territories. It is not difficult to find out two strands in the cultural—no less than the racial—texture of the population. The same nation that produced relentless fighters and, exterminators of kings' and clans like Jarāsandha of epic legend, Ajāṭaśatru, Mahāpadma, Chaṇḍāśoka (the ruthless conqueror of Kaliṅga) and perhaps Samudra Gupta, hearkened at the same time to the devout teachings of Madhyama Prātibodhīputra, Varddhamāna Mahāvīra, and Gautama Buddha, and played a conspicuous part in the propagation of a world religion as it did in the establishment of an empire embracing nearly the whole of India. The birth of Ajāṭaśatru and the enlightenment of the Buddha took place in the same country and the same age, and they met in Rājagriha as Charles V and Martin Luther did at Worms. The symbol of aggressive imperialism stood face to face with the preacher of piety and morality, leader of a movement that was destined to convulse a continent. The two ideologies did not long remain apart. They were harmonised and the magician who worked the miracle was Dharmāśoka who
combined in himself the imperial tradition of his forbears as well as the spiritual fervour of the sage of the Śākyas.

A characteristic of the people of Magadha was an elasticity of social behaviour which was absent in the system which developed on the banks of the Sarasvatī and the Dṛishadvatī. In their country Brāhmaṇas could associate with Vṛālyas, the Rājanya could admit the Śūdra girl to the harem, the Vaiśya and even the Yavana could be promoted to gubernatorial office, hereditary rulers of aristocratic lineage could be expelled to make room for the offspring of a nagara-sobhinī, and the "royal throne of kings" was not beyond the reach of a barber.

Magadhan rulers and chancellors like Vassakāra (Var-shakāra) and Kauṭilya, were not over-scrupulous in their methods. Tradition credits some of them with the use of Machiavellian diplomacy in disintegrating kingdoms and republics, and invention of engines of destruction which worked with deadly effect. But they had the sagacity to evolve an administrative system in which princes royal, ministers of state as well as leading men of villages had their due share. Foreign diplomats and pilgrims in the fourth century B.C., as well as the fifth and seventh centuries A. D. speak of their sense of justice, their hospitals, charitable institutions and public works. They believed in ceaseless endeavour with the object of realising the dream of a united Jambudvīpa (Greater India) integrated by political as well as spiritual ties. In the Māgadha bards, the rulers of Girivraja and Pātaliputra had a body of devoted men who could rouse popular enthusiasm in a cause in which they believed. These singers and chroniclers have left a legacy which is invaluable to the student of ancient history.

The rise of Magadha synchronised with, and may have been a contributory cause of, an exodus of people from the Madhya-deśa to the outlying parts of India, notably the west and the south. The displacement of the Yādavas in antiquity is vouched for by epic tradition. It is well-known that the Vṛishṇis and cognate clans of Dvārka in
Kāthiāwār and several peoples of the Deccan claimed Yadu lineage. It was in the period under review that the Far South of India comes definitely within the geographical horizon of the grammarians and foreign diplomats some of whom graced the Durbar of Magadhan kings. Saptasindhu had at last developed into Jambudvīpa. And the time was not distant when a notable attempt would be made to impress the stamp of unity on it in the domain of culture and politics.

In making their prowess felt throughout the vast subcontinent of India the great men of Magadha had at first to face three problems, viz., those presented by the republics mainly on their northern frontier, the monarchies that grew up on the Rāptī, the Jumna and the Chambal and the foreign impact that made itself felt in the Punjab and Sind. We turn first to the republics.

**Section II. Republics in the age of Bimbisāra**

It was Rhys Davids who first drew pointed attention to the survival, side by side with the monarchies, of a number of small aristocratic republics in the age of the Buddha and of Bimbisāra. The most important amongst these states were the Vrijians of North Bihār and the Mallas of Kusinārā (Kusiñagara) and Pāvā. An account of both these peoples has already been given. Among the smaller republics we find mention of the Sākyas of Kapilavastu, the Koliyas of Devadaha and Rāmagāma, the Bhaggas (Bhargas) of Simsumāra Hill, the Bulis of Allakappa, the Kālāmas of Kesaputta, and the Moriyas of Pipphalivana.

The Sākyas were settled in the territory bordered on the north by the Himālayas, on the east by the river Rohiṇī, and on the west and south by the Rāptī. Their

---

capital, Kapilavastu, stood close to the western bank of the Rohinī, some eight miles to the west of the famous Lumbinīvāna, the place of the Buddha's nativity, the site of which is marked by the Rummindeī pillar of one of the greatest of his followers. The city is possibly mentioned in the Tīrthayātrā section of the Mahābhārata under the name of Kapilāvāṭa. It was connected by roads with the capitals of the Kosalas and the Vṛujikas, and through them with the other great cities of the age. The Śākyas had a town called Devadaha which they appear to have shared with their eastern neighbours, the Koliyas. They acknowledged the suzerainty of the king of Kosala and, like him, claimed to belong to the solar (Āditya) race and Ikshvāku family.

The Koliyas claim to have been cadets from the royal house of Benares. Tradition connects them with the cities of Rāmagāma and Devadaha. The river Rohinī separated their capital from that of the Śākyas, and helped to irrigate the fields of both the clans. "Once upon a time in the month of Jetṭhamūla when the crops began to flag and droop, the labourers from amongst both the peoples assembled together." Then followed a scramble for water. Bloodshed was averted by the mediation of the Buddha. From the mutual recriminations in which they indulged, we learn that the Śākyas had the custom of marrying their own sisters. Cunningham places the Koliya country between the Kohāna and Aumi (Anomā) rivers. The Anomā seems to have formed the dividing line between the Koliyas on the one hand and the Mallas and Moriyas on the other.

The Bhaggas (Bhargas) are known to the Aitareya

---

1 AGI (new ed.) 476
2 Kapilavastu is sometimes identified with Piprāwa in the north of the Bastī district, or Tilaura Koṭ and neighbouring ruins in the Tarai about 10 miles to the N.W. of Piprāwā (Smith, EHI, third ed., p. 159.)
3 III, 84, 31.
4 DPPN, I. 686f. The Koliya capital stood close to the eastern bank of the Rohinī.
5 The Kunāla Jātaka (introductory portion).
6 DPPN, I 690, Cunn. AGI (new) 477; 491 ff.
Brāhmaṇa and the Ashtādhyāyī of Paṇini. The former work refers to the Bhārgāyaṇa prince Kairiśi Sutvan. In the latter half of the sixth century B.C., the Bhagga state was a dependency of the Vatsa kingdom; for we learn from the preface to the Dhonasākha Jātaka, that prince Bodhi, the son of Udayana, king of the Vatsas, dwelt in Sunisumāragiri and built a palace called Kokanada. The Mahābhārata and the Harivamśa also testify to the close connection between the Vatsas and the Bhargas (Bhaggas) and their proximity to the Nishādas. The testimony of the epic and the Apadāna seems to locate them in the Vindhyān region between the Jumna and the Son.

Regarding the Bulis and the Kālāmas we know very little. The Dhammapada commentary refers to the Buli territory as the kingdom of Allakappa, and says that it was only ten leagues in extent. From the story of its king’s intimate relationship with king Vēṭhadīpaka it may be presumed that Allakappa lay not far from Vēṭhadīpa, the home of a famous Brāhmaṇa in the early days of Buddhism, who made a cairn over the remains of the Buddha in his native land. The Kālāmas were the clan of the philosopher Ālāra, a teacher of Gautama before he attained to Sambodhi. The name of their nigaṇa (town) Kesaputta, reminds us of the Keśins, a people mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa and probably also in the Ashtādhyāyī of Paṇini, and connected with the Paṇchālas and Dālḥiyas who appear in the Rig-Veda, as settled on the banks of the Gomati. Kesaputta itself seems to have been annexed to

---

1 VIII. 28.
2 IV i. III. 177
3 No. 358.
4 Mbh., II. 30. 10-11; Hariv., 29. 73. DPPN. II. 345. Supra p. 133
6 Majumdar Sāstrī connects Vēṭhadīpa with Kasita (AGI, 1924, 714); cf Fleet in JRAS, 1906, p. 900 n; Hoey suggests that Vēṭhadīpa is Bettiah in the Champaran District of Bihār.
7 Buddhacharita, XII. 2.
9 VI. 4. 165.
10 V. 61.
Kosala, and no doubt acknowledged the suzerainty of the king of that powerful state.

The Moriyas (Mauryas) were the same clan which gave Magadha its greatest dynasty. They are sometimes spoken of as of Śākyan origin, but the evidence is late. Earlier evidence distinguishes between these two clans. The name is derived, according to one tradition, from mora (mayūra) or peacock. The place where they settled down is said to have always resounded with the cries of these birds. Pipphalivana, the Moriya capital, is apparently identical with the Nyagrodhavana or Banyan Grove, mentioned by Hiuen Tsang, where stood the famous Embers’ Tope. Fa Hien tells us that the Tope lay four yojanas to the east of the river Anomā, and twelve yojanas (probably some 54 miles) to the west of Kusinārā.

It will perhaps not be quite out of place to say here a few words about the internal organisation of the republics. Space, however, forbids a detailed treatment of the subject. They fall mainly into two classes, viz., those that were constituted by the whole or a section of a single clan (kula) e.g., the Śākyas, the Koliyas, the Mallas of Kusinārā, the Mallas of Pāvā etc., and those that comprised several clans like the Vṛijis (Vajjis) and the Yādavas. The distinguishing feature of a state of this type is the absence of one single hereditary monarch who exercised full control over it. The Basileus, if he survived at all, must have done so as a mere magistracy or as a dignified part of the constitu-

---

1 The Aṅguttara (P. T. S., I, 188; Nipāta, III. 65).
2 "Then did the Brāhmaṇa Cānakka anoint a glorious youth, known by the name Candagutta, as king over all Jambudīpa, born of a noble clan, the Moriyas." Geiger, Mahāvaṃśa, p. 27; DPPN, II. 673.
3 Mahāparinibbāna Sutta.
4 Rhys Davids, Buddhist Suttas, p. 135; Watters, Yuan Chwang, II, pp. x3-24; Cunningham, AGI., new ed., pp. 491f, 496f.
5 AGI (new) 491. Legge, Fa Hien, p. 79; Watters, I, 141; cf. JRAS., 1903. As Kasia (Kusinārā, Kuśinagara) lay 35 miles to the east of Gorakhpur (AGI, 493), the Moriyan city could not have been situated very far from the last-mentioned town. The Moriyas seem also to have been close neighbours of the Koliyas beyond the Anomā and the Mallas of Anupiyā on the banks of that river.
TION. The efficient part comprised a president (chief, gaṇapati, gaṇajyesṭha, gaṇarāja, saṅghamukhya) and a council of archons taken from the ruling class. Such a president was Cheṭaka of Vaiśālī and Akouphis of Nysa in later times, the terrestrial counterpart of Indra, in his capacity as the Jyeshṭha of the Marud gaṇa. According to a Jain tradition the number of members of the supreme executive in charge of foreign and military affairs was in some states nine. There were functionaries like uparājās and senāpatis who exercised judicial and military functions. All these Elders possibly answer to the Mahallakas of Pāli texts and Mahattarins of the Vāyu Purāṇa, whom it was the duty of the citizens to respect and support.

Some of the clans possibly had an elaborate system of judicial procedure with a gradation of officers. Others, notably the Koliyas, had a police force which earned notoriety for extortion and violence. Reverence for tradition, especially for traditional religion with its shrines and ministers, was a feature that recalls the part that ancestral religion played in ancient Babylonia and modern Nippon.

Perhaps the most important institution of the free republics was the Parishā, the popular assembly, where young and old held frequent meetings, made their decisions and carried them out in concord. Kettledrums were used by an officer (styled sabhāpāla in the epic) to bring the people to the Mote Hall, called Santhāgāra in the Pāli texts. The procedure is perhaps analogous to that followed in the Kuru-Paṇḍhāla assembly mentioned in the Jaiminiya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa, in a palaver in Śakra's heaven

1 Cf. the case of Ugrasena among the Yādavas.
2 Rg-veda, I. 23. 8; cf. II. 23. 1.
3 Nava Mathai, Nava Laoschhrai etc. supra p. 125. In Nysa the governing body consisted of 300 members. The number of "leading men of cities and provinces" entrusted by the Kshudrakas with power to conclude a treaty is not definitely stated.
4 Vāyu, 96. 35.
5 DPPN, I. 690.
6 Kindred Sayings, II. 178 (reference to kettledrum of the Dasārhas; cf. Mbh., I. 220. 11.)
described in the Mahāgovernā Suttanta, or in formal gatherings of the Chapters of the Buddhist Order referred to in the Vinaya texts. Members "are seated in a specified order. After the president has laid the proposed business before the assembly, others speak upon it, and recorders take charge of the unanimous decision arrived at." If there is any disputation (saṃvāda) the matter is referred to a committee of arbitrators. It is possible that technical expressions like āsana-prajñāpaka (seat-betokener), ūatti (jñāpti, motion), ālāhī-gāhāpaka (ballot-collector), gana-pūraka (whip), ubbāhikā (referendum) found in the Rules of the Order, were adopted from those in use in the assemblies of the free tribes or clans.

Section III. The Minor Principalities and the Great Monarchies

An important feature of Indian history throughout the ages is the presence of numerous petty Rājās holding their courts either in some forest region, mountain fastness, or desert tract away from the main currents of political life, or in a riparian or maritime district, each separated from his neighbour by a range of hills, a stream, a forest or an expanse of sandy waste. It is impossible to enumerate all such tiny states that flourished and decayed in the days of Bimbisāra. But a few deserve notice. Among these were Gandhāra ruled by Paushkārasārin or Pukkusāti, a remote predecessor of Ambhi, Madra governed by the father of Khemā, a queen of Bimbisāra, Roruka (in Sauvīra or the Lower Indus Valley) under the domination of Rudrāyaṇa, Sūrasena ruled by Avantiputta (either a successor of, or identical with, Subāhu), and Aṅga under the sway of Dṛḍhavaran and Brahmadatta.

It is difficult to say anything about the ethnic affiliation of these rulers. The form of the names indicates

2 Divyāvadāna, p. 545.
that they were either Aryans themselves or had come under the influence of Aryan culture. But there were certain
principalities which were definitely styled Nishāda in
the epic, and Ālavaka (forest-folk of Yaksha-infested land)
in the Pāli texts and were doubtless of non-Aryan origin.

One of these, the realm of Ālavaka\(^1\) demands some
notice as the relic of a past that was fast disappearing.

This little state was situated near the Ganges and was prob-
ably identical with the Chanchu territory visited by
Yuan Chwang (Hiuen Tsang). Cunningham and Smith
identify it with the GhāZIPur region.\(^2\) The name is
derived from the capital Ālavī\(^3\) (Sanskrit Aṭavī, cf. Aṭavika)
or Ālabhiya\(^4\) which stood close to a large forest that doubt-
less suggested the particular nomenclature.\(^5\) In the Abhi-
dhānappadīpi$kā Ālavī finds a place in a list of twenty
famous cities: Bārāṇasī, Sāvatthī, Vesālī, Mithilā, Ālavī,
Kosambhī, Ujjēnī, Takkasīlā, Champā, Sāgala, Suśu-
māragira, Rājagaha, Kapilavatthu, Sāketa, Indapaṭṭa,
Ukkaṭṭha,\(^6\) Paṭaliputtaka, Jettuttara,\(^7\) Sāmkassā\(^8\) and
Kusinārā. The Chullavagga\(^9\) mentions the Aggālave shrine
at Ālavī which the Buddha honoured by his visits, as it
lay on the way between the capitals of Kosala and Magadha.
In the Uvāsaga-dasāo the king of Ālabhiyā is named
Jiyasattū (Jita-sātru, conqueror of enemies). But Jiyasattū
seems to have been a common designation of kings\(^10\) like

\(^1\) Sutta Nīpāṭa, S. B. E., X, II. 29-30.
\(^2\) Watters, Yuan Chwang, II, pp. 61, 340.
\(^3\) Sutta Nīpāṭa The Book of the Kindred Sayings, Vol I, p 275
\(^4\) Uvāsaga-dasāo, II, p. 103; Appendix, pp 51-53.
\(^5\) Cf. The Book of the Kindred Sayings, Vol. I, p. 160 The derivation of
the name of the country from aṭavā was suggested by Hoemle who also pointed
out the reference in the Abhidhānappadīpi$kā. Cf. also the references to forest
peoples and kingdoms in the inscriptions of Aśoka and Samudra Gupta.
\(^6\) A town in the Kingdom of Kosala (Dialogues of the Buddha, I. 108)
\(^7\) Near Chitor (N. I. Dey).
\(^8\) Sanskrit Sāṅkṣāya or Kapithikā which is identified by Cunningham with
Sankisa on the Ikshumati river, in the Farukhabad District. U. P. (Cunn,
AGI, new ed., pp. 422f, 706).
\(^9\) VI. 17; cf. also Gradual Sayings, IV. 147; DPPN, I. 295.
\(^10\) Cf. Amīrāṇīm hantā of the Ait. Br. The Essay on Gunādhva (189)
mentions Hatthālavaka as the king of Ālavī.
the epithet Devānampiya of a later age. The name is
given also to the rulers of Sāvatthi Kampilla, Mithilā,
Champā Vāniyagāma, Bārāṇasī and Polasapura, who were
all contemporaries of Mahāvīra. Buddhist writers refer
to other “Yakkha” principalities besides Ālavaka.

The most important factors in the political history of
the period were, however, neither the republics nor the
forest principalities but the four Great Kingdoms
of Kosala, Vatsa, Avanti and Magadha.

In Kosala king Mahākosala had been succeeded by his
son Pasenadi or Prasenajit. As already stated, the Kosalan
monarchy had spread its tentacles over a vast area extend-
ing perhaps from the Guntī to the Little Gaṅḍak and from
the Nepalese Tarāī to the Ganges, possibly even to the
eastern part of the Kaimur range. It counted amongst
its vassals several rājās, including, doubtless, the rulers of
the Kāsis, the Śākyas and the Kālāmas. Among its officials
were two Mallas, Bandhula and his nephew Dirgha Chārā-
yāna, who must have helped their sovereign to secure
influence in the tiny state beyond the Little Gaṅḍak from
which they came. “Nine Mallakis” appear as allies of the
rulers of Kāsi-Kosala in Jaina texts. Friendship with the
“Visālikā Līchchhavī” and with Seniya Bimbisāra, the
master of Magadha, must have favoured peaceful penetra-
tion in the east and left the king free to organise his king-
dom and dealing drastically with robbers and savages who

1 In Babylon, however, the style “favourite of the gods” is found as early
as the age of Hammurabi (Camb. And Hist., I, p. 511; I. C., April-June, 1946,
p. 241).

2 Cf. Hoernle, Uvāsaga-dasā, II, pp. 6, 64, 100, 103, 106, 116, 166. In
the Ārya Mañjuśrī Māla Kalpa (ed. G. Śāstrī, p. 645), a king of Gaudā is styled
“Jītastrau”. It is absurd to suggest, as does Hoernle (p. 109 n.), that Jiyasattī,
Prasenajit and Cheḷaḷa were identical. Cf. Indian Culture, II, 806.


4 For the identification of the Rājās, see Part I ante, 155f.

5 Majjhima N., II, p. 118. He is probably identical with the person of
that name mentioned in the Kauṭiyā Arthaśāstra and inscriptions (nītivijīta-
Chārāyaṇaḥ, Ep. Ind., III. 210) as a writer on politics, and by Vatsyāyana as
an authority on Erotica.

menaced the road from Sāketa to Sāvatthī, and interfered with the peaceful life of the monks.¹

The character of such a man, one of the leading figures of the age, who had received his education at Taxila, and became a friend of the Buddha, deserves study and we have an admirable exposition by Mrs. Rhys Davids. “He is shown combining like so many of his class all the world over, a proneness to affairs of sex with the virtues and affection of good ‘family man’, indulgence at the table with an equally natural wish to keep in good physical form, a sense of honour and honesty, shown in his disgust at legal cheating, with a greed for acquiring wealth and war indemnities, and a fussiness over lost property, a magnanimity towards a conquered foe with a callousness over sacrificial slaughter and the punishment of criminals. Characteristic also are both his superstitious nervousness over the sinister significance of dreams due, in reality, to disordered appetites, and also his shrewd politic care to be on good terms with all religious orders, whether he had testimonials to their genuineness or not.”²

The family life of the king had its bearing on affairs of the state. He married a Magadhan princess which fact must have cemented his friendship with Bimbisāra, who got a Kosalan wife in return. Another queen of Pasenadi (Prasenajit) was the famous Vāsabhakkhatiyyā, daughter of Mahānāman, the Śākyan, by a slave girl.¹ The issues of this marriage were a son, Viḍūḍabha (Viduratha), who rose to be his father’s senāpati (general)³ and afterwards his successor,⁴ and a daughter Vajirā or Vajiri.

¹ Mahāvagga, SBE, XIII, pp. 220, 261. Among the marauders was the notorious Aiṅgilimāla.
³ DPPN, II. 171; 857.
⁴ For the employment of princes as Senāpati, see Kautilya (Mysore edition), 1919, p. 54; cf. 546.
⁵ Viḍūḍabha’s name is generally omitted in Purānic manuscripts. The Purāṇas, however, mention a king named Suratha. Pargiter points out (D. K. A., 12, n 65) that one manuscript of the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa gives the name Viduratha instead of Suratha. But that prince is represented as the great-grandson of Prasenajit. Similarly, the Purāṇas represent Udāyin as the grand-
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Kumarī who became the queen of Ajātaśatru, the successor of Bimbisāra on the throne of Magadha. The careers of the prince and the princess are bound up with memorable events, *viz.*, the war of the Kosalan king with Ajātaśatru, the loss of his throne as a result of his son’s revolt, and the terrible vengeance that the latter wreaked on the Sākyas for sending the offspring of a slave woman to the Kosalan harem to become the mother of the prince.

When the Magadhan war brought disaster to the king’s arms he married Mallikā, daughter of the chief of garland-makers, who sweetened his days till her death, and made herself famous by her benefactions. Among these was a garden, the Mallikārama, which was set apart for religious discussion. She leaned towards the Buddha and his order, though her husband, with great insight, extended his patronage to Brāhmaṇas as well. Mallikā and Sumanā, the king’s sister, remind one of Kāruvāki and Rājyaśrī, famous for their charity and interest in Buddhist teaching in the days of Aśoka and Harsha respectively.

The internal organisation of the kingdom of Kosala presents some interesting features. There was a body of ministers at the centre, but they had little control over the king’s whims. Those specifically mentioned by tradition were Mṛigadhara, Ugga, Siri-Vaḍḍha, Kāla and Junha. The generals included the Crown Prince and some Malla chiefs. Police duties on roads were performed by soldiers. Portions of the royal domain were granted to Brāhmaṇas like Pokkharasādi, with power over them as if they were kings. The weakness of the system soon became apparent,
and led to the downfall of the king. Ministers, who were lavish in their charity, were preferred to those who approved of a more economical policy, and one of the favourites is said to have actually been allowed to rule over the kingdom for seven days. The large powers granted to Brāhmaṇa donors must have promoted centrifugal tendencies, while the infidelity of some of the generals including the Crown Prince, and the cruel treatment by the latter, when he became king, of vassal clansmen contributed to the eventual downfall of the monarchy.

In the Vatsa kingdom which, probably at this time, extended along the southern frontier of Kosala, king Satānīka Parantapa was succeeded by his son Udayana who rivalled Śrī Rāmachandra, Nala and the Pāṇḍavas in being the hero of many romantic legends. The commentary on the Dhammapada gives the story of the way in which Vāsuladattā or Vāsavadattā, the daughter of Pradyota, king of Avanti, became his queen. It also mentions two other consorts of the Vatsa king, viz, Māgandiyā, daughter of a Kuru Brāhmaṇa, and Sāmāvati, the adopted child of the treasurer Ghosaka. The Mihindapañho refers to a peasant woman named Gopāla-mātā who also became his wife. The Svapna-Vāsavadatta attributed to Bhāṣa, and some other works, mention another queen named Padmāvatī who is represented as sister to king Darśaka of Magadha. The Priyadarśikā speaks of Udayana’s marriage with Āranyakā, the daughter of Dṛḍhavarman, king of Aṅga. The Ratnāvali tells the story of the love of the king of Vasta and of Sāgarikā, an attendant of his chief queen Vāsavadattā. Stories about Udayana were widely current in Avanti in the time of Kālidāsa as we learn

2 Cf. Anupamā, Dvīpamānā, 96.
3 IV. 8. 25; DPPN, I. 379-80.
from the *Meghadūta*: "prāpy-Avantim Udayana-katha-kovida-grāmavīdddhān." The Jātakas throw some sidelight on the character of this king. In the preface to the *Māṭanga Jātaka* it is related that in a fit of drunken rage he had Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja tortured by having a nest of ants tied to him. The *Kathā sarit-sāgara* of Somadeva, a writer of the eleventh century A.D., contains a long account of Udayana’s *Digvijaya.*¹ The *Priyadarśikā* of Śrī Harsha² speaks of the king’s victory over the lord of Kaliṅga, and the restoration of his father-in-law Dṛḍha-varman to the throne of Aṅga. It is difficult to disentangle the kernel of historical truth from the husk of popular fables. It seems that Udayana was a great king who really made some conquests, and contracted matrimonial alliances with the royal houses of Avanti, Aṅga and Magadha. But his career was meteoric. He left no worthy successor. Bodhī, his son by the chief queen, preferred a quiet life amidst the sylvan surroundings of Sutumāragiri to the troubles of imperial adventure. The kingdom, harassed by various wars, was at last overcome by its ambitious neighbour on the south-west, viz., Avanti, and was governed by a prince of the royal line of Ujjain.³

The throne of Avanti was, in the days of Udayana, occupied by Chaṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsena whose daughter, Vāsavadattā, became the chief queen of the lord of the Vatsas. Regarding the character of Pradyota the *Mahā-vagga* says that he was cruel.⁴ The *Purāṇas* observe that he was "nayavarjita", i.e., destitute of good policy and add that "he will indeed have the neighbouring kings subject to him—sa vai praṇata-sāmantaḥ". He had at one time made the Vatsa king a captive and had a close relation on

² Act IV.
⁴ S.B.E., XVII, p. 187.
the throne of Mathurā. The terror that he struck among his neighbours is apparent from a statement of the Majjhima Nikāya that Ajātaśatru, son of Bimbisāra, fortified Rājagriha because he was afraid of an invasion of his territories by Pradyota. He also waged war on Pushkarasārin, the king of Taxila.²

SECTION IV. MAGADHA CRESCENT—BIMBISĀRA

According to Jaina legend Pradyota went forth to attack Rājagriha even during the lifetime of Bimbisāra.³ The last-mentioned prince, the real founder of Magadhan imperial power in the historic period, was the son of a petty chief of South Bihār, whose very name seems to have been forgotten. Traditionally tried to fill the lacuna possibly by an imaginary nomenclature.¹ An early authority describes the family to which the prince belonged as the Haryāṇika-kula. As we have already seen,¹ there is no reason to discard this evidence in favour of the later tradition of the Purāṇas. Young Bimbisāra, who also bore the name or epithet of Seniya (Śreniıkā), is said to have been anointed king by his own father when he was only fifteen years old.⁴ The momentous event cannot fail to recall a solemn ceremony that took place some nine hundred years later when another king of Magadha clasped his favourite son in arms in the presence of the princes royal and ministers, in council assembled, and exclaimed, “Protect the entire land”.

The new ruler had a clear perception of the political

¹ III, 7.
² Pradyota was unsuccessful in this war and was only saved from disaster by the outbreak of hostilities between Pushkarasārin and the Pāṇḍavas (Essay on Guṇāḍhya, 176).
³ He was foiled by the cunning of Prince Abhaya (Annals of the Bhāndākar Institute, 1920-21, 3 ; cf. DPPN, I. 128).
⁴ Among the names given by various late writers we find the following: Bhāṭṭiya (Bhāṭṭiya, Bodhisa), Mahāpādma, Hemajit, Kṣemajit, Kṣettraja or Kṣetrauja.
⁵ Supra, p. 115ff.
⁶ Mahāvamśa (Geiger’s trans.), p. 12
situation of his time. The military power of the Vṛijī Confederation was growing in the North. Aggressive monarchies under ambitious rulers were following a policy of expansion from their bases in Śrāvasti, and Ujjain. The cruel and unscrupulous ruler of the last-mentioned city engaged in hostilities with Pushkaraśārin of Taxila. The king of Taxila harassed by numerous enemies including the mysterious Pāṇḍavas who are known to have been in possession of Śākala (in the Punjab) in the days of Ptolemy, turned to the king of Magadha for help. Though ready to oblige his Gandhārian friend by receiving an embassy, Bimbisāra, who had to liquidate the long-standing feud with his eastern neighbour across the Champā, was in no mood to alienate Pradyota or any of the other military chiefs of the age.

When the king of Avanti was suffering from jaundice he sent the physician Jīvaka. He also pursued a policy of dynastic marriages like the Hapsburgs and Bourbons of Europe and contracted alliances with the ruling families of Madra, Kosala and Vaiśāli. These measures were of great importance. They not only appeased the most formidable militarists of the age, but eventually paved the way for the expansion of the kingdom both westward and northward. Bimbisāra's Kosalan wife brought a Kāśi village producing a revenue of a hundred thousand for bath and perfume money. The Vaiśāli connection produced momentous consequences in the next reign.

1 Khemā, the princess of Śākala (Madra) is said to have been the chief consort of Bimbisāra. Was she connected with the Pāṇḍavas who are found in Śākala as late as the age of Ptolemy?

2 According to the Dhammapada Commentary (Harvard, 20, 60; 30, 225) Bimbisāra and Pasenadi were connected by marriage, each having married a sister of the other.

3 Jātaka, Nos 239, 289, 492. According to the Thusa Jātaka (338) and the Mūdhika Jātaka (378) the Kosalan princess was the mother of Ajātaśatru. The preface to the Jātakas says, "At the time of his (Ajātaśatru's) conception there arose in his mother, the daughter of the king of Kosala, a chronic longing to drink blood from the right knee of king Bimbisāra". In the Samyukta Nībāya (Book of Kindred Sayings, 110) Pasenadi of Kosala calls Ajātaśatru his nephew. In Vol. I, page 58n of the Book of the Kindred Sayings, however, Madlā (Madrā) appears as the name of Ajātaśatru's mother.
The shrewd policy of Bimbisāra enabled him to devote his undivided attention to the struggle with Aṅga which he annexed after defeating Brahmadatta. The annexation of Aṅga by Bimbisāra is proved by the evidence of the Mahāvagga and that of the Sūrādanda Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya in which it is stated that the revenues of the town of Champā have been bestowed by King Bimbisāra on the Brāhmaṇa Sūrādanda. We learn from Jaina sources that Aṅga was governed as a separate province under the Magadhan Crown Prince with Champā as its capital. The king himself resided in Rājagiri-Girivraja. Thus by war and policy Bimbisāra added Aṅga and a part of Kāśi to the Magadhan dominions, and launched Magadha to that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Asoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kaliṅga. We learn from the Mahāvagga that Bimbisāra's dominions embraced 80,000 townships.

The victories of Bimbisāra's reign were probably due in large measure to the vigour and efficiency of his administration. He exercised a rigid control over his High Officers, dismissing those who advised him badly...

---

A Tibetan writer calls her Vāśī (DPPN, I 34). The Jaina writers represent Chellanā, daughter of Chetaka of Vatsāhā as the mother of Kūnika-Ajātaśatrū. The Nikāyas call Ajātaśatrū Vadehpūtta (Vadehpūtra), i.e., son of the Videhan princess. This is taken to confirm the Jaina tradition because Vaiśālī was in Videha. Buddhaghosha, however, resolves "Vadehū" into Veda-sha, Vedena that or intellectual effort (BKS, Vol I, 1009) and seems to suggest that "Vadehuputta" simply means "Son of the accomplished princess". We should moreover remember that the Kosalan monarch Paraśramā, had the epithet Vadeha and the name Vaiśālī was applied to several Kāśi princesses in the epic. The appellation Vadehuputta, therefore, does not necessarily disprove the Kosalan parentage of the mother of Ajātaśatrū. According to one authority "Chelī" (Chellanā) was styled Vadehī "as she was brought from Videha" (AIU, II 20).

---

1 JASB, 1914. p. 321.
2 SBE, XVII, p. 1.
3 Hemchandra, the author of the Paris妲story p. 22, cf. also the Bhagavati Sūtra and the Nirvacñavabi Sūtra (ed. Warren, p. 39) King (tūyā) Kunava son of King Seniya by Chellanādevī, ruled in Champā nagaṇā in Bharatarśvara, which is in Jambudvīpa.
4 Sutta Nīpāta, SBE, X, ii, 67.
5 Apparently a stock number.
6 Chullavagga of the Vinayapitaka, VII 9 5 See also Vinaya I, 738 74f 207, 240.
and rewarding those whose advice he approved of. The result of the 'purge' was the emergence of the type of official represented by Vassakāra and Sunītha. The High Officers (Rājabhaṭa) were divided into several classes, viz., (1) Sābbattha (the officer in charge of general affairs), (2) Senānāyaka Mahāmattas (generals), and (3) Vihārīka Mahāmattas (judges).\textsuperscript{1} The Vinaya texts afford us a glimpse of the activities of these Mahāmātras, and the rough and ready justice meted out to criminals. Thus we have reference not only to imprisonment in jails (kārā), but also to punishment by scourging (kaśā), branding, beheading, tearing out the tongue, breaking ribs, etc. There seems to have been a fourth class of mahāmātras who were responsible like the village syndic and headmen (grāmabhojaka or grāmakuṭa) for the levy of the tithe on produce.\textsuperscript{2}

In provincial administration a considerable degree of autonomy was allowed. We hear not only of a sub-king at Champā, but of māṇḍalika rāja\textsuperscript{3} corresponding perhaps to the earls and counts of mediaeval European polity. But Bimbisāra, like William the Conqueror, sought to check the centrifugal tendencies of the system by a great gnomon of village headmen (grāmbikas) who are said to have assembled from the 80,000 townships of the realm.

Measures were taken for the improvement of communications and the foundation of a new royal residence. Yuan Chwang (Hiuen Tsang) refers to Bimbisāra's road and causeway, and says that when Kuśāgrapura (old Rājagriha) was afflicted by fires, the king went to the cemetery and built a new city. Fa Hien, however, gives the credit for the foundation of New Rājagriha to Ajataśatru. The patronage of Jīvaka shows that medical arrangements were not neglected.

In one respect Bimbisāra was unfortunate. Like

\textsuperscript{1} Another judicial officer mentioned in Pali texts (Kindred Sayings, II. 172) is the Vinichchayāmachecha.

\textsuperscript{2} Camb. Hist., I. 199.

\textsuperscript{3} DPPN, II. 898.
Prasenajit he was possibly the victim of the malevolence of the Crown Prince whom he had appointed to the vice-royalty of Champā, and had perhaps even admitted to royalty, following the precedent of his own father. The ungrateful son, who is variously called Ajātaśatru, Kūnīka and Asokachanda is said to have put his father to death. The crime seriously affected the relations of Magadha with Kosala. Dr. Smith regards the story of the murder as 'the product of odium theologicum', and shows excessive scepticism in regard to the evidence of the Pāli canon and chronicles. But the general credibility of these works has been maintained by scholars like Rhys Davids and Geiger whose conclusions seem to be confirmed directly or indirectly by the testimony of independent classical and Jain writers.

Section V. Magadha Militant—Kūnīka-Ajātaśatru

Whatever may have been the mode by which he acquired the throne, Kūnīka-Ajātaśatru proved to be an energetic ruler. The defences of the realm were strengthened by fortifications at Rājagriha and the foundation of a new stronghold at Pātaligrāma near the junction of the Son and the Ganges. Like Frederick II of Prussia he carried out the policy of a father with whom his relations were by no means cordial. His reign was the highwater

---

1 Bhagavati Sūtra, Nirayavali Sūtra, Pañcaviṃśatisāstra IV. 1-9; VI. 22 and the Kathākosa, p. 178.
2 Chullavagga, VII. 3. 5. Bimbisāra seems to have sought the assistance of other sons, too, in the work of government. One of these, Abhaya (son of Padmāvati of Ujjain or of Nandā helped his father to foil the machinations of Pradyota. Other children, recorded by tradition were Vimala Kondabhājī by Ambapālī. Halla and Vehalla by Chellanā, Kāla, Silavat, Jayasena and a girl Chumbi by other wives.
3 Kathākosa. The Aupapātīa sūtra styles him Devānāpiya (IA, 1881, 108) a title possibly identical with Devānāpiya of inscriptions of the third century B.C.
4 Cf. the Jaina attempt to whitewash Kūnīka from the stain of intentional parricide (Jacobi referring to the Nirayavali Sūtra in his Kalpa Sūtra of Bhadravahū, 1879, p. 5).
mark of the power of the Haryanka dynasty. He not only humbled Kosala and permanently annexed Kasi, or a part of it, but also absorbed the state of Vaisali. The traditional account of his duel with Kosala is given in Buddhist texts. It is said that when Ajatasatru murdered Bimbisara, his father, the queen Kosala Devi died of love for him. Even after her death the Magadhan King continued to enjoy the revenues of the Kasi village which had been given to the lady for bath money. But Prasenajit, the sovereign of Kosala, determined that no parricide should have a village which was his by right of inheritance. War followed, sometimes the Kosalan monarch got the best of it, and sometimes the rival king. On one occasion Prasenajit fled away in defeat to his capital Srvasthi; on another occasion he took Ajatasatru prisoner but spared his life as he was his nephew. He confiscated the army of the captive prince but sought to appease him by the offer of the hands of his daughter Vajira. The princess was dismissed with the Kasi village in question, for her bath money. Her father could not enjoy the fruits of peace for more than three years. During his absence in a country town, Digha Charanaya, the Commander-in-Chief, raised prince Vindudabha to the throne. The ex-king set out for Rajaigrha, resolved to take Ajatasatru with him and capture Vindudabha. But he died from exposure outside the gates of the Magadhan metropolis.

The traditional account of the war with Vaisali is preserved in part by Jain writers. King Seniya Bimbisara is said to have given his famous elephant Scyanaga (Schanaka, the sprinkler), together with a large necklace of eighteen strings of jewels, to his younger sons Halla and Vehalla born from his wife Chellan, the daughter of Raja Chetaka of Vaisali. His eldest son Kuniya (Ajata-

\[2\] DPPN, II. 172.
\[3\] Bhaddasala Jataka
WAR WITH VAISALI

The preliminaries to the struggle between Magadha and Vaisali are described in several Pali texts. In the Mahavagga it is related that Sunida and Vassaka, two ministers of Magadha, were building a fort at Pataligrama in order to repel the Vajjis (Vrijis). The Mahaparinibbana Sutta says: "The Blessed One was once dwelling in Rājagaha on the hill called the Vulture's Peak. Now at that time Ajatasattu Vedehiputta, the king of Magadha, was desirous of attacking the Vajjians; and he said to himself, 'I will root out these Vajjians, mighty and powerful though they be, I will destroy these Vajjians. I will bring these Vajjians to utter ruin'."

"So he spake to the Brāhmaṇa Vassaka, the prime minister of Magadha, and said, 'Come now, Brāhmaṇa, do you go to the Blessed One, and tell him that Ajatasattu has resolved, 'I will root out these Vajjians'. Vassaka

1 The appellation Padmāvatī is of so frequent occurrence in connection with Magadhan royalty that it seems to be an epithet rather than a personal name. The mother of prince Abhaya, a queen of Ajatasattu, and a sister of Darsaka, all have this name according to tradition. Cf. the name Padmāni applied to the most commendable type of women in treatises on Erotics. It is also not improbable that the name belongs to the domain of mythology.


4 SBE, XI, pp. 1-7; XVII 101, Gradual Sayings, IV. 14 etc.
hearkened to the words of the king..." (and delivered to the Buddha the message even as the king had commanded).

In the *Nirayāvalī Sūtra* (*Nirayāvaliyā Sutta*) it is related that when Kūṇika (Ajātaśatru) prepared to attack Chetaka of Vaiśālī the latter called together the eighteen Gaṇaraṇas of Kāsi and Kosala, together with the Lichchhavis and Mallakis, and asked them whether they would satisfy Kūṇika's demands, or go to war with him. The good relations subsisting between Kosala and Vaiśālī are referred to in the *Majjhima Nikāya*.² There is thus no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Jaina statement regarding the alliance between Kāsi Kosala on the one hand and Vaiśālī on the other. It seems that all the enemies of Ajātaśatru including the rulers of Kāsi-Kosala and Vaiśālī offered a combined resistance. The Kosalan war and the Vajjian war were probably not isolated events but parts of a common movement directed against the establishment of the hegemony of Magadha. The flames fused together into one big conflagration.¹ We are reminded of the tussle of the Samnites, Etruscans and Gauls with the rising power of Rome.

In the war with Vaiśālī Kūṇiya-Ajātaśatru is said to have made use of the *Mahāsūlākaṇṭaga* and *va(t)hamusala*. The first seems to have been some engine of war of the nature of catapult which threw big stones. The second was a chariot to which a mace was attached and which, running about, effected a great execution of men.₄ The *va(t)hamusala* may be compared to the tanks used in the great world wars.

The war is said to have synchronised with the death of Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta, the great teacher of the Ājivika sect. Sixteen years later at the time of Mahāvīra's death the anti-Magadhan confederacy is said to have been still

---

¹ Chiefs of republican clans. Cf. 125 ante.
³ We are told that even Pradyota of Avanti made preparations to avenge the death of his friend Bimbisāra (*DPPN*, I. 34).
in existence. We learn from the *Kalpa Sūtra* that on the death of Mahāvīra the confederate kings mentioned in the *Nirayāvali Sūtra* instituted a festival to be held in memory of that event. The struggle between the Magadhan king and the powers arrayed against him thus seems to have been protracted for more than sixteen years. The *Aṭṭhakathā* gives an account of the Machiavellian tactics adopted by Magadhan statesmen headed by Vassakāra to sow the seeds of dissension among the Vaiśāliyaus and thus bring about their downfall.

1 S.B.E., xxi, 266 (para. 128). As pointed out by Jacobi (*The Kalpasūtra* of *Buddhavāha*, 6th.), the traditional date of Mahāvīra's *Nirvāṇa* is 570 years before Vikrama (58 B.C.) according to the *vṛtāmbavārav*, and 605 according to the *Digambharav*. It is suggested that Vikrama of the *Digambharas* is intended for Śākyāvana (78 A.D.). A different tradition is, however, recorded by Hemachandra who says that 175 years after the liberation of Mahāvīra Chandragupta became king:—

 evam eva śrī-śākyāvanam uttara varsha-śata gate
 pāñcāhataśaśad-hakke Chandragupta-śāhan naṁiṇāḥ

As Chandragupta’s accession apparently took place between 326 and 312 B.C., the tradition recorded in Hemachandra’s *Parīśṭhāpaṇa* would place the date of Mahāvīra’s death between 481 and 467 B.C. But early Buddhist texts (*Dialogues*, III, pp. 111, 203; *Mahābhārata*, II, 213) make the famous Jaina teacher predecease the Buddha, and the latest date assigned by reliable tradition to the *parinirvāṇa* of the Śākyya sage is 86 B.C. (Cantonese tradition, Smith, *EHL*, 4th ed., 49). According to Ceylonese writers, Sakyamuni entered into *nirvāṇa* in the eighth year of Aśoka (Aśokasattvam vasce aṭṭhante maniśubhak, Mahāvīrasa, 114). This would place the accession of the son of Bimbisāra in 399 B.C., if the Cantonese date for the *nirvāṇa* of the Buddha is accepted. Jaina writers put the interval between Kūnpika’s accession and the death of their master at 10 and ‘x’ years. According to Buddhist chroniclers the interval would be less than 8 years as Mahāvīra predeceased the Buddha. The divergent data of the Jaina and Buddhist texts can only be reconciled if we assume that the former took as their starting point the date of the accession of Kūnpika as the rāja of Champā, while the Buddhists begin their calculation from a later date when Aśokasattu mounted the throne of Rājagrīha. According to Buddhist tradition Vassakāra’s visit to the Buddha in connection with the Vrijian incident took place a year after the *parinirvāṇa*. The destruction of the Vrij power took place some three years later on (*DPPN*, I, 33-34) i.e. c. 481 B.C. Too much reliance cannot, however, be placed on the traditional chronology.

2 Diplomacy (*upālāpana*) and disunion (*unabheda*), *DPPN*, II, 846.


The absorption of Vaiśāli and a part at least of Kāsi as a result of the Kosalan and Vajjian wars probably brought the aspiring ruler of Magadha face to face with the equally ambitious sovereign of Avanti. We have already referred to a statement of the Majjhima Nikāya that on one occasion Ajātaśatru was fortifying his capital because he was afraid of an invasion of his dominions by Pradyota. We do not know whether the attack was ever made. Ajātaśatru does not appear to have succeeded in humbling Avanti. The conquest of that kingdom was reserved for his successors.

It was during the reign of Ajātaśatru that both Mahāvīra and Gautama, the great teachers of Jainism and Buddhism respectively, are said to have entered nirvāṇa. Shortly after the death of Gautama a Council is said to have been held by the monks of his Order for the recitation and collection of the Doctrine.

Section VI. Ajātaśatru’s Successors—The Transfer of Capital and The Fall of Avanti

Ajātaśatru was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by Darśaka. Geiger considers the insertion of Darśaka after Ajātaśatru to be an error, because the Pāli Canon indubitably asserts that Udāyi-bhadda was the son of Ajātaśatru and probably also his successor. Jaina tradition recorded in the Kathākoṣa and the Pariśishtaparvan also represents Udaya or Udāyin as the son of Kūṇika by his wife Padmāvatī, and his immediate successor.

Though the existence of Darśaka, as a ruler of Magadha and a contemporary of Udayana, is rendered probable by references in the Svapnā-Vāsavatāla attributed to Bhāsa, yet in the face of Buddhist and Jaina evidence it

Vaiśāli in the north. In the opinion of Dr. Jayaswal the Parkham statue is a contemporary portrait of king Ajātaśatru. But Kūṇika of Parkham (Lüders List No. 159) is obviously not a king.

1 P. 177.
2 P. 42.
3 Buddhist writers represent Vajrā, daughter of Prasenajit, as the mother of Udāyi.
cannot be confidently asserted that he was the immediate successor of Ajātaśatru on the imperial throne of Magadha. He may have been one of the maṇḍalīka rājās like the father of Viśākha Pāṇḍāliputra. His inclusion among Magadhan suzerains is possibly paralleled by that of Suddhodana in the main list of the Ikshvākuids. Certain writers identify him with Nāga-Dāsaka who is represented by the Ceylonese Chronicles as the last king of Bimbisāra’s Āne.¹ The Drivyāvadāna,² however, omits this name altogether from the list of the Bimbisārids. There was thus no unanimity even among Buddhists about the lineage and position of the king.

Udāyin: Before his accession to the throne Udāyin or Udāyi-bhadda, the son of Ajātaśatru, seems to have acted as his father’s Viceroy at Champā.³ The Parisīṣṭha-parvan informs us that he founded a new capital on the banks of the Ganges which came to be known as Pāṭaliputra.⁴ This part of the Jaina tradition is confirmed by the testimony of the Gārgi Saṃhitā and the Vāyu Purāṇa according to which Udāyin built the city of Kusumapura (Pāṭaliputra) in the fourth year of his reign. The choice of the place was probably due to its position in the centre of the realm which now included North Bihār. Moreover, its situation at the confluence of two large rivers, the Ganges and the Soṇ and close to other streams, was important from the commercial as well as the strategic point of view. In this connection it is interesting to note that the

¹ E.g., Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar. In this connection mention was made, in earlier editions, of a passage in the Stye-kūr, (Beal’s Trans., II, p. 102): “To the south-west of the old Saṅghārāma about 100 it is the Saṅghārāma of Ti-lo-shī-kia. . . . It was built by the last descendant of Bimbisāra rāja.” The name of the second Saṅghārāma was sought to be connected with that of Darsaka who was here represented as the last descendant of Bimbisāra. But I now think that the connection of the monastery with the name of Darsaka is extremely doubtful. See Watters, II, p. 106f.
² P. 369.
³ Jacobi, Parisīṣṭha-parvan, p. 42.
⁴ VI. 34: 175-180.
⁵ Kern, Brihat Samhitā, 36.
Kauṭūliya Arthasastra recommends a site at the confluence of rivers for the capital of a kingdom.

The Parisisiṣṭaparvan refers to the king of Avanti as the enemy of Udāyin. This does not seem to be improbable in view of the fact that his father had to fortify his capital in expectation of an attack about to be made by Pradyota, ruler of that country. The fall of Aṅga and Vaiśālī and the discomfiture of Kosala had left Avanti the only important rival of Magadha. This last kingdom had absorbed all the monarchies and republics of Eastern India. On the other hand, if the Kathā-sarit-sāgara and the Āvasyaka kathānaka are to be believed, the kingdom of Kauśāmbī was at this time annexed to the realm of Pālaka of Avanti, the son of Pradyota and was governed by a prince belonging to his family. The two kingdoms, Magadha and Avanti, were brought face to face with each other. The war of nerves between the two for ascendency probably began, as we have seen, in the reign of Ajātaśatru. It must have continued during the reign of Udāyin.

The issue was finally decided in the time of

---

2 See Supra Sec. III, p. 204.

For a traditional account of the conflict between Udāyin and the king of Avanti, see IHQ, 1929, 599.

In the opinion of Dr. Jayaswal one of the famous “Patna Statues” which, at the time of the controversy, stood in the Bharhut Gallery of the Indian Museum (Ind. Ant., 1919, pp. 29ff.), is a portrait of Udāyin. According to him the statue bears the following words:

 Bhage ACHO chhōnudhise.

He identifies ACHO with king Aja mentioned in the Bhāgavata list of Saśimāga kings, and with Udāyin of the Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa lists. Dr. Jayaswal’s reading and interpretation of the inscription have not, however, been accepted by several scholars including Dr. Barnett, Mr. Chanda and Dr. R. C. Majumdar. Dr. Smith, however, while unwilling to dogmatize, was of opinion that the statue was pre-Maurya. In the third edition of his Aśoka he considers Dr. Jayaswal’s theory as probable. The characters of the short inscription on the statue are so difficult to read that it is well-nigh impossible to come to a final decision. For the present the problem must be regarded as not yet definitely solved. Cunningham described the statue as that of a Yakscha. According to him the figure bore the words “Yakhe Achosanāigika”. Mr. Chanda’s reading is: Bha(?) ga Achaṅchhaśaṁvika (the owner of inexhaustible capital, i.e., Vaṅsaraṇa). See Indīmā Antiquary, March, 1919. Dr. Majumdar reads: Gāte (Yakhe) Lechchhaṁ (oi) 40.4 (Ind. Ant., 1919).
Śisunāga, or of Nanda as Jain tradition seems to suggest.

Udāyi's successors in the Purāṇas are Nandivardhana and Mahānandin. According to the Jainas he left no heir. The Ceylonese chroniclers place after Udāyi the kings named Anuruddha, Muṇḍa and Nāga-Dāsaka. This tradition is partially confirmed by the Aṅguttara Nikāya which alludes to Muṇḍa, King of Pātaliputra. The Divyāvadāna, too, mentions Muṇḍa but omits the names of Anuruddha and Nāga-Dāsaka. The Aṅguttara Nikāya by mentioning Pātaliputra as the capital of Muṇḍa indirectly confirms the tradition regarding the transfer of the Magadhan metropolis from Rājagṛhya to Kusumapura or Pātaliputra before his reign.

The great Ceylonese chronicle avers that all the kings from Ajātaśatru to Nāga-Dāsaka were parricides. The citizens drove out the family in anger and raised an amālīya (official) to the throne.

Śusunāga or Śisunāga, the new king seems to have been acting as the Magadhan Viceroy at Benares. The employment of amālīyas as provincial governors or district officers need not cause surprise. The custom continued as late as the time of Gautamīputra Śatakarni and Rudradāman I. The Purāṇas tell us that "placing his son at Benares he will repair to (the stronghold of) Girivraja". He had a second royal residence at Vaiśāli which ultimately became his capital. "That monarch (Śisunāga), not unmindful of

1 Ind. Ant., II. 362.
2 Paniṣḥṭaparvan, VI. 236.
3 Aṅg. III. 57. "The venerable Nārada dwelt near Pātaliputta in the Cock's Park. Now at that time Bhaddā, the dear and beloved queen of king Muṇḍa died." The king's grief was intense. The queen's body was placed in an oil vessel made of iron. A treasurer, Priyaka, is also mentioned. (Gradual Sayings, III. 48).
4 The violent death of Kūṇika (Ajātaśatru) is known to Jain tradition (Jacobi, Paniṣḥṭaparvan, 2nd ed. p. xiii).
5 The question of the relative merits of Purāṇic and Ceylonese accounts of this king and his place in early Magadhan lists of kings have been discussed in Part I, pp. supra, 115 ff.
6 SBE, XI, p. xvi. If the Dvātrimśat-puttalikā is to be believed Vaiśāli (Vaiśāli) continued to be a secondary capital till the time of the Nandas.
his mother's origin, re-established the city of Vesālī (Vaiśālī) and fixed in it the royal residence. From that time Rājagaha (Rājagriha-Girivraja) lost her rank of royal city which she never afterwards recovered”.

The most important achievement of Śiśunāga seems to have been the destruction of the 'glory' of the Pradyota dynasty of Avanti. Pradyota the first king of the line, had been succeeded, according to tradition, by his son Gopāla and Pālaka after whom came Viśākha and Āryaka. The name of Gopāla is omitted in the Purāṇas with the possible exception of the k Vishnu manuscript, where it finds mention instead of Pālaka. The accession of the latter synchronised, according to Jaina accounts, with the passing away of Mahāvīra. He is reputed to have been a tyrant. Viśākha-bhūpa (i.e., king Viśākha called Viśākha-yūpa in most Purānic texts) may have been a son of Pālaka. The absence of any reference to this prince in non-Purānic accounts that have hitherto been available, may suggest that he ruled in some outlying district (Māhishmati), or was set aside in favour of Āryaka who occupied the throne, as a result of a popular outbreak, almost immediately after the fall of Pālaka. The Purāṇas place after Āryaka or Ajaka a king named Nandivardhana, or Vartivardhana, and add that Śiśunāga will destroy the prestige of the Pradyotas and be king. Dr. Jayaswal identifies Ajaka and Nandivardhana of the Avanti list with Aja-Udāyin and Nandivardhana of the Purānic list of Śiśunāga kings.

---

1 Śiśunāga, according to the Mahāvanisaṭṭhikā (Turnour's Mahāvaṁśa, xxxvii), was the son of a Lichchhavi rājā of Vaiśālī. He was conceived by a naga-lgobhini and brought up by an officer of State.

2 Essay on Gunādhya, 115; Gopāla and Pālaka find mention in the Bṛhat Kāthā, Saṃgita-Vāssudattā, Pratyā-Jauagandharāyaṇa, Mṛchchhakaṭīka, etc. A prince named Kumārasena is known to the Harsha-charita. According to the Nepalese Bṛhatkāthā (cf. Kathā-sarit-sāgara, XIX. 57) Gopāla succeeds Mahāsenā (Pradyota) but abdicates in favour of his brother Pālaka. Pālaka renounces the crown in favour of Avantivardhana, son of Gopāla. In the Avatarkya Kathānakas (Partisīhāpurva, 2nd ed. xii) Avatīsenā is mentioned as a grandson of Pālaka.

3 DKA., 19. n29. The Kalki Purāṇa (1. 3. 32f.) mentions a king named Viśākha-yūpa who ruled at Māhishmati near the southern frontier of ancient Avanti.
Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, on the other hand, says that Āryaka or Ajaka was the son of Gopāla, the elder brother of Pālaka. 'Nandivardhana' and 'Vartivardhana' are apparently corruptions of Avantivardhana, the name of a son of Pālaka according to the Kathā-sarit-sāgara, of Gopāla according to the Nepalese Brihat-kathā, or possibly identical with Avantisena, a grandson of Pālaka according to the Āvasyaka Kathānakas. The Pradyota dynasty must have been humbled by Śiśunāga in the time of king Avantivardhana. The Magadhan victory was doubtless facilitated by the revolution that placed Āryaka, a ruler about whose origin there is hardly any unanimity, on the throne of Ujjain.

Śiśunāga was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by his son Kākavarna, and according to the Ceylonese chronicles by his son Kālaśoka. Jacobi, Geiger and Bhandarkar agree that Kālaśoka, ‘the black Aśoka’ and Kākavarna, ‘the crow-coloured’ are one and the same individual. The conclusion accords with the evidence of the Aśokāvadāna which places Kākavarnin after Muṇḍa, and does not

1 Carm. Lec., 1918, 64f. But J Sen rightly points out (IIIQ, 1930, 606) that in the Mrichchhakatika Āryaka is represented as a cow-boy who was raised to the throne after the overthrow of the inveterate Pālaka.


3 Essay on Günāgya, 115.

4 Purvāśvataparv, 2nd ed. p. xii.

TRADITIONAL GENEALOGY OF THE PRADYOTAS

Pūṇika (Anantanemi)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chaṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsena</th>
<th>Kumārasena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gopāla</td>
<td>Pālaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(possibly only a cow-boy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āryaka (?)</td>
<td>Avantivardhana (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśākha (?)</td>
<td>son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king of Māhish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avantisena</td>
<td>Maniprabha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king of Ujjain</td>
<td>King of Kaśāmbī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 The Kāṇya Mitāsā (3rd ed., p. 50) contains an interesting notice of this king and says that he prohibited the use of cerebrals in his harem.
mention Kālāśoka. The new king already served his apprenticeship in the art of government possibly at Benares and in the district of Gayā. The two most important events of his reign are the meeting of the second Buddhist Council at Vaiśālī, and the final transfer of the capital to Pāṭaliputra.

Bāṇa in his Harsha-charita gives a curious legend concerning his death. It is stated that Kākavarna Śāśi-nāgi had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The story about the tragic fate of this king is, as we shall see later on, confirmed by Greek evidence.

The traditional successors of Kālāśoka were his ten sons who are supposed to have ruled simultaneously. Their names according to the Mahābodhivainśa were Bhadrasena, Koraṇḍavarna, Maṅgura, Sarvaṇjaha, Jālika, Ubhaka, Saṅjaya, Koravya, Nandivardhana and Pañchamaka.¹

Only one of these names, viz., that of Nandivardhana occurs in the Purānic lists.² This prince attracted some attention in recent years. His name was read on a Patna statue and in the famous Hāthigumpha inscription of

¹ Durvāyādaṇā, 969, Geiger, Mahāvainśa, p. 811
³ The Durvāyādaṇā (p. 969) gives a different list of the successors of Kākavarnin: Sahālin, Tulakuchhi, Mahāmaṇḍala and Prasenajit. After Prasenajit the crown went to Nanda.
⁴ Bhandarkar, Carm. Let., 1918, 83
⁵ Dr. Jayaswal opined that the headless "Patna statue" which stood, at the time when he wrote, in the Bhārhat Gallery of the Indian Museum, was a portrait of this king. According to him the inscription on the statue runs as follows:—

Śaṭa (or Śava) khaṭe Vāṭa Naṇḍi.

He regarded Vāṭa Naṇḍi as an abbreviation of Vattivardhana (the name of Nandivardhana in the Vāya list) and Nandivardhana. Mr. R. D. Banerji in the June number of the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, 1919, said that there cannot be two opinions about the reading Vāṭa Naṇḍi. Mr. Chanda, however, regarded the statue in question as an image of a Yaksha and read the inscription which it bore as follows:—

Yaksha sa (? ) roṭa naṇṭi.

Dr. Majumdar said that the inscription might be read as follows:—

Yakhe saḥ vaṇjaṁ 70.

He placed the inscription in the second century A. D., and supported the Yaksha theory propounded by Cunningham and upheld by Mr. Chanda. He did not agree with those scholars who concluded that the statue was a portrait of a Śāśi-nāga sovereign simply because there were some letters in the inscrip-
Khāravela. He was sought to be identified with Nandaśrāja of Khāravela’s record on the strength of Kshemendra’s reference to Pūrvananda (Nanda the Elder) who, we are told, should be distinguished from the Navaṇandadhā or New (Later) Nandas, and taken to answer to a ruler of the group represented by Nandivardhana and Mahānandin of the Purāṇas.¹ In the works of Kshemendra and Somadeva, however, Pūrvananda (singular) is distinguished, not from the Navaṇandadhā, but from Yogananda (Pseudo-Nanda), the re-animated corpse of king Nanda.² The Purāṇa as well as the Ceylonese chroniclers know of the existence of only one Nanda line and agree with Jaina tradition in taking nava to mean nine (and not new).³ They represent Nandivardhana as a king of the Śaśuṇāga line—a dynasty which is sharply distinguished from the Nandas. The Purāṇas contain nothing to show that

1 Jayaswal (supported by R. D. Banerji), The Oxford History of India, Additions and Corrections; JBOs, 1918, 91.
3 Cf. Jacobi, Parīśhāparvan VIII. 3; App. p. 2; ‘Nāṇḍavanīse Navamo Naḥdarāyād.’
Nandivardhana had anything to do with Kaliṅga. On the contrary, we are distinctly told that when the Śaiśunāgas and their predecessors were reigning in Magadha 32 kings ruled in Kaliṅga synchronously. "It is not Nandivardhana but Mahāpadma Nanda who is said to have brought 'all under his sole sway' and 'uprooted all Kshatriyas.' So we should identify Naṅdarāja of the Hāthigumphā inscription who held possession of Kaliṅga either with the all-conquering Mahāpadma Nanda or one of his sons."

Section VII. Chronology of the Haryanka-Śaiśunāga Kings

There is considerable disagreement between the Purāṇas and the Ceylonese chronicles regarding the chronology of the kings of the Bimbisārian (or Haryanka) and Śaiśunāga dynasties. Even Smith and Pargiter are not disposed to accept all the dates given in the Purāṇas. According to Ceylonese tradition Bimbisāra ruled for fifty-two years, Ajāṭhaśatrū for 32 years, Udāyī for 16 years, Anuruddha and Muṇḍa for 8 years, Nāga-Dāsaka for 24 years, Śīśunāga for 18 years, Kālāśoka for 28 years and Kālāśoka’s sons for 22 years. Gautama Buddha died in the eighth year of Ajāṭhaśatrū, i.e., in the (52 + 8 =) 60th year (i.e., a little more than 50 years) after the accession of Bimbisāra. The event happened in 544 B.C. according to a Ceylonese reckoning, and in 486 B.C. according to a Cantonese tradition of 489 A.D., based on a ‘dotted record’ brought to China by Śaṅgha-bhadra. The date 544 B.C. can, however, hardly be reconciled with a gāthā transmitted in the

1 Chanda, Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. I, p. 11.
2 Pargiter (AIHT, pp. 286-7) reads the Matsya Purāṇa as assigning the Śiśunāgas 163 years, and further reduces the number to 145 allowing an average of about 14½ years for each reign. He places the beginning of the Śiśunāgas (among whom he includes the Bimbisārids) in B.C. 587 and rejects (847n) the traditional figures for the reigns of Bimbisāra and his son. Cf. also Bhandarkar, Carm. Lec., 1918, p. 68. ‘A period of 369 years for ten consecutive reigns’ i.e., 36.3 years for each ‘is quite preposterous.’
3 Mahāvaṁśa, Ch. 2 (p. 12 of translation).
Ceylonese chronicles which states that Priyadarśana (Aśoka Maurya) was consecrated 218 years after the Buddha had passed into nirvāṇa.¹ This fact and certain Chinese and Chola synchronisms led Geiger and a few other scholars to think that the era of 544 B.C. is a comparatively modern fabrication and that the true date of the death of the Buddha is 483 B.C.²—a result closely approaching that to which the Cantonese tradition leads us. The Chola synchronisms referred to by these scholars are, however, not free from difficulties, and it has been pointed out by Geiger himself that the account in Chinese annals of an embassy which Mahānāman, king of Ceylon, sent to the emperor of China in 428 A.D., does not speak in favour of his revised chronology. The traditional date of Menander which is c. 510 A.B., works out more satisfactorily with a Nirvāṇa era of 544 B.C., than with an era of 483 or 486 B.C. In regard to the Maurya period, however, calculations based on the traditional Ceylonese reckoning will place the accession of Chandragupta Maurya in 544 – 162 = 382 B.C., and the coronation of Aśoka Maurya in 544 – 218 = 326 B.C. These results are at variance with the evidence of Greek writers and the testimony of the inscriptions of Aśoka himself. Classical writers represent Chandragupta as a contemporary of Alexander (326 B.C.) and of Seleukos (312 B.C.). Aśoka in his thirteenth Rock Edict speaks of certain Hellenistic kings as alive. As one at least of these rulers died not later than 258 B.C. (250 B.C. according to some authorities) and as rescripts on morality began to be written when Aśoka was anointed twelve years, his consecration could not have taken place after 269 B.C. (261 B.C. according to some). The date cannot be pushed back beyond 277 B.C., because his grandfather Chandragupta must have ascended the throne after 326 B.C., as he met Alexander in that year as an

¹ *Dve satāni cha vassāni antāharaṇa vassām cha Sambuddhe parinibbuta abhisitto Piyaḍāsano.*


ordinary individual and died after a reign of 24 years, and the next king Bindusāra, the father and immediate predecessor of Aśoka, ruled for at least 25 years, 326 B.C.—49 = 277 B.C., Aśoka’s coronation, therefore, took place between 277 and 261 B.C., and as the event happened, according to the old Gāthā recorded by the Ceylonese Chroniclers, 218 years after the parinirvāṇa of the Buddha, the date of the Great Decease should be placed between 495 and 479 B.C. The result accords not with the Ceylonese date 544 B.C., but with the Cantonese date 486 B.C., and Geiger’s date 483 B.C., for the parinirvāṇa. The Chinese account of embassies which King Meghavarna sent to Samudra Gupta, and King Kia-Che (Kassapa) sent to China in 527 A.D., also speaks in favour of the date 486 B.C., or 483 B.C., for the Great Decease. Geiger’s date, however, is not recognised by reliable tradition. The same remark applies to the date (Tuesday, 1 April, 478 B.C.) preferred by L. D. Swami Kannu Pillai. The Cantonese date may, therefore, be accepted as a working hypothesis for the determination of the chronology of the early dynasties of Magadha. The date of Bimbisāra’s accession, according to this reckoning, would fall in or about 486 + 59 = 545 B.C., which is very near to the starting point of the traditional Ceylonese Nirvāṇa era of 544 B.C. ‘The current name of an era is no proof of origins.’ It is not altogether improbable that the Buddhist reckoning of Ceylon originally started from the coronation of Bimbisāra and was later on confounded with the era of the Great Decease.

In the time of Bimbisāra Gandhāra was an independent kingdom ruled by a king named Paushkarasārin (Pukkusāti). By B.C. 519 at the latest it had lost its independence and had become subject to Persia, as we learn from the inscriptions of Darius. It is thus clear that Paushkarasārin and his contemporary Bimbisāra lived before B.C. 519. This accords with the chronology

1 An Indian Ephemeris, I, Pt. 1, 1922, pp. 471 ff.
which places his accession and coronation in or about B.C. 545-44.

**SUGGESTED CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE**

**(APPROXIMATE DATES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year B.C.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565 Birth of the Buddha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 Birth of Bimbisāra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 558 Accession of Cyrus the Achaemenid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545-44 Accession of Bimbisāra. Epoch of a Ceylonese Era.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 The Great Renunciation (of the Buddha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Enlightenment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530-29 The Buddha’s visit to Bimbisāra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527 Traditional Epoch of the era of Mahāvīra’s <strong>Nirvāṇa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522 Accession of Darius I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493 Accession of Ajātaśatru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486 Cantonese date of the <strong>Parinirvāṇa</strong> of the Buddha. The death of Darius I. Council of Rājagriha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461 Accession of Udāyibhadraka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457 Foundation of Pātaliputra (Kusumapura).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445 Aniruddha (Aniruddha) and Hūṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437 Nāga-Dāsaka (omitted in the <strong>Divyāvadāna</strong> and <em>Jaina texts</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413 Śiśunāga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395 Kālāśoka (Kākaṇvarṇa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386 Council of Vaiśāli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367 Sons of Kālāśoka, and <em>de facto</em> rule of Mahāpadma Nanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345 End of the Śiśunāga dynasty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION VIII. THE NANDAS**

The Śiśunāga dynasty was supplanted by the line of Nanda.¹ With the new family we reach a stage of East

¹ According to Jaina tradition Nanda was proclaimed king after Udāyin’s assassination, and sixty years after the **Nirvāṇa** of Varddhāna (Pariśīṣṭa, p. VI. 243). For Nanda’s history see now *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, pp. 9-26. N. Sastri, Raychaudhuri and others.
Indian history when the indubitable evidence of inscriptions becomes available to supplement the information gleaned from traditional literary sources. The famous Hāthigumpha record of Khāravela, of the second or first century B.C., twice mentions Naṅda-rāja in connection with Kaliṅga.

Paṁchame cedāṇi vase Naṁdarāja-ti-vasa-
sata-oghāṭitam

Tanasuliya-vāḷā paṇāḍi (m) nagaram
pavesa (yatī).....

“And then, in the fifth year (Khāravela) caused the canal opened out by King Nanda three hundred years back to be brought into the capital from the Tanasuliya road.”

Again, in connection with the twelfth year of Khāravela’s reign, we have a reference to Nadarāja-jīta Kaliṅga-
janasām(ṇ)i(ve)ṣaṁ (or, according to another reading, Naṁda-rājanītāṁ Kaliṅga-Jīna-saṁnīvēsaṁ), i.e., a station

1 This interpretation of ‘ṭuvasasata’ accords substantially with the Purānic tradition, regarding the interval between the Nandas and the dynasty to which Śātakarnī, the contemporary of Khāravela in his second regnal year, belonged (137 years for the Mauryas + 112 for the ‘Suṅgas’ + 45 for the Kāṇyas = 294). If the expression is taken to mean 103 years (as is suggested by some scholars), Khāravela’s accession must be placed 103 - 5 = 98 years after Nandarāja. His elevation to the position of Yuvāraja took place 9 years before that date, i.e., 98 - 9 = 89 years after Nanda, i.e., not later than 324 - 89 = 235 B.C. Khāravela’s senior partner in the royal office was on the throne at that time and he may have had his predecessor or predecessors. But we learn from Aśoka’s inscriptions that Kaliṅga was actually governed at that time by a Maurya Kumāra (and not by a Kaliṅga-adhipati or Chakravarti) under the suzerainty of Aśoka himself. Therefore, tuvasasata should be understood to mean 300 and not 103 years.

S. Konow (Acta Orientalia, I, 22-26) takes the figure to express not the interval between Nanda and Khāravela, but a date during the reign of Nanda which was reckoned from some pre-existing era. But the use of any such era in the particular country and epoch is not proved. Khāravela himself, like Aśoka, uses regnal years. The agreement with Purānic tradition speaks in favour of the view adopted in these pages.

2 Barua, Hāthigumpha Inscription of Khāravela (IHQ, XIV. 1938, pp. 259ff). Sannivesa is explained in the dictionaries as an assemblage, station, seat, open space near a town, etc. (Monier Williams). A commentator takes it to mean ‘a halting place of caravans or processions’. Kuṇḍagrāma was a sannivesa in Videha (SBE, XXII. Jaina Sūtras, pt. I, Intro.). The reference in the inscription to the conquest of a place, or removal of a sacred object from Kaliṅga by Nandarāja disposes of the view that he was a local chief (Gamb Hist., 598).
or encampment, or a Jaina shrine, in Kaliṅga acquired\(^1\) by king Nanda.

The epigraphs, though valuable as early notices of a line known mainly from literature, are not contemporaneous. For contemporary reports we must turn to Greek writers. There is an interesting reference, in the *Cyropaedia*\(^2\) of Xenophon, who died some time after 355 B.C., to “the Indian king, a very wealthy man”. This cannot fail to remind one of the Nandas whom the unanimous testimony of Sanskrit, Tamil, Ceylonese and Chinese writers describe as the possessors of enormous wealth.\(^3\) Clearer information about the ruling family of Magadha (c. 326 B.C.) is supplied by the contemporaries of Alexander whose writings form the bases of the accounts of Curtius, Diodorus and Plutarch. Unfortunately, the classical writers do not mention the family name ‘Nanda’. The reading ‘Nandrum’ in the place of ‘Alexandrum’ in the account of Justin is absolutely unjustifiable.

\(^1\) Dr. Balua (*op. cit.,* p. 276n) objects to a Nanda conquest (or domination) of any part of Kaliṅga on the ground that the province “had remained unconquered (*nāyita*) till the 7th year of Aśoka’s reign”. But the claim of the Maurya sceptarian is on a par with Jahāngir’s boast that “not one of the Sultans of lofty dignity has obtained the victory over it” (i.e., Kangāla, Rogers, *Tūzuk*, II. 184). Kaliṅgas appear in the Purāṇas among the contemporaries of the Saṅkunītās who were overpowered by Nanda, the Saṁkha-Kṣatrāntaka.

\(^2\) *III*, ii. 25 (trans. by Walter Miller).

\(^3\) Cf. the names Mahāpadmapati and Dhana Nanda. The *Mudrārākshava* refers to the Nandas as ‘*navanāvatisatādvarṣāyakoṭiśvarāh*’ (Act III, verse 27), and ‘Arthanāchi’ (Act I).


Dr. Aiyangar points out that a Tamil poem contains an interesting statement regarding the wealth of the Nandas “which having accumulated first in Pātali hid itself in the floods of the Ganges.” *Beginnings of South Indian History*, p. 89. For N. Sastri’s views see *ANM.,* pp. 253ff.

According to Ceylonese tradition “The youngest brother (among the sons of Ugrasena) was called Dhana Nanda, from his being addicted to hoarding treasure... He collected riches to the amount of eighty *koṭis*—in a rock in the bed of the river (Ganges) having caused a great excavation to be made, he buried the treasure there...Levying taxes among other articles even on skins, gums, trees and stones he amassed further treasures which he disposed of similarly” (Turnour, *Mahāvaṁśa*, p. xxxix).

Hiuen Tsang, the Chinese pilgrim, refers to “the five treasures of King Nanda’s seven precious substances”. 
For a detailed account of the dynasty we have to rely on Indian tradition. Indian writers seem to be mainly interested in the Nanda age partly as marking an epoch in a social upsurge and the evolution of imperial unity, and partly as accessory to the life-sketch of Jaina patriarchs and to the Chandragupta-kathā of which we have fragments in the Milinda-pañho, Mahāvamsa, the Purānic chronicles, the Brihat-Kathā and its later versions together with the Mudrā-rākshasa and the Arthaśāstra compendiums.

The first Nanda was Mahāpadma or Mahāpadmapati according to the Purāṇas and Ugrasena according to the Mahābodhivamsa. The Purāṇas describe him as a son of the last Kshatrabandhu (so-called Kshatriya) king of the preceding line by a Śūdrā mother (Śūdrā-garbha-odbhava). The Jaina Parīśīṣṭaparvan, on the other hand, represents Nanda as the son of a courtesan by a barber. The Jaina tradition is strikingly confirmed by the classical account of the pedigree of Alexander's Magadhan contemporary who was the predecessor of Chandragupta Maurya. Referring to this prince (Agrammes) Curtius says, "His father was in fact a barber, scarcely staving off hunger by his daily earnings, but who from his being not uncomely in person, had gained the affections of the queen, and was by her influence advanced to too near a place in the confidence of the reigning monarch. Afterwards, however, he treacherously murdered his sovereign, and then, under the pretence of acting as guardian to the royal children, usurped the supreme authority, and having put the young princes to death, begot the present king."

The barber ancestry of Agrammes, recorded by the classical writers is quite in keeping with the Jaina story of the extraction of the Nanda line. That the Magadhan contemporary of Alexander and of young Chandragupta

---

1 'Sovereign of an infinite host' or 'of immense wealth' according to the commentator (Wilson, Vishnu P., Vol. IX. 184n.). A city on the Ganges, styled Mahāpadmapura, is mentioned in Mbh., XII. 353.
2 P. 46. Text VI. 251-52.
was a Nanda king is not disputed. The real difficulty is about his identity. He could not possibly have been the first Nanda himself. The words used in reference to Agrames, “the present king,” *i.e.*, Alexander’s contemporary in Curtius’ narrative, make this point clear. He (Agrames) was *born in purple* to one who had *already “usurped supreme authority”* having secured the affections of a queen. That description is scarcely applicable to the founder of the dynasty who was, according to Jaina testimony, the son of an ordinary courtesan (*ganikā*) by a barber apparently without any pretensions to supreme power in the state.

The murdered sovereign seems to have been Kālaśoka-Kālavarṇa who had a tragic end as we learn from the *Harsha-charita*. Kālavarnā śáśunāgi, says Bāna, had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The young princes referred to by Curtius were evidently the sons of Kālaśoka-Kālavarnā. The Greek account of the rise of the family of Agrames fits in well with the Ceylonese account of the end of the śāśunāga line and the rise of the Nandas, but not with the Purāṇic story which represents the first Nanda as a son of the last śāśunāga by a Śūdra woman, and makes no mention of the young princes. The name Agrames is probably a distorted form of the Sanskrit Augrāsainya, “son of Ugrasena”.

Ugrasena is, as we have seen, the name of the first Nanda according to the *Mahābhodhivamśa*. His son may aptly be termed Augrāsainya which the Greeks corrupted into Agrames and later on into Xandrames.

---

1 “Augrāsainya” as a royal patronymic is met with in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, viii. 21.

2 The identification of Xandrames (taken to answer to Sanskrit Chandramas), the Magadhan contemporary of Alexander, with Chandragupta, proposed by certain writers, is clearly untenable. Plutarch (*Life of Alexander*, Ch. 62) clearly distinguishes between the two, and his account receives confirmation from that of Justin (Watson’s tr., p. 142). Xandrames or Agrames was the son of a usurper born after his father had become king of the Prasii, while Chandragupta was himself the founder of a new sovereignty, the first king of his line. The father of Xandrames was a barber who could claim no royal ancestry. On the other hand, Brāhmaṇical and Buddhist writers are un.
The Purāṇas call Mahāpadma, the first Nanda king, the destroyer of all the Kshatriyas (sarva Kshatrāntaka) and the sole monarch (ekarūṭ) of the earth which was under his undisputed sway, which terms imply that, he finally overthrew all the dynasties which ruled contemporaneously with the Śaśunāgas, viz., the Ikshvākus, Pañcchālas, Kāsīs, Haihayas, Kaliṅgas, Āsmakas, Kurus, Maithilas, Śūrasenas, Vīthihotras, etc. The Jainas, too, allude to the wide dominion of Nanda. The Indian account of the unification of a considerable portion of India under Nanda’s sceptre is corroborated by several

animous in representing Chandragupta as a descendant of a race of rulers, though they differ in regard to the identity of the family and its claim to be regarded as of pure Kshatriya stock. Jaina evidence clearly suggests that the barber usurper is identical with the Nānika or Nāpāsā (Parīśīṭa, VI. 231 and 244) who founded the Nanda line.

1 Conquest of some of the territories occupied by the tribes and clans named here by former kings of Magadha does not necessarily mean the total extinction of the old ruling families, but merely a deprivation of their glory (yasuḥ) and an extension of the suzerainty of the conqueror. Extirpation cannot be meant unless it is definitely asserted as in the case of Mahāpadma Nanda’s conquest, or that of Samudra Gupta in Āryavarta. It may also sometimes be implied by the appointment of a prince of the conquering family as viceroy. Allowance, however, must be made for a good deal of exaggeration. Even the Vaijayanta were not literally ‘rooted out’ by Ajātaśatru, as the most important of the constituent clans, viz., the Lichchhavis, survive till the Gupta Age. A branch of the Ikshvākus may have been driven southwards as they are found in the third or fourth century A.D. in the lower valley of the Kṛiṣṇā. The Kāsīs overthrown by Nanda may have been the descendants or successors of the prince whom Śiśunāga had placed in Benares. The Haihayas occupied a part of the Narmadā valley. Conquest of a part of Kaliṅga by Nanda is suggested by the Hāthigumphā record, that of Āsmaka and part of the Godāvari valley by the city called ‘Nau Nand Dehri’ (Nander, Macauliffe, Sikh Religion, V. p. 296). Vīthihotra sovereignty had terminated before the rise of the Pradyotidas of Avanti. But if the Purāṇic statement (DKA, 23, 69) “Contemporaneously with the aforesaid kings (Śaśunāgas, etc.) there will be………Vīthihotras” has any value, the Śaśunāgas may have paved the way for a restoration of some scion of the old line in Avanti. According to the evidence of the Purāṇas (Vāyu, 94, 51-52) the Vīthihotras were one of the five gānas of the Haihayas, and the survival of the latter is well attested by epigraphic evidence. The Maithilas apparently occupied a small district to the north of the Vajjian dominions annexed by Ajātaśatru. The Pañchālas, Kurus, and the Śūrasenas occupied the Gaṅgetic Doab and Mathurā and the control of their territories by the king of Magadha, c. 286 B.C., accords with Greek evidence.

2 Samudravasanekebhyaḥ āś mudramapiśriyaḥ
uśāya hastairākrīṣhyā tataḥ eva kṛita Nandasāṁ.

Parīśīṭa Parvan, VII. 91
MAHAPADMA

classical writers who speak of the most powerful peoples who dwelt beyond the 'extensive deserts' (apparently of Rājputāna and some adjoining tracts) in the time of Alexander, viz., the Prasii (Prāchyas) and the Gangaridac (people of the lower Ganges Valley) as being under one sovereign who had his capital at Palibothra (Pāṭaliputra). Pliny informs us that the Prasii surpass in power and glory every other people in all India, their capital being Palibothra (Pāṭaliputra), after which some call the people itself Palibothri, nay, even the whole tract of the Ganges. The author is referring probably to conditions in the time of the Mauryas, and not in that of the Nandas. But the greatness that the Prasii (i.e. the Magadhans and some other eastern peoples) attained in the Maurya Age would hardly have been possible but for the achievements of their predecessors of which we have a record by the historians of Alexander. The inclusion of the Ikshvāku territory of Kosala within Nanda's dominions seems to be implied by a passage of the Kathā-sarit-sāgara which refers to the camp of king Nanda in Ayodhyā. Several Mysore inscriptions state that Kuntala, a province which included the southern part of the Bombay Presidency and the north of Mysore, was ruled by the Nandas. But these are of comparatively modern date, the twelfth century, and too much cannot be built upon their statements. More important is the evidence of the Háthigumphā inscription which mentions the constructive activity of Nandarāja in Kaliṅga and his conquest (or removal) of some place (or sacred object) in that country. In view of Nanda's control over parts of Kaliṅga, the conquest of Asmaka and other regions lying further south does not seem to be altogether improbable. The existence on the Godāvari of a city called

1 *Inv. Alex.*, 221, 281; *Megasthenes and Arrian* by McCrindle (1926), pp. 671, 141, 161.
3 Tawney's Translation, p. 21.
4 Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 9; Fleet, *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, 884, n. 2.
“Nau Nand Dehra” (Nander) also suggests that the Nanda dominions may have embraced a considerable portion of the Deccan.

The Mātṣya Puraṇa assigns 88 years to the reign of the first Nanda, but 88 (Aśṭāṣṭi) is probably a mistake for 28 (Aśṭāvimiṣṭi), as the Vāyu assigns only 28 years. According to Tāranāth Nanda reigned 29 years. The Ceylonese accounts inform us that the Nandas ruled only for 22 years. The Purānic figure 28 is probably to be taken to include the period when Nanda was the de facto ruler of Magadha before his final usurpation of the throne.

Mahāpadma-Ugrasena was succeeded by his eight sons who were possibly kings in succession. They ruled for twelve years according to the Purāṇas. The Ceylonese Chronicles, as we have already seen, give the total length of the reign-period of all the nine Nandas as 22 years. The Purāṇas specify the name of one son of Mahāpadma, viz., Sukalpa. The Mahābodhivaiśa gives the following names: Paṇḍuka, Paṇḍugati, Bhūtapāla, Rāśtrapāla, Govishāṇaka, Daśasiddhaka, Kaivarta and Dhana. The last king is possibly identical with the Agrammes or Xandrames of the classical writers. Agrammes is, as we have seen, probably a distortion by the Greeks of the Sanskrit patronymic Au-grasainya.

The first Nanda left to his sons not only a big empire but also a large army and, if tradition is to be believed, a full exchequer and an efficient system of civil government. Curtius tells us that Agrammes, king of the Gangaridae and the Prasii, kept in the field for guarding the approaches to his country 20,000 cavalry and 200,000

---

1 Macauliffe’s Sikh Religion, V. p. 296.
2 Ind. Ant., 1875, p. 362.
3 The name has variants. One of these is Sahalya. Dr. Barua makes the plausible suggestion that the prince in question may be identical with Sahalin of the Daiyādāna (p. 369; Pargiter, DKA. 25n 24; Baudhā Dharmaka Kosha, 44). The evidence of that Buddhist work in regard to the relationship between Sahalin and Kākavarṇa can, however, hardly be accepted. The work often errs in this respect. It makes Pushyamitra a lineal descendant of Aśoka (p. 433).
infantry, besides 2,000 four-horsed chariots, and what was the most formidable force of all, a troop of elephants which, he said, ran up to the number of 3,000. Diodoros and Plutarch give similar accounts. But they raise the number of elephants to 4,000 and 6,000 respectively. The name of one of the generals, Bhaddasāla is preserved by Buddhist tradition.\footnote{1}

The immense riches of the Nandas have already been referred to. The family may also be credited with irrigation projects in Kalinga and the invention of a particular kind of measure (Nandopakramani mānāni).\footnote{2} The existence of a body of capable ministers is vouched for both by Brāhmanical and Jaina tradition. But in the end they proved no match for another traditional figure whose name is indissolubly linked up with the fall of the Nandas and the rise of a more illustrious race of rulers.

No detailed account of this great dynastic revolution has survived. The accumulation of an enormous amount of wealth by the Nanda kings probably implies a good deal of financial extortion. Moreover, we are told by the classical writers that Agrammes (the Nanda contemporary of Alexander) "was detested and held cheap by his subjects as he rather took after his father than conducted himself as the occupant of a throne."\footnote{3}

The Purānic passage about the revolution\footnote{4} stands as follows:

\begin{quote}
Uddharishyati tān sarvān
Kauṭlyo vai dvijarshabhaḥ
\end{quote}

\footnote{1}{Mīlinda-Pañho, SBE, xxxvi. pp. 147-8.}
\footnote{2}{S. C. Vasu’s trans. of the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini, rule illustrating śūtra II. 4. 21.}
\footnote{3}{McGrindle, The Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 222. Cf. Ref. to Nanda’s avarice and parentage DKA., 125, Jaina Pariśisha parvan, vi. 244.—tataścata kechit sāmantā madenāndhaṁ bhavishṇavaḥ Nandasya na nāthaṁ chakrurusau nāpitāsūrīti.}
\footnote{4}{The dynastic change is also referred to by the Kauṭliya Arthaśāstra, the Kāmandaṅkīya Niśātra, the Mudrāraksha, the Chaṇḍa Kauṭika; the Ceylonese Chronicles, etc.}
Kauṭilyaś-Chandraguptam tu
tato rājye bhisekshyati.¹

The Milinda-Pañho² refers to an episode of the great struggle between the Nandas and the Mauryas: "There was Bhaddasāla, the soldier in the service of the royal family of Nanda, and he waged war against king Chandagutta. Now in that war, Nāgasena, there were eighty Corpse dances. For they say that when one great Head Holocaust has taken place (by which is meant the slaughter of ten thousand elephants, and a lac of horses and five thousand charioteers, and a hundred koṭis of soldiers on foot), then the headless corpses arise and dance in frenzy over the battle-field." The passage contains a good deal of mythical embellishment. But we have here a reminiscence of the bloody encounter between the contending forces of the Nandas and the Mauryas.³

---

¹ Some Mss. read dvirashṭabhiḥ in place of dvijarshamhaḥ. Dr. Jayaswal (Ind. Ant., 1914, 124) proposed to emend it to Virashṭrabhiḥ. Virashṭras he took to mean the Aṛaṭtas and added that Kauṭilya was helped by the Aṛaṭtas "the band of robbers" of Justin. Cf. Cunningham, Bhilsa Topes, pp. 88, 89. Pargiter, however, suggests, (Dynasties of the Kali Age, pp. 26, 85) that dvija-
ṛṣabhah (the best among the twice-born, i.e., Brāhmaṇas) may be the correct reading instead of "dvirashṭabhiḥ".


³ Cf. Ind. Ant., 1914, p. 124n.
CHAPTER III. THE PERSIAN AND MACEDONIAN INVASIONS

SECTION I. THE ADVANCE OF PERSIA TO THE INDUS.

While the kingdoms and republics of the Indian interior were gradually being merged in the Magadhan Empire, those of North-West India (including modern Western Pakistan) were passing through vicissitudes of a different kind. In the first half of the sixth century B.C., the Uttarapatha (northern region) beyond the Madhyadesa (Mid-India, roughly the Ganges-Jumna Doab, Oudh and some adjoining tracts), like the rest of India, was parcelled out into a number of small states the most important of which were Kamboja, Gandhara and Madra. No sovereign arose in this part of India capable of welding together the warring communities, as Ugrasena-Mahapadma had done in the East. The whole region was at once wealthy and disunited, and formed the natural prey of the strong Achaemenian monarchy which grew up in Persia (Iran).

Kurush or Cyrus (558-530 B.C.) the founder of the Persian Empire, is said to have led an expedition against India through Gedrosia, but had to abandon the enterprise, escaping with seven men only. But he was more successful in the Kabul valley. We learn from Pliny that he destroyed the famous city of Kapiši, at or near the confluence of the Ghorband and the Panjshir. Arrian informs us that "the district west of the river Indus as far as the river Cophen (Kabul) is inhabited by the Astacienians (Aṣṭakas) and the Assacenian (Aṣvakas), Indian tribes.

---

1 550-549 B.C. according to A Survey of Persian Art, p. 64.
2 H. and F., Strabo, III. p. 74.
3 Chinnock, Arrian's Anabasis, p. 999.
4 Patañjali (IV. 2. 2) refers to "Aṣṭakarī nāma dhana;" (cf. Hashtnagar, and Aṭhakanagara, Lüders, 990).
These were in ancient times subject to the Assyrians, afterwards to the Medes, and finally they submitted to the Persians, and paid tribute to Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, as ruler of their land." Strabo tells us that on one occasion the Persians summoned the Hydræs (the Kshudrakas) from India (i.e., the Pañjāb) to attend them as mercenaries.

In the Behistun or Bahistān Inscription of Dārayavaush or Darius I (c. 522-486 B.C.) the third sovereign of the Achaemenian dynasty, the people of Gandhāra (Gadāra) appear among the subject peoples of the Persian Empire. But no mention is there made of the Hidus (Hindus, people of Sindhu or the Indus Valley) who are explicitly referred to in the Hamadan Inscription, and are included with the Gandhārians in the lists of subject peoples given by the inscriptions on the terrace at Persepolis, and around the tomb of Darius at Naqš-i-Rustum.¹ From this it has been inferred that the "Indians" (Hidus) were conquered at some date between 519 B.C. (the probable date of the Behistun or Bahistān inscription),² and 513 B.C.³ The preliminaries to this conquest are described by Herodotus:⁴ "He (Darius, being desirous to know in what part the Indus, which is the second river that produces crocodiles, discharges itself into the sea, sent in ships both others on whom he could rely to make a true report and also Scylax of Caryanda. They accordingly setting out

---

¹ Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achaemenid inscription by H. C. Tolman; Rapson, Ancient India; Herzfeld, MASI, 34, pp. 1 ff. For contact between the Medes and India, see India Antiqua, 1947, 180ff.
² In the opinion of Jackson (Camb. Hist. India, 1, 334) the Bahistān Rock Inscription is presumably to be assigned to a period between 520 and 518 B.C. with the exception of the fifth column, which was added later. Rapson regarded 516 B.C. as the probable date of the famous epigraph while Herzfeld prefers the date 519 B.C. (MASI, No. 34, p. 2).
³ Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire, 145. Herzfeld is, however, of the opinion that reference to the 'Thagauah' in early Persian epigraphs shows that (part of) the Pañjāb, like Gandhāra, was Persian from the days of Cyrus the Great. (Satrapy of Hidus was formed before 513 B.C., Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire, p. 143. Some scholars believe that the conquest of Sind preceded Scylax's exploration of the Indus—India Antiqua, p. 481).
⁴ McCrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, pp. 4:5.
from the city of Caspatyrus\(^1\) and the country of Paktyike (Pakthas?)\(^3\) sailed down the river towards the east and sunrise to the sea; then sailing on the sea westwards, they arrived in the thirtieth month at that place where the king of Egypt despatched the Phoenicians, to sail round Libya. After these persons had sailed round, Darius subdued the Indians and frequented the Sea."

- Herodotus tells us that "India" constituted the twentieth and the most populous satrapy of the Persian Empire, and that it paid a tribute proportionately larger than all the rest,—360 talents of gold dust, equivalent to \(\ell 1,290,000\) of the pre-war period. There is no reason to believe that all this gold came from Bactria or Siberia. Gold deposits are not unknown in several tracts of the North-West Frontier and quantities of gold are recovered from the alluvium of rivers. A small quantity of the precious metal used to be imported by Bhotiya traders from the Tibetan Hills.\(^3\) Gandhāra was at first included in the seventh satrapy. The details regarding "India" left by Herodotus leave no room for doubt that it embraced the Indus Valley and was bounded on the east by the desert of Rājaputāna.\(^4\) "That part of India towards the rising sun is all sand; for of the people with whom we are acquainted, the Indians live the furthest towards the east and the sunrise, of all the inhabitants of

\(^1\) Camb. Hist. Ind., I. 336. The city was probably situated in ancient Gandhāra; Herod. IV. 44.

\(^3\) Camb. Ibid, 82, 339. Paktyike is apparently the ancient name of the modern Pathan country on the north-west borderland of the sub-continent of India.

\(^4\) Crooke, The North-Western Provinces of India, 1897, p. 10; Amrita Bazar Patrika, 19-7-39, p. 6; cf. Watters, Yuan Chwang, I. 225, 239.

\(^3\) There is no reason to believe that the Indian satrapy of Darius refers to Sind or to some small territory to the west of the Indus. The account of Herodotus III. 94-98 seems to suggest that it extended eastwards beyond the Beas as far as the river Sarasvati which flowed past the Marudhanavan in the days of the Mahābhārata (see \(\text{2an a ante}; cf., desert beyond the Beas, ANM, p. 16) and finally disappeared in the sands of Rājaputāna. "Eastward of India lies a tract which is entirely sand . . . the Indians dwell nearest to the east, and the rising of the Sun. Beyond these the whole country is desert on account of the sand." The Sattagydiams, the Gandarians, the Dādikāe and the Apatyae, constituted the seventh satrapy and the Indians the twentieth (Herod. III. 91-94).
Asia, for the Indians' country towards the east is a desert by reason of the sands.” Curtius refers to extensive deserts beyond the Beas.

The organisation of the empire into Satrapies served as a model to several succeeding dynasties, and was given a wider extension in India by the Sakas and the Kushāns in the centuries immediately preceding and succeeding the Christian era. The Deśa-goptṛi of the Gupta Age was the lineal successor of the Satrap (Kṣatra-pāvan) of earlier epochs.

The Persian conquerors did much to promote geographical exploration and commercial activity. At the same time they took from the country not only an enormous amount of gold and other commodities such as ivory and wood, but denuded it of a great portion of its man-power. Military service was exacted from several tribes. Contact between the East and the West became more intimate with important results in the domain of culture. If the Achaemenians brought the Indian bowmen and lancers to Hellenic soil, they also showed the way of conquest and cultural penetration to the peoples of Greece and Macedon.

Khshayārshā or Xerxes (486-465 B.C.), the son and successor of Darius I, maintained his hold on the Indian provinces. In the great army which he led against Hellas both Gandhāra and “India” were represented. The Gandhārians are described by Herodotus as bearing bows of reed and short spears, and the “Indians” as being clad in cotton garments and bearing cane bows with arrows tipped with iron. One of the newly discovered stone-tablets at Persepolis records that Xerxes “by Ahuramazda’s will” sapped the foundations of certain temples of the Daivas and ordained that “the Daivas shall not be worshipped”. Where the Daivas had been worshipped, the king worshipped Ahuramazda together with Rtam (divine world order). ‘India’ may have been among the lands which

witnessed the outcome of the religious zeal of the Persian king.

The Persian Empire rapidly declined after the death of Xerxes. But if Ktesias who resided at the Court of Artaxerxes II, Mnemon 405-358 B.C., is to be believed, the Great King used to receive costly presents from India even in the fourth century B.C. The South Tomb Inscription at Persepolis, usually assigned to Artaxerxes II, continues to mention the Sattagydians, the Gandharians and the Hi(n)dus side by side with the Persians, the Medians, the Susians and others apparently as subjects of the Achaemenian King.

Among interesting relics of Persian dominion in India mention is sometimes made of a Taxila Inscription in Aramaic characters of the fourth or fifth century B.C. But Herzfeld points out that the form Priyadarśana occurs in the record which should be referred to the reign of Aśoka, and not to the period of Persian rule. To the Persians is also attributed the introduction of the Kharoshṭī alphabet, the "Persepolitan capital" and words like "dipi" (rescript) and "nipishta" ("written") occurring in the inscriptions of Aśoka. Persian influence has also been traced in the preamble of the Aśokan edicts.

SECTION II. THE LAST OF THE ACHAEMENIDS AND ALEXANDER

Artaxerxes II died in or about 358 B.C. After a period of weak rule and confusion, the crown went to Darius III Codomannus (335-330 B.C.). This was the king against whom Alexander, the great king of Macedon, led forth his famous phalanx. After several engagements in which the Persian forces suffered repeated defeats, the Macedonian conqueror rode on the tracks of his vanquish-

---

2 S. Sen, Old Persian Inscriptions, 172ff.
ed enemy and reached the plain watered by the river Bumodus.

Three distinct groups of Indians figured in the army which mustered under the banner of the Persian monarch in that region. "The Indians who were conterminous with the Bactrians as also the Bactrians themselves and the Sogdianians had come to the aid of Darius, all being under the command of Bessus, the Viceroy of the land of Bactria. They were followed by the Sacians, a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwell in Asia. These were not subject to Bessus but were in alliance with Darius... Barsaentes, the Viceroy of Arachotia, led the Arachotians and the men who were called Mountaineer Indians. There were a few elephants, about fifteen in number, belonging to the Indians who live this side of the Indus. With these forces Darius had encamped at Gau-gamela, near the river Bumodus, about 600 stades distant from the city of Arbela." The hold of the Achaemenians on the Indians in the various provinces on the frontier had, however, grown very feeble about this time, and the whole of north-western India was parcelled out into innumerable kingdoms, hyparchies and republics. A list of the more important among these is given below:

1. The Aspasian territory (Alishang-Kūnar-Bajaur valley):

It lay in the difficult hill country north of the Kābul river watered by the Khoes, possibly the modern Alishang, and the Euaspla, apparently the Kūnar. The name of the people is derived from the Irānian "Aspa," i.e., the Sanskrit "Aśva" (horse) or Aśvaka. The Aspasians were thus the western branch of the Aśvakas (Assakenians). The chieftain, hyparch, of the tribe dwelt in a city on or near the river Euaspla, supposed to be identical with the Kūnar, a tributary of the Kābul. Other Aspasian cities were Andaka and Arigaeum.

1 Chinnock, *Arrian's Anabasis*, pp. 142-143.
3 Chinnock's *Arrian*, pp. 290-291.
2. The country of the Guraeans:

It was watered by the river Guraeus, Gauri, or Pañj-kora, and lay between the land of the Aspasians and the country of the Assakenians.

3. The Kingdom of Assakenos (part of Swat and Buner):

It stretched eastwards as far as the Indus and had its capital at Massaga, a "formidable fortress probably situated not very far to the north of the Malakand Pass but not yet precisely identified." The name of the Assakenians probably represents the Sanskrit Aśvaka 'land of horses,' not Aśmaka, 'land of stone.' The territory occupied by the tribe was also known in different ages as Suvāstu, Udyāna and, according to some, Oḍḍiyāna. The Aśvakas do not appear to be mentioned by Pāṇini unless we regard them as belonging to the same stock as the Aśmakas of the south for which there is no real ground. They are placed in the north-west by the authors of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa and the Brāhmat Sāṁhitā. The Assakenian king had a powerful army of 20,000 cavalry, more than 30,000 infantry and 30 elephants. The reigning king at the time of Alexander's invasion is called by the Greeks Assakenos. His mother was Kleophis. Assakenos had a brother who is called Eryx by Curtius and Aphikes by Diodoros. There is no reason to believe that these personages had any relationship with king Śarabha, whose tragic fate is described by Bāṇa and who belonged apparently to the southern realm of the Aśmakas in the valley of the Godāvari.

4. Nysa:

This was a small hill-state which lay at the foot of Mt. Meros between the Kophen or Kābul river and the

---

1 IV. I. 178.
2 Invasion of Alexander, p. 378.
3 He led the flying defenders of the famous fortress of Aornos against the Greeks (Camb. Hist. Ind., I. 356). Aornos is identified by Sir Aurel Stein with the height of Una between the Swat and the Indus (Alexander's Campaign on the Frontier, Benares Hindu University Magazine, Jan., 1927). The southern side of the stronghold was washed by the Indus. (Inv. Alex., 271).
Indus. It had a republican constitution. The city was alleged to have been founded by Greek colonists long before the invasion of Alexander. Arrian says, "The Nysaeans are not an Indian race, but descended from the men who came to India with Dionysus." Curiously enough, a Yona or Greek state is mentioned along with Kamboja in the Majjhima Nikāya as flourishing in the time of Gautama Buddha and Assalāyana: "Yonq Kambojesu dueva vaṁṇā Ayyo c'eva Dāsoca (there are only two social grades among the Yonas and the Kambojas, viz., Aryan and Dāsā).

According to Holdich the lower spurs and valleys of Kohi-Mor in the Swat country are where the ancient city of Nysa once stood. At the time of Alexander's invasion the Nysaens had Akouphis for their President. They had a Governing Body of 300 members.

5. Peukelaotis (in the Peshāwar District):

It lay on the road from Kābul to the Indus. Arrian tells us that the Kābul falls into the Indus in the land called Peukelaotis, taking with itself the Malantus, Soastus and Guraeus. Peukelaotis represents the Sanskrit Pushkarāvati. It formed the western part of the old kingdom of Gandhāra. The people of the surrounding region are sometimes referred to as the "Astakenoi" by historians. The capital is represented by the modern Mīr Ziyārat and Chārsadda, about 17 miles N. E. of Peshāwar, on the Swat river, the Soastus of Arrian, and the Suvāstu of the Vedic texts.

The reigning hyparch at the time of Alexander's invasion was Astes identified with Hasti or Ashṭaka. He

---

1 Inv. Alex., 79. 193.
3 Chinnock's Arrian, p. 399.
4 II. 149.
6 Invasion of Alexander, p. 81.
7 Chinnock's Arrian's Anabasis of Alexander and Indica, p. 408.
8 Chinnock, Arrian, p. 218.
was defeated and killed by Hephaestion, a general of the Macedonian king.

6. Taxila or Takshaśila (in the Rāwalpindi District): Strabo says1 "between the Indus and the Hydāspes (Jhelum) was Taxila, a large city, and governed by good laws. The neighbouring country is crowded with inhabitants and very fertile." The kingdom of Taxila formed the eastern part of the old Kingdom of Gandhāra.

In B.C. 327 the Taxilian throne was occupied by a hyparch, or basileus, whom the Greeks called Taxiles. When Alexander of Macedon arrived in the Kābul valley he sent a herald to the king of Taxila to bid him come and meet him. Taxiles accordingly did come to meet the conqueror, bringing valuable gifts. When he died his son Mophis or Omphīs (Sanskrit Āmbhi) succeeded to the government. Curiously enough, the reputed author of the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra, himself a native of Taxila according to the Mahāvanisa Ṭikā, refers to a school of political philosophers called Āmbhiyas, and Dr. F. W. Thomas connects them with Taxilā.2

7. The kingdom of Arsakes:
The name of the principality represents the Sanskrit Uraśā which formed part of the modern Hazāra District. It adjoined the realm of Abisares, and was probably, like the latter, an offshoot of the old kingdom of Kamboja. Uraśā is mentioned in several Kharoshṭhī inscriptions, and, in the time of the geographer Ptolemy, absorbed the neighbouring realm of Taxilā.

8. Abhisāra:
Strabo observes3 that the kingdom was situated among the mountains above the Taxilā country. The position of this state was correctly defined by Stein who pointed out that Dārvābhīsāra4 included the whole tract of the lower and middle hills lying between the Jhelum and the Chenāb.

---

1 H. and F.'s tr., III, p. 90.
3 H. & F.'s tr., III, p. 90.
4 Cf. Mbh., VII. 91, 45.
Roughly speaking, it corresponded to the Punch and some adjoining districts in Kaśmīra with a part at least of the Hazāra District of the North-West Frontier Province. It was probably an offshoot of the old kingdom of Kamboja. Abisares, the contemporary of Alexander, was a shrewd politician of the type of Charles Emanuel III of Sardinia. When the Macedonian invader arrived in Taxila he informed him that he was ready to surrender himself and the land which he ruled. And yet before the battle which was fought between Alexander and the famous Poros, Abisares intended to join his forces with those of the latter.¹

9. The **kingdom of the Elder Poros**:
   
   This territory lay between the Jhelum and the Chenāb and roughly corresponded to parts of the modern districts of Guzrāt and Shāhpur.² Strabo tells us³ that it was an extensive and fertile district containing nearly 300 cities. Diodoros informs us⁴ that Poros had an army of more than 50,000 foot, about 3,000 horses, above 1,000 chariots, and 130 elephants. He was in alliance with Embisaros, i.e., the king of Abhisāra.

   Poros probably represents the Sanskrit Pūru or Paurava. In the *Rīg-Veda* the Pūrus are expressly mentioned as on the Sarasvati. In the time of Alexander, however, we find them on the Hydaspes (Jhelum). The *Bṛihat Saṃhitā*,⁵ too, associates the ‘Pauravas’ with ‘Madraka’ and ‘Mālava.’ The *Mahābhārata*,⁶ also, refers to a “*Purānī Paurava-rākshitam*”, city protected by the Pauravas, which lay not far from Kaśmīra. It is suggested in the *Vedic Index*⁷ that either the Hydaspes was the earlier home of the Pūrus, where some remained after the others had wandered east, or the later Pūrus represent a successful onslaught upon the west from the east.

² It apparently included the old territory of Kekaya.
³ H. & F.’s tr., III, p. 91.
⁴ *Invasion of Alexander*, p. 274.
⁵ XIV. 27.
⁶ II. 27, 15-17.
10. The country of the people called Glauganikai (Glauganicians) by Aristobulus, and Glausius by Ptolemy:
This tract lay to the west of the Chenāb and was con-
terminous with the dominion of Poros. It included no
less than seven and thirty cities, the smallest of which had
not fewer than 5,000 inhabitants, while many contained
upwards of 10,000.

This little kingdom lay between the Chenāb and the
Rāvi and (if Strabo has given the correct name of the
territory) probably represented the easternmost part of
the old Mahājanapada of Gandhāra. It was ruled by
the Younger Poros, nephew of the monarch who ruled
the country between the Jhelum and the Chenāb.

12. The Adraistai (in the Bari Doāb):
They dwell on the eastern side of the Hydraotes
or the Rāvi, and their main stronghold was Pimprama.

13. Kathaioi or Cathaeans (probably also in the Bari
Doāb):
Strabo points out that "some writers place Cathaia
and the country of Sopeithes, one of the nomarchs, in the
tract between the rivers (Hydaspes and Acesines, i.e., the
Jhelum and the Chenāb); some on the other side of the
Acesines and of the Hydarotis, i.e., of the Chenāb and the
Rāvi, on the confines of the territory of the other Poros,
the nephew of Poros who was taken prisoner by Alexander."
The Kathaioi probably represent the Sanskrit Kaṭha,
Kāṭhaka, Kantha or Krātha. They were the most emi-

1 With the second part of the name anika, troop or army, may be com-
pared that of the Sanaṇikas of the Gupta period. Dr. Jayaswal, who
doubtless following Weber in IA, ii (1879), p. 147, prefers the restoration of
the name as Glauchukāyanaka, does not apparently take note of this fact.
2 Chinnock, Arrian, p. 276. Inv. Alex., 112. The country was sub-
sequently given to the elder Poros to rule.
3 But see Camb. Hist. Ind., I. 370, n. 4; the actual name of the territory
in olden times was, however, Madra.
4 Adrijas? Mbh., VII. 259. 5.
5 Yaudheyn Adrijan rājan Madrahān Mālavān apī.
6 H. & F.'s tr., III, p. 98.
7 Idly SBE., VII. 15: Ep. Ind., III. 8.
8 Cf., Pānini, II. 4. 20. 
9 Mbh., VIII. 85. 16.
nent among the independent tribes dwelling in the area of which the principal centre was Sangala (Sāṅkala). This town was probably situated in the Gurudāspur district, not far from Fathgarh. Anspach locates it at Jandiāla to the east of Amritsar.

The Kathaians enjoyed the highest reputation for courage and skill in the art of war. Onesikritos tells us that in Kathaiia the handsomest man was chosen as king.

14. The kingdom of Sophytes (Saubhūti), probably along the banks of the Jhelum:

In the opinion of Smith, the position of this kingdom is fixed by the remark of Strabo that it included a mountain composed of fossil salt sufficient for the whole of India; Sophytes was, therefore, according to him, the "lord of the fastness of the Salt Range stretching from the Jhelum to the Indus." But we have already seen that the classical writers agree in placing Sophytes' territory east of the Jhelum. Curtius tells us that the nation ruled by Sopeithes (Sophytes), in the opinion of the "barbarians," excelled in wisdom, and lived under good laws and customs. They did not acknowledge and rear children according to the will of the parents, but as the officers entrusted with the medical inspection of infants might direct, for if they remarked anything deformed or defective in the limbs of a child they ordered it to be killed. In contracting marriages they did not seek an alliance with high birth but made their choice by the looks, for beauty in the children was highly appreciated. Strabo informs us that the dogs in the territory of Sopeithes (Sophytes) were said to possess remarkable courage. We have some coins of Sophytes bearing on the obverse the head of the king, and on the reverse the figure of a cock. According to Smith

1 JRAS., 1903, p. 687.
3 McCrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p. 38.
4 H. & F.'s tr., III, p. 93.
5 Invasion of India by Alexander, p. 219.
6 H. & F., III, p. 93.
7 Whitehead (Num. Chron., 1948, pp. 60-74) rejects the identification of
the style is suggested probably by the "owls" of Athens. Strabo calls Sophytes a nomarch which probably indicates that he was not an independent sovereign, but only a viceroy of some other king.¹

15. The kingdom of Phegelas or Phegeus (in the Bari Doāb):

It lay between the Hydraotes (Rāvi) and the Hyphasis (Bias).² The name of the king, Phegelas, probably represents the Sanskrit Bhagala—the designation of a royal race of Kshatriyas mentioned in the Gaṇapāṭha.³

16. The Siboī (in the lower part of the Rechna Doāb):

They were the inhabitants of the Shorkot region in Jhang district below the junction of the Jhelum and the Chenāb.⁴ They were probably identical with the Śiva people mentioned in a passage of the Rig-Veda⁵ where they share with the Alinas, Pakthas, Bhalānases, and Viśāṇins the honour of being defeated by Sudās.⁶ The Jātakas mention a Sivi country and its cities Aritṭhapura⁷ and Jetuttara.⁸ It is probable that Śiva, Śivi, Sibi, and Siboī were one and the same people. A place called Śiva-pura is mentioned by the scholiast on Pāṇini as situated in the northern country.⁹ It is, doubtless, identical with Śibipura

Sophytes with Saubhūti. He thinks that "Saubhūti is a philologist’s creation. There is no historical evidence that Saubhūti existed" (p. 69). Saubhūti (from which Saubhūti is apparently derived) is a fairly common name in Indian literature. (The Questions of King Mīlinda, Part II, SBE. XXXVI, pp. 315, 323; Geiger, the Mahāvaśīṣa, tr., 1511, 275.) It is by no means improbable that a Hindu Rajah should strike a piece bearing a Hellenized form of his name, as the Hinduised Scythian rulers did in later ages.

¹ Was it the Great King of W. Asia or some Indian potentate? Among other nomarchs mention may be made of Spitakes, a nephew and apparently a vassal of the elder Poros (Camb. Hist. Ind., 36, 305, 307).
² Inv. Alex., p. 281, 401.
⁴ Inv. Alex., p. 452.
⁵ VII. 18. 7.
⁷ Ummadanti Jātaka, No. 547; cf. Pāṇini, VI. 2. 100.
⁸ Vessantara Jātaka, No. 547. See also ante, p. 198, n 6.
⁹ Patañjali, IV, 2. 2; Ved. Ind., II, p. 982. IHQ. 1926, 758.
mentioned in a Shorkot inscription edited by Vogel. In the opinion of that scholar the mound of Shorkot marks the site of this city of the Śibis.1

The Siboi dressed themselves with the skins of wild beasts, and had clubs for their weapons.

The Mahābhārata2 refers to a rāșhtra or realm of the Śivis ruled by king Uśinara, which lay not far from the Yamunā.3 It is not altogether improbable that the Uśinara country was at one time the home of the Śivis. We find them also in Sind, in Madyamikā (Tambavatī nagarī?) near Chitor in Rājputāna,5 and in the Daśa-kumāra-charita, on the banks of the Kāverī.6

17. The Agalassoi:
This people lived near the Siboi, and could muster an army of 40,000 foot and 3,000 horse.

18. The Sudracaee or Oxydrakai:
The accounts of Curtius and Diodoros leave the impression that they lived not far from the Siboi and the Agalassoi, and occupied part of the territory below the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenāb. At the confluence Alexander garrisoned a citadel and thence came into the dominions of the Sudracaee and the Malli (Mālava). The former may have occupied parts of the Jhang and Lyallpur districts. The name of the Sudracaee or the Oxydrakai represents the Sanskrit Kshudraka. They were one of the most numerous and warlike of all the Indian tribes in the Pañjāb. Arrian in one passage refers to the “leading men of their cities and their provincial governors” besides other eminent men. These words afford us

1 Ep. Ind., 1921, p. 16.
2 III. 190-131.
4 Vide pp. 65, 66 ante.
6 The southern Śivis are probably to be identified with the Chola ruling family (Kielhorn, List of Southern Inscriptions, No. 685).
7 Inv. Alex., 293-4, 296-7.
8 Mbh., II. 52, 15; VII. 68.9.
a glimpse into the internal condition of this and similar tribes.

19. The Malloi:

They seem to have occupied the right bank of the lower Hydorotes (Rāvi) and are mentioned as escaping across that river to a city of the Brāhmaṇas. The Akesines (Chenāb) is said to have joined the Indus in their territory. Their name represents the Sanskrit Mālava. According to Weber, Āpiśali (according to Jayaswal, Kātyāyana), speaks of the formation of the compound “Kshaudraka-Mālavāḥ.” Smith points out that the Mahābhārata couples the tribes in question as forming part of the Kaurava host in the Kurukshestra war. Curtius tells us that the Sudrae and the Malli had an army consisting of 90,000 foot soldiers, 10,000 cavalry and 900 war chariots.

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar informs us that Pāṇini refers to the Mālavas as living by the profession of arms. In later times they are found in Rājputāna, Avanti and the Mahī valley.

20. The Abastanoi:

Diodorus calls them the Sambastai, Arrian Abastanoi, Curtius Sabraca, and Orosius Sabagrae. They were settled on the lower Akesines (Chenāb) apparently below the Mālava country, but above the confluence of the Chenāb and the Indus. Their name represents the Sanskrit Āmbashṭha or Āmbatḥa. The Ambashthas are mentioned in several Sanskrit and Pāli works. An Ām-

---

1 Megasthenes and Arrian (2nd ed.), p. 196. The accuracy of this statement may be doubted. The Malloi territory seems to have included part of the Jhang district, besides a portion of South Lyallpur, West Montgomery, and perhaps North Multan.

2 EML., 1914, p. 94n.; Mbh., VI. 59. 195.

3 Invasion of Alexander, 234.


5 Invasion of Alexander, p. 292.

6 Dr. Surya Kānta draws a distinction between Ambashṭha and Ambastha, regarding the former as a place-name, and the latter as the name of a particular class of people, "an elephant-driver, a Kshatriya, a mixed caste". (B.C. Law, Vol. II, pp. 187ff). To us the distinction seems to be based upon philosophical conjectures.
bashṭha king is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa whose priest was Nārada. The Mahābhārata mentions the Ambashṭhas along with the Śvis, Kshudrakas, Mālavas and other north-western tribes. The Purāṇas represent them as Ānava Kshatriyas and kinsmen of the Śvis. In the Bārhaspatya Arthasastra, the Ambashṭha country is mentioned in conjunction with Sind:

Kāśmīra-Hūn-Āmbashṭha-Sindhavāh.

In the Ambaṭṭha Sutta, an Ambaṭṭha is called 'a Brāhmaṇa. In the Smyti literature, on the other hand, Ambashṭha denotes a man of mixed Brāhmaṇa and Vaiśya parentage. According to Jātaka IV. 363, the Ambaṭṭhas were farmers. It seems that the Ambashṭhas were a tribe or clan who were at first mainly a fighting race, but some of whom took to other occupations, viz., those of priests, farmers and, according to Smyti writers, physicians (Ambashṭhānāṁ chikitsitami).

In the time of Alexander, the Ambashṭhas were a powerful tribe having a democratic government. Their army consisted of 60,000 foot, 6,000 cavalry and 500 chariots.

In later times the Ambashṭhas are found in South-Eastern India near the Mekala range, and also in Bihar and possibly in Bengal.

1 VIII. 21.
2 II. 52. 14-15.
4 Ed. F. W. Thomas, p. 21.
6 Manu. X. 47. Dr. Surya Kānta suggests the reading (Law Volume, I, 134) cha hāstīnam. In his dissertation he speaks of the possibility of Ambashṭha being a Sanskritized form of a Celtic word meaning 'husbandman, tiller of the ground'. It is also pointed out that the word may be an exact parallel to 'mahāmātra' inasmuch as 'ambhāś' means 'of large measure', 'an elephant', so that Ambashṭha would mean 'one sitting on the elephant', i.e., a driver, a keeper, a sāmanta, or a Kshatriya. They lived on warfare, presumably as gajārohas, and banner-bearers.

A distinction is drawn between Ambashṭha and Ambashṭha. The last mentioned expression is considered to be a place-name, based on the plant name Amba. For other notes on the subject see Prabāśī, 1351 B. S.; I, 206; JUΦH, July-Dec., 1945, pp. 148 ff; History of Bengal (D. U.), pp. 568 ff.
7 Invasion of Alexander, p. 252.
8 Cf. Ptolemy, Ind. Ant., XIII, 361; Brihat Sāhhitā; XIV. 7; Mekhaltā
21-22. The Xathroi and the Ossadioi

The Xathroi are according to McCrindle the Kshatri of Sanskrit literature mentioned in the Laws of Manu as an impure tribe, being of mixed origin. V. de Saint-Martin suggests that in the Ossadioi we have the Vasāti of the Mahābhārata, a tribe associated with the Śibis and Sindhu-Sauviras of the Lower Indus Valley. Like the Abastanoi, the Xathroi and the Ossadioi seem to have occupied parts of the territory drained by the lower Akesines (Chenāb) and situated between the confluence of that river with the Rāvi and the Indus respectively.

23-24. The Sodrai (sogdoi) and the Massanoi:

They occupied Northern Sind with contiguous portions of the Pañjāb (Mithan-kot area) and the Bahawalpur state, below the confluence of the Pañjāb rivers. The territories of these two tribes lay on opposite banks of the Indus. The Sodrai are the Sūdra tribe of Sanskrit literature, a people constantly associated with the Ābhiras who were settled near the Sarasvatī. Their royal seat (basileion) stood on the Indus. Here another Alexandria was founded by the Macedonian conqueror.

musha of Mārkaṇḍeya P., LVIII. 14, is a corruption of Mekal-Ambashta. Cf. also the Ambashta Kāyaśtas of Bihār, the Gauḍa Ambashta of the Surjan-Charita (DHNI., II. 1061 n. 4) of the time of Akbar, and the Vaidyas of Bengal whom Bharata Mallika classes as Ambashta. This is not the place to discuss the authenticity or otherwise of the tradition recorded by Bharata and some of the Purāṇas. The origin of the Vaidyas, or of any other caste in Bengal, is a thorny problem which requires separate treatment. What the author aims at in these pages is to put some available evidence, early or late, about the Abastanoi. That some Ambashtas, and Brāhmaṇas too, took to the medical profession is clear from the evidence of Manu and Atri (Samhitā, 578) and Bopadev. It is equally clear that the Vaidya problem cannot be solved in the way it has been sought to be done in some recent publications. Due attention should be given to historical evidence hearing on the point like that of Megasthenes and of certain early Chalukya, Pāṇḍya, and other epigraphs, e.g. the Talamanchi plates, Ep. Ind. IX. 101; Bhandarkar's List 1971, 2061, etc.

1 Invasion of Alexander, p. 156 n.
2 VII. 19. 11; 89. 37; VIII. 44. 99.
3 "Āmabhāhāh Sāraṇaḥ Śivayo’tha Vaśātayah" (Mbh., VI. 106. 8).
4 "Vaśātī Śindhu-Sauvīrāḥ itipṛāya tikutsītāḥ."
5 "Gandharāh Śindhu-Sauvīrāḥ Śivayo’tha Vaśātayah" (Mbh., VI. 51 14).
6 Patañjali, 1. 2. 3; Mbh., VII. 19. 6; IX. 37. 1.
25. The kingdom of Mousikanos:

This famous state included a large part of modern Sind. Its capital has been identified with Alor in the Sukkur district. The characteristics of the inhabitants of the realm of Mousikanos as noticed by Strabo are given below: ²

The following are their peculiarities; to have a kind of Lacedæmonian common meal, where they eat in public. Their food consists of what is taken in the chase. They make no use of gold nor silver, although they have mines of these metals. Instead of slaves, they employed youths in the flower of their age, as the Cretans employ the Aphamiotæ, and the Lacedæmonians the Helots. They study no science with attention but that of medicine:³ for they consider the excessive pursuit of some arts, as that of war, and the like to be committing evil. There is no process at law but against murder and outrage, for it is not in a person’s own power to escape either one or the other; but as contracts are in the power of each individual, he must endure the wrong, if good faith is violated by another; for a man should be cautious whom he trusts, and not disturb the city with constant disputes in courts of justice.”

From the account left by Arrian it appears that the “Brachmans,” i.e., the Brâhmanaṣas exercised considerable influence in the country. They were the instigators of a revolt against the Macedonian invadore.⁴

26. The principality of Oxykanos:

Curtius calls the subjects of Oxykanos the Praesti (Prosbtas?).⁵ Oxykanos himself is styled both by Strabo and Diodoros Portikanos. Cunningham places his terri-

---

¹ Bevan in Camb. Hist. Ind., p. 377, following Lassen (Inv. Alex., 157 n) restores the name as Müshika. Dr. Jayaswal in his Hindu Polity suggests Muchukarna. Cf. Maushikára (Patañjali, IV. i. 4).
² H. & F., III, p. 96.
³ This trait they shared with the Ambashthas (cf. Manu, X. 47).
⁴ Chinnock, Arrian, p. 319. Cf. Strabo, xv. i. 66,—"Nearchos says that the Brachmans engage in the affairs of the state and attend the king as councillors."
⁵ Mbh., VI. 9. 61.
tery to the west of the Indus in the level country around Larkhana. 1

27. The principality of Sambos: 2

Sambos was the ruler of a mountainous country adjoining the kingdom of Mousikanos, with whom he was at feud. His capital, called Sindimana, has been identified, with little plausibility, with Sehwan, a city on the Indus. 3 According to Diodoros 'a city of the Brähmanas' (Brähmanāvāta ?) had to be stormed whilst the operations against Sambos were going on. 4

28. Patalene:

It was the Indus delta, and took its name from the capital city, Patala probably near the site of Bahmanābād.

Diodoros tells us 5 that Tauala (Patala) had a political constitution drawn on the same lines as the Spartan; for in this community the command in war was vested in two hereditary kings of different houses, while a Council of Elders ruled the whole state with paramount authority. One of the kings in the time of Alexander was called Moeres. 6

The states described above had little tendency to unity or combination. Curtius tells us 7 that Ambhi, ruler of Taxila, 8 was at war with Abisares and Poros. Arrian informs us that Poros and Abisares were not only enemies of Taxila but also of the neighbouring autonomous tribes. On one occasion the two kings marched against the Kshudrakas and the Mālavas. 9 Arrian further tells us that the relations between Poros and his nephew were far from friendly. Sambos and Mousikanos were also on hostile terms. Owing to these feuds and strifes amongst the petty states, a foreign invader had no united

1 Invasion of Alexander, p. 158; AGI., Revised ed. 300.
2 Sambhu, according to Bevan (Camb. Hist. Ind., 377). Samba is a possible alternative.
4 Diod. XVII. 103. 1; cf. Alberuni (I. 516; II. 262).
5 Inv. Alex., p. 396.
6 Inv. Alex., p. 256, cf. Maurya.
7 Inv. Alex., p. 292.
8 Chinnock, Arrian, p. 297.
resistance to fear; and he could be assured that many among the local chieftains would receive him with open arms out of hatred for their neighbours.

The Nañdas of Magadha do not appear to have made any attempt to subjugate these states of the Uttarāpatha (North-West India). The task of reducing them was reserved for a foreign conqueror, viz., Alexander of Macedon. The tale of Alexander’s conquest has been told by many historians including Arrian, Q. Curtius Rufus, Diodoros Siculus, Plutarch and Justin. We learn from Curtius that Scythians and Dahae served in the Macedonian army. The expedition led by Alexander was thus a combined śaka-Yavana enterprise. The invader met with no such general confederacy of the native powers like the one formed by the East Indian states against Kūñika-Ajātaśatru. On the contrary he obtained assistance from many important chiefs like Āmbhi of Taxila, Sangāeus (Sañjaya ?) of Pushkarāvatī, Kophaios or Cophaeus (of the Kābul region ?), Assagetes (Aśvajit ?), and Sisikottos (Saśigupta) who got as his reward the satrapy of the Assakenians. The only princes or peoples who thought of combining against the invader were Poros and Abisares, and the Mālavas (Malloï), Kshudrakas (Oxydrakai), and the neighbouring autonomous tribes. Even in the latter case personal jealousies prevented any effective results. Alexander met with stubborn resistance from individual chiefs and clans, notably from Astes (Hastī or Ashtaka ?), the Aspasians, the Assakenians, the elder Poros, the Kathaians, the Malloï, the Oxydrakai, and the Brāhmanas of the kingdom of Mousikanos. Massaga, the stronghold of the Assakenians, was stormed with great difficulty, Poros was defeated on the banks of the Hydaspes (B.C. 326), the Malloï and the Oxydrakai were also no doubt crushed. But Alexander found that his Indian antagonists were different from the effete troops of Persia. Diodoros informs us that at Massaga, where Alexander treacherously massacred the

1 *Inv. Alex.*, p. 208.
2 *Inv. Alex.*, p. 112.
mercenaries, "the women, taking the arms of the fallen, fought side by side with the men."\footnote{\textit{Inv. Alex.}, p. 270.} Poros, when he saw most of his forces scattered, his elephants lying dead or straying riderless, did not flee—as Darius Codomannus had twice fled—but remained fighting, seated on an elephant of commanding height, and received nine wounds before he was taken prisoner.\footnote{\textit{Cf. Bury, History of Greece for Beginners}, pp. 428-29.} The Malloi almost succeeded in killing the Macedonian king. But all this was of no avail. A disunited people could not long resist the united forces of the Hellenic world led by the greatest captain of ancient Europe. Alexander succeeded in conquering the old Persian Provinces of Gandhāra and "India," but was unable to try conclusions with Agrammes king of the Gangaridae and the Prasii, \textit{i.e.}, the last Nanda king of Magadha and the other Gangetic provinces in Eastern India. Plutarch informs us that the battle with Poros depressed the spirits of the Macedonians and made them very unwilling to advance further into India. Moreover, they were afraid of the "Gandaritai and the Praisaii" who were reported to be waiting for Alexander with an army of 80,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 8,000 war-chariots and 6,000 fighting elephants. As a matter of fact when Alexander was retreating through Karmania he received a report that his satrap Philippos, governor of the Upper Indus Province, had been murdered (324 B.C.). Shortly afterwards the Macedonian garrison was overpowered. The Macedonian governor of the Lower Indus satrapy had to be transferred to the north-west borderland beyond the Indus and no new satrap was appointed in his place. The successors of Alexander at the time of the Triparadeisos agreement in 321 B.C. confessed their inability to remove the Indian Rājās of the Pañjāb without royal troops under the command of some distinguished general. One of the Rājās, possibly Poros, was treacherously slain by Eudemos, an officer stationed in the Upper Indus satrapy. The withdrawal of the latter (\textit{cir.} 317 B.C.) marks the
ultimate collapse of the first serious attempt of the Yavanas to establish an empire in India.

The only permanent effect of Alexander's raid seems to have been the establishment of a number of Yavna settlements in the Uttarāpatha. The most important of these settlements were:

1. The city of Alexandria (modern Charikar or Opian?) in the land of the Paropanisadae, i.e., the Kābyl region.

2. Boukephala, possibly on the east side of the Hydaspes (Jhelum).

3. Nikaia, where the battle with Poros took place.

4. Alexandria at or near the confluence of the Chenāb and the Indus, to the north-east of the countries of the Sodrai, or Sogdoi, and Massanoi, and

5. Sogdian Alexandria, below the confluence of the Panjāb rivers.

Asoka recognised the existence of Yona (Yavana) settlers on the north-western fringe of his empire, and appointed some of them, (e.g., the Yavana-rāja Tushāspha) to high offices of state. Boukephala Alexandria flourished as late as the time of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea. One of the Alexandrias (Alasanda) is mentioned in the Mahāvarṣa.

---

1 According to Tarn (The Greeks in Bactria and India, 1st. ed., 464) Alexandria stood on the west bank of the united Panjshir-Ghorband rivers near the confluence facing Kāpiśa on the east bank. It is represented by the modern Begram.

2 Nikaia and Boukephala stood on each side of the Jhelum. Tarn thinks (Alexander the Great, Sources and Studies, p. 238) that Boukephala stood on the east bank of the Jhelum and Nikaia on the west bank (ibid. p. 238).

3 The completion of Nikaia is doubted by Tarn (Alexander the Great, II. 298).

4 The confluence of the Indus and the Akesines was fixed as the boundary of the Upper and Lower Indus satrapies.

5 Inv. Alex., pp. 293, 354; Bury, History of Greece for Beginners, p. 433; Camb. Hist. Ind., I. 376f.

6 For the nationality of Tushāspha and significance of the term "Yavana" see Raychaudhuri, Early History of the Vaishnavas Sect, 2nd Ed., pp. 28f, 314 post.

7 Schoff's tr., p. 41.

8 Geiger's tr., p. 194.
Alexander's invasion produced one indirect result. It helped the cause of Indian unity by destroying the power of the petty states of north-west India, just as the Danish invasion contributed to the union of England under Wessex by destroying the independence of Northumbria and Mercia. If Ugrasena-Mahāpadma was the precursor of Chandragupta Maurya in the east, Alexander was the forerunner of that emperor in the north-west.